

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



Inaugurated Resurrection in Earliest Christianity

Hayter, Daniel

Awarding institution:
King's College London

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Inaugurated Resurrection in Earliest Christianity

by

Daniel W. Hayter

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Theology and
Religious Studies,

King's College London

June 2023

Abstract

This thesis focuses on the concept of ‘inaugurated resurrection’ within earliest Christianity. By ‘inaugurated resurrection’ is meant the view that believers have experienced a present resurrection with Christ, in advance of their final resurrection at his return. Earlier scholars often understood this to be a Pauline belief, visible in Romans 6.1–14, and rooted in the influence of the Graeco-Roman mystery cults. In contrast, modern scholars often contend that this is a view which Paul did not espouse. Instead, it emerged as a later development of his more futuristic view of resurrection.

This study contends that belief in inaugurated resurrection is already discernible in Paul’s own writings, in large part due to the influence of Scripture. Following recent work by John Yates, it is suggested that the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 (and the vision of resurrection in 37.1–14 in particular) on Paul’s understanding of the gift of the Spirit helps to explain this belief. In brief: Paul saw inaugurated resurrection as a way of speaking of receiving the Spirit.

To demonstrate this, the reception of Ezekiel 36–37 on Second Temple Jewish literature is explored, in order to situate Paul’s own understanding of these chapters in the wider Jewish context. This is followed by an extensive exploration of Ezekiel 36–37 in Paul’s own writings. It becomes clear that Paul’s pneumatology was deeply influenced by these chapters. Particularly relevant for this study, Paul understood Ezekiel’s vision of the resurrection of dry bones (Ezek 37.1–14) to have been fulfilled in the present in the gift of God’s Spirit to those in Christ.

Paul’s understanding of Ezekiel is then brought to bear on a close exegesis of Romans 6.1–14. Against much modern scholarship, it is argued that Paul describes a present, inaugurated resurrection for believers. Furthermore, the nature of this resurrection is consistent with Paul’s understanding of the Spirit’s work as influenced by Ezekiel 36–37. This understanding of inaugurated resurrection is the same as that displayed in both Colossians and Ephesians. It is argued that this continuity has clear implications for the question of authorship of these letters. Finally, Paul’s view of the Spirit in light of Ezekiel 36–37 helps to explain the strong connection between inaugurated resurrection and baptism. In fact, this association with baptism could also open the door for thinking of inaugurated resurrection as a bodily phenomenon. Again, here, Paul’s understanding of the Spirit provides the link. Far from being non-bodily,

inaugurated resurrection, by baptism in one Spirit, implies incorporation into the resurrected body of Christ.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Table of Contents	4
Abbreviations	8
Chapter 1: Introduction	11
1.1 The Question of Inaugurated Resurrection.....	11
1.2 Inaugurated Resurrection in Modern Scholarship.....	17
1.2.1 Inaugurated Resurrection as an Early Pauline Belief	18
1.2.2 Inaugurated Resurrection as a pre-Pauline View which Paul Rejects.....	25
1.2.3 Alexander Wedderburn: Inaugurated Resurrection as a deutero-Pauline Development	29
1.2.4 After Wedderburn: The Question of the Origins of Inaugurated Resurrection.....	30
1.2.5 John Yates and the Spirit of Life	32
1.3 Moving Forward.....	34
1.4 Outline of this Study.....	36
Chapter 2: The Approach of this Study	38
2.1 Introduction	38
2.2 Echoes, Allusions and the Mind of the Author	39
2.3 Beyond the Explicit Text.....	42
2.3.1 Metalepsis	43
2.3.2 Allusions to Matrices of Texts and Traditions	45
2.3.3 Conclusion: Beyond the Explicit Text.....	47
2.4 Tests for Identifying Allusions and Echoes.....	48

2.5 Summary and Approach of the Study	51
Chapter 3: The Influence of Ezekiel 36–37 in Early Judaism	53
3.1 Introduction	53
3.2 Ezekiel 36–37 in Context	53
3.2.1 Some Preliminary Text-Critical Questions.....	53
3.2.2 The Message of Ezekiel 34–37.....	59
3.2.3 The Use of רוּחַ in Ezekiel.....	60
3.2.4 Ezekiel 36–37	61
3.2.5 Conclusion	68
3.2.6 Excursus: Ezekiel 34–37 and Jeremiah 31	68
3.3 Reception of Ezekiel 36–37 in Early Judaism.....	70
3.3.1 Septuagint	70
3.3.2 Dead Sea Scrolls	75
3.3.3 Other Early Jewish Texts.....	84
3.4 Excursus: The Dura-Europos Ezekiel Cycle	91
3.5 Conclusion.....	93
Chapter 4: Ezekiel 36–37 in Pauline Literature.....	95
4.1 Introduction	95
4.2 Ezekiel in the New Testament.....	95
4.3 Ezekiel 36–37 in Paul’s Letters.....	98
4.3.1 Paul’s Familiarity with Ezekiel	98
4.3.2 2 Corinthians 2–7.....	102
4.3.3 1 Corinthians.....	111
4.3.4 Romans 7–8	117
4.3.5 1 Thessalonians.....	132
4.3.6 Galatians	134

Table of Contents

4.3.7 Ephesians 2	137
4.4 Conclusion: Ezekiel 36–37 in Pauline Literature	145
Chapter 5: Inaugurated Resurrection in Romans 6	147
5.1 Introduction	147
5.2 Paul’s Language of Resurrection.....	149
5.2.1 Vocabulary Used to Refer to Jesus’ Resurrection or Resurrected Life.....	150
5.2.2 Vocabulary Used to Refer to Believers’ Resurrection	150
5.2.3 Ezekiel 37.1–14 and the Question of Resurrection-Language	152
5.3 Christ’s Resurrection and Salvation in the Present.	152
5.4 Romans 6.1–14 and Inaugurated Resurrection.....	155
5.4.1 Text and Translation	155
5.4.2 An Overview of Romans 6.1–14	157
5.4.3 A Common Tradition?	158
5.4.4 Exegesis of Key Phrases	161
5.5 Concluding Thoughts: What is the Nature of this Present Life?.....	182
Chapter 6: Inaugurated Resurrection in Colossians and Ephesians.....	185
6.1 Introduction	185
6.2 Colossians.....	185
6.2.1 Inaugurated Resurrection in Colossians 2.11–13	185
6.2.2 Resurrection Ethics in Colossians 3.1–4	192
6.2.3 Conclusion	194
6.3 Ephesians 5.14b.....	195
6.3.1 A Baptismal Hymn?	195
6.3.2 Realised or Inaugurated?	199

6.3.3 Conclusion	201
6.4 Conclusion and Implications for Authorship	201
Chapter 7: Baptism, Body and Resurrection.....	206
7.1 Introduction	206
7.2 Baptism and Inaugurated Resurrection	206
7.2.1 The Symbolism of Burial and Resurrection in Baptism.....	207
7.2.2 Baptism and the Gift of the Spirit.....	209
7.2.3 Conclusion: Baptism and Inaugurated Resurrection	220
7.3 Body, Church, Baptism and Resurrection	221
7.4 Conclusion.....	228
Chapter 8: Conclusions and Implications	230
8.1 Summary	230
8.2 Implications and Further Research.....	233
8.2.1 Did this Belief Originate with Paul?.....	234
8.2.2 The Authorship of Colossians and Ephesians	234
8.2.3 Ezekiel 37 and Later Christian Writers	235
8.3 Conclusion.....	236
Appendix: A Translation of Ezekiel 36.16–37.14	237
Bibliography	241

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
<i>AthR</i>	Anglican Theological Review
BDAG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 3 rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000 (Danker-Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich)
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Loveniensium
<i>BIOSCS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
<i>Bsac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
<i>BT</i>	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
<i>BYUSQ</i>	<i>BYU Studies Quarterly</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CGTC	Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary
<i>Colloq</i>	<i>Colloquium</i>
ConBNT	Coniectanea Neotestamentica or Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
<i>DLNT</i>	<i>Dictionary of the Later New Testament and Its Developments</i> . Edited by Martin P. Ralph and Peter H. Davids. Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1997.
<i>DNTB</i>	<i>Dictionary of New Testament Background</i> . Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000.
EBib	Etudes bibliques
ECL	Early Christianity and Its Literature
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
EJL	Early Judaism and Its Literature
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
<i>FN</i>	<i>Filología Neotestamentaria</i>
HTANT	Historisch Theologische Auslegung Neues Testament

Abbreviations

IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JCT	Jewish and Christian Texts
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSPL</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Paul and his Letters</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
LHBOTS	The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LNTS	The Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9 th ed. With revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996
LSTS	The Library of Second Temple Studies
<i>OTP</i>	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NIDNTT</i>	<i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i> . Edited by Colin Brown. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975–1978
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NTL	New Testament Library
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>Numen</i>	<i>Numen: International Review for the History of Religions</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OTS	Old Testament Studies
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentaries
<i>QC</i>	<i>Qumran Chronicle</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>ScEs</i>	<i>Science et Esprit</i>

Abbreviations

SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and Its World
SPCK	Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TPINTC	TPI New Testament Commentaries
TS	Texts and Studies
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
UNT	Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament
UUA	Uppsala Universitetsårskrift
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
ZECNT	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
<i>ZNW</i>	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 The Question of Inaugurated Resurrection

To a greater extent than it is anything else, Christianity – at least the Christianity of the New Testament – is a religion of resurrection; and it is this to a greater extent than is any other religion.¹

Earliest Christianity was a resurrection-centred movement. The impetus of this obsession with resurrection was the belief that its founder, Jesus of Nazareth, had been raised from the dead to everlasting life. From the very early days of its existence, the Christian movement confessed that the Messiah had been raised from the dead on the third day, in accordance with the Scriptures.²

Yet belief in resurrection was not a Christian innovation. By the time of Jesus' life, resurrection had become a major eschatological belief for many Jews, who claimed that God would one day raise them from the dead to everlasting life. This belief is attested in many Second Temple Jewish texts.³ Additionally, the evidence suggests that resurrection, for early Jews, referred to the raising of a *body* of some kind; it was not a way of describing immortality of the soul.⁴ Early Jewish texts which referred to

¹ C. F. Evans, *Resurrection and the New Testament*, SBT (London: SCM, 1970), 1.

² 1 Cor 15.4. 1 Corinthians 15.3b–5 is commonly agreed to be an early creedal formula. 'Form criticism has established that within 1 Cor 15:3–7 Paul quotes a primitive Christian creed originally formulated during the earliest years of the Jesus movement' (Kirk R MacGregor, '1 Corinthians 15:3b–6a,7 and the Bodily Resurrection of Jesus', *JETS* 49.2 [2006]: 225–26). Amongst the many commentaries and articles, Conzelmann gives a helpful summary of the reasons it is clearly a pre-Pauline tradition: Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 251–54. See also the good and brief summary of reasons in Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 3rd ed., New Testament Library (SCM Press, 1966), 101–2. Harnack thinks that two statements have been combined: one focused on the appearances to Peter and the Twelve; the other focused on the appearance to James and all the apostles (summarised in Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 251–52). Héring restricts the tradition to verses 3b–4 and claims that the absence of *παρὰ κυρίῳ* suggests that the tradition is from the early church (Jean Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, trans. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock [London: Epworth, 1962], 158). So also William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther, *1 Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32 (New York: Doubleday, 1976), 320.

³ See for example 1 En. 51.1–5; 2 Macc 7; 12.42–44; 14.46; 4Q521; 4Q385; T. Sim. 6.7; T. Jud. 25.1–5; T. Zeb. 10.2; T. Ben. 10.6–8; Sib. Or. 2.221–26; 4.181–84; LAB 3.10; 4 Ezra 7.31–32; 2 Bar. 30.1–5; 49–51; Josephus, *J.W.* 2.163; 3.374; Apoc. Mos. 13.2–6.

⁴ I have argued this in detail in my MA dissertation as well as in Daniel W. Hayter, "'How Are the Dead Raised?': The Bodily Nature of Resurrection in Second Temple Jewish Texts", in *The Body in Biblical*,

resurrection sometimes described the kind of body which would be raised. For example, whilst describing in lurid detail the torture of seven brothers under Antiochus Epiphanes' persecution, 2 Maccabees 7 envisages a strong continuity between the present and future bodies:

From heaven I have gained these [hands], and because of his laws I overlook them, and from him I hope to get them back again. (2 Macc 7.11)⁵

Elsewhere, there is very little continuity between the body which dies and that which is raised. For example, 2 Baruch 50–51 describes a resurrection for the righteous in which they initially resemble their old selves (that the wicked may recognise their vindication). Subsequently, though, they are 'changed into any shape which they wished' (2 Bar 51.10).⁶ Yet other texts do not make explicit the nature of resurrected existence. However, there is no clear evidence of the terminology of resurrection being used to refer to disembodied immortality.⁷ The overall assumption is that a *body* is raised.

This view of future, bodily resurrection for the righteous was carried over into early Christianity, although it was reshaped around the belief in the resurrection of Jesus. The New Testament attests to the widespread early Christian hope of a future resurrection of the dead at the eschaton.⁸ In line with early non-Christian Jewish understanding, this was to be a *bodily* experience. Even in 1 Corinthians 15, a text which many scholars have used to play down this notion of *bodily* resurrection, the apostle Paul speaks of a σῶμα, body, being raised. The fact that it is described as

Christian and Jewish Texts, ed. Joan E Taylor, LSTS (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 123–43. See also N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God: Christian Origins and the Question of God* (London: SPCK, 2003), 129–206; John Granger Cook, 'Resurrection in Paganism and the Question of an Empty Tomb in 1 Corinthians 15', *NTS* 63.1 (2017): 56–75 and references.

⁵ Unless otherwise specified, translations of Greek and Hebrew texts are my own. Unless specified, the Greek text of the LXX is taken from Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, Revised Edition; the Greek text of the New Testament is taken from *Nestle-Aland* 28th Edition; text from the Hebrew Bible is drawn from *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.

⁶ Trans. A. F. J. Klijn, *OTP* 1:638.

⁷ The most likely exception to this is Jubilees 23.30–31, which could hint at the idea of a resurrection of the spirit. However, this is not as clear as it might seem, as I argue in Hayter, 'How Are the Dead Raised?', 131–32.

⁸ E.g. Matt 22.23–33; Mark 12.18–27; Luke 20.27–40; John 5.25; 6.39–40; Acts 23.6–10; 24.15, 21; Rom 8.10–11, 23; 11.15; 1 Cor 6.13–14; 15; 2 Cor 1.9–10; 4.13–5.10; Phil 3.10–11, 20–21; Col 3.1–4; 1 Thess 4.13–18; Heb 6.1–2; 1 John 3.2; Rev 20.4–6.

πνευματικόν (1 Cor 15.44) does not mean that it is therefore simply interchangeable with ‘spirit’.⁹ Had Paul wanted to argue that resurrection was in fact a form of immortality of the soul, there was a whole Jewish tradition on which he could draw.¹⁰ But Paul was clear: whatever its precise nature the resurrected body is still a body.

At this stage it is appropriate to provide a broad definition of resurrection, as it is used in this work. Drawing together several threads from the above discussion, resurrection, as a concept, refers to *the bringing back of the whole individual to everlasting life*. Because it involves the *whole individual*, it is a bodily phenomenon. It is not the same as disembodied immortality. It involves both body and soul/spirit. Because it entails *everlasting life*, it is different, strictly speaking, to miracles in which an individual is brought back to mortal life (e.g. Elijah and Elisha’s raisings; Lazarus).¹¹ These miracles could perhaps more accurately be referred to as resuscitations or revivifications. That is not to deny the significant overlap conceptually or linguistically between the two,¹² but they are not exactly the same.

Early Christians, as we have seen, believed that Christ had already been bodily raised. They also hoped in their own future, bodily resurrection at his return. However, there remains a particular early Christian use of the language of resurrection which does not seem to fit within the definition given above. Despite the self-evident fact that resurrection at the *parousia* still lay in the future, several early Christian writings claim that believers had, in fact, *already* been raised. Furthermore, this present resurrection, in striking contrast to the definition of resurrection provided above, does not seem to

⁹ See for example Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1276–81. See also the articles: Ronald J Sider, ‘St. Paul’s Understanding of the Nature and Significance of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians XV 1-19’, *NovT* 19.2 (1977): 124–41; MacGregor, ‘1 Corinthians 15:3b–6a,7’; James Ware, ‘Paul’s Understanding of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15:36–54’, *JBL* 133.4 (2014): 809–35; James Ware, ‘The Resurrection of Jesus in the Pre-Pauline Formula of 1 Cor 15.3–5’, *NTS* 60.4 (2014): 475–98.

¹⁰ For example, Wis 3; Ps.-Phoc. 105–15; T. Ash. 6.5. The writings of Philo of Alexandria clearly advocate a desire for disembodied immortality (E.g. *Migr.* 9; *Gig.* 14). See 4 Maccabees’ adaptation of the strong physicality of 2 Maccabees 7. Josephus’ descriptions in *A.J.* 18.18–22 and *J.W.* 2.154–58 associate the Essenes’ afterlife beliefs with disembodied immortality.

¹¹ 1 Kgs 17.17–24; 2 Kgs 4.18–37; 13.20–21; John 11.1–44. See also Matt 9.18–26 (par. Mark 5.21–43; Luke 8.40–56); Luke 7.11–17; Acts 9.36–42; 20.7–12.

¹² The case of Lazarus is a helpful example. It is a revivification to mortal life. However, the miracle is clearly used, in part, as a pointer to the reality of future resurrection. ‘Even before the last day, and *in anticipation of it*, Jesus’ cry “Lazarus, come out!” proved to be an instance when the dead heard the voice of the Son of God (5:25, 28–29) and sprang to life’ (D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* [Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1991], 418 [my italics]).

involve a body. It is this present, seemingly non-bodily view of resurrection which will be the focus of this thesis.

This present form of resurrection is most clearly attested in Pauline literature.¹³ In the undisputed letters this is clearest in Romans 6.1–14. In this passage, Paul explains that believers were ‘baptised into [Christ’s] death (εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν)’ (6.3). They were also buried through baptism (6.4). But this was not the end. The aim of death and burial was that they would ‘walk in newness of life (ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν)’ (6.5). As a result, believers are to think of themselves as ‘dead to sin but alive to God in Christ Jesus (ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ)’ (6.10) and they are described ‘as those alive from the dead (ὥσπερ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας)’ (6.13). This seems to refer to believers undergoing a form of resurrection this side of the eschaton.¹⁴ This is not a present resurrection *at the expense of* a future one. Within Romans itself Paul refers to a future resurrection, described as ‘the redemption of our body’ (8.23 – τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν). Furthermore, in light of the future redemption of the body, the present resurrection to which Romans 6.1–14 refers appears at first sight to be non-bodily. This is in stark contrast to the bodily nature of resurrection in early Jewish writings observed above.

This view is also displayed in the disputed letters of Colossians and Ephesians.¹⁵ For example:

[you have been] buried together with him [Christ] in baptism, in which also you were raised (συνηγέρθητε) together through faith in the working of God who raised him from the dead (Col 2.12)

If therefore you were raised (συνηγέρθητε) with Christ, seek the things above, where the Christ is seated at the right hand of God. (Col 3.1)

And he [God] raised us up with him (συνήγειρεν) [i.e. Christ] and seated us with him in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus. (Eph 2.6)

¹³ At this stage, I use the expression ‘Pauline literature’ to refer to New Testament writings which are attributed to Paul, without making an explicit judgement on authorship.

¹⁴ Many readers will be aware that it is controversial to simply state that Romans 6.1–14 refers to dying *and* rising with Christ. I will seek to show that this is the case below in chapter 5.

¹⁵ No judgement will be made at this stage on the authorship of Colossians and Ephesians. I will, however, draw out some implications of our study for the question of authorship towards the end of chapter 6.

As with Romans 6, this does not appear to be a replacement of a future eschatology with a present one. Indeed, in Colossians, the writer also refers to the future *parousia* of Christ (3.4). Ephesians, admittedly less clearly, also has a futuristic outlook, referring, for example, to the coming of God's wrath (e.g. 5.6). These letters seem to assume both a past/present resurrection and a future one for the believer.

In this thesis, resurrection as both a present and a future reality will be referred to as *inaugurated resurrection*. This expression is an intentional nod to the broader notion of 'inaugurated eschatology' in New Testament studies. The concept of inaugurated eschatology recognises that early Christians understood the age to come to have dawned in the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, as well as in the gift of the Spirit. The notion is often associated with George Elton Ladd, though he was by no means the first to make the case for it (nor does he particularly tend to use the phrase itself). The focus of the debate to which Ladd contributed was Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God. Was it a purely present reality? Or was it a future reality? Ladd, and others, insisted that it was not either/or but both/and. This was, on the one hand, in contrast to the 'consistent' or 'thoroughgoing' eschatologies of scholars such as Schweitzer and Weiss.¹⁶ It was, on the other hand, clearly distinguished from the 'realised' eschatology of other scholars, most famously C. H. Dodd, for whom Jesus saw the kingdom as having already come (without much, or any, place for a future consummation of the kingdom in space and time).¹⁷ Although agreement on the details was still needed, according to Ladd, '[t]here is a growing consensus in New Testament scholarship that the Kingdom of God is in some sense both present and future.'¹⁸ Anthony Hoekema, writing only shortly after Ladd, and himself a proponent of the phrase 'inaugurated eschatology,' summarised this view as follows:

¹⁶ Weiss and Schweitzer are often seen as the most significant early figures in promoting a thoroughgoing eschatology, in reaction to earlier writers who promoted non-eschatological understandings of the historical Jesus (for more thorough surveys of this history see George Eldon Ladd, *The Presence of the Future: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974], 3–42; Anthony A. Hoekema, *The Bible and the Future* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979], 288–316). The main works by Weiss and Schweitzer that are cited in the literature are Johannes Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900); Albert Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: Eine Geschichte der Leben Jesu Forschung* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1906).

¹⁷ For Dodd, see C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, Rev. ed. (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1961) (particularly 21–59). His view was also summarised in C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), 79–96.

¹⁸ Ladd, *Presence of the Future*, 3.

We conclude, then, that the nature of New Testament eschatology may be summed up under three observations: (1) the great eschatological event predicted in the Old Testament has happened; (2) what the Old Testament writers seemed to depict as one movement is now seen to involve two stages: the present age and the age of the future; and (3) the relation between these two eschatological stages is that the blessings of the present age are the pledge and guarantee of greater blessings to come.¹⁹

This makes sense of many New Testament writings. It is surely what the author to the Hebrews had in mind when writing of those who had tasted the ‘powers of the age to come (δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος)’ (Heb 6.5).²⁰ It is also certainly what Paul had in mind when he wrote of Christ as ‘the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep (ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων)’ (1 Cor 15.20) and of the Holy Spirit as ‘firstfruits’ (Rom 8.23). But both Romans 8 and 1 Corinthians 15 make it unambiguously clear that the end had not yet come (Rom 8.24; 1 Cor 15.24). The age to come had been *inaugurated*, but it had not been fully realised, hence the phrase ‘inaugurated eschatology.’²¹

Inaugurated resurrection, then, is a subset of this broader category of inaugurated eschatology. After all, resurrection was an eschatological belief, but it had now broken into the present age, both in the resurrection of Jesus and in the inaugurated resurrection of believers.

As noted above, it is striking that this belief involves applying the language of resurrection to an apparently non-bodily phenomenon. Unlike in 1 Corinthians 15, there is no mention of the transformation of believers’ bodies when they die and rise with Christ in baptism. In that sense, inaugurated resurrection does not appear to be a literal eschatological resurrection as I have defined it above, or at the very least it is an *incomplete* form of resurrection. It involves using the language and concept of resurrection (which was understood to be a bodily reality) to refer to something which

¹⁹ Hoekema, *Bible and the Future*, 21–22.

²⁰ See Hugh W. Montefiore, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, BNTC (London: A. & C. Black, 1964), 109: ‘The powers of the age to come are the present manifestations of the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. Xii. 1 ff), which break in, from baptism onwards, on those on whom the ends of the world have come (1 Cor. X. 11).’ Also William L Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, WBC 47A (Dallas, TX: Word, 1991), 142: ‘The present period was already pervaded by the power of the coming age, which, through Christ, had made a profound inroad upon the community.’

²¹ One of the most significant proponents of inaugurated eschatology, in the sense that it provides the foundation for his whole understanding of biblical and New Testament theology, is G. K. Beale. See particularly G. K. Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011).

does not (yet) involve the raising of individual bodies to everlasting life.²² This raises the question of how this specific belief could have emerged, and how early it did. A. J. M. Wedderburn has asked the question well:

when and how easily was the language of ‘*resurrection*’ spiritualized in such a way that it could be used to refer to an existence which was, at least outwardly, still being lived out in this world and on this side of death? Did it not originally have such physical and material connotations that it was only with difficulty that Christians came to reinterpret it figuratively, so that ‘*resurrection*’ could apply to an existence still in this world subject to decay and death?²³

The problem is clear: how did something which had such clear bodily connotations come to be applied to something which apparently did not involve a normal, human body? How early and how easily did this belief emerge, and what context allowed for its growth? It is these questions this study seeks to answer.

1.2 Inaugurated Resurrection in Modern Scholarship

This question (how did the belief in inaugurated resurrection emerge?) received substantial attention in earlier New Testament scholarship, but it has not received as much attention in recent years. Because the texts which attest to this idea of resurrection are part of the Pauline tradition (whether authentic or not), answering this question has mainly been the task of Pauline scholarship. Furthermore, as will be clear below, there is a clear sense in which the history of this question is more narrowly a history of the interpretation of Romans 6.1–14. At the risk of oversimplifying a complex discussion, it is possible to trace some key stages over the last century. These key stages are outlined below.

²² It would therefore be accurate to refer to this as a *metaphorical* view of resurrection, since it is not a literal raising of individual bodies to everlasting life. Nonetheless, as we shall see, it is a metaphor with a high degree of ‘correspondence’ – that is a metaphor in which the image, or *vehicle*, which is used (resurrection) and the reality, or *tenor*, which it points towards (receiving the Spirit, I shall argue) share very strong conceptual parallels (see George B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980], 153–54. On vehicle and tenor see also below 152 footnote 22). It is surely this high degree of correspondence which means that Paul, as I shall argue, is able to claim that those in Christ have experienced resurrection. The language and concept of resurrection are appropriate to describe the phenomenon we are studying whilst recognising that it is not, strictly-speaking, a literal resurrection.

²³ A. J. M. Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology against Its Graeco-Roman Background*, WUNT 44 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 87.

Before proceeding, it should be noted that scholars have not generally used the phrase ‘inaugurated resurrection’ to describe the phenomenon in view. Expressions such as ‘dying and rising with Christ’ or ‘present resurrection’ are more common. For the sake of clarity, though, I will use the expression ‘inaugurated resurrection’ as broadly equivalent to these.

1.2.1 Inaugurated Resurrection as an Early Pauline Belief

The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries saw a proliferation of scholarly investigations into the origins of Paul’s view of dying and rising with Christ. The main text discussed was Romans 6.1–14. Despite varied conclusions on the background(s) of this belief, scholarship of the period was in almost unanimous agreement that Paul himself understood believers to have already been raised with Christ.²⁴ As such, this belief was thought to be *at least* as early as Paul himself and possibly a Pauline innovation.

A Pauline Belief Modelled on the Mysteries

Scholars of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* argued that the background to Paul’s view of dying and rising with Christ was to be found in the mystery cults of the ancient Hellenistic world.²⁵ Initiates in the mysteries would supposedly undergo a ritual of participation in the death and resurrection of the mystery’s god.²⁶

²⁴ Søren Agersnap writes that in the early decades of the twentieth century ‘[T]here is a consensus about the Pauline intention in the text [Rom 6.1–14]: Paul consistently expresses himself with enthusiasm about the certainty of final redemption, about the total turnabout from the old sinful existence to the new righteous life’ (Søren Agersnap, *Baptism and the New Life: A Study of Romans 6.1–14* [Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1999], 17).

²⁵ According to Wagner, Gustav Anrich was the first to provide a full investigation into the influence of the mystery religions on early Christianity. Anrich claimed that the early Christian rite of baptism would have been viewed as a mystery concept within the ancient world. However, unlike many subsequent scholars, he did not think that Paul himself took his own view of baptism from the mysteries. Rather, Pauline baptism was ‘an original product of Christian genius based upon genuine Judaism’ (Gustav Anrich, *Das Antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*. [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1894], 110 quoted in Günter Wagner, *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries* [Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1967], 7).

²⁶ Probably the most commonly cited text is in Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 11. In this book, Lucius wishes to become an initiate of the Isis mystery. When he expresses his desire, a priest tells him, ‘both the gates of death and the guardianship of life were in the goddess’s hands, and the act of initiation was performed

How consciously Paul had modelled his view of baptism on these cults was variously explained. Some suggested that the influence was indirect, mediated via Judaism.²⁷ Others pointed to Paul's own direct exposure to such ideas in the Hellenistic world. For example, Heitmüller drew attention to the influence of the Mithras cult in Tarsus, Paul's birthplace. There, Paul was likely immersed in a culture of mysteries and of dying and rising gods. His own religious experience could have therefore also been clothed in these pictures and thoughts. It would then make sense for him to think of baptism in the same way as the mystery religions.²⁸ Wilhelm Bousset adds that Paul could simply assume that his pagan converts would be familiar with this language when he wrote of baptism.²⁹

Alfred Loisy argued that Paul introduced this mystery element into Christianity but without intentionally borrowing from the mysteries. There is clearly influence but we do not need to prove complete correspondence. For him, Christianity was a mystery, but a unique one.³⁰ For Loisy, and others, Christianity being modelled on, or influenced by, the mysteries was not meant to detract from its uniqueness. Christianity was regularly seen as the greatest of the mysteries, but a mystery nonetheless.³¹

One common emphasis of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* was to posit a major difference between Pauline (and Hellenistic) Christianity and earliest Jewish Christianity, particularly in their respective understandings of baptism. Holtzmann, for example, claimed that 'im ganzen Komplex paulin. Gedanken kein Element dem im Boden Israels wurzelnden Geist der Verkündigung Jesu so fern und fremdartig

in the manner of voluntary death and salvation obtained by favour' (Apuleius, *Metam.* 11.21, LOEB translation).

²⁷ So Hermann Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903), 83–84.

²⁸ Wilhelm Heitmüller, *Taufe und Abendmahl im Urchristentum* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1911), 24–25.

²⁹ Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1970), 157: 'The belief must already have been present that baptism as an act of initiation is a dying and coming to life again, somehow comparable to Christ's death and resurrection.'

³⁰ Alfred Firmin Loisy, *Les Mystères Païens et Le Mystère Chrétien* (Paris: Émile Nourry, 1914), 357–58. See the concluding comment on 363: 'Quoi que l'on fasse, il restera toujours, en dernière analyse, que, si le christianisme des premiers temps n'a rien copié, rien emprunté littéralement, il s'est essentiellement conformé aux mystères, tout en les dépassant.'

³¹ Gunkel quotes Pfleiderer with approval: 'Wie unvergleichlich höher an Werte ... stehen diese Mysterien (Taufe und Abendmahl) über allen heidnischen!' (Gunkel, *Religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis*, 333).

gegenübersteht, wie gleich die Lehre von der Taufe.³² Wilhelm Heitmüller saw (as many others did) a clear distinction between the earthly Jesus, in whom the earliest, Palestinian church had a keen interest (the Christ ‘according to the flesh’), and the spiritual Jesus in whom Paul lived and who lived in Paul. Somewhat rhetorically, Heitmüller asks, ‘[w]ie könnte der irdische Jesus, der Χριστὸς κατὰ σάρκα, für ihn [Paul] wichtig sein?’³³ In line with this, Loisy claims that Paul had abandoned Judaism and the historical Jesus, and had inaugurated a religion in which, as in the mysteries, there were no ethnic requirements. The Jesus of history did not lie behind Paul’s Christ. Instead, the ‘Spiritual Christ’ was the real focus of Paul’s faith.³⁴ In some quarters this view endured long after the *Religionsgeschichtliche* view had lost its popularity. For example, in the mid-twentieth century, S. G. F. Brandon still affirmed the school’s broad conclusions, seeing a strong disconnect between Paul’s Gospel and that of the Jerusalem church. He even claimed that the ‘other Gospel’ referred to in Galatians 1.6 was that of the Jerusalem church.³⁵ In his view, a strong rift existed between Jewish Christianity and Hellenistic Christianity, with inaugurated resurrection having no place or origin in the former. Its source was to be found in the mystery cults.

In summary, whether Paul consciously borrowed, adapted, or was unconsciously influenced by the mystery cults, these scholars agreed that the mystery religions of the Graeco-Roman world were the strongest parallels to the Pauline (or pre-Pauline, which Paul also adopts) view of baptism as dying and rising. Importantly, all of these scholars agreed that dying and rising with Christ in the present was reflected in Romans 6.1–14.

³² Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1911), 2:196. Herman Gunkel heartily agreed with this assessment and refers to the first edition of Holtzmann’s work in Gunkel, *Religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis*, 83.

³³ W. Heitmüller, ‘Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus’, *ZNW* 13 (1912): 323.

³⁴ Loisy, *Les Mystères Païens et Le Mystère Chrétien*, 269.

³⁵ S. G. F. Brandon, ‘The Historical Element in Primitive Christianity’, *Numen* 2.1 (1955): 160–61. See also S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1951).

Detractors from the Background of the Mysteries

Although all scholars in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries agreed that Paul taught present dying and rising with Christ, not all thought that he had been influenced by the mystery cults of dying and rising gods.³⁶

For some, the main influence was Paul's own experience. For example, Adolf Deissmann saw Paul's Christianity as a religion of mystical fellowship with Christ, a view which grew out of Paul's own experience. Deissmann claimed that 'the ancient Christians were easily able to comprehend the mystic application of the several stages of baptism to death, burial, and resurrection with Christ, because, having been baptized as adults they had an indelibly vivid recollection of the ceremony performed on them by immersion.'³⁷ Through baptism, Deissmann argued, the believer is included in the mystical body of Christ, and as such has participated in what is true of this body. The believer has therefore already been raised with Christ.³⁸ This idea, Deissmann argued, is included in the 'undogmatic element' of Paul, the part of his theology which is difficult to understand intellectually but which comes down to an inward, mystical experience.³⁹ So, according to Deissmann, Paul came to understand the believer as mystically raised with Christ seemingly without recourse to the mystery cults. Rather, *experience* was the bedrock of Paul's theology of dying and rising with Christ.

This emphasis on experience is also present in W. E. Wilson's work. Although Wilson admits that the mysteries had influenced Paul somewhat, he contends that the origin of his view of dying and rising with Christ came from a specific personal experience in his life.⁴⁰ Wilson notes that in 1 Corinthians the doctrine of dying and rising with Christ is absent. It does not appear in 1 or 2 Thessalonians either. Later, though, it emerged in embryonic form in 2 Corinthians 4–5, in chapters which are very personal. Paul had been, Wilson argues, through a mortal distress. He notes:

³⁶ In fact, Anrich (see above), who was apparently first to undertake a full comparison of Paul's belief with the mystery cults, did not himself think that the mysteries were the source of Paul's belief.

³⁷ Adolf Deissmann, *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*, trans. William Edward Wilson, 2nd ed. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1926), 182–83.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 182.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ William E. Wilson, 'The Development of Paul's Doctrine of Dying and Rising Again with Christ', *ExpTim* 42.12 (1931): 562–65. Wilson highlights two key items which would differentiate Paul's view from those of the mysteries: (1) Salvation was a present experience, not just a promise of future immortality, as in the mystery religions. (2) Salvation was by faith. 'These two positions are fundamental to Paul's thought' (*Ibid.*, 563).

In this terrible experience the presence of Christ had been so strongly with him that he felt himself to be going through the very Passion itself, and then, as despair was turned into joy through release, his experience of return to life seemed like being raised with Christ.⁴¹

Henceforth, Paul could feel that he had participated in Christ's sufferings. 'From this point onwards, dying with Christ and Rising again with Him is an essential element in Paul's doctrine of salvation.'⁴² This doctrine is then more clearly obvious in Romans and Galatians.⁴³

Albert Schweitzer looked to eschatology rather than primarily to experience to find the source of Paul's concept of dying and rising with Christ. As did Deissmann, Schweitzer pointed to the centrality of the body of Christ metaphor. But for him, the background of this metaphor was to be found in early Judaism where the community of God would be united both together and to the Messiah. Whereas in Jewish eschatology this was a future hope, with Jesus this eschatological idea 'receives an anticipatory realisation.'⁴⁴ According to Schweitzer, Jesus himself emphasised the idea of belonging to him in his teaching.⁴⁵

Paul, according to Schweitzer, developed Jesus' own mysticism and made it appropriate to a time after his death and resurrection. Schweitzer argued that whilst the earliest church originally looked forward to their *future* fellowship with Christ, Paul claimed that the elect's union with Christ was *already* being worked out in the present.⁴⁶ This union is due to the fact that the elect have secretly, but truly, died and been raised with Christ. Believers are already 'supernatural beings' although 'not yet manifest.'⁴⁷ Still working within a Jewish framework, Paul refused to separate the resurrection of

⁴¹ Wilson, 'Dying and Rising Again', 564.

⁴² Ibid., 565.

⁴³ Wilson also makes the point that his argument gives more credibility to the late date of Galatians; he claims that the chief argument for this is its similarity to Romans (Ibid., 565). Some recent arguments in favour of the southern Galatian hypothesis would place Galatians earlier, though, and could prove to be a flaw in Wilson's argument (see Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 [Dallas, TX: Word, 1990], lxi–lxxxviii; Douglas J. Moo, *Galatians*, BECNT [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013], 4–18).

⁴⁴ Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, trans. William Montgomery, 2nd ed. (London: A. & C. Black, 1953), 105.

⁴⁵ 'He [Jesus] brings them [his hearers] again and again face to face with the thought that by fellowship with Him they have fellowship with the Son of Man' (Ibid., 109).

⁴⁶ Ibid., 109.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 110.

Jesus and the general resurrection and therefore claims that believers have participated in resurrection proleptically. Schweitzer notes:

The original and central idea of the Pauline Mysticism is therefore that the Elect share with one another and with Christ a corporeity which is in a special way susceptible to the action of the powers of death and resurrection, and in consequence capable of acquiring the resurrection state of existence before the general resurrection of the dead takes place.⁴⁸

This happens, in Schweitzer's view, at baptism. The baptised person is automatically included within the mystical body of Christ.⁴⁹ This is not a concept found in Hellenism, claims Schweitzer: 'Since the concept of the mystical body of Christ and the concomitant concept of being-in-Christ have their roots in eschatology it is impossible to find sources for them in Hellenistic literature.'⁵⁰ For Schweitzer, eschatology is the key to this mystical understanding of dying and rising with Christ.

Other scholars pointed to the supposed Old Testament idea, very popular in the early to mid-twentieth century, of *corporate personality* to explain Paul's understanding of dying and rising with Christ. In his influential study of Baptism in Paul, Rudolf Schnackenburg states that Paul's idea of baptism was not modelled on the initiation rituals of the mysteries.⁵¹ He highlights several problems with seeing Christian baptism in the same light as these initiation rites.⁵² But Schnackenburg does not thereby negate the efficacious nature of baptism, nor does he deny that the believer has already participated in Christ's resurrection. Baptism, he argued, brings one into association with the salvific events of Easter. Schnackenburg believed that Paul drew on the Semitic idea of corporate personality: 'When we join ourselves in faith to the

⁴⁸ Ibid., 116.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 116–17.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 118.

⁵¹ Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of St Paul: A Study in Pauline Theology*, trans. George R. Beasley-Murray (Oxford: Blackwell, 1964).

⁵² Ibid., 141–45: (1) There was a key difference between the mystery cults' stories and early Christianity's founding story: in the mystery cults, these stories are myths, are often related to fertility and seasons and are often very extraordinary. In Christianity, however, the story is a historical event. (2) In Christianity, it is the salvation-historical event which takes centre-stage and not the symbol itself. This is unlike the way the mysteries have the initiate embodying the divinity. (3) In Christianity, the ritual is incomplete without proclamation. In the mysteries the ritual is thought of as efficacious, whereas faith works alongside baptism in Christianity, and there is also an ethical interest which is not so present in the mysteries. (4) Paul's view of the final consummation is unlike the beliefs of the mystery religions; Paul does not disparage the body. It is something which will eventually be transformed.

new Founder of the race and in baptism become members of the “Body of Christ”, we gain a share in his death and resurrection and step with Him from death to life.’⁵³ Furthermore, he claimed that this idea of dying and rising with Christ is specifically Pauline: ‘its formulation is the original work of the Apostle.’⁵⁴ Schnackenburg also emphasised the role of the Spirit in bringing the believer into union with Christ. Baptism, as is clear from 1 Corinthians 12.13, mediates the Spirit. As such, dying and rising with Christ happens in the ‘pneuma-sphere.’ Dying and rising with Christ is only possible because Christ is a life-giving spirit.⁵⁵ It is the result of coming under the Lordship of Christ, who is the founder of a new corporate race, and of being united to the pneuma-Christ.

Perhaps the most important study in terms of its criticism of the mystery-cult view is Günter Wagner’s study, *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries*.⁵⁶ Wagner provided a thorough survey of the supposed parallels to Paul’s thoughts on baptism in Romans 6.1–11 in particular, exploring the cults of Eleusis, Osiris-Isis, Tammuz and Marduk, Adonis, and Attis.⁵⁷ All of these supposed parallels are problematic, he argues. They do not provide a background to Paul’s understanding of baptism in Romans 6.1–11, and therefore this precludes them from being the source of the idea of present resurrection with Christ. Wagner instead finds the source of Paul’s teaching on baptism as dying and rising with Christ in Christian tradition and Jewish background. As did Schnackenburg, Wagner thought that the Old Testament idea of ‘corporate personality’ provides the way of thinking about how the believer is linked with the representative and salvific events of the death and resurrection of Jesus.⁵⁸ ‘For [Paul] the baptised person was involved in the “history” that began with Christ, i.e. in the eschatological event of the Cross and Resurrection.’⁵⁹

The greatest contribution of Wagner’s study was mainly negative. It provided the strongest case yet against the view that Paul had himself directly depended on the mystery cults for his view on baptism. Though not all agreed with his conclusions (see

⁵³ Ibid., 162.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 162–66.

⁵⁶ Wagner, *Pauline Baptism*. The German is Günter Wagner, *Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem von Römer 6, 1–11* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1962).

⁵⁷ Wagner, *Pauline Baptism*, 61–256.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 286–94.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 293.

below), Wagner's work did mainly end the view which had been propounded by the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*. The source of Paul's view on dying and rising was no longer to be found in the mystery cults.

1.2.2 Inaugurated Resurrection as a pre-Pauline View which Paul Rejects

Since Wagner's study appeared, almost no scholars have traced Paul's own view of present resurrection to the mystery cults. Instead, another view emerged as 'an accepted axiom of New Testament studies.'⁶⁰ Scholars began to argue that inaugurated resurrection was a pre-Pauline, Hellenistic-Christian belief. However, whereas Romans 6.1–14 was previously read as a defence of inaugurated resurrection, it was now commonly read as a *rebuttal* of an enthusiastic and earlier Hellenistic-Christian view. Furthermore, it was often claimed that this earlier view was preserved and revived in Colossians and Ephesians (considered deutero-Pauline). According to this view, some of Paul's followers (the authors of Colossians and Ephesians) revived a belief which Paul himself had explicitly denied in Romans 6.

Rudolf Bultmann sits on the edge of this modification thesis. For Bultmann, the 'historical presupposition for Paul's theology is not the kerygma of the oldest Church [i.e. the Jerusalem Church] but that of the Hellenistic Church; it was the latter that mediated the former to Paul.'⁶¹ This Hellenistic church understood baptism as similar to the initiation rites of the mysteries. Bultmann (unlike others after him) is keen to stress that Paul does not *counter* this view. Indeed, he assumes it in Romans 6.1–14. However, Paul does *adapt* this view by adding that the guarantee of future resurrection is 'an already present resurrection which realizes itself in ethical conduct.'⁶² So Bultmann sees a strong ethical aspect to Paul's modification. For Bultmann, though, this is still not Paul's own view on the matter. According to him, Paul's own view is based more on Gnostic thought: the idea of the body of Christ.⁶³ Also, for Paul it is not baptism *qua* baptism which makes Christ's death and resurrection available to the believer, but the proclamation of the word. Paul attempted to partly (though not completely) strip baptism of its association with the mystery religions and saw it as the

⁶⁰ Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 1.

⁶¹ Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1965), 1:63.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 1:140.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 1:141.

foundation for ethical life: he did not see baptism as guaranteeing salvation (e.g. 1 Cor 10.1–12), and he saw it as subordinate to the word (1 Cor 1.17).⁶⁴ Bultmann then sees the school of Paul continuing this thought, as seen in Colossians and Ephesians.⁶⁵ So for Bultmann, Paul sought to partly disassociate the idea of dying and rising in baptism from the mystery religions by emphasising the ethical aspect of the motif. Bultmann did not, as most proponents of the adaptation theory suggest, think that Paul wished to *explicitly counter* the idea of a present resurrection. Rather he simply emphasised the moral and ethical aspect of this present resurrection over a more ontological aspect.

Eduard Schweizer continued broadly in this kind of view. For him, Paul was faced with an early Christian belief which had developed in which those who had been baptised were already transferred into the kingdom of God. He explains this perspective:

Baptism was first conceived of as the divine promise or even God's guarantee for the participation in these coming events, for the entry into the kingdom of God. More and more it became the admission into the present kingdom of God or of Christ, and was understood as being raised with Christ to the life of the new aeon. The experience of the Spirit seemed to prove that the new aeon had in the church already broken into this world; resurrection was already an accomplished fact, since it had taken place in the rising with Christ in baptism.⁶⁶

It seems that Schweizer does not, unlike others, explicitly argue that Colossians and Ephesians revive this early view.⁶⁷ Nonetheless, he does think that Paul was opposed to this belief: 'Paul emphasizes that the rising with Christ is still to be awaited.'⁶⁸ Something definitive happened at baptism: the believer died with Christ. Paul does explain, according to Schweizer, that there is new life for the believer. However, this life is not to be understood as something ontological. Instead, '[t]his life had to validate

⁶⁴ Ibid., 1:311–12.

⁶⁵ He notes that Colossians 3.1 is closer to the thought of Romans 6.2f than are Colossians 2.12ff and 2.16ff. Ephesians 2.5f is similar, but the idea of dying with Christ has faded a bit. However, according to Bultmann, the complete mystery idea reappears in 2 Timothy 2.11 (Ibid., 1:141–42).

⁶⁶ Eduard Schweizer, 'Dying and Rising with Christ', *NTS* 14.1 (1967): 8.

⁶⁷ In fact in his commentary on Colossians, he seems to think that Colossians 2.12 is indebted to Romans 6.4 or another Pauline tradition to do with baptism (Eduard Schweizer, *Der Brief an die Kolosser*, EKKNT [Zürich: Benziger, 1976], 111).

⁶⁸ Schweizer, 'Dying and Rising', 8.

itself in the obedience of the believer.’⁶⁹ For Schweizer, Paul reserved the concept of resurrection for something which was in the future.

Eduard Lohse also propounded this view. He argued that whilst the mysteries held to different mythologies, a uniting factor was that ‘through the initiation, a person is reborn to immortality.’⁷⁰ That these mystery religions influenced early Christianity is taken for granted by Lohse. The mysteries promised an unbreakable link between the initiate and the deity. Therefore, many Christians, in Lohse’s view, took the view that through baptism they had been irreversibly united to Christ. However, ‘Paul very sharply opposes these views and emphasizes that baptism and the Supper do not – as is assumed of the mysteries – bestow a material gift of salvation, but rather subject the Christian to the lordship of Christ, in order that one day they might be raised from the dead and be united with him.’⁷¹ Again, resurrection is projected squarely and exclusively into the future. Lohse gave a similar view in his earlier commentary on Colossians: ‘In many circles of Hellenistic Christianity baptism was thought to convey divine powers of life by means of which the baptized person experienced in himself the resurrection of Christ.’ However, he argued that Paul puts resurrection in the future to counter ‘an enthusiastic evaluation of baptism which would conceive of it as a pledge of accomplished resurrection [sic]’.⁷²

As noted above, some scholars started to assume that the pre-Pauline understanding of inaugurated resurrection was later revived in Colossians 2.11f and Ephesians 2.14f.⁷³ In his study on dying and rising with Christ, Robert Tannehill claims, without much support, that Romans 6 is not the most primitive association of dying and rising with baptism. In Colossians 2 dying and rising are associated with baptism, but there rising is past. Tannehill claimed that the ideas of Colossians 2 are earlier (i.e. a follower of Paul must have revived them) because in Romans 6 Paul presupposes the idea of past resurrection with Christ (v.4 and vv.11 and 13) but speaks of resurrection

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Eduard Lohse, *The New Testament Environment* (London: SCM, 1976), 234.

⁷¹ Ibid., 242.

⁷² Eduard Lohse, *A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, trans. William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 103.

⁷³ See Wedderburn’s assessment: Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 1–6.

with Christ as still future. This suggests that Paul has modified an already existing idea.⁷⁴

Käsemann also understood Paul to be correcting an earlier, Hellenistic-Christian enthusiasm. However, he took issue with the extent to which Günter Wagner had dismissed the mystery cults as valid parallels to baptism in early Christianity. In particular, he thinks that he plays down the Isis initiation ceremony from Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.⁷⁵ He claims that Paul 'must have used an understanding that was current in the Hellenistic community, since the idea of dying and rising again with the Redeemer can even less be explained in terms of Judaism.'⁷⁶ So Käsemann sees the mysteries as a valid parallel for pre-Pauline views on baptism in the Hellenistic church, views which Paul sought to rein in. Käsemann also agreed that the view expressed in Colossians and Ephesians is earlier than Paul's own:

In the pre-Pauline community outside Palestine baptism was really understood as a mystery event which incorporated one into the fate of the cultic God, Christ. Christ was thereby the heavenly *eikon* who trod the way of redemption first and to whom believers had to be conformed.⁷⁷

Käsemann argued that in Romans 6 Paul sought to correct this idea by noting that while the Christian has been united with Christ's death, he or she has not yet been united with his resurrection.⁷⁸

By the 1980s, the view that Paul was consciously modifying or countering a pre-existing, Hellenistic-Christian view of dying and rising with Christ had become something of a consensus. As such, it was common to claim that whilst the earliest Hellenistic Christians, under the influence of the mysteries, saw themselves as having participated in Christ's resurrection, Paul sought to show that this was not yet the case (except perhaps in a restricted, ethical sense). For Paul, resurrection was to be placed squarely in the future. Yes, the believer had participated in Christ's death, but

⁷⁴ Robert C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ: A Study in Pauline Theology*, BZNW 32 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967), 10. It is this assumption which formed the impetus for Wedderburn's later study: Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 1.

⁷⁵ Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (London: SCM, 1980), 161. Käsemann refers to Niklaus Gämman, *Taufe und Ethik: Studien zu Römer 6* (Munich: Kaiser, 1967), 44ff; Klaus Wengst, 'Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums.' (1967), 39ff.

⁷⁶ Käsemann, *Romans*, 161.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 162.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 160–71.

resurrection proper was still to come. For many who held this view, the authors of Colossians and Ephesians (considered deuterio-Pauline) revived an early understanding which Paul had himself countered: Christians had already been raised with Christ in baptism. According to these scholars, the mystery religions did influence early Hellenistic Christianity and led to the view that resurrection with Christ had already happened. This coincides with many of the earlier views of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*. However, against these earlier views, Paul himself *countered*, rather than adopted this idea.

1.2.3 Alexander Wedderburn: Inaugurated Resurrection as a deuterio-Pauline Development

In the late 1980s, A. J. M. Wedderburn's study on baptism and resurrection dealt a significant blow to the view we have just outlined.⁷⁹ Wedderburn took issue with the fact that New Testament scholarship had come to assume that inaugurated resurrection was both pre-Pauline and non-Pauline. He was unconvinced that the authors of Colossians and Ephesians, letters Wedderburn considers pseudonymous, would revive a view which Paul had himself explicitly countered in Romans 6.1–14. Wedderburn agreed that Paul places resurrection squarely in the future in Romans 6. However, he disputed the idea that Paul was countering an existing and overly enthusiastic view. Paul's language in Romans 6 is, to say the least, 'unguarded,'⁸⁰ if he were actively countering an already existing view of present resurrection.

What of Colossians and Ephesians? The dominant view prior to Wedderburn's work was that these deuterio-Pauline epistles revived an earlier view of present resurrection, the same view that Paul had explicitly countered in Romans and 1 Corinthians. Wedderburn was unconvinced. Although he considers it to be deuterio-Pauline, he dates Colossians to within Paul's lifetime.⁸¹ This makes the theory that its author (a follower of Paul) was expounding an anti-Pauline view difficult to sustain. Wedderburn, instead, contended that the authors of Colossians and Ephesians were

⁷⁹ Mainly Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*. See also A. J. M. Wedderburn, 'Hellenistic Christian Traditions in Romans 6', *NTS* 29.3 (1983): 337–55; A. J. M. Wedderburn, 'The Soteriology of the Mysteries and Pauline Baptismal Theology', *NovT* 29.1 (1987): 53–72.

⁸⁰ Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 46.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 71.

simply expanding and developing Paul's own view. This could well have been in response to the broken parallelism of Romans 6.4, a parallelism which would not have taken a huge logical leap to complete. This could also have happened in response to the specific situation faced in Colossians particularly: in view of the ascetic teachings in the Colossian church, the author emphasises the completeness of what Christ had done. The author of Ephesians then would have drawn on Colossians but dropped its polemical aspect. Wedderburn argues that far from reviving the idea of realised resurrection, Colossians and Ephesians actually 'help to bring it into being.'⁸² As such, belief in inaugurated resurrection was a post-Pauline development and its emergence can be explained as a progressive development of Paul's own theology, a theology in which resurrection was originally an exclusively future reality for the believer.

1.2.4 After Wedderburn: The Question of the Origins of Inaugurated Resurrection

Wedderburn's study appears to have led to a sea-change on the question of dying and rising with Christ. The views of both the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* and those who saw Paul as countering an earlier Hellenistic-Christian view have now been laid to rest. But where did the concept of an inaugurated resurrection come from? The fact that, to my knowledge, no full-length study of the background of inaugurated resurrection has been attempted since Wedderburn's book shows just how effectively he has laid the views highlighted above to rest.⁸³ Romans 6 does indeed not seem to contain any evidence of polemic against a previous, enthusiastic view of baptism. Additionally, Wedderburn is surely correct that later followers of Paul (the authors of Colossians and Ephesians) would be unlikely to intentionally revive a position which Paul himself had strongly countered. Most, it seems, would agree with Wedderburn on this.

However, that is not to say that the subject of inaugurated resurrection is no longer hotly debated. On the contrary, there is currently a stark split in scholarship between those who suggest that Paul himself put resurrection exclusively into the future and those who think that he held to a belief in inaugurated resurrection. This split in

⁸² Ibid., 84.

⁸³ There is the exegetical study of Romans 6.1–14 by Søren Agersnap (*Baptism*) which is of interest, though its focus is more narrowly on Romans 6 and baptism itself, rather than specifically inaugurated resurrection.

scholarship usually runs down the line between those who see Colossians as pseudonymous and those who do not.⁸⁴ On the one hand, those for whom Colossians is authentic, obviously, see the belief as Pauline, or at least as accepted by Paul, and generally then read Romans 6.1–14 as referring to inaugurated resurrection. On the other hand, those for whom Colossians is deutero-Pauline tend to view inaugurated resurrection as a post-Pauline belief. Indeed, from the latter camp there is a strong reticence to see any traces of present resurrection in Paul's undisputed letters. So Bart Ehrman notes, with characteristic confidence: 'it is quite clear [in Romans 6.1–6] that, whereas those who have been baptised "have died" with Christ, they decidedly have not been "raised up" with him yet.'⁸⁵

It is probably fair to say that this strong reticence to see inaugurated resurrection in Paul's undisputed letters represents the current majority view in critical commentaries and articles. If Paul himself placed resurrection squarely in the future, then (on the view of Colossians as *pseudonymous*) it makes sense to follow Wedderburn's suggestion that a later follower of Paul developed Paul's own view and explicitly spoke of resurrection with Christ in baptism. As such, the question of the belief's origins is not particularly problematic: Paul himself sees the presence of the risen Lord as operating in the believer, but he does not think of the believer as raised with Christ yet; a later follower did not express such caution. This is a straightforward explanation of how this belief could emerge in a context which saw resurrection as bodily.

But this view rests on two assumptions: firstly, that Paul himself did not speak of inaugurated resurrection in Romans 6; secondly, that Colossians is post-Pauline. However, both assumptions are worth rethinking. Indeed, on the second assumption (that Colossians is pseudonymous), a growing number of scholars are not convinced by the arguments against Pauline authorship.⁸⁶ This development itself makes it at least

⁸⁴ Though see James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, WBC 38A (Waco, TX: Word, 1988), 316–18. Dunn sees Paul as speaking of a temporal future and using eschatological reserve in Romans 6.1–11. However, he also argues for the Pauline authorship of Colossians, albeit with the help of a secretary, perhaps even Timothy (James D. G. Dunn, *Commentary on Colossians and Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text.*, NIGTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996], 35–39).

⁸⁵ Bart D. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counter-Forgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 176.

⁸⁶ See for example Douglas Campbell's recent case for Pauline authorship: Douglas A. Campbell, *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Account* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 260–309. Particularly

worth rethinking whether inaugurated resurrection is simply a later expansion of a more reserved Pauline view.

But even if Colossians is pseudonymous, there are some serious weaknesses with the first assumption (that Paul himself does not believe in inaugurated resurrection).⁸⁷ Claims, such as Ehrman's (above), that in Romans 6, the believer has 'decidedly' not been raised yet are often overly confident. Michael Gorman is representative of several scholars in their growing frustration with this view when he states,

Some New Testament scholars seem blindly, dogmatically opposed to the idea of present resurrection and insist only on a future resurrection in Paul. This is simply wrong, as both Galatians 2 and Romans 6 (plus Romans 8) show.⁸⁸

Although the link with the mystery religions has rightly been laid to rest, it is telling that the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* nonetheless assumed that present resurrection was attested in the undisputed Pauline epistles. This is even more significant when we remember that these scholars almost all held to the pseudonymity of Colossians and Ephesians. Perhaps the claim that Paul himself did not, or *could not*, claim that the believer is already raised with Christ, has been pressed too strongly. It is time for a reassessment.

Amongst those who do understand *inaugurated* resurrection to be present in Paul, there has not been a full-length attempt to trace the background and earliest development of such a belief. If, as we will suggest, there is reason to question the view that inaugurated resurrection was a post-Pauline, or late Pauline development, then the question of how early this belief is and how it could have grown still requires an answer.

1.2.5 John Yates and the Spirit of Life

Although, to my knowledge, there have been no further full-length studies on the origin and source of the idea of inaugurated resurrection in early Christianity, John Yates'

significant is the fact that Campbell dates Colossians very early on compared to, say, Romans. As such the development thesis would not work with Campbell's dating.

⁸⁷ For a start, it feels like this reticence is too closely bound up with the view that *if* Colossians is pseudonymous, then surely the authentic Paul *could not* have written about resurrection in the same way.

⁸⁸ Michael J. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 75 note 97.

2008 monograph, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul* raises questions and conclusions that provide a helpful way forward.⁸⁹ Yates' thesis is not primarily driven by the question of inaugurated resurrection. Instead, his interest is *pneumatology*, specifically the background and implications of Paul's description of the Spirit as life-giving. Nonetheless, his argument and conclusions have far-reaching implications for the study of inaugurated resurrection.

Yates argues that the background to Paul's description of the Spirit as the Spirit of Life can be traced to the combination of two traditions concerning the Spirit in the Hebrew Scriptures: that of the Spirit as the breath of life, and that of the Spirit as the agent of creation (and renewal of creation). These traditions appear to be initially distinct, but they come to be combined most notably in Ezekiel 36–37, chapters which refer to God giving his Spirit to his people through the imagery of a new heart (Ezekiel 36) and also through the image of resurrection of dry bones (Ezekiel 37). This is a reality which, according to Yates, is developed further in the LXX, particularly in Judith and the Greek text of Ezekiel 36–37. Other early Jewish literature also associates the Spirit with the renewal of creation, particularly in the Qumran *Hodayot*.⁹⁰ Yates argues, convincingly that 'the authors of the *Hodayot* believed themselves and their community to be the recipients of the promised spirit of Ezekiel 37:6, 14.'⁹¹ Yates does not claim that there is a direct influence flowing from Qumran to Paul. Rather he is highlighting the existence of a tradition which shows similarities with Paul.

Turning to Paul, Yates argues that he considered the Spirit of Life to be associated with the act of new creation. Writing of 1 Corinthians 15.45, he notes:

While the breath of God, breathed into the face of Adam, provided the vivifying power of the original creation, now, in light of Christ's resurrection and the subsequent outpouring of the spirit, we are to view the personal divine spirit as the vivifying presence of God in the new creation.⁹²

This idea of the Spirit being the agency of new creation is further seen in 2 Corinthians 3–5 and Romans 8, Yates argues. He notes that the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 is particularly visible in these chapters and that the tradition of associating the Spirit with

⁸⁹ John W. Yates, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul*, WUNT 2/251 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 64–84.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 105.

new creation and resurrection, evident in Ezekiel 36–37, helps to support the view that for Paul, the spirit brings about new life.

If the Spirit's work is fundamentally life-giving in the present and not just in the future, then there is a clear continuity between the present experience of the believer and the future experience of the believer. The Spirit has already brought about new life in the believer, and this is not something that is fully relegated to the eschaton. This has implications for our understanding of inaugurated resurrection, a point which Yates briefly draws out. He briefly argues that the language of Romans 6 suggests that a real resurrection of some kind has been experienced by believers and that Paul's understanding of the life-giving Spirit could account for this. In a footnote, Yates perceptively notes:

The spirit is not mentioned in 6:3–4, but read in the context of Paul's argument in 5:12–8:39 one understands that the phrase *καινότητι ζωῆς* anticipates the spirit's role that Paul describes in chapter 8.⁹³

Yates argues that an understanding of the Spirit as the agency of new creation helps to make sense of how Paul can speak of believers as raised in the present, despite them having not experienced bodily resurrection yet: 'In this context it is perfectly sensible, if not somewhat striking, to speak of the present reality of resurrection *as a way of speaking of the presence of the new creation.*'⁹⁴

1.3 Moving Forward

Yates' work has major implications for the study of inaugurated resurrection. Although his focus was not first and foremost resurrection, he offers a fruitful way forward in the study of inaugurated resurrection in early Christianity. In many ways, this present study builds upon his thesis, particularly his emphasis on the way that Ezekiel 36–37 played a key role in influencing Paul's understanding of the Spirit.

As noted above, the battleground for demonstrating that Paul did or did not believe in inaugurated resurrection is usually Romans 6.1–14, since it is the only passage in the undisputed Pauline letters that seems to explicitly describe rising with Christ in the present, though it has also been interpreted to refute such a notion, as we

⁹³ Ibid., 159 note 2.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 162 emphasis in original.

have seen. The challenge for interpreters is to show that Romans 6.1–14 does in fact describe or imply inaugurated resurrection. However, we have also noted above that scholarship is at something of an exegetical *impasse* on the issue, with some confidently proclaiming that Romans 6 does imply present resurrection and others claiming with equal confidence that it clearly does not. Fresh exegesis is clearly required, but we cannot simply rehash the arguments of previous scholars.

To provide a fresh ingredient in the exegesis of passages such as Romans 6, this thesis builds on one key aspect of John Yates' study: the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on Pauline texts. These chapters contains some of the most famous sections of Ezekiel: the description of God giving his people a new heart, and giving them his Spirit to empower them to obey him (36.22–32). It also includes the vision of the valley of dry bones in which the imagery of resurrection is used to describe both Israel's return to the land, and God's giving of his Spirit to them (37.1–14).⁹⁵ Whereas Yates' interest was more broadly on traditions involving the Spirit of life, my interest is more narrowly on the way that the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 can be seen in Pauline writings, and how that influence can be brought to bear on our exegesis of passages such as Romans 6.1–14. In particular, Ezekiel 37.1–14 is hugely significant for our purposes, as the most detailed description of resurrection in the Hebrew Scriptures.

This claim (that Ezek 37.1–14 is the most detailed description of resurrection in the Hebrew Bible) requires some qualifications and caveats, though. Indeed, the vision is a metaphor for national restoration and renewal, and the image itself of the dead coming to life may not strictly-speaking be one of resurrection, as I have defined it above. It is possible that the image is, instead, one of revivification rather than resurrection to *everlasting* life.⁹⁶ Nonetheless, the conceptual and linguistic overlaps between this vision and the idea of eschatological resurrection are very strong. This is presumably why, as we shall see, it was often interpreted as a vision of eschatological resurrection in many early Jewish texts. As such, even though it is not a vision of eschatological resurrection, it was often read as such, and at the very least provided much of the imagery for the belief. It is with these caveats and qualifications, then, that I consider Ezekiel 37.1–14 to be the most detailed description of resurrection in the

⁹⁵ As we will see in chapter 3, these two visions are complementary and explain each other.

⁹⁶ Though, conversely, since the image is used to refer to a *nation* being restored, it is certainly within the bounds of possibility that the dry bones are raised to everlasting life since they are not to be thought of as representing individual Israelites, but the nation as a whole.

Hebrew Bible, and therefore significant for this study. If there is evidence that Paul believed this vision to have been fulfilled in the outpouring of the Spirit, this could pave the way for a fresh reading of Romans 6 in which present resurrection makes conceptual sense. It could also help to furnish an explanation as to how the language of resurrection came to be applied to a reality that was seemingly not bodily, since this view had some kind of Scriptural background.

We can now refine the questions which will guide this study. Specifically, does Paul's understanding of Ezekiel 36–37 (chapters which, after all, contain a detailed description of resurrection) explain how this belief could have emerged? Was Paul's understanding of the present life of believers shaped by these chapters? If so, what does a reading of Romans 6.1–14 with this in mind look like? Is this reading also reflected in Colossians and Ephesians? Finally, does this make sense of the jarringly non-bodily nature of inaugurated resurrection? All these questions lead us to the question: is inaugurated resurrection, for Paul, another way of speaking of receiving the Holy Spirit?

1.4 Outline of this Study

Since much of this study involves exploring the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on Paul's writings, chapter 2 will set out some methodological pointers for detecting and interpreting echoes and allusions of earlier texts in later ones. I will then explore, in chapter 3, the use of Ezekiel 36–37 in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature. I will seek to understand how Jewish interpreters understood the fulfilment of these promises to be worked out. This is important because it will later be possible to situate Paul's own views within the broader matrix of early Jewish views. In what ways did Paul line up with other Jewish writers? In what ways did he innovate? Chapter 4 then explores the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 in Pauline writings, noting not only *whether* and *where* these chapters are alluded to or echoed, but also *why* and *how* they are alluded to: are they echoed in contexts and ways relevant to the question of inaugurated resurrection? Having established Paul's use of Ezekiel 36–37, I then turn in chapter 5 to provide an exegesis of Romans 6.1–14 in light of this. Are there some assumptions which Paul makes elsewhere in light of Ezekiel 36–37 which impact our understanding of Romans 6? In chapter 6, I turn to Colossians 2 and Ephesians 5. Without arguing for or against Pauline authorship, I explore the level of continuity between inaugurated

resurrection in these letters and Romans 6.1–14. In chapter 7, I ask the question of why inaugurated resurrection is so commonly associated with baptism and also explore the possible bodily nature of this form of resurrection. Chapter 8 then summarises the results of this study and offers conclusions.

Chapter 2: The Approach of this Study

2.1 Introduction

How does one identify and understand the influence of one text on a later author? Is it even possible? What clues and evidence should the reader be looking for? These are important questions. After all, a major aim of this study is to explore whether the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on Paul helps to explain the rise of belief in inaugurated resurrection. Chapters 3 and 4 are given over to exploring the reception and influence of Ezekiel 36–37 in, respectively, early non-Christian Jewish writings and Paul’s writings. The purpose of this present chapter is, therefore, to spell out some of the methods and assumptions which will undergird the process of exploring this influence.

In a general sense, by exploring the influence of a given text on the writings of another author, we are dealing with intertextuality.¹ Studies on intertextuality are becoming more common in biblical studies, as scholars increasingly appreciate how advances in literary studies can aid biblical exegesis.² Several of these advances will be particularly helpful for this project. As will become clear, much of my approach has been influenced by Richard Hays’ ground-breaking work.³ Hays was one of the first, and certainly one of the most influential, to adopt some of the theory of intertextuality from literary studies and bring it to bear on the study of the New Testament (in his case,

¹ B. J. Oropeza explains intertextuality as ‘the presence of a text (or texts) in another text’: Craig A. Evans, B. J. Oropeza, and Paul Sloan, eds., ‘New Studies in Textual Interplay: An Introduction’, in *New Studies in Textual Interplay*, LNTS 632 (London: T&T Clark, 2020), 3. Within the field of literary studies, intertextuality can have a broader meaning dealing with the way that texts are constantly referring to other texts, but also transforming and even ‘destroying’ other works. This ends up becoming applicable to the very nature of language itself. As a very brief introduction, see Anthony C. Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 495–99.

² For some recent examples, see Craig A. Evans, B. J. Oropeza, and Paul Sloan, eds., *New Studies in Textual Interplay*, LNTS 632 (London: T&T Clark, 2020); Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias, eds., *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality: Volume 1: Thematic Studies* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009); Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias, eds., *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality: Volume 2: Exegetical Studies* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009); B. J. Oropeza and Steve Moyise, eds., *Exploring Intertextuality: Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016).

³ In particular, Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

Paul). Much of what follows is indebted to Hays' work and to its impact on other scholars' work.

A couple of caveats are necessary, though: Firstly, although this study is intertextual, it is so in a very restricted sense. Many studies of intertextuality focus on the general interplay of texts. However, I am interested here in how a particular author (Paul) has been influenced by an *earlier* text (Ezekiel 36–37). In that sense this study is *diachronic*. It asks how a certain earlier text been understood by a later writer, rather than, for example, how an interaction of texts leads to fresh contemporary readings of the earlier text. Secondly, unlike some intertextual or modern literary approaches, I am interested primarily in the author's own use of prior material and traditions. Whatever the merit of more radical reader-response approaches, that will not be the focus of this study.⁴

2.2 Echoes, Allusions and the Mind of the Author

What textual evidence in Paul's letters would indicate the influence of Ezekiel 36–37? Clearly, we cannot only rely on word-for-word quotations of passages from Ezekiel, as important as those are. Authors indicate the influence of previous texts in far more subtle and varied ways than straightforward quotations. Much more commonly, authors show the influence of earlier texts through allusions and echoes.

Yet the meaning and implications of each of these terms is not immediately clear. It has often been noted that many of the terms used by biblical scholars in the study of intertextuality are used very loosely and without much definition. For example, what is meant by 'allusion'? How does it differ from an 'echo'? When does something count as a quotation or not? What if the supposed citation does not match the wording of any Old Testament versions we possess, either Greek or Hebrew? Does it thereby cease to be a citation and become an allusion? What of the difference between an allusion and an echo? Do they both require intentionality on the part of the author? If

⁴ Richard Hays (Ibid., 26–27) notes 5 possible *loci* of an intertextual event (one text's use of another): (1) in the mind of the author, (2) in the mind of the original readers, (3) in the text itself, (4) in the modern reader's act of reading and (5) in the community of interpretation. Since the focus of this study is first and foremost Paul's own understanding of Ezekiel 36–37 it is clear that *locus* (1) is the most significant for our purposes. However, the other *loci* are not insignificant and provide a supportive value (i.e. it is more likely that we have identified an intertextual event happening in the mind of the author if it is also happening in the other *loci*).

so, how do we determine whether an allusion is intentional or an echo unintentional? As a result, there has been a growing call for clearer definitions of terms.⁵

Some have responded by providing very clear definitions. In his monograph, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*,⁶ a title which intentionally echoes Richard Hays' earlier work, Christopher Beetham provides a helpful and in-depth discussion of the differences between citation/quotation, allusion and echo. Beetham provides the following definitions:

Quotation: An intentional, explicit, verbatim or near verbatim citation of a former text of six or more words in length. A *formal* quotation is a quotation accompanied by an introductory marker, or *quotation formula*; an *informal* quotation lacks such a marker.⁷

Allusion: A literary device intentionally employed by an author to point a reader back to a single identifiable source, of which one or more components must be remembered and brought forward into the new context in order for the alluding text to be understood fully. An allusion is less explicit than a *quotation*, but more explicit than an echo. In this study, a linear marker of five words or less is considered to be an allusion.⁸

Echo: A subtle, literary mode of reference that is not intended for public recognition yet derives from a specific predecessor. An author's wording may echo the precursor consciously or unconsciously and/or contextually or non-contextually.⁹

In a broad sense, such definitions can be helpful. They ensure clarity in the use of certain terms. They can also be helpful in interpreting the significance of an allusion or echo. For example, using the category of intentional for an allusion but not for echo suggests that an allusion signals that a text may have exercised a more formative influence on the author. Furthermore, if a text contains an allusion to a Scripture, as opposed to an echo, we can assume that the author expected and intended his audience

⁵ Stanley E. Porter has noted the dizzying number of (often undefined or loosely-defined) terms that scholars adduce whilst discussing the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament. Even defining what counts as a direct quotation has not been clear amongst scholars, Porter claims: see Stanley E. Porter, 'The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology', in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 80–82.

⁶ Christopher A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

⁷ Ibid., 17 (bold and emphasis in original).

⁸ Ibid., 20 (bold and emphasis in original).

⁹ Ibid., 24 (bold in original).

to be aware of the allusion. This indicates that the author may have intended his readers should understand the source text in a particular way.

Nonetheless, such definitions can also be overly limiting if they are adopted too rigidly, and if their implications are held to too staunchly. Firstly, we must remember that these terms are primarily heuristic categories with which modern scholars operate. It is not clear that the authors we are exploring would have consciously differentiated between a quotation and an allusion, let alone an echo. Secondly, when we consider how formative Scripture was to early Jewish and Christian authors, it becomes difficult in practice to differentiate between an (intentional) allusion and a (possibly unintentional) echo. Indeed, it is likely that a mind steeped in Scripture could unconsciously echo a text in such a way as to fall under the category of conscious allusion in Beetham's definitions. On the other hand, it is possible for an author to very subtly, yet intentionally, allude to a particular text. At this point what may look like an unintentional echo is actually an intentional allusion.

Thirdly, I noted above that an intentional allusion could indicate that a source text is more formative to an author than an unintentional echo would. But this is not necessarily always true. In fact, an unintentional echo may often indicate a *higher* degree of influence on the author. It is often the assumptions that we are not even aware of holding that highlight what ideas, texts and people have influenced us in the most formative ways.¹⁰ None of these limitations are a criticism of Beetham's definitions, nor do I dismiss the value of categorising intertextual events into different categories. It is simply that such a categorisation is of limited value in discerning the *impact* of a particular text or tradition on the author (and the readers).

The main purpose of this discussion is not so much to provide a clear definition of terms (as helpful as that can be). Rather, it is to make explicit certain assumptions that will guide us as we explore the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on Paul. Although in general, this study will use the term 'allusion' to refer to a clearer reference to a source text than an 'echo', I will not use any strict criteria to differentiate the two. The main

¹⁰ This relates closely to the concept of *worldview*. A helpful working definition of 'worldview' in an excellent introduction to the topic for non-specialists is: 'the conceptual lens through which we see, understand, and interpret the world and our place within it' (Tawa J. Anderson, W. Michael Clark, and David K. Naugle, *An Introduction to Christian Worldview: Pursuing God's Perspective in a Pluralistic World* [London: Inter-Varsity Press, 2017], 8). On the application of the concept of *worldview* to New Testament studies, see particularly N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (London: SPCK, 1992), 47–80.

assumption that comes out of the above discussion, though, is that very explicit allusions to a text do not necessarily indicate a higher level of influence on the author. Often, very subtle, even unintentional references can indicate a profoundly formative nature of the source text on the author. This is especially the case if the author often echoes or alludes to a given text. We should therefore be alert to subtle echoes, and not dismiss their significance, especially if a similar echo appears multiple times in Paul's letters.

2.3 Beyond the Explicit Text

One of the key assumptions in this study is that when authors allude to a source text, they often allude to both the text and its wider context. This is an important point to make because some scholars have claimed that Paul's use of the Old Testament, and that of many Jewish writers, could be described as 'cherry-picking' – using a short quotation from the Scriptures, with little or no regard to the surrounding context, to support a claim. E. P. Sanders' words from his short guide on Paul, are representative of this view:

Those who know something of modern fundamentalism will understand Paul's technique. He was not concerned with the meaning of biblical passages in their own ancient context. He had in Scripture a vast store of words, and if he could find passages which had the right combination of words, and stick them together, he scored his point.¹¹

This is an unfair assessment. It is now generally recognised that Paul's (and other writers') use of Scripture is much more complex than Sanders claims. For example, writing of early Jewish authors, William Tooman shows that whilst there is clear evidence of 'atomistic' use of Scripture without regard to context, this is neither always the case nor characteristic of early Jewish writers.¹² Paul, as a Second Temple Jew, may

¹¹ E. P. Sanders, *Paul: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 66.

¹² William A. Tooman, 'Scriptural Reuse in Ancient Jewish Literature: Comments and Reflections on the State of the Art', in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*, ed. David Allen and Steve Smith, LNTS (London: T&T Clark, 2019), 31–34. Tooman (33) points to several scholars who advocate for more complex and 'wholistic' views of early Jewish exegesis. See also, in the same volume, Beate Kowalski, 'Selective versus Contextual Allusions: Reconsidering Technical Terms of Intertextuality', in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context*

have used Scripture in ways which seem confusing to modern interpreters, but it is unwarranted to claim that Paul alluded to Scripture without any regard to the source-text's context.

It is also important to note, as Arthur Keefer has done recently, that Old Testament 'context' can be a slippery notion with a variety of specific meanings, including immediate literary context, wider literary context, thematic context, historical context, to name but a few.¹³ It is important to be clear on what is meant by 'context', and it will be clear in the case of Paul's use of Ezekiel that it is mostly literary and thematic contexts which I have in mind. At this stage, though, I simply note that Paul was unlikely to have been 'cherry-picking' words without any awareness of their embeddedness in Old Testament contexts, whatever those contexts were. Here, some recent categories drawn from the study of intertextuality will be helpful to explore. They will help to provide a methodological framework to show that we can expect that when authors steeped in Scripture draw on or allude to a given text, they often draw on a larger world or context than the explicit words alluded to.

2.3.1 *Metalepsis*

One particularly helpful category, drawn from literary studies, is that of *metalepsis*. The notion of metalepsis was brought to the fore in New Testament studies through the influence of Richard Hays' work on Paul's use of the Old Testament.¹⁴ But Hays was himself drawing on earlier literary scholarship. Biblical scholars who deal with metalepsis usually refer to Hollander's 1981 work *The Figure of an Echo*.¹⁵

Jeannine Brown provides a useful and concise definition of metalepsis as 'an author's reference to the larger literary context when offering a citation or allusion from an earlier text.'¹⁶ A further definition of metalepsis by Hays is also helpful:

and *Criteria*, ed. David Allen and Steve Smith, LNTS (London: T&T Clark, 2019), 101: 'The contexts are almost always important as NT authors did not have an atomistic understanding of texts.'

¹³ Arthur Keefer, 'The Meaning and Place of Old Testament Context in OT/NT Methodology', in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*, ed. David Allen and Steve Smith, LNTS (London: T&T Clark, 2019), 73–85.

¹⁴ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*.

¹⁵ John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

¹⁶ Jeannine K. Brown, 'Metalepsis', in *Exploring Intertextuality: Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts*, ed. B. J. Oropeza and Steve Moyise (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016), 30.

Metalepsis is a rhetorical and poetic device in which one text alludes to an earlier text in a way that evokes resonances of the earlier text *beyond those explicitly cited*. The result is that the interpretation of a metalepsis requires the reader to recover unstated or suppressed correspondences between the two texts.¹⁷

The main point which Hays and others are making when they apply the idea of metalepsis to the New Testament and to Paul in particular is this: when Paul alludes to or cites an Old Testament passage, he is not simply finding a “proof-text” to justify a point of view. Instead, he is often drawing on the wider literary context from which that Old Testament text is taken from.

When we are dealing with writers such as Paul and other early Jewish authors whose minds were shaped from childhood by Israel’s Scriptures, it becomes *a priori* very likely that we will regularly have to do with metalepsis.¹⁸ As readers of ancient texts, we should be alert to how a given allusion may evoke ideas contained in the source-text that aren’t *verbally* alluded to or echoed. Like the root-system of a tree, there are moments where the source text may be visible above the surface, but there is far more going on underground than meets the eye.

When it comes to our discussion of the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on early Christian writings, the concept of metalepsis is particularly important. A quotation of or allusion to a part of Ezekiel 36–37 could evoke the whole context of those two chapters (or perhaps even the larger context of Ezekiel 34–37). For example, when we explore 2 Corinthians 3–5, we note that although there is a specific allusion to Ezekiel 36.26 early on, this allusion is followed by several themes present in Ezekiel 37. This suggests that Paul had a wider context in mind than simply Ezekiel 36.26. In the following chapter I will show that within the text of Ezekiel 36–37 there are several clues showing that the two chapters were to be understood as complementing and explaining each other. As such, an allusion to Ezekiel 36.26, for example, at least contains the possibility of an allusion to the wider context. In one sense, the most important part of Ezekiel 36–37 for the purpose of this study is Ezekiel 37.1–14, the

¹⁷ Richard B. Hays, ‘The Conversion of the Imagination: Scripture and Eschatology in 1 Corinthians’, *NTS* 45.3 (1999): 392–93 (emphasis in original).

¹⁸ On Paul’s possible education in and access to the Scriptures, see Stanley E. Porter, ‘Paul and His Bible: His Education and Access to the Scriptures of Israel’, in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley, SBL Symposium Series 50 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 97–124.

vision of resurrection. But the concept of metalepsis should encourage us to explore allusions not only to Ezekiel 37.1–14 but also to Ezekiel 36.16–38, since the two passages form part of a larger, consistent unit.

Of course, there is always a danger of overreading into an allusion, of seeing metalepsis when it is not present or of over-interpreting an instance of metalepsis – that is why certain controls and tests are helpful in evaluating a given reading (see below).¹⁹ Nonetheless, it is perhaps just as likely, given how formative Scripture would have been to Paul and other early Jews, that we, in a less biblically-literate culture, are in danger of *underreading* instances of metalepsis.

2.3.2 *Allusions to Matrices of Texts and Traditions*

The above discussion of metalepsis has dealt mainly with the way that an allusion can draw on the wider *literary* context of the source text. But allusions and echoes should not necessarily be restricted to *one single* text, or even a text *per se*. Authors can also allude, via a single text or phrase, to a matrix of texts or even a whole tradition. Earlier in the chapter, I drew on Beetham’s definition of an allusion. One debatable aspect of his definition is that an allusion is meant to point the reader back to a ‘single identifiable source’ or that an echo derives from a ‘specific predecessor’. In all fairness, Beetham’s definition allows for the possibility of a ‘single identifiable source’ being a matrix of texts or a tradition, and not a single text. But it is worth making this explicit here, and it should be relatively uncontroversial to note that early Christian and Jewish writers regularly drew on multiple texts simultaneously, often amalgamating them.²⁰ Indeed, there are clear instances of Paul quoting or alluding to multiple Old Testament texts in the same breath. One instance of allusion to multiple Old Testament passages, which we explore in this study, is 2 Corinthians 3.3, in which Paul is likely alluding simultaneously to 3 separate Old Testament texts: Ezekiel 36.26, Jeremiah 31.33 and

¹⁹ On the possibility of overreading an allusion or instance of metalepsis, see Paul Foster, ‘Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament’, *JSNT* 38.1 (2015): 96–111. Foster is concerned that many studies in Hays’ wake run the risk of lacking general plausibility, with some arguing for complex allusions and echoes without any direct verbal overlap.

²⁰ Tooman, ‘Scriptural Reuse’, 28–31. In fact, Tooman goes as far as to say, ‘I would suggest that amalgamation is the norm for Second Temple literature. *Most* texts are a complex of diverse scriptural materials’ (29, emphasis in original).

Exodus 34. In this case, insisting on an allusion having one identifiable source could obscure the way in which these multiple texts interplay within Paul's mind. Our understanding of 2 Corinthians 3 is influenced not only by understanding how Paul understood each of these texts individually, but also by how he sees them as acting *together*.

Furthermore, just as an author can allude to, or echo, multiple texts in consort, he or she can also echo a whole tradition, narrative or idea more generally. These traditions and ideas will have been shaped by texts (particularly if they are Scriptural traditions), but they cannot always be reduced to specific texts. Sylvia Keesmaat, for example, has made a case for Paul's echoing of and transformation of the Exodus tradition in Romans 8.14–30.²¹ Paul does not have one identifiable text in mind as he writes these verses. Instead, he echoes a whole tradition associated with the Exodus, both in the Old Testament and within early Judaism. Keesmaat notes:

The writings of Paul also, I suggest, take place within certain 'cultural codes' which endow his writings with plausibility. Sometimes these can be traced to specific texts, but more commonly he is drawing on a matrix of ideas which cannot be linked to any specific text but which is shaped and formed by a number of texts (and traditions) within his culture.²²

This is an important observation. In our case, we cannot assume that the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 is only clear when the *text* is alluded to. When Paul draws on themes and ideas which are central to Ezekiel 36–37 (such as the idea of God's Spirit enabling obedience or giving life), this may still be evidence of the (indirect) influence of these chapters. This is especially the case, if it is clear from elsewhere that Paul had been deeply formed by these chapters.

Keesmaat continues:

It should be noted that even when it is possible precisely to determine the text to which Paul is alluding, this does not mean that in his allusion Paul has only evoked that specific text. Texts exist in certain contexts, therefore, in alluding to or echoing a specific text the whole world of that text is evoked.²³

²¹ See Sylvia C. Keesmaat, 'Exodus and the Intertextual Transformation of Tradition in Romans 8:14–30', *JSNT* 16.54 (1994): 29–56; Sylvia C. Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story: (Re)Interpreting the Exodus Tradition*, JSNTSup 181 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999).

²² Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story*, 50.

²³ *Ibid.*, 51.

This is another important observation. When Keesmaat writes, ‘the whole world of that text is evoked’ she presumably has in view something larger than simply the *literary* world of the text. A brief allusion can evoke not just a given text in its literary context, but a whole tradition to which that text, or even a given interpretation of that text, belongs. The Old Testament Scriptures did not present themselves to early Christian writers in a vacuum, but were *mediated* through early Jewish interpretive traditions, as well as early Christian experience and traditions concerning Jesus. Roy Ciampa, in agreement with Keesmaat, explains that ‘it is often impossible to distinguish the direct influence of Scripture from the “indirect” influence of Scripture whereby Paul reflects the influence of early Jewish scriptural understandings as they are found, in part, in postbiblical literature that is based upon a tradition of biblical interpretation.’²⁴ This does not mean that early Christian writers, and Paul, were slavishly reproducing tradition. But it does mean that their understanding of Old Testament texts was inevitably influenced and shaped by their cultural and social contexts. Therefore, it is important to situate early Christian allusions and echoes of Ezekiel 36–37 within the larger context of early Jewish understandings of these chapters. This is precisely the purpose of the work carried out in chapter 3. Early Christian understandings of these chapters may conceivably be completely at odds with early non-Christian Jewish understandings, but that is *a priori* very unlikely. The conviction that Jesus had died and been raised from the dead, and the experience of the pouring out of the Holy Spirit will have had a seismic effect on Paul and other early Christians’ understandings of Old Testament texts, but it is almost inconceivable that these understandings had *nothing* in common with early Jewish interpretive traditions.

2.3.3 Conclusion: Beyond the Explicit Text

So then, as we explore the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on early Jewish and Christian writers, we should look beyond the content of explicit verbal allusions. Firstly, we should assume that a verbal allusion to a small part of Ezekiel 36–37 can evoke the broader context of these chapters. Secondly, we should also recognise that the influence

²⁴ Roy E. Ciampa, ‘Scriptural Language and Ideas’, in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 44.

of Ezekiel 36–37 may be detected in the use of themes, ideas and concepts which are present in these chapters, even if the text itself is not specifically alluded to.

2.4 Tests for Identifying Allusions and Echoes

At this point, a couple of questions emerge: firstly, how do we know that we have identified an echo or allusion? Secondly, how do we know whether we have correctly interpreted it? Clearly, this will be more of an art than a science. Nonetheless, there are certain tests which can help guide the process. Richard Hays suggests 7 oft-cited tests or criteria which can be used to gauge whether one has accurately detected and interpreted an echo or allusion:²⁵

1. *Availability*: Do the author and the original readers have access to the source of the echo?
2. *Volume*: How clearly does the author use the vocabulary of the possible source? Hays also adds: how distinctive is the language used to the source?
3. *Recurrence*: does the author use the same passage elsewhere and how regularly?
4. *Thematic Coherence*: does the echo fit with the argument the author is making?
5. *Historical Plausibility*: is it plausible for the author to have intended the echo?
6. *History of interpretation*: have other authors seen this echo throughout history?
7. *Satisfaction*: does it provide a satisfactory reading of the author?

Although Hays' tests have been adopted by other scholars, they have also been subjected to criticism.²⁶ Perhaps the strongest critique has come from Stanley E. Porter.²⁷ Porter claims that Hays' final 4 criteria are not ways of detecting the presence

²⁵ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 29–32. Jeannine Brown adduces 6 tests, 3 drawn from Powell and 3 drawn from Hays, but they overlap with Hays' own tests: Brown, 'Metalepsis', 33.

²⁶ A recent, helpful and brief overview of the influence, adoption and critiques of the Haysian criteria can be found in David Allen, 'The Use of Criteria: The State of the Question', in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*, ed. David Allen and Steve Smith, LNTS (London: T&T Clark, 2019), 129–41. Allen ultimately concludes that, despite criticisms, Hays' criteria 'still remain the primary set or corpus against which to evaluate mooted OT/NT associations' (140). Allen wonders, however, whether it is helpful to speak of 'criteria' since they cannot *prove* an allusion. Perhaps 'we need to offer a different lens to the allusion discourse' (141).

²⁷ Some works in question are Porter, 'Use of the Old Testament'; Stanley E. Porter, 'Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles*:

of an echo, but ways of testing the validity of its interpretation – something which Hays himself admits. This means that in Porter's view, Hays has only provided 3 criteria by which to detect an echo or allusion:²⁸ availability, volume and recurrence.

Unfortunately, Porter also finds fault with Hays' remaining three criteria. Regarding availability, Porter asks whether an echo disappears if the audience don't have access to the text being echoed. He seems to take issue with the emphasis being put on the readers in this criterion. Porter asks: 'Apart from audience perception, what means are available to recognize an echo.'²⁹ Secondly, concerning *volume*, Porter is concerned that an explication of one metaphor by another one is risky. He also takes issue with Hays' suggestion that 'explicit repetition' is part of *volume*. Porter sees it as more related to 'verbal coherence.'³⁰ Finally, Porter criticises Hays' third criterion, *recurrence*. For Porter this is simply a statistical tool which may work for 'identifying more or less frequent echoes, but it does not seem to be able to determine a singular echo.'³¹

Alec Lucas has helpfully responded to Porter's critique of Hays. He notes that Porter has not sufficiently appreciated the aesthetic and poetic nature of Hays' enterprise. That is to say: 'Interpretation of metaleptic appeals to precursor texts is, in the first instance, a qualitative enterprise and only secondarily a quantitative one.'³² Lucas takes issue with Porter's dismissal of Hays' final 4 criteria and argues that in the case of historical study (which is what Hays is concerned with) only 2 criteria are *necessary* for an echo or allusion to be possible: availability and historical plausibility. Lucas considers the other criteria to be guidelines which vary in their usefulness and strength in different circumstances. Since Hays' endeavour of detecting echoes is *qualitative* primarily rather than quantitative, Porter's dismissal of Hays' four final criteria is unfair. In fact, Lucas spends time, using the example of an allusion of

Explorations of Theory and Practice, ed. Thomas L Brodie, Stanley E. Porter, and Dennis Ronald MacDonald, New Testament Monographs 16 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2006), 98–110; Stanley E. Porter, 'Allusions and Echoes', in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley, SBL Symposium Series 50 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 29–40.

²⁸ Porter, 'Allusions and Echoes', 38–39.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 38. See also Porter, 'Use of the Old Testament', 83.

³⁰ E.g. Porter, 'Allusions and Echoes', 38.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² Alec J. Lucas, 'Assessing Stanley E Porter's Objections to Richard B Hays's Notion of Metalepsis', *CBQ* 76.1 (2014): 100.

Deuteronomy 9–10 in Romans 2.5–11, demonstrating that the remaining criteria can make the detection of various allusions more *plausible*.

Lucas spends more time focusing on Porter's rejection of the criteria of availability and volume. Dealing first with availability, Lucas' criticism of Porter is two-fold. Firstly, Porter is dealing with *allusions* in his criticisms, and both Porter and Hays agree that allusions require some degree of intentionality by the author. As such Porter's association of Hays' criterion of availability with an audience-oriented approach falls down; both Porter and Hays recognise that there is authorial intention involved in an allusion. Therefore, availability to the author is necessary, and Hays would not dispute this.³³ Secondly, and most importantly, Lucas argues that Porter's criticism obscures the most important aspect which Hays draws out of this criterion which is the issue of chronological priority: the text alluded to must logically predate the text which is doing the alluding. Bearing in mind that this issue of chronological priority is the central idea of Hays' *availability* criterion, it is surprising, as Lucas notes, that it receives no mention in Porter's treatment. Lucas therefore considers Porter to have misunderstood Hays' criterion of availability.

Finally, on the issue of *volume*, Lucas notes that Porter seems to be unaware that Hays has clarified the use of this criterion in a subsequent essay.³⁴ In this article, Hays elaborates in detail what specifically the criterion of volume entails:³⁵ (1) 'the degree of verbatim repetition of word and syntactical patterns'; (2) 'the distinctiveness, prominence, or popular familiarity of the precursor text' and (3) 'the rhetorical stress placed upon the phrase(s) in question, both within the precursor text and in Paul's discourse.' These clarifications nullify Porter's accusation of Hays qualifying a metaphor with another metaphor since it is clear what Hays means by *volume*. Therefore, Lucas rightly notes that Porter's objection to the question of *volume* is incomplete since it does not consider Hays' later clarifications. In fact, Porter's accusation seems unfair even based purely upon Hays' original treatment in *Echoes of*

³³ Lucas acknowledges that Hays is not consistent in his use of allusion and echo, so Porter's criticism is understandable.

³⁴ Originally published in 1999 and subsequently republished as Richard B. Hays, "'Who Has Believed Our Message?'" Paul's Reading of Isaiah', in *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament*, ed. John M. Court (London: SPCK, 2002), 46–70.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 54–56.

Scripture in the Letters of Paul. Indeed, there Hays had already clarified (though not as substantially as in his later article) what *volume* entailed.³⁶

Lucas' response to Porter does not mean that Hays' tests are watertight. But they are helpful in terms of gauging the plausibility of an echo or allusion. In particular, the criteria of availability and volume are critical, and the responsible use of the volume criterion as defined above will ensure that a possible allusion or echo with no distinctive verbal overlap is not given a high degree of plausibility.³⁷

As we proceed, we must remember Hays' contention that,

[t]he identification of allusions and especially of echoes is not a strictly scientific matter lending itself to conclusive proof, like testing for the present or absence of a chemical in the bloodstream.³⁸

When taken as a scientific method, Hays' criteria are clearly problematic. However, as general rules of thumb to alert us to the likelihood of a particular allusion or echo being present, they are useful. I will therefore bear them in mind as I explore the use of Ezekiel 36–37 in early Christian writings. I will not explicitly run every possible allusion and echo through these tests, but they will shape my analysis.

2.5 Summary and Approach of the Study

In this chapter, I have laid out several methodological assumptions which will undergird my analysis of Paul's understanding of Ezekiel 36–37. Firstly, I will operate with the understanding that a given text's influence on an author is not only evidenced in explicit quotations but also through allusions and even subtle echoes, particularly if they are common. Secondly, I have noted that an allusion to a specific text can carry

³⁶ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 30: 'The volume of an echo is determined primarily by the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns, but other factors may also be relevant: how distinctive or prominent is the precursor text within Scripture, and how much rhetorical stress does the echo receive in Paul's discourse?'

³⁷ Foster ('Echoes without Resonance', 109) notes that 'verbal affinities between the source text and the newer text' are important. I have suggested that the idea of 'distinctive verbal overlap' is important. If two texts share a small, but distinctive phrase, then this makes an allusion more probable than if they share a more common phrase. Beate Kowalski makes a similar point, referring to *hapax legomena*: 'While allusions to a single word of a pre-text should be regarded critically, *hapax legomena* are an exception' (Kowalski, 'Selective versus Contextual Allusions', 102). I suggest in subsequent chapters that the expression *πνεῦμα ζῶντος* is distinctive enough in the LXX to make verbal overlap significant.

³⁸ Hays, 'Paul's Reading of Isaiah', 50.

with it an allusion to the wider context of the text (metalepsis). But even more, an author can also allude, though a single phrase, to a matrix of texts, a theme or even a tradition. We should therefore be alert to instances where Paul deals with a topic which is dominant in Ezekiel 36–37 even if he does not clearly allude to the text of Ezekiel itself. Thirdly, I have noted that there are particular tests that can be borne in mind to avoid hearing an allusion which is not there or over-interpreting an echo. Richard Hays' tests will be helpful tools to bear in mind as we survey these texts, but we must nonetheless remember that these are not scientific tests. There will always be an element of plausibility at play. There is a sense in which Hays' final test (whether a particular allusion provides a satisfying reading of the author) will be the ultimate question, both in terms of the individual texts I analyse but also in terms of the cumulative case I am making. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, so to speak.

With this in mind, chapter 3 will explore the use of Ezekiel 36–37 in early non-Christian Jewish texts. Chapter 4 will then seek to ascertain the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on Paul's own writings. The aim is to see whether Paul's understanding of these chapters (which themselves use the image of resurrection) provide a clue as to how early and in what way the belief in inaugurated resurrection arose.

Chapter 3: The Influence of Ezekiel 36–37 in Early Judaism

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I investigate the reception of Ezekiel 36–37 in Second Temple, non-Christian Judaism. Firstly, I explore Ezekiel 36–37 in its own literary and historical context before turning to its reception in Jewish writings, beginning with early Greek translations and moving on to other Second Temple Jewish texts. The conclusions of this chapter will provide some insight into how various Jewish groups and writers were influenced by these chapters. This will in turn help to provide a broader context within which to explore the influence of these chapters on Paul, with the hope of finding there a background to his understanding of inaugurated resurrection.

3.2 Ezekiel 36–37 in Context

3.2.1 *Some Preliminary Text-Critical Questions*

The book of Ezekiel has a difficult textual history. Scholars note that there often appears to be a different Hebrew *Vorlage* behind the LXX (at least in LXX^B) to that behind the MT. This is particularly significant in chapters 36–37 because the earliest extant Greek manuscript containing these chapters, Papyrus 967,¹ deviates from the MT in these chapters in a couple of ways. Firstly, Ezekiel 36.23c–38, containing the description of Israel's new heart, is completely missing in P967. Secondly in P967, the order of chapters 36–39 differs from the MT: Ezekiel 37 appears after chapters 38–39, rather than immediately after Ezekiel 36. Although P967 is the earliest extant Greek manuscript of Ezekiel, it is also unique amongst Greek manuscripts: other major manuscripts contain small variations from the MT, but they match the chapter order of

¹ P967 is a pre-hexaplic manuscript usually dated to around about the second century CE. It contains most of Ezekiel 11.25–48.35 in Greek. For a general overview of P967 see Siegfried Kreuzer, 'Papyrus 967: Bemerkungen zu seiner buchtechnischen, textgeschichtlichen und kanongeschichtlichen Bedeutung', in *Die Septuaginta - Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 64–82. For the text of Ezekiel specifically, see Raymond S Foster, 'The Text of Ezekiel in Papyrus 967', *Colloq* 4.1 (1971): 46–53.

the MT; they also contain Ezekiel 36.23c–38. The only other manuscript in which Ezekiel 36.23c–38 is omitted is the sixth-century Old Latin manuscript *Codex Wirceburgensis*, a manuscript apparently not dependent upon P967.²

Although P967's variations from the MT used to be attributed to a scribal error, such as parablepsis, this conclusion has become difficult for scholars to maintain. An omission of 1451 letters would seem difficult to attribute to scribal error.³ It also seems unlikely that a scribe would mistakenly rearrange the order of Ezekiel 36–39. Furthermore, scribal error would not account for the omission of 36.23c–38 in *Codex Wirceburgensis*, which, as we noted above, is apparently not dependent on P967. It is now often claimed that the differences in P967 cannot be attributed simply to a copyist's mistake.

This has led some to suggest that P967 provides evidence of an earlier Hebrew *Vorlage* than the one which led to the MT. Johan Lust is one of the most significant proponents of this view. He argues that Ezekiel 36.23c–38 is stylistically different to the rest of the book in Greek, as well as in Hebrew. Instead, it is similar to sections of Jeremiah. He notes:

We may conclude that Ezek. 36:23c-38 is most probably a late redactional addition. Both in the Hebrew text and in the traditional Greek version, the style and the vocabulary of the passage betray a hand different from the one in the surrounding parts of the book. The redactor appears to have been inspired by the Book of Jeremiah in its final form. Moreover, his language shows some characteristics which are rather typical of a later period. His hand can also be recognized in some “plusses” of the MT.⁴

If this is so, why was 36.23c–38 added? According to Lust, the section was composed to create a link between 36.16–23b and chapter 37. In the tradition represented by P967, chapter 37 comes after chapter 39. Lust suggests that the earlier chapter order represented in P967 (36 [minus vv.23c–38], 38–39, 37) was later rearranged to form the one we now have in the MT. As such, a link was required to make the transition from Ezekiel 36 to 37 more natural. So, Lust suggests that P967 is based on an earlier

² Hector M. Patmore, ‘The Shorter and Longer Texts of Ezekiel: The Implications of the Manuscript Finds from Masada and Qumran’, *JSOT* 32.2 (2007): 240–41.

³ See for example Ashley Crane, *Israel's Restoration: A Textual-Comparative Exploration of Ezekiel 36–39*, VTSup (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 212.

⁴ Johan Lust, ‘Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript’, *CBQ* 43.4 (1981): 524–25.

Hebrew textual tradition than the MT, a tradition in which chapter 37 followed chapters 38–39.⁵

Ashley Crane, in an extensive chapter of his doctoral dissertation, broadly supports Lust's conclusions.⁶ He surveys the proposals for explaining the minus of 36.23c–38 in P967 and concludes, as Lust does, that it cannot have been an omission due to scribal error.⁷ In his view, the minus of 36.23c–38 must be considered together with the different chapter order and not as two separate changes. According to Crane, the chapter order of P967 has a better logic than that of the MT and is therefore difficult to attribute to scribal error.⁸ Instead, he contends that the original Hebrew text had the chapter order of P967. This order was subsequently revised, and 36.23c–38 was inserted to create a bridge to chapter 37. Crane's evidence for 36.23c–38 being an addition is, similarly to that of Lust, based largely on stylistic differences between this section and the rest of Ezekiel.⁹

Studies such as Lust's and Crane's have been influential. Nonetheless, their overall conclusion about the *priority* of P967 over the MT suffers from a couple of major weaknesses. Firstly, P967's oddities in themselves do not necessarily have to reflect an earlier Hebrew *Vorlage*. Many scholars feel that Lust and Crane's theories take us beyond where the *concrete* evidence can lead. Although an omission by parablepsis would be unlikely for such a lengthy section, it is not impossible for 36.23b–38 to have been omitted accidentally, for example through the loss of a couple of leaves.¹⁰ In fact, María Victoria Spottorno has suggested a (admittedly speculative) way in which P967's oddities could be accounted for without recourse to a scribe's theological agenda. She suggests the hypothesis of a Greek manuscript earlier than P967 which contained 36.23b–38 on one codex page and 37.1–28 on two separate pages (with the conjectured omission of 53 letters). The page containing 36.23b–38 could have been lost either due to overuse or possibly even parablepsis (this is more likely if the whole omitted text is on a single leaf). The pages containing 37.1–28 could

⁵ Ibid., 528.

⁶ Published as Crane, *Israel's Restoration*.

⁷ Ibid., 211–16.

⁸ Ibid., 216–20.

⁹ Ibid., 220–25.

¹⁰ See Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel Chapters 25–48*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 340.

have been rearranged to fall after chapter 39.¹¹ P967 would then represent a further copy of this corrupt manuscript.

This is an elaborate and very speculative theory. However, Spottorno's aim does not seem to be to argue convincingly for *this* hypothesis. She suggests, rather, that the *possibility* of such a hypothesis shows that a recourse to a theological explanation is not necessary.¹² This does not prove anything concrete, but it does show that it is possible to explain P967's oddities as an omission rather than as evidence of an earlier *Vorlage*.¹³

Secondly, the most significant weakness of the possible priority of P967 is the discovery of a Hebrew manuscript of Ezekiel at Masada (MasEzek). Shemaryahu Talmon has dated this fragment to the turn of the century, and definitely prior to 73–74 CE, the date of the capture of Masada by the Romans.¹⁴ Ashley Crane himself draws on Talmon who notes that the Script of MasEzek is early Herodian and therefore must be dated to the last half of the first century BCE. He concludes: 'MasEzek therefore provides us with the earliest readable Hebrew text for Ezekiel 36–39, albeit incomplete.'¹⁵ What is significant about the Ezekiel fragment from Masada is just how closely it follows the order and wording of the MT. Ezekiel 37 follows chapter 36 and precedes 38, and Ezekiel 36.23c–38 is included. This means that the earliest extant *Hebrew* manuscript of Ezekiel 36–37 (which possibly antedates P967 by 150 years) broadly adheres to the received text of the MT.¹⁶

¹¹ María Victoria Spottorno, 'La omisión de "Ez." 36, 23b - 38 y la transposición de capítulos en el papiro 967', *Emerita* 50 (1982): 93–98.

¹² *Ibid.*, 97.

¹³ Many scholars remain open to the possibility of an accidental omission of some kind: e.g. Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, WBC 29 (Waco, TX: Word, 1990), 177: 'it may well go back to a mechanical accident, as the breaking off in the middle of the expanded recognition formula could indicate.'

¹⁴ Shemaryahu Talmon, 'Fragments of an Ezekiel Scroll from Masada (Ezekiel 35:11–38:14): MasEzek, Masada 1043–2220', in *Tehillah Le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg*, ed. Mordechai Cogan, Barry L. Eichler, and Jeffrey H. Tigay (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 53–69.

¹⁵ Crane, *Israel's Restoration*, 8.

¹⁶ See Heinz-Josef Fabry, 'Ezechiel in Qumran und Masada – Bezeugung und Rezeption', in *Das Buch Ezechiel: Komposition, Redaktion und Rezeption*, ed. Jan Christian Gertz, Corinna Körting, and Markus Witte, BZAW 516 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2020), 16: 'Beachtlich ist, dass diese Rolle bereits für das ausgehende 1. Jh. v. Chr. einen Text enthält, der die Kapitelfolge Ez 35.36.37.38 wie MT bezeugt und zugleich auch die Verse Ez 36,23b–38 (Kol. II 15–42; ab Z. 32 sehr fragmentarisch) enthält, also auch den Text, der in Pap 967 fehlt.'

Crane and Lust, as noted, are aware of MasEzek. It features largely in Crane's monograph in particular. But they posit a change in the Hebrew tradition *prior* to MasEzek. It is here that Crane and Lust's conclusions seem to overreach somewhat. What can likely be concluded from the manuscript evidence is that multiple versions of Ezekiel existed by the second century CE.¹⁷ In this sense, Hector Patmore lines up with Crane's view when he states:

It appears that Papyrus 967 and the proto-MT from Masada (and Qumran) demonstrate that at some point two different versions of the Hebrew were in existence at the same time. The 'longer' (i.e. Masoretic) and 'shorter' (i.e. Greek) texts were in circulation *concurrently and in Hebrew* for at least 200 years.¹⁸

However, unlike Crane, Patmore does not attempt to suggest which of these two different versions was earlier.¹⁹ When not only our earliest Hebrew manuscript but our earliest manuscript, full stop, agrees with the MT, Patmore's view seems to be wise. Decisions about textual priority in a case like this will always be speculative. Ingrid Lilly agrees with Patmore in this regard. She notes:

In sum, while Patmore's study should be viewed with caution, he is correct that it is still too early to establish textual priority definitively between p967 and MT's texts. Lust and Crane have not yet conclusively proven their positions on textual priority, although Lust's work has clearly made the stronger case. While textual priority is still undecided, Lust did lay important groundwork for further study of p967 as a variant literary edition of Ezekiel.²⁰

It seems safest then to conclude the following for our purposes: P967 could point to the existence of a variant Hebrew text to that contained in MasEzek and the MT. However, the content and order of the MT of Ezekiel 36–37 was certainly established by the late Second Temple era at the very latest and very likely beforehand, as evidenced by the

¹⁷ See Andrew Mein, 'Ezekiel: Structure, Themes and Contested Issues', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Prophets*, ed. Carolyn J. Sharp (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 193: 'However hard it is to determine when the component sections were originally produced, at the very least it appears that two variant editions of Ezekiel were in circulation in the late Second Temple period.'

¹⁸ Patmore, 'Shorter and Longer Texts', 241.

¹⁹ He writes: 'It appears that Greek translations arose before the Hebrew text was stabilized, and thus they may reflect different *Vorlagen*. There does not seem to have been a single authoritative translation into Greek from which all other translations derived (an *Urseptuaginta*), although there is an obvious closeness between a number of the Greek versions' (Ibid).

²⁰ Ingrid E. Lilly, *Two Books of Ezekiel: Papyrus 967 and the Masoretic Text as Variant Literary Editions*, VTSup 150 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 25.

extant Hebrew texts from Qumran and Masada.²¹ Furthermore, as Block notes, ‘if the absence of this section were original, it is remarkable that it is preserved in only one Greek manuscript and an obscure Latin text.’²² Admittedly, in light of Lust and Crane’s studies, Block now thinks it possible that ‘the *Vorlage* to the Old Greek text may well antedate the Hebrew text underlying MT.’²³ Nonetheless, the issue is still far from settled, as Patmore and Lilly’s comments above show, as well as the recent work of Heinz-Josef Fabry.²⁴ It is probably wise to follow Paul Joyce’s suggestion on P967:

While P. 967 should be acknowledged as the earliest and best text of LXX Ezekiel, it is unclear what implications this might have for the Hebrew. It is one thing to attempt to recover the most original text of the LXX; it is another to identify its Hebrew *Vorlage*.²⁵

Furthermore, to understand the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 in early Jewish and Christian writings, knowing the “original” text of Ezekiel is not crucial. What is more important is knowing what version(s) were in use at the time we are exploring. If Ezekiel 36.23c–38 is referred to in early Jewish or Christian works (and there is ample evidence that it was), we can safely assume that that author was not working with the tradition preserved in P967. Furthermore, we will see that Paul, in particular, drew on themes contained in both Ezekiel 36 and 37. This suggests that he was not working with the manuscript tradition contained in P967. Text-critical issues are important, but in this instance, they are not decisive for our purposes.

²¹ See Martin G. Abegg, Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 407: ‘Small fragments from six manuscripts of Ezekiel were found at Qumran and another atop Masada. All of them and the traditional Masoretic Text fairly uniformly attest the same textual tradition. Only seven minor variants are clearly preserved, though reconstruction according to spatial requirements indicates that in two places (5:13 and 23:16) the scrolls may have had a shorter text than the Masoretic Text.’ See also Heinz-Josef Fabry’s essay on this question. He explores the reception of Ezekiel in both the Qumran Scrolls and Masada and concludes that there is no clear evidence of P967’s order at an earlier date: Fabry, ‘Ezechiel in Qumran und Masada’.

²² Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 340.

²³ Daniel I. Block, ‘Transformation of Royal Ideology in Ezekiel’, in *Transforming Visions: Transformations of Text, Tradition, and Theology in Ezekiel*, ed. William A. Tooman and Michael A. Lyons, Princeton Theological Monograph Series 127 (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010), 238. Olley (*Ezekiel: A Commentary Based on Iezekiël in Codex Vaticanus*, Septuagint Commentary Series [Leiden: Brill, 2009], 9) also refers to Crane’s influence on Block.

²⁴ Fabry, ‘Ezechiel in Qumran und Masada’.

²⁵ Paul M. Joyce, *Ezekiel: A Commentary*, LHBOTS 482 (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 48.

3.2.2 The Message of Ezekiel 34–37

Having noted the textual debate above, I will work with the text of Ezekiel 36–37, specifically 36.16–37.14, as preserved in the MT. This section is part of a wider collection of oracles in chapters 34–37.²⁶ From a strictly literary point of view, chapters 34–37 are not a unit within Ezekiel, but a collection of four oracles (34.1–31; 35.1–36.15; 36.16–37.1–14; 37.15–28) within the wider literary unit of 33.21–39.29.²⁷ Nonetheless, as I note below, there are thematic and linguistic connections between the first (34.1–31) and final (37.15–28) oracles of these chapters which suggest it is warranted to read the four oracles together as a description of God’s plan to restore Israel.

Ezekiel 34.1–31 is an oracle denouncing the wicked shepherds (leaders) of Israel. Yahweh promises that he himself will shepherd the flock. He will do so by providing one shepherd, David, who will shepherd it (34.23–24). He also promises to make a covenant of Peace with Israel (34.25). The following oracle, in 35.1–36.15, envisages both judgement on Edom for its role in the aftermath of Jerusalem’s destruction (35.1–15) and the repopulation of the mountains of Israel as God promises to bring his people back to their land and rid the land of its enemies (36.1–15). This is followed by a third oracle (36.16–37.14) in which Yahweh promises to bring his people back to the land and restore them for his own sake (36.16–38). He will cleanse them from their sins and transform them, so that they are able to obey his laws. This is followed by and explained by the vision of the valley of dry bones in which resurrection is used as an image of national restoration and of the giving of God’s Spirit to his people (37.1–14). Finally, the oracle contained in 37.15–28 describes God’s promise to reunite Judah and Israel and to provide them with a single king, David. He also promises to

²⁶ For our purposes, the question of whether this section can be traced back to Ezekiel need not detain us. It is sufficient for us to note that this section would have been considered as from the mouth/pen of Ezekiel by the time of the Second Temple period. For a cautious defence of this section being rooted in Ezekiel’s prophecies see *Ibid.*, 195–96.

²⁷ See Tyler D. Mayfield, ‘Literary Structure and Formulas in Ezekiel 34–37’, in *Ezekiel: Current Debates and Future Directions*, ed. William A. Tooman and Penelope Barter, FAT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 237–40. Mayfield shows how the major section (33.21–39.29) is introduced by a ‘chronological formula’ and narrative (33.21–22), and the following oracles (33.23–33; 34.1–31; 35.1–36.15; 36.16–37.14; 37.15–28; 38.1–39.29) are each introduced by a ‘prophetic word formula’ (‘and the word of Yahweh came to me’).

make an everlasting covenant of peace and that his dwelling (MT: משכני; LXX: ἡ κατασκήνωσίς μου) will be in their midst (37.27).

As noted above, several elements bookend chapters 34–37, suggesting that in the final form of Ezekiel these chapters can be read together. Firstly, the section begins and ends with an emphasis on Israel being ruled by Yahweh’s servant David as ‘one shepherd’ (34.23; 37.24–25). Secondly, the language of a ‘covenant of peace’ (ברית שלום) being made with Israel appears in both 34.25 and 37.26.²⁸ These are the only places in Ezekiel in which this phrase appears. This suggests that Ezekiel 34–37 can be read together as predicting God’s restoration of his people after the exile. In light of the work of Hays and others on metalepsis, described in the previous chapter, it is plausible that an ancient author could allude to one part of 34–37 whilst bearing the wider literary context in mind. If there is evidence of an author drawing on themes and language which span this whole section, we should not assume that this is mere coincidence.

3.2.3 The Use of רוּחַ in Ezekiel

Before exploring Ezekiel 36.16–37.14 in particular, I will highlight a key theme of Ezekiel, which is particularly important for this study: the emphasis on the Spirit, or רוּחַ, of Yahweh. This theme is central to Ezekiel 36–37 and, as we shall see, is an emphasis that strongly influenced early Christians, not least Paul. Ezekiel has been called the ‘the prophet of the spirit’ by at least one scholar and with good reason.²⁹ It is not only that the term רוּחַ is more prevalent in Ezekiel than elsewhere in the prophets, but also that Ezekiel develops the theme of רוּחַ in his own unique way.³⁰

Daniel Block has identified 8 different uses of the term רוּחַ in Ezekiel:³¹ it is used to denote (1) wind; (2) direction; (3) side; (4) agency of conveyance; (5) agency of animation; (6) agency of prophetic inspiration; (7) mind; (8) sign of divine ownership. According to Block the most prominent use of the term in Ezekiel is as a reference to (5) ‘agency of animation’: ‘Judging by frequency, for Ezekiel the employment of *rwḥ* to denote the animating, vitalizing force was more important than

²⁸ In the LXX, the covenant of peace in 34.25 is made with David.

²⁹ Daniel I. Block, ‘The Prophet of the Spirit: The Use of *Rwḥ* in the Book of Ezekiel’, *JETS* 32.1 (1989): 28. See also James Robson, *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*, LHBOTS (London: T&T Clark, 2006).

³⁰ So Block, ‘Prophet of the Spirit’, 28.

³¹ Block, ‘Prophet of the Spirit’.

any other.’³² This is important as we turn to explore the text of Ezekiel 36–37, as this is one of the key ways in which the term is used in these chapters. This is also important as we bear in mind the connection that the idea of רוח/πνεῦμα has with resurrection.

But the variety of meanings should not obscure the fact that it is the same Hebrew word. Although the precise nuance of רוח may change in different contexts, there would have been a conceptual and semantic overlap in the hearers’ minds that would not be the case to English speakers. In English, the words ‘wind’, ‘breath’ and ‘spirit’ are three very different things. However, the fact that a single word can denote all three ideas in Hebrew means that a certain amount of fluidity of meaning and wordplay is possible. This is why I have simply transliterated רוח in my translation of 36.16–37.14 (see appendix).

3.2.4 Ezekiel 36–37

In much of this study, I am interested in the reception of Ezekiel 36.16–37.14.³³ It is important to note that in the MT, Ezekiel 36.16–37.14 is a single oracle introduced by the structural marker, ‘and the word of Yahweh came to me saying’ (וַיְהִי דְבַר יְהוָה אֵלַי (לֵאמֹר). Tyler Mayfield notes that although scholars often divide the oracle based on the different genres of 36.16–38 and 37.1–14,

the literary pattern of the book and the use of the PWFs [prophetic word formulas] enjoin us to read the vision of Ezek 37 and the passage on a new heart and spirit as more closely linked together than our readings have traditionally allowed. Is there a way to read Ezek 37’s vision as an elaboration of Ezek 36.16–38’s oracle? Is there a way to read these two passages together instead of dividing them based on their differing genres?³⁴

We will see below that there are also thematic and linguistic connections between 36.16–38 and 37.1–14 which suggest that they are mutually clarifying. For ease, 36.16–38 and 37.1–14 will be dealt with under two separate headings. However, it is important to remember that they form a single oracle in the final form of Ezekiel. I will now

³² Ibid., 34.

³³ In this thesis, Ezekiel 36–37 is usually used as a shorthand to refer to Ezekiel 36.16–37.14.

³⁴ Mayfield, ‘Literary Structure’, 241.

explore Ezekiel 36.16–37.14 in more detail, before discussing how this oracle was received in early Jewish writings.³⁵

Ezekiel 36.16–38

The key problem addressed here is the defiling of Israel's land with their idolatry, the idolatry which led to the Babylonian exile. For example:

בן אדם בית ישראל ישבים על אדמתם ויטמאו אותה בדרכם ובעלילותם כטמאת הנדה
היתה דרכם לפני

Son of man, the house of Israel was dwelling upon their land and they defiled it with their conduct and by their deeds; like the defilement of menstrual impurity was their conduct before me. (Ezek 36.17)

The land was defiled by Israel's bloodshed and idolatry (בגלוליהם and על הדם – 36.18). As a result, Yahweh scattered Israel in exile to the nations (36.19). But this exile led to them profaning Yahweh's name (36.20). The reason they profaned his name, though, does not seem to have been continued idolatry in exile. Instead, Yahweh's name was profaned because the nations said of Israel: 'these are the people of Yahweh and from his land they went out' (עם יהוה אלה ומארצו יצאו – 36.20). Put another way, Yahweh's reputation was at stake: 'Outsiders were left to conclude that either Yahweh had willingly abandoned his people, or that he was incapable of defending them against the superior might of Marduk, the god of Babylon.'³⁶ Therefore, Yahweh had concern for his name (ואחמל על שם קדשי – 36.21) and would act for his reputation's sake, not for the sake of his people (36.22).

Yahweh acting for his name's sake would work itself out in two ways, according to vv.24–27: (1) bringing Israel back from exile (36.24) and (2) purifying his people from their impurities (36.25). This process of purification is spelt out in 36.25–27:

וזרקתי עליכם מים טהורים וטהרתם מכל טמאותיכם ומכל גלוליתכם אטהר אתכם
ונתתי לכם לב חדש ורוח חדשה אתן בקרבכם והסרתי את לב האבן מבשרכם ונתתי
לכם לב בשר. ואת רוחי אתן בקרבכם ועשיתי את אשר תלכו ומשפטי תשמרו
ועשיתם

²⁵ And I will sprinkle upon you clean waters and you will be clean from all your uncleanness, and from all your idols I will cleanse you.

²⁶ And I will give you a new heart and a new *ruach* I will set in your

³⁵ For the text and translation of Ezekiel 36.16–37.14 used here see the Appendix.

³⁶ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 348. See also Andrew Mein, *Ezekiel and the Ethics of Exile*, Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 159; Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 178.

midst, and I will take away the heart of stone from your flesh and I will give you a heart of flesh.²⁷ And I will set my *ruach* in your midst and I will make it so that you walk in my statutes, and my judgements you will keep and do.

Yahweh would cleanse Israel when they returned to their land, but he would also solve the problem which led to their idolatry and ensuing exile in the first place: he would change their heart. The Hebrew term לֵב (heart) here combines, according to Joyce, ‘moral will’ and the idea of ‘inner reality as distinct from mere outward appearance.’³⁷ Yahweh was promising, through the gift of a new heart (of flesh rather than stone) and the gift of his Spirit,³⁸ that he would transform Israel’s will and make them able to obey his laws.³⁹ The text of Ezekiel 36.26–27 is almost identical to that of 11.19–20. In 11.19, though, Yahweh promises one heart (לֵב אֶחָד) rather than a new heart. Additionally, in 11.19–20 Yahweh speaks of Israel in the third person whereas in 36.26–27 he is speaking to Israel in the second person. Most importantly, though, Ezekiel 36.26–27 amplifies the promise of 11.19–20 by noting that Yahweh would give his *own* Spirit to his people (36.27).

Ezekiel 36.26–27 does not lie in isolation. It shares similarities with several other Hebrew texts, both in the Pentateuch and the prophets. The language is strongly Deuteronomistic and echoes Deuteronomy 30.6 in particular. There, Israel is promised that after exile Yahweh would restore them to their land and circumcise their heart (וּמַלֵּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת לִבְךָ; ‘and Yahweh your God will circumcise your heart’ – Deut 30.6).⁴⁰ The text also has strong linguistic and thematic similarities with Jeremiah 31.31–34, another exilic text (see below for more details). Jeremiah notes in 31.31–34 (MT) that Yahweh would make a new covenant with Israel and write his laws on their hearts. This is clearly a metaphor to express the same idea as Ezekiel 36.27: giving Israel the will and ability to obey God’s laws.

³⁷ Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 204. So broadly also Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 355.

³⁸ Clearly the ‘new spirit’ in 36.26 is explained by ‘my Spirit I will put in your midst’ in 36.27. See e.g. Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 204.

³⁹ Robson suggests an interesting connection between the idea of a heart of stone and the idea of death, which would add weight to the idea of seeing 37.1–14 as an expansion of 36.26–27. He draws on 1 Sam 25.37 and the language of Nabal’s heart dying and of him becoming like stone (יָמַת לִבּוֹ בְּקִרְבוֹ וְהוּא הָיָה לְאִבֶּן). He goes on to write: ‘The exiles’ heart is not simply “hard” in the sense of unresponsive, but even dead to Yahweh’ (Robson, *Word and Spirit*, 244).

⁴⁰ Block suggests that what Ezekiel envisages is even more dramatic than Deuteronomy: ‘The only answer is the removal of the petrified organ and its replacement with a warm, sensitive, and responsive heart of flesh’ (Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 355).

Ezekiel, however, is unique among these texts in one respect: the language of God's רוּחַ being given to his people. As we noted above, the term is pervasive throughout Ezekiel. Because of the strongly eschatological nature of this section, it seems appropriate to see here resonances of the promise, apparent in a number of Old Testament texts, that God would give his Spirit to his people in days to come.⁴¹ In comparison with the language of Jeremiah 31, it has plausibly been suggested that the language of רוּחַ possibly 'serves to intensify the role that YHWH plays in the transformation of his people'.⁴² It is God *himself* who will transform his people. Furthermore, the theme of God giving his Spirit will receive further treatment in chapter 37: 'In customary Ezekielian style, the subject is not developed here, but will be picked up and afforded full-blown exposition in 37:1–14.'⁴³ We have already seen how Ezekiel 34–37 forms a unit. We should therefore be alert to how chapter 37 develops the promise of chapter 36, and whether this connection was made in Ezekiel's later reception.

The next section, Ezekiel 36.28–32, deals with the promise of restoration of the land and the fruitfulness which accompanies it. Joyce notes that although the word covenant does not appear here, 'renewal of the covenant is in view.'⁴⁴ This again shows the affinities between this passage and Jeremiah 31.31–34. In fact, it is possible that Ezekiel 36.27–28 has been influenced by Jeremiah.⁴⁵ It is not surprising, then, as we will note in the next chapter, that Ezekiel 36–37 and Jeremiah 31 are sometimes alluded to together in New Testament texts. Verse 32 reiterates the fact that Yahweh is not acting for Israel's sake but for his own sake, thereby forming an *inclusio* with verse 22.⁴⁶

Following this, the final 6 verses of the chapter contain two elaborations and reiterations of this promise of restoration (36.33–36 and 36.37–38). The first of those sections focuses primarily on the restoration and rebuilding of the land. The second section (vv.37–38) refers to Israel increasing like a flock (צאן). This description of Israel

⁴¹ There are several texts in which the eschatological outpouring of Yahweh's Spirit is referred to and there is no reason to suppose that Ezekiel would have been ignorant of this hope. See for example Isa 32.15; 44.3; Joel 3 (MT). See also Ezek 39.29.

⁴² Mein, *Ethics of Exile*, 245 (following Zimmerli).

⁴³ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 356.

⁴⁴ Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 206.

⁴⁵ E.g. Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 356.

⁴⁶ This *inclusio* makes it less likely that 36.22c–38 was a later addition.

as a flock creates a verbal and thematic link back to chapter 34. But it also points ahead to the end of the next chapter in which Yahweh reiterates his promise to provide one shepherd, David (37.24). This, again, reinforces the sense that this chapter is not meant to be separated from the following one. The fact that the chapters were clearly linked together originally makes it *a priori* more likely that they were not considered in isolation from each other by later interpreters, such as Paul.

Ezekiel 37.1–14

The following section, Ezekiel 37.1–14, is one of the most famous passages in the whole of Ezekiel.⁴⁷ It is as vivid as it is memorable: Ezekiel is taken in the Spirit by Yahweh to a valley which is full of dry bones (vv.1–2). He is told to prophesy to the bones. In what follows (vv.5–6), Yahweh tells Ezekiel what will happen to these bones. Firstly, he will put רוח in the bones and they will live (v.5). This promise is then “fleshed out” as Yahweh notes that he will put sinews and skin and flesh on these bones, and he reiterates his promise to put רוח in them (v.6). Already, we are prepared for the idea that רוח will be one of the major themes in this vision. Daniel Block notes: ‘No text in the entire OT portrays the vivifying power of the divine spirit as dramatically as 37:1–14.’⁴⁸

Ezekiel prophesies, as he is instructed, and the bones come together (v.7) and are then given sinews, skin and flesh (v.8). Crucially, though, Ezekiel notes that ‘there was no *ruach* in them’ (רוח אין בהם – v.8). The absence of רוח means lack of life. In response, Ezekiel is told to prophesy to the רוח and to tell it to come from the four רוחות and to breathe into the slain (v.9).⁴⁹ This is exactly what happens: רוח enters the corpses and they are brought back to life.

The vision is vivid and straightforward. But what does it refer to? Yahweh provides the explanation for Ezekiel in verses 11–14: the bones represent the whole house of Israel who are saying that their hope has perished (presumably due to exile). In response, Yahweh promises to open their tombs and bring them out and to bring them into the land of Israel. Crucially, in verse 14 he explains:

⁴⁷ Although some have questioned the unity of this passage, it is more likely that this is a unity. For a survey of views and defence of unity see Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 370–72.

⁴⁸ Block, ‘Prophet of the Spirit’.

⁴⁹ Translating these various occurrences of רוח with different English words, as several translations do, obscures the wordplay.

ונתתי רוּחִי בְכֶם וְחַיִּיתֶם וְהִנַּחֲתִי אֶתְכֶם עַל אֲדָמְתְּכֶם וִידַעְתֶּם כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה דְּבַרְתִּי
וַעֲשִׂיתִי נֶאֱמַר יְהוָה

“And I will put my *ruach* in you and you shall live and I will settle you upon your land and you will know that I, Yahweh, have spoken and done it” says Yahweh.

It is *Yahweh*’s רוּחַ that is given to Israel. On the one hand, this is a prophecy about national restoration to the land.⁵⁰ But it is not *only* about the physical regathering of Israel. It is also about the giving of Yahweh’s רוּחַ to them. Israel would experience a form of resurrection. Furthermore, a reader who has just read Ezekiel 36.26–27 will already be aware that Yahweh’s רוּחַ enables his people to obey his commands. Daniel Block rightly notes that ‘the entire unit (37:1–14) is an exposition of the notion introduced in 36:26–27.’⁵¹ This is, again, about a transformed ability to love and please Yahweh. As Robson notes, ‘[n]ot simply revivification, but moral transformation and a new community united in their knowledge of Yahweh are in view.’⁵²

The repetition of רוּחַ in 37.1–14 is significant. It has the effect of reminding the reader/hearer of the oracle from the previous chapter. Both 36.16–38 and 37.1–14 describe the same reality in different ways: the ingathering of Israel back to their land and the giving of Yahweh’s רוּחַ. These similarities make sense of why these two sections are part of a single oracle (36.16–37.14) in the final form of MT Ezekiel, despite clear differences in genre. Leslie Allen rightly notes that the whole of 37.1–14 is an expansion on 36.27:

The following of the promise with an assurance of dwelling or settling in the land both in 36:28 and here confirms that an echo of 36:27 is intended. In fact, the placing of this whole unit in its present position seems to have been due to an intent to amplify 36:27: רוּחַ “breath, spirit” is used no less than ten times.⁵³

⁵⁰ ‘Because God identifies the bones as “the whole house of Israel” (37:11), it is evident that Ezekiel, along the lines of the Second Temple sections of Isaiah, conceives of this resurrection hope as communal, for the living population in exile, rather than as a prediction for what happens postmortem to literally dead people.’: Bruce D Chilton, *Resurrection Logic: How Jesus’ First Followers Believed God Raised Him from the Dead*. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019), 39.

⁵¹ Block, ‘Prophet of the Spirit’, 39.

⁵² Robson, *Word and Spirit*, 230. See also Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 187: ‘The metaphorical reviving breath given by Yahweh (v 6) is related to a new potential, the opportunity to comply with Yahweh’s covenant terms and so to enjoy the life that is life indeed’.

⁵³ Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 187.

Another particularly noteworthy feature of this section is the way in which it seems to draw on Genesis 2, and perhaps also Genesis 1.⁵⁴ There is a *creational* echo at play in this passage. The two stages of forming and inbreathing in verses 7–10 are parallel to the creation of Adam in Genesis 2 in which forming precedes inbreathing.⁵⁵ Claude Cohen-Matlofsky also draws attention to the possible parallel between the creation of Eve in Genesis 2.22 using the rib of Adam and Ezekiel 37.1–14.⁵⁶ Furthermore, it is also possible that 37.9, with the recurring language of רוח, is drawing on Genesis 1.2, where the רוח of God hovers above the face of the waters, though this is perhaps less certain.⁵⁷

As we shall see in what follows, Ezekiel 37.1–14 was certainly influential as the Jewish belief in eschatological resurrection developed. But it does not seem likely that Ezekiel himself had eschatological resurrection in mind when he wrote this. Paul Joyce goes as far as saying that verse 11 ‘excludes any notion of a literal resurrection from the dead.’⁵⁸ That said, even though eschatological resurrection is not in view, we should be cautious of thinking that Judah’s physical return to the land exhausts the significance of this metaphor. A mere return to the land might be tantamount to skin, flesh and sinews, but not to life. As in Deuteronomy 30, the climax of this prophecy is not a simple physical return; it is a national renewal, a supernatural infusing of Israel with the divine רוח. In that sense, the climax of the whole of Ezekiel 36.16–37.14 is the moral transformation of Israel by Yahweh’s רוח to live in line with his laws.⁵⁹

⁵⁴ See Bossu’s table noting linguistic points of contact between Ezek 37.1–14 and Gen 2: Nicolas Bossu, *Une prophétie au fil de la tradition: L’oracle des ossements desséchés (Ez 37, 1-14) et ses relectures chrétiennes, entre herméneutique et théologie*, EBib (Paris: Gabalda, 2015), 51.

⁵⁵ Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 209; Robson, *Word and Spirit*, 216 note 14, 225. Allen notes that many commentators link this moment of resurrection to Genesis 2.7 (Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 185)

⁵⁶ Claude Cohen-Matlofsky, ‘Resurrection, from the Hebrew Bible to the Rock-Cut Tombs: An Inscribed Concept’, *QC* 23 (2015): 445.

⁵⁷ Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 185.

⁵⁸ Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 209. So broadly Bossu, *Une prophétie*, 100.

⁵⁹ Robson, it seems, would broadly agree. He suggests that 37.1–14 shows how Yahweh’s רוח is given to enable the exiles to respond to Ezekiel’s prophecy with obedience and repentance, and 36.16–38 envisages Yahweh’s רוח enabling continued obedience to Yahweh’s commands. See Robson, *Word and Spirit*, 224–52.

3.2.5 Conclusion

As components of a single oracle, Ezekiel 36.16–38 and 37.1–14 are two consecutive descriptions of the same reality. In the final form of the text, these two passages are meant to be read together: they complement and interpret each other. The problem in Ezekiel 36.16–38 is that Israel's sins have led to exile, and that exile has led to Yahweh's name being spurned. The solution is a return to the land and a moral transformation of Israel through Yahweh giving his Spirit. The problem in Ezekiel 37.1–14 is again exile, this time depicted as the death of Israel and the loss of hope. The solution is presented in the image of a national resurrection, a resurrection which would take the form of restoration to the land and the giving of Yahweh's Spirit to his people. These chapters are about more than a geographical return to Judah. They are ultimately about the transformation of Israel through the giving of Yahweh's Spirit, a gift which would lead to a new ability to love and obey Yahweh.

3.2.6 Excursus: Ezekiel 34–37 and Jeremiah 31

I noted above that Ezekiel 36–37 and Jeremiah 31 (MT) contain several similarities. My aim in this study is not to explore the reception of Jeremiah 31. However, the two passages were clearly linked, and we will see evidence in the next chapter of Paul drawing on both simultaneously. It will, therefore, be beneficial to briefly explore several ways in which Jeremiah 31 has influenced Ezekiel.⁶⁰

Firstly, there are thematic similarities between the overall literary context of Jeremiah 31 and that of Ezekiel 36–37. Jeremiah 31.31 explicitly talks about a 'new covenant' (ברית חדשה). This phrase is absent elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. However, Ezekiel's language of 'covenant of peace' (ברית שלום – Ezek 34.25; 37.26) is very similar. This is especially true when we bear in mind that each time the language of 'covenant of peace' appears in Ezekiel, it is in the context of David being Israel's shepherd. Jeremiah 30–33 refers several times to the promise of David reigning and to

⁶⁰ That Jeremiah 31 has influenced Ezekiel 36 is the position of the majority of scholars. However, Henk Leene has suggested that the influence actually runs the other way round: Henk Leene, 'Ezekiel and Jeremiah: Promises of Inner Renewal in Diachronic Perspective', in *Past, Present, Future: The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets*, ed. Johannes Cornelis de Moor and H. F. Van Rooy, OTS 44 (Leiden: Brill, 2000). For our purposes it is sufficient to note that the two texts overlap thematically and verbally and that they were received as related in some way.

Yahweh’s covenant with him (particularly Jer 33.14–26; see also Jer 30.9). Furthermore, the main emphasis of Jeremiah 30–33, like that of Ezekiel 34–37, is the restoration of Israel.⁶¹

Secondly, there are verbal links between Ezekiel 36.27–28 and Jeremiah 31.33. Block has helpfully highlighted these overlaps:⁶²

Jeremiah 31.33		Ezekiel 36.27–28	
נתתי את תורתי בקרבם	I will put my Law in their midst	ואת רוחי אתן בקרבכם	I will set my <i>ruach</i> in your midst
והייתי להם לאלהים והמה יהיו לי לעם	And I will be for them as God, and they will be for me as a people	והייתם לי לעם ואנכי אהיה לכם לאלהים	you will be for me as a people, and I will be for you as God.

In addition to these specific verbal overlaps, the result of God putting his law in Israel’s midst and writing it on their heart (Jer 31.33) and God putting his *ruach* in his people (Ezek 36.27) is the same: a transformed ability to obey Yahweh’s commands. Block rightly notes:

It would appear that at these points they are describing the same event. What Jeremiah attributes to the infusion of the divine Torah, Ezekiel ascribes to the infusion of the *rwah*. In both the result is the renewal of the covenant relationship.⁶³

What implications does this have for this study? That Ezekiel 36 and Jeremiah 31 overlap so closely suggests that an allusion to one of these texts carries with it the *potential* of an allusion to the other.⁶⁴ Furthermore, in line with what I argued concerning metalepsis in the previous chapter, it would not be unexpected for an allusion to Jeremiah 31.31–34 not only to be combined with an allusion Ezekiel 36.25–

⁶¹ Strictly speaking, Jeremiah 30–33 is more naturally broken down into 2 or 3 sections: what is often called ‘the book of consolation’ (Jer 30.1–31.40) and then 32.1–44 and 33.1–26. Nonetheless, Jeremiah 30–33 forms a collection of oracles of restoration similar to Ezekiel 34–37.

⁶² Table reproduced and adapted from Block, ‘Prophet of the Spirit’, 39.

⁶³ Ibid. Also Robson, *Word and Spirit*, 262: ‘What Jeremiah sees as achieved by Yahweh writing the Torah on the hearts of the house of Israel (Jer 31:33), what Deuteronomy ascribes to Yahweh circumcising the hearts of Israel (Deut 30:6–8), Ezekiel ascribes to the giving of the divine רוח.’

⁶⁴ This is certainly the case if, as we noted above (45 footnote 20), Tooman (‘Scriptural Reuse’, 29) is correct to assert that amalgamating Scriptural texts was the norm in early Jewish writings.

28 but also to bring up the wider context of Ezekiel 36–37. This is certainly what we will observe with 2 Corinthians 3–5 and Romans 8.

3.3 Reception of Ezekiel 36–37 in Early Judaism

We now turn to the reception of Ezekiel 36–37 in non-Christian Jewish circles during the Second Temple period. The aim of this exercise is to ensure that we are situating Paul’s own understanding within the broader context of Jewish readings. It is very likely that Paul, himself a Jew, would not only have been influenced by Ezekiel 36–37 but also by other Jewish readings of these chapters.

Interestingly, the book of Ezekiel does not seem to have played a particularly prominent role in many circles in early Judaism (with the notable exception of Qumran). As Paul Joyce notes, ‘[i]n frequency of citation, Ezekiel generally fares less well in post-biblical tradition than either Isaiah or Jeremiah.’⁶⁵ This may partly be due to lack of extant written evidence (i.e. there may be many lost Jewish texts which allude to or quote Ezekiel). That said, there is nonetheless evidence of the use and influence of Ezekiel 36–37 in several Second Temple Jewish texts. It is particularly interesting that the book played a significant role at Qumran, since the communities described in the scrolls shared several similarities with early Christians, especially in holding to some form of inaugurated eschatology.

In what follows, I will firstly explore early Greek translations of Ezekiel 36–37. I will then turn the reception of these chapters in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and then to their reception in other early Jewish writings.

3.3.1 *Septuagint*

A brief note on terminology: in this study, the terms *Septuagint* and LXX refer broadly to the various early Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible.⁶⁶ When noting variations

⁶⁵ Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 53.

⁶⁶ This fits with one of the major uses of the term highlighted (and used) by Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 14–15. The authors are careful to note: ‘Strictly speaking, there is really no such thing as *the* Septuagint’ (14). The need for a precise definition of terms, as well as the multiplicity of ways in which the term LXX was used by early Christian writers, was highlighted by Leonard Greenspoon (Leonard Greenspoon, ‘The Use and

between Greek manuscripts, I will refer specifically to those manuscripts, but when all early Greek versions agree, the terms LXX or Septuagint will be used. Exploring the translation(s) of Ezekiel 36–37 in the Septuagint can give some clues as to how these texts were understood by some early Jewish groups and/or writers.

Here, a methodological difficulty arises: can one simply compare a Greek version of Ezekiel 36–37 with the MT and assume that any changes which are not scribal errors reflect the theological emphases of the translator? Things are not so simple. On the one hand, differences between the MT and the Greek versions may be evidence of theological convictions by the translator(s). On the other hand, they could point to the use of a different Hebrew *Vorlage* than the MT. Put another way: a difference could either be an indicator of the *reception* of a text, or it could be evidence of a *text-critical* history. It is therefore important not to attribute too much to a difference between the LXX and the MT. Nonetheless, there are still good reasons for exploring the LXX of Ezekiel 36–37 as evidence of the chapters' reception:

(1) *The general reliability of the MT over against the LXX.* Jobes and Silva note:

Generally speaking, the MT can be shown to reflect a more reliable text than that of the LXX's assumed Hebrew *Vorlage*. Such an evaluation is strictly text-critical in nature and has nothing to do with theological considerations. The point is simply that in a majority of demonstrable cases, the readings of the LXX appear to be secondary.⁶⁷

This does not mean that a variation between the LXX and the MT *never* signifies a different (and possibly even earlier) Hebrew *Vorlage*, but it does mean we should not *assume* that it does. Additionally, a different Hebrew *Vorlage* is not necessarily *earlier* than the MT tradition. Certain Greek translations could be working with a different, but later, *Vorlage* than the one preserved in the MT.

(2) *The Manuscript evidence for the Hebrew of Ezekiel, and chapters 36–37 in particular.* We have already explored textual uncertainties concerning Ezekiel 36–37, based on 967. It is important to reiterate that the best and earliest extant Hebrew manuscripts of Ezekiel all conform to a textual tradition preserved in the MT. This is particularly the case with chapters 36–37 since our earliest Hebrew manuscript, from

Abuse of the Term "LXX" and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship', *BIOSCS* 20 [1987]: 21–29).

⁶⁷ Jobes and Silva, *Invitation*, 166.

Masada (MasEzek), is very close to the MT. As such, comparing later Greek translations with the MT can be fruitful for exploring the reception of Ezekiel 36–37.

(3) *The existence of other Hebrew Vorlagen would still be evidence of varying views.* Even if LXX manuscripts do reflect alternative Hebrew *Vorlagen* (and it is possible that they do) these alternative *Vorlagen* would themselves reflect different theological perspectives. Our interest is in early Jewish understandings of Ezekiel 36–37. Therefore, a difference between an alternative *Vorlage* (reflected in the LXX) and the text of the MT is still evidence of a different view of these chapters, and therefore noteworthy.

It is therefore a worthwhile exercise to compare the various Greek translations of Ezekiel 36–37 with the MT as possible evidence of the chapters' reception in early Judaism.

Ezekiel 37.1–14

There are no significant differences between the MT of Ezekiel 36.16–38 and the LXX (outside of the text-critical issues related to P967 which are dealt with above). In the case of 37.1–14, however, there are a few small, but possibly significant, differences. In 37.1, the major Greek manuscripts (with the notable exception of P967) render the MT's והיא מלאה עצמות ('and it was full of bones') with the more explicit καὶ τοῦτο ἦν μεστὸν ὀστέων ἀνθρωπίνων ('and it was full of human bones'). Ashley Crane suggests:

G^{B,A} have the interpretive or clarifying plus of 'human' bones, possibly pointing to a physical resurrection and not only a moral/spiritual one, although, it still includes the moral/spiritual resurrection motif.⁶⁸

Many Greek translations of Old Testament books seem to display a penchant for identifying eschatological resurrection where the MT perhaps did not. N. T. Wright has noted that in places where the MT was ambiguous and sometimes even denied the prospect of resurrection, the LXX has rendered the Hebrew with a clearer emphasis on resurrection.⁶⁹ As we shall see, in the Second Temple period, Ezekiel 37 was used in several Jewish texts to support future, bodily resurrection, so we might expect the LXX to reflect this. It is unclear, though, how the addition of ἀνθρωπίνων points towards a

⁶⁸ Crane, *Israel's Restoration*, 90.

⁶⁹ See for example Wright, *Resurrection*, 147–50.

‘physical resurrection,’ as Crane suggests it could.⁷⁰ Whether ἀνθρωπίνων is added or not, the bones are clearly human. The addition does not make physicality any more or less obvious. It may simply be a clarification for the reader at the outset of the vision that human, rather than animal, bones are in view.⁷¹

Subsequent verses contain translation choices which are important for our purposes. Firstly, whereas in 37.5, the MT has הנה אני מביא בכם רוח וחיים (‘behold I am bringing *ruach* into you and you shall live’), the LXX has ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φέρω εἰς ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ζωῆς (‘behold I am placing into you the spirit of life’). As Yates points out, πνεῦμα ζωῆς is an odd way of translating רוח וחיים and it is possibly rendered this way for a couple of reasons.⁷² Firstly this translation could be influenced by the earlier references in Ezekiel to רוח החיה in 1.20, 1.21 and 10.17 which is rendered by πνεῦμα ζωῆς in the LXX. In these instances, the MT seems to be referring to the Spirit of the living being residing in the wheels underneath them,⁷³ but the LXX translator has interpreted this as a reference to the spirit of life more generally. Secondly, Yates also points out that the LXX possibly intends to remind the reader of the creation narrative in Genesis 2.7.⁷⁴ We have noted above that Ezekiel 37.1–14 draws upon this narrative. The LXX takes this a step further by alluding to Genesis 2.7, which states, ‘and he breathed the breath of life (πνοήν ζωῆς) into his face and the man became a living soul/being (εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν)’. Although πνοή ζωῆς, and not πνεῦμα ζωῆς, is used in Genesis 2.7, the subsequent biblical tradition shows that these two expressions are broadly interchangeable.⁷⁵ The LXX makes clear what was already implied in the MT: the vision concerns not just an act of physical return to Judah, but a moment of re-creation for the nation.

⁷⁰ To be fair, Crane uses the language of possibility, not likelihood. Later he notes: ‘It could be as simple as the later LXX scribes adding ἀνθρώπινος just to clarify the meaning of bones in the context’ (Crane, *Israel’s Restoration*, 90–91).

⁷¹ Olley (*Ezekiel*, 489), following Crane, notes that the addition in LXX^A and LXX^B is ‘unnecessary in P967’s order, coming after the slaughter of battle’. Nicolas Bossu suggests that the addition could act as a ‘mot-crochet’ linking to the immediately preceding 36.38 which refers to προβάτων ἀνθρώπων (Bossu, *Une prophétie*, 41).

⁷² See Yates, *Spirit and Creation*, 39–40. See also Crane, *Israel’s Restoration*, 93–94.

⁷³ Though cf. Block, ‘Prophet of the Spirit’, 36–37 who argues that the expression is used by Ezekiel in chapters 1 and 10 to refer to the spirit of life rather than the spirit of the living being. Robson agrees on the use of the phrase in Ezek 1, noting that it ‘makes better sense to say that the “breath of life” (or “the spirit of life”) was in the wheels’: Robson, *Word and Spirit*, 88.

⁷⁴ So also Bossu, *Une prophétie*, 49.

⁷⁵ See Gen 6.17 and 7.15, the only two places that πνεῦμα ζωῆς occurs in the LXX outside of Ezekiel.

Another difference of interest between the MT and the LXX of Ezekiel 37.1–14 is in 37.6. In the MT, the vision of verses 1–10 is primarily an image. It is not until verses 11–14 that it is explained as a reference to God giving his Spirit to his people. The LXX, however, adds an interpretive detail in 37.6 and clarifies that the πνεῦμα which will be given to the dry bones is indeed Yahweh's. So whereas the MT has ונתתי בכם רוח והייתם ('and I will put *ruach* within you and you shall live'), the LXX clarifies, καὶ δώσω πνεῦμά μου εἰς ὑμᾶς καὶ ζήσεσθε ('and I will give my Spirit into you, and you shall live'). Not only does the addition of μου anticipate 37.14, but it also creates a link with 36.16–32 by echoing 36.27. This minor change has the effect of further emphasising what was clear in the MT a few verses later:⁷⁶ this vision is not simply about a return to the land, but about the giving of Yahweh's Spirit to his people.

There are variations between LXX manuscripts in 37.9.⁷⁷ In the MT, LXX^B and 967 Ezekiel is told to prophesy for the רוח/πνεῦμα to come from the four רוחות/πνεύματα. There is no linguistic difference between the spirit/breath which comes into the corpses and the four winds/spirits of heaven. In LXX^A, though, Ezekiel is told to prophesy to the Spirit from the four ἀνέμων (winds) of heaven. This is most likely simply a clarification by LXX^A about the identity of the four winds/spirits. It does, however, obscure the wordplay contained in the MT and the conceptual overlap between the idea of רוח/πνεῦμα as 'wind' and as 'spirit'.⁷⁸

In 37.10, LXX^A renders MT's ותבוא בהם הרוח ('and the *ruach* came into them') as καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς αὐτοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα ζωῆς ('and the spirit of life came into them'), again highlighting the link with the creation account. This is the only LXX version which includes ζωῆς in this particular verse. Perhaps this can be explained by the inclusion of ζωῆς in 37.5 by all extant LXX manuscripts: the scribe responsible for this part of LXX^A may have repeated it in 37.10 for clarity, or simply accidentally. Whatever the case, the propensity of the LXX to include τὸ πνεῦμα ζωῆς creates a stronger link with the creation narrative of Genesis than does the MT.

⁷⁶ So Bossu, *Une prophétie*, 43.

⁷⁷ The various texts for 37.9 LXX are available in Crane, *Israel's Restoration*, 97.

⁷⁸ Referring to the whole of Ezek 37.1–14, Olley notes: 'While the picture may be of "wind" or "breath", words can be multivalent and unmistakably the whole is pointing to the divine source of life and energy' (Olley, *Ezekiel*, 488).

Conclusion

The various extant early Greek translations of Ezekiel 36–37 do not deviate much from the MT. For the purposes of this study, the most significant differences appear in 37.1–14, and these differences have the effect, not of changing, but of *emphasizing* the MT’s meaning. The LXX clarifies: it is the creative spirit of life which will be put into God’s people. And this creative spirit of life is Yahweh’s own Spirit. It is possible, as we have seen, that the LXX betrays an emphasis on individual, eschatological resurrection, but this is not obvious. The primary meaning of the text is the same in the LXX and the MT: this vision of resurrection is about the restoration of Israel and the eschatological giving of Yahweh’s Spirit. The fact that Yahweh’s Spirit is the creative spirit of life is made clear in the LXX. This will be significant as we approach the reception of Ezekiel 36–37 in Paul’s letters.

3.3.2 Dead Sea Scrolls⁷⁹

There are not many fragments of Ezekiel in the extant Dead Sea Scrolls, nor are there many explicit quotations in the non-biblical scrolls.⁸⁰ However, Ezekiel’s influence is felt in more than simply the number of quotations. Indeed, Paul Joyce notes that in the scrolls ‘indirect references [to Ezekiel] abound.’⁸¹ Furthermore, García Martínez notes that despite the paucity of quotations, there is strong evidence that the book exercised a significant influence on the communities of the *Yahad*.⁸² As we shall see, of all extant

⁷⁹ The Hebrew text of the Dead Sea Scrolls in this study is drawn from the *Qumran Non-Biblical Manuscripts* module for Accordance Bible Software, compiled by Martin G. Abegg (1999–2009).

⁸⁰ For this relative paucity, see George J. Brooke, ‘Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts’, in *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18–21 March, 1991*, ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:317–37. See also Johan Lust, ‘Ezekiel Manuscripts in Qumran: Preliminary Edition of 4Q Ez a and b’, in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*, ed. Johan Lust, BETL 74 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986).

⁸¹ Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 54.

⁸² F. García Martínez, ‘L’interprétation de la Torah d’Ézéchiél dans les MSS. de Qumran’, *RevQ* 13 (1988): 441–42. I refer to ‘communities of the *yahad*’ rather than the more popular expression ‘Qumran community’. This is because the thesis that the so-called sectarian literature of Qumran was written by and for a specific settlement at Qumran – called the *yahad* – has been found wanting. Indeed, John Collins has demonstrated that there is nothing in the sectarian writings themselves to suggest that they apply only to a settlement at Qumran. On the contrary, there is a clear recognition even within the *Serekh* itself that the *yahad* was constituted of several different “communities.” Furthermore, the group(s) behind the *Serekh* in its various recensions are also likely an offshoot of a wider movement described in

early Jewish texts, it is the Dead Sea Scrolls that display the highest interest in the themes of Ezekiel 36–37.

The Serekh

The version of the *Serekh* (Community Rule) preserved in 1QS contains a couple of possible allusions to Ezekiel 36.⁸³ 1QS III describes the futility of ritual cleansing for someone who has not been cleansed by God's Spirit. This is a natural result of the clear association, as Jonathan Klawans has argued,⁸⁴ of sin and defilement in the sectarian writings of Qumran:

Repentance from sin and purification from defilement have become mutually dependent. According to the sectarians, moral repentance is not efficacious without ritual purification, and ritual purification without moral repentance is equally invalid.⁸⁵

Indeed, it is only by 'the spirit of the council of the truth of God that the ways of a man can be atoned of all his iniquity' (1QS III, 6–7). Afterwards, this person can face ritual sprinkling (להזות במי נדה ולהתקדש במי דוכי – 1QS III, 9). There is a high concentration of the terms מים and טהר (in verbal form) in these lines, as well as other terminology of cleansing. It is not uncommon for these two terms to appear together in Priestly laws of the Pentateuch.⁸⁶ Outside of the Pentateuch, though, the two terms appear together only in Ezekiel 36.25 and 2 Kings 5.12. Of course, it is likely that Levitical Law has influenced the writer. But the emphasis on the need for spiritual cleansing makes a link

the so-called Damascus Document. On this see particularly John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010); John J. Collins, 'Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. John J. Collins and Timothy H. Lim (Oxford University Press, 2010), 151–72. It is not necessary nor possible in this thesis to argue for a particular relation between the Scrolls and the settlements at Qumran. Collins suggests: 'At most, Qumran was one settlement of the *yahad*. It was never the *yahad* in its entirety. Even the *Community Rule* (*Serek ha-Yahad*) was not written specifically for a community at Qumran, although it may have applied to that community among others. The *yahad*, and still more the new covenant of the Damascus Rule, was not an isolated monastic community, as has sometimes been imagined, but was part of a religious association spread widely throughout the land' (Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 208).

⁸³ These are picked up upon by Gary T. Manning Jr., *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 51.

⁸⁴ See particularly Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 75–88.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 85.

⁸⁶ E.g. Lev 11.32; 14.8–9; 15.13; 17.15; Num 8.7; 19.19; 31.23.

with Ezekiel 36.25 possible. If this is so, the author could be emphasising that the clean waters of Ezekiel 36.25 are not merely a reference to external, ritual cleansing, but to cleansing by God's Spirit. In this case, the author seems to assume that the reality described in Ezekiel 36.25 can occur in some sense in the *present*.

In column 4, Ezekiel 36.25–26 is again alluded to, but this time in a more strictly eschatological context. Towards the end of the two-spirit treatise (1QS III, 13–IV, 26) there is a prediction of what God will do to purify some of humanity at the eschaton, the time of visitation (מועד פקודה – IV, 19–20):

20 ואז יברר אל באמתו כול מעשי גבר וזקק לו מבני איש להתם כול רוח עולה מתכמי
21 בשרו ולטהרו ברוח קודש מכול עלילות רשעה. ויז עליו רוח אמת כמי נדה מכול
תועבות שקר והתגולל
22 ברוח נדה להבין ישרים בדעת עליון וחכמת בני שמים להשכיל תמימי דרך. כיא
בם בחר אל לברית עולמים

²⁰ And then God will purify by his truth/faithfulness every work of man and he shall refine for himself from the sons of man to remove every spirit of abomination from the bowels of

²¹ his flesh and to purify him by a Holy spirit from all deeds of wickedness. And he will sprinkle upon him a Spirit of truth like waters of sprinkling from all abominations of deceit (and he shall wallow in

²² a spirit of impurity) to make the upright understand in the knowledge of the most high and the wisdom of the sons of heaven and to make wise those whose way is perfect. For them has God chosen for an eternal covenant.

The similarities between Ezekiel 36.25–26 and this passage are striking.⁸⁷ Both texts deal with realities which could rightly be called eschatological. Both speak of purification and sprinkling (זרק in Ezek 36.25 and נזה in 1QS IV, 21). Both refer to something being taken *out* of the flesh (heart of stone in Ezekiel 36.26 and every spirit of abomination in 1QS IV, 20). Both emphasise the importance of a new spirit in one way or another. It seems likely that the author was influenced by Ezekiel's promise of a new heart and new Spirit.

In line 22, those who have been cleansed and follow the perfect path are chosen for an eternal covenant (ברית עולמים). Similarly, in Ezekiel 37.24–28, those who walk

⁸⁷ Craig Keener notes that there is 'a possible background in passages such as Ezek. 36:25–27': Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Introduction and 1:1–2:47* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 533.

in Yahweh's decrees will dwell in the land and have an eternal covenant (ברית עולם – 37.26). Although the allusion to Ezekiel 37.24–28 is less certain, clearly the author seems to think that the promises of Ezekiel 36–37 had not yet been fulfilled in the return from Babylon in the late sixth and early fifth centuries BCE. Rather, the writer expected their fulfilment at the time of visitation (מועד פקודה), presumably a reference to a day of eschatological reckoning. So then, we see in 1QS III–IV (possibly due to the composite nature of 1QS), Ezekiel 36–37 being used both of a present possibility and of a future, eschatological reality.

The Hodayot

The Hodayot (1QH^a) present an exceptionally bleak view of humanity. The writers of these hymns regularly note how unworthy they are. A human is, 'a figure of dust kneaded with water (מבנה עפר ומגבל מים). Gu[ilt and s]in are his foundation, nakedness of shame, and a so[urce of impur]ity. And a perverted spirit rules in him' (V, 32–33). Elsewhere the writer notes, 'I am a vessel of clay kneaded with water. A foundation of shame and source of impurity, a furnace of iniquity and building of sin, a spirit of error, twisted without understanding and terrified by righteous judgement' (1QH^a IX, 23–25). One of the most common ways of describing a human being in the Hodayot is as a vessel of clay (יצר חמר; see 1QH^a III, 29; XII, 30; XIX, 6; XX, 29, 35; XXIII, 13) or vessel of dust (יצר עפר; see 1QH^a VII, 34; VIII, 18; XXI, 25). This language is obviously based on the account of Adam's creation in Genesis 2.7.⁸⁸ This language suggests, then, that the utter worthlessness and weakness of humans is rooted in their created nature rather than in their sinfulness *per se*.⁸⁹

One description of the weakness of humanity is particularly significant. In 1QH^a XXI, 11–12 the Hymn writer notes, 'And I am a creature [of clay, and a kneading of water, a structure of d]ust and a heart of stone (ולב האבן)'.⁹⁰ The expression לב האבן matches the exact wording of the MT of Ezekiel 36.26 and 11.19 and appears nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible. An allusion is virtually certain. The hymn writer clearly found

⁸⁸ MT: יהיה אלהים את האדם עפר מן האדמה.

⁸⁹ Jason Maston, 'Anthropological Crisis and Solution in the Hodayot and 1 Corinthians 15', *NTS* 62.4 (2016): 538.

⁹⁰ Hebrew reconstructed text in brackets taken from Eileen M. Schuller and Carol A. Newsom, *The Hodayot (Thanksgiving Psalms): A Study Edition of 1QH^a*, EJL 36 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 64.

a scriptural basis for the weakness of humanity in Ezekiel's description of Israel as having a heart of stone. But why do we not find the counterpart to לב האבן, namely לב בשר ('heart of flesh'), in this hymn? It is possibly because, as E. Cothenet notes, לב בשר in the Qumran writings has a predominantly pejorative meaning.⁹¹ Whatever the reason, the Hymn writer saw humanity's condition as linked with having a heart of stone. Whether the direct influence is from Ezekiel 36.26 or Ezekiel 11.19 in some senses is not a major problem as the two texts would presumably have been read as referring to the same reality, and we can assume that a quote from Ezekiel 11.19 would also have recalled the fuller treatment in Ezekiel 36.

The solution to the problem of human weakness described in the Hodayot seems to also have been inspired by Ezekiel 36–37. Jason Maston suggests that the author of the hymns found the solution to the corrupt human spirit in the promise of the giving of the Spirit announced in Ezekiel 37.⁹² Maston notes that the statement found in V, 36; VIII, 29; XX, 14–15; XXI, 34, לי ברוח אשר נתתה לי ('by the spirit which you have given to me') is closest to the wording of Ezekiel 37.14 (נתתי רוחי בכם – cf. Ezekiel 37.6). Furthermore, both Ezekiel and the hymn writer 'link the Spirit with knowledge.'⁹³ So in one hymn we find: 'And I your servant know by the spirit which you placed in me' (ידעתי ברוח אשר נתתה בי – 1QH^a V, 35–36). The righteous person's understanding is linked with God giving him a particular spirit (e.g. 1QH^a VI, 22–24). In 1QH^a VI, 36, God favours the author with a spirit of knowledge (רוח דעת). In 1QH^a XX, 14–15, the instructor notes that he knows God by the spirit that he has been given (see also 21.34). The theme of knowledge also draws attention to Jeremiah 31.31–34, which as noted above, was closely linked with Ezekiel 36–37. Knowledge (and knowledge of Yahweh in particular), as is clear from Jeremiah 31.34, is not merely an intellectual enterprise; it is closely associated with ethics. Therefore, when the hymn-writers note that God has given them a Spirit of knowledge, this has implications for their conduct. This is presumably why 1QH^a VI, 22–23 explains that God discerns whether one is good or

⁹¹ E. Cothenet, 'Influence d'Ézéchiél sur la spiritualité de Qumrân', *RevQ* 13 (1988): 435: 'on ne trouve pas l'opposition entre coeur de pierre et coeur de chair (Ez 36,26) en raison de la valeur péjorative attachée à *bašar* à Qumrân.'

⁹² Maston, 'Anthropological Crisis'. See also his earlier discussion in Jason Maston, *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul*, WUNT 2/297 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 106–8.

⁹³ Maston, 'Anthropological Crisis', 539.

evil according to their spirits: ‘For according to (their) spirits (לפי רוחות) you differentiate between the good and the wicked’ (1QH^a VI, 22–23).

There is a tension in these hymns. The writers clearly did not see themselves as fully liberated from weakness. The Hodayot are less optimistic than Paul is when he describes the gift of the Spirit. In many instances the authors describe themselves as *currently* experiencing corruption and sinfulness. Nonetheless, they are also able to thank God for having given them a spirit of knowledge, a spirit(s) which is not common to humanity or even Israel as a whole. If the writers were thinking of themselves and the community in terms of Ezekiel 36–37, they clearly saw the promises of Ezekiel 36–37 as *partially* fulfilled, at least amongst the leaders of the community. Corruption and weakness still gripped the community, but they had already experienced the giving of a spirit from God. This is particularly interesting as a background to early Christianity as this tension between present and future fulfilment is apparent in early Christian writings as well.

Pseudo-Ezekiel

In the Scrolls, Ezekiel 36–37 is most clearly alluded to in Pseudo-Ezekiel (4Q385–391). The work is a rewriting of several passages from the book of Ezekiel. One section is of particular interest because it contains a reworking of the vision of the valley of dry bones from Ezekiel 37.1–14. We reproduce the full text below of 4Q385 fragment 2 (completed with reconstructions from other manuscripts):

- 1 [כי אני יהוה] הגואל עמי לתת להם הברית. []
- 2 [ואמרה יהוה] ראיתי רבים מישראל אשר אהבו את שמך וילכו
- 3 בדרכי [לבך]. וא[לה מתי יהיו והיככה ישתלמו חסדם. ויאמר יהוה
- 4 אלי אני אראה] את בני ישראל וידעו כי אני יהוה. []
- 5 [ויאמר] בן אדם הנבה על העצמות ואמרת ויקבצו עצם אל עצמו ופרק
- 6 [אל פרקו ויהי כן]. ויאמר שנית הנבא ויעלו עליהם גדים ויקרמו עור
- 7 [מלמעלה ויהי כן]. ויאמר שוב אנבא על ארבע רוחות השמים. ויפחו רוח
- 8 [בהרוגים ויהי כן]. וי[ח]יו עם רב אנשים ויברכו את יהוה צבאות אש[ר]
- 9 [חיים. [] ו] אמרה יהוה מתי יהיו אלה ויאמר יהוה אל[י עד]
- 10 [אשר -- ומקץ י]מים יכף עץ ויזקף[--].

¹ [For I am Yahweh] the redeemer of my people to give to them the covenant. []

² [And I said, Yahweh] I have seen many from Israel who loved your name and walked

³ In the ways [of your heart. Now th]ese (things) when will they come to pass and how will their faithfulness be rewarded? And Yahweh said

- ⁴ to me, I will see [] the sons of Israel and they shall know that I am Yahweh
⁵ [And he said], ‘Son of man, prophesy to the bones and say, “let bone come near to its bone and joint
⁶ [to its joint and it wa]s so. And he said a second time, ‘prophesy and let sinews come over them and let skin cover
⁷ [over them and it was so.] And he said, ‘return, I will prophesy to the four spirits of the heavens. And let spirit blow
⁸ [in the slain and it was so]. And they came to life, a great people of men and they blessed Yahweh of hosts wh[o]
⁹ [had made them live [[]] and] I said, ‘Yahweh when will these things be and Yahweh said to [me as long]
¹⁰ [as – and from the time of d]ays when a tree shall bend and stand up [--]

That this is a reworking of Ezekiel 37.1–14 is clear. Unlike Ezekiel 37.1–14, though, this seems to envisage eschatological resurrection. As noted above, in Ezekiel 37 the image of resurrection was used as a way of referring to the whole house of Israel (37.11). In 4Q385, though, resurrection is given as a reward to many faithful in Israel. Furthermore, Ezekiel’s question in 4Q385 frag. 2, 9, ‘when will these things be’ suggests a more obviously eschatological application. We have here, then, evidence that Ezekiel 37.1–14 was read in some early Jewish circles as evidence for an eschatological resurrection of individual faithful Jews.

This emphasis on individual resurrection does not mean that the hope of national restoration has been completely abandoned, though. Albert Hogeterp has demonstrated that Pseudo-Ezekiel still alludes to Ezekiel’s hope of Israel returning to their land.⁹⁴ The reworking of the valley of dry bones we have just looked at in 4Q385 appears also in 4Q386. However, unlike 4Q385, 4Q386 contains multiple columns. 4Q386 frag. 1 I contains the vision of the dry bones. The second column, though, alludes to other texts from Ezekiel which emphasise restoration of Israel to the land. For example, in the first 3 lines of 4Q386 frag. 1 II we read:

1 [אר]ץ וידעו כי אני יהוה. [[]] ויאמר אלי התבונן
 2 בן אדם באדמת ישראל. ואמר ראיתי יהוה והנה חרבה.
 3 ומתי תקבצם.

- ¹ [la]nd and they shall know that I am Yahweh. [[]] And he said to me, ‘look

⁹⁴ Albert L. A. Hogeterp, ‘Resurrection and Biblical Tradition: Pseudo-Ezekiel Reconsidered’, *Bib* 89 (2008): 59–69.

² son of man at the land of Israel.’ And I said, ‘I see it, Yahweh, and behold it is desolate.

³ and when will you gather them?’

The recognition formula in line 1 (וידעו כי אני יהוה) follows immediately after what is likely to be the word ארץ. This is possibly a reworking of Ezekiel 37.12–13 in which Israel is told: ‘and I will bring you into the land (אדמה) of Israel, and you will know that I am Yahweh...’⁹⁵ Furthermore, these lines contain an emphasis on the land of Israel similar to that found in Ezekiel 36–37. In particular, Hogeterp notes that the idea of the land being a desolation (חרבה) matches the assessment of Ezekiel 36.33–36 in which Israel will rebuild the חרבות.⁹⁶ Pseudo-Ezekiel’s question in line 3 (‘when will you gather them?’ – ומתי תקבצם) fits with the hope of regathering of Israel to its land. Ezekiel 36.24 uses the same verb to speak of the regathering of Israel. Hogeterp seems correct to argue that the hope of national restoration has not simply been *replaced* by a hope of individual resurrection. Rather, the hope of eschatological resurrection has been *added* to the promise of national restoration.

What is missing from Pseudo-Ezekiel, as far as we know, is an emphasis on Yahweh’s Spirit being given to his people, as in Ezekiel. There could be several reasons for this. Firstly, it is possible that the work does draw on this theme, but that these sections did not survive the passing of time. Secondly, it is possible that the theme of the Spirit being given to God’s people was simply not a major concern for this author. Thirdly, and perhaps more likely, since Ezekiel 37.1–14 was interpreted primarily as eschatological resurrection here, perhaps the author did not feel the need to interpret it in terms of the giving of Yahweh’s Spirit.

Interestingly, Pseudo-Ezekiel may well have been known by early Christian writers. For example, in Barnabas 4.3, we find: ‘For this purpose the Master has cut short the times and the days, so that his beloved might make haste and come to his inheritance.’ This resembles the combination of hastening the day and inheritance in 4Q385 frag. 4, 3–4.⁹⁷ More striking, though, is the parallel between Barnabas 12.1 and 4Q385 frag. 2:

⁹⁵ Hogeterp suggests this as well (Ibid., 66).

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ See Menahem Kister, ‘Barnabas 12:1; 4:3 and 4Q Second Ezekiel’, *RB* 97.1 (1990): 63–67; Devorah Dimant, *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 261.

[and] I said, Yahweh when will these things be and Yahweh said to [me until] [... and from the time of d]ays (in which) a tree shall bend and stand up. (4Q385 frag. 2, 9–10)

Again, in the same way he explains concerning the cross in another prophet, saying ‘And when will these things be accomplished (πότε ταῦτα συντελεσθήσεται)? The Lord says, ‘When a tree lies down and rises and when from a tree blood drips.’ (Barn. 12.1)

The verbal similarity is striking. Although Kister does not unequivocally conclude that the author of Barnabas is quoting from Pseudo-Ezekiel, he does note that the verbal correspondence proves the quotation’s ‘non-Christian Jewish origin ... beyond doubt.’⁹⁸ It is plausible that Pseudo-Ezekiel has exercised some influence on Barnabas, whether directly or indirectly.

Another early Christian work for which direct dependence on Pseudo-Ezekiel has been claimed is the Apocalypse of Peter. Richard Bauckham has argued that the author of the apocalypse has drawn specifically on Pseudo-Ezekiel.⁹⁹ Bauckham picks up on some similarities between Apocalypse of Peter 4.7–9 (which refers to the valley of dry bones) and Pseudo-Ezekiel as preserved in the scrolls. There are some distinctive expressions which these two texts share which are difficult to explain by positing a variant Hebrew text of Ezekiel to the MT. Instead, it is likely, Bauckham claims, that the author of the Apocalypse of Peter has used Pseudo-Ezekiel.

None of this is conclusive, and we should bear in mind Dimant’s caution against seeing a *direct* influence from Pseudo-Ezekiel on early Christian works. She notes that ‘we have no evidence that the authors of these early Christian works knew Hebrew or could have had any contact with Qumran writings.’¹⁰⁰ Instead she suggests:

More in line with historical probability is the assumption that the said Christian writers had access to Jewish traditions transmitted by various channels, as may have been the case for traditions related to resurrection found in *Pseudo-Ezekiel*.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Kister, ‘Barnabas 12:1’, 65. The main difficulty in seeing this as a direct quotation from Pseudo-Ezekiel is that Barnabas has just quoted (in 11.10) a text which most closely resembles Ezekiel. This would suggest that he doesn’t attribute the work quoted in 12.1 to Ezekiel. Kister notes, though, that if the author of Barnabas is working from some *Testimonia* then he may be unaware that the quotation is from a work attributed to Ezekiel (Ibid., 66).

⁹⁹ Richard Bauckham, ‘A Quotation from “4QSecond Ezekiel” in the “Apocalypse of Peter”’, *RevQ* 15.3 (1992): 437–45.

¹⁰⁰ Dimant, *Bible Interpretation*, 264.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

So then, there seems to be evidence that, at the very least, the traditions which were reflected in Pseudo-Ezekiel were known elsewhere in early Judaism and early Christianity. The use of Ezekiel 37.1–14 to refer to eschatological and individual resurrection clearly existed beyond Qumran.

Conclusion: Ezekiel 36–37 in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Other parts of Ezekiel also exercised a significant influence on the writers of the Dead Sea Scrolls,¹⁰² but Ezekiel 36–37 was clearly important in shaping some of the communities' self-understanding and eschatology. On the one hand, Ezekiel 36–37 was being read *eschatologically* within the group(s) which composed the Scrolls: Pseudo-Ezekiel clearly (re)interprets the language of Ezekiel 37.1–14 as a reference to eschatological resurrection. Furthermore, the giving of the Spirit referred to in Ezekiel 36–37 is thought of as something which will occur fully on the day of visitation. On the other hand, some of the sectarian scrolls envisaged Ezekiel 36–37 as at least *partially* fulfilled. This tension between already and not-yet is most obvious in the Hodayot.

3.3.3 Other Early Jewish Texts

Although its use was not as widespread as in the communities addressed in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ezekiel 36–37 did exercise influence over other Jewish groups in the Second Temple period. Outside of the Scrolls, though, it is mainly Ezekiel 37.1–14 which is alluded to.

Sibylline Oracles 2

Sibylline Oracles 2 is a heavily Christianised work. As such it is difficult to know for sure what is part of the original Jewish composition and what is part of the Christian additions.¹⁰³ The passage of interest is not clearly a Christian redaction, and as such

¹⁰² For example, it seems that the vision of Ezekiel 40–48 had some influence over 4QTemple. The emphasis on the sons of Zadok as the recipients of the covenant (e.g. CD III, 21–IV, 1, 3; 1QS V, 2, 9; 1QSa I, 2; II, 3; 1QSB III, 22) seems to mirror the concern in Ezekiel 40.46; 43.19; 44.15; 48.11. The vision of the throne chariot from Ezekiel 1 and the temple vision of chaps 40–48 also seem to have exercised an influence on the community in 4Q400–407 (Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice). For a helpful overview of the reception of Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Manning Jr., *Echoes of a Prophet*, 22–77.

¹⁰³ See on this, J. J. Collins in *OTP* 1:330–32.

may be evidence for an early Jewish interpretation of Ezekiel 37. In Sibylline Oracles 2.221–226, a passage on eschatological resurrection, we read:

καὶ τότε νερτερίοις ψυχὰς καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ αὐδήν
δώσει ἐπουράνιος, καὶ τ' ὅστέα ἄρμωσθέντα
ἄρμοις παντοίοις, σάρκες καὶ νεῦρα
καὶ φλέβες ἡδέ τε δέρμα περὶ χροῖ καὶ πρὶν ἔθειραι
ἀμβροσίως πηχθέντα, καὶ ἔμπνοα κινηθέντα
σώματ' ἐπιχθονίων ἐνὶ ἡματ' ἀναστήσονται.

And then, to those under-ground, the Heavenly one will give souls
and spirit and speech and also bones fitted with all kinds of joints.
And flesh and tendons and veins already and skin around the flesh
and former hairs. Earthly bodies, divinely bound and breathing, set
in motion in one day, shall rise.

Richard Bauckham has noted that the list of body parts in this verse is almost identical to the Apocalypse of Peter 4.7–9, and he therefore adduces literary dependence.¹⁰⁴ This conclusion depends on whether this section of the Sibylline Oracles is a Christian redaction or not. The composition of the original Jewish section of book 2 could be from the early first century CE, though this is not a firm conclusion.¹⁰⁵ The lines quoted above are not necessarily Christian. As such, it is quite possible for them to pre-date the Apocalypse of Peter which is itself dated by Bauckham to the early second century CE, possibly during the Bar Kokhba revolt (132–35 CE).¹⁰⁶ It is more likely that Sibylline Oracles 2.221–26 is influenced directly by Ezekiel 37.1–14 rather than by the Apocalypse of Peter.

But even if these lines were a Christian addition, dependent on the Apocalypse of Peter, the influence of Ezekiel 37.1–14 is clear, whether directly or indirectly. In both Ezekiel 37.1–14 (LXX) and Sibylline Oracles 2.221–26 we find the following components in common: πνεῦμα (spirit/breath); ὅστέα (bones); ἄρμονίαν (joint – ἄρμος in Sib. Or.); σάρκες (flesh); νεῦρα (tendons); δέρμα (skin). It is unlikely that a passage on resurrection would use so much similar language to Ezekiel 37.1–14 if there were not some kind of influence, direct or indirect. This is further evidence of either the early Jewish or early Christian use of Ezekiel 37.1–14 to refer to eschatological resurrection. This is something which we have observed already in 4Q385 and possibly in the LXX.

¹⁰⁴ Bauckham, 'A Quotation', 438.

¹⁰⁵ See Collins, *OTP* 1:331; John J. Collins, 'Sibylline Oracles', *DNTB*, 1110.

¹⁰⁶ Bauckham, 'A Quotation', 437; Richard Bauckham, 'Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Writings', *DLNT*, 69.

Lives of the Prophets 3

The *Lives of the Prophets* is most likely an early first-century CE Jewish writing and possibly from Palestine.¹⁰⁷ In the short chapter detailing Ezekiel's life we find the following:

Οὗτος ἀπολλυμένου τοῦ λαοῦ ὑπο τῶν ἐχθρῶν προσῆλθε τοῖς ἡγουμένοις καὶ διὰ τεραστίων φοβηθέντες ἐπαύσαντο. Τοῦτο τε ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι Διαπεφωνήκαμεν; ἀπώλετο ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν; καὶ ἐν τέρατι τῶν ὀστέων τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοὺς ἔπεισεν, ὅτι ἔσται ἐλπίς τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ὧδε καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος (Liv. Pro. 3.12–13)¹⁰⁸

When the people were perishing under their enemies, he came to the leaders and through wonders they feared and stopped. And he said this to them, 'are we lost? Has our hope perished?' And in the wonder of the dead bones he convinced them that there will be hope for Israel both here and in the time to come.

This writer turns what is a statement by the people in Ezekiel 37.11 into a rhetorical question by Ezekiel: Διαπεφωνήκαμεν; ἀπώλετο ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν; ('are we lost? Has our hope perished?'). The only difference between this and the LXX of Ezekiel 37.11 is the order of the questions (Greek question marks were presumably absent in the earliest manuscripts of *Lives of the Prophets*).¹⁰⁹ The author clearly interprets Ezekiel 37.1–14 as a reference to present restoration (ἔσται ἐλπίς τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ὧδε), but he also envisages a future aspect to this hope, as is clear from the expression καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος. This latter expression presumably refers to the eschatological age, rather than to the generic future.

But what kind of end-time fulfilment did the author envisage? We have already seen Ezekiel 37.1–14 used to refer to eschatological resurrection. It is likely that this is in view here, too. If this is so, the author of the *Lives of the Prophets* saw Ezekiel 37.1–14 as a reference to both eschatological resurrection and national restoration.¹¹⁰ Sigvartsen claims:

¹⁰⁷ For dating and provenance see D. R. A. Hare in *OTP* 2:380–82.

¹⁰⁸ Greek text from Charles Cutler Torrey, *The Lives of the Prophets: Greek Text and Translation*, SBLMS (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1946).

¹⁰⁹ This is compelling evidence in favour of Greek being the original language of composition.

¹¹⁰ Sigvartsen notes: 'This passage shows a dual understanding of Ezekiel's vision, giving it both a personal and a corporate interpretation ... the nation will have a future in the present age and will be restored. The same is true on a personal level. Individuals are killed, yet through their resurrection they will have a future in the age to come' (Jan Age Sigvartsen, *Afterlife and Resurrection Beliefs in the Pseudepigrapha*, JCT 31 [London: Bloomsbury, 2019], 95).

It also becomes evidence that during this period, Ezek. 37:1–14 was understood both as a reference to a personal eschatological resurrection and to the restoration of the nation of Israel following the Babylonian captivity.¹¹¹

This seems broadly correct. That said, it is unclear that the aspect of national restoration refers only to the period after the Babylonian captivity. It is unlikely that an early first-century Jewish writer, especially if writing from Palestine, would refer to hope in the present age as a *past* return of the exiles in the sixth century BCE. N. T. Wright has famously argued that many Second Temple Jews saw themselves as in a continuing exile.¹¹² We do not need to fully subscribe to Wright's thesis to recognise that Jews living under Roman occupation would be unlikely to see themselves as living in the good of national restoration. Presumably when the author of *Lives of the Prophets* wrote of hope 'now' (ᾧδε) he did not merely have the historical return to Judah in the sixth century BCE in mind. He presumably thought that there was *still* a hope of further national restoration in the present age.

Whatever the case, the *Lives of the Prophets* envisages a dual fulfilment of Ezekiel 37.1–14. On the one hand, it is a promise of national restoration. On the other hand, it is also a promise of eschatological resurrection.

4 Maccabees

Fourth Maccabees is a first-century CE Hellenistic-Jewish writing which expands, in lurid detail, the account of the torture and death of the seven brothers from 2 Maccabees 7.¹¹³ At the end of the book, the brothers' mother praises their late father. She commends him for having taught them the Scriptures, including Ezekiel 37:

τὸν Ιεζεκιηλ ἐπιστοποῖει τὸν λέγοντα εἰ ζήσεται τὰ ὀστᾶ τὰ ξηρὰ ταῦτα, ᾧδὴν μὲν γάρ ἦν ἐδίδασκεν Μωυσῆς οὐκ ἐπελάθετο διδάσκων τὴν λέγουσαν ἐγὼ ἀποκτενῶ καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν καὶ ἡ μακρότης τῶν ἡμερῶν (4 Macc 18.17–19 LXX)

He [i.e. the father] confirmed Ezekiel who said, 'can these dry bones live?', for he did not forget to teach the song which Moses taught,

¹¹¹ Ibid., 96.

¹¹² See Wright, *New Testament*, 268–72.

¹¹³ On dating and provenance see H. Anderson, *OTP* 2:531–37; David deSilva, *4 Maccabees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), 12–21.

which said, ‘I kill, and I make alive; this is your life and length of days’.

The father teaching the song of Moses to his sons was tantamount to confirming Ezekiel’s words. The specific words of Moses’ song quoted here (ἐγὼ ἀποκτενῶ καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω – Deut 32.39 LXX) suggest that the author is making a link between Ezekiel 37 and eschatological resurrection.¹¹⁴ This, however, is surprising since 4 Maccabees does not seem to envisage resurrection elsewhere. In fact, Wright notes, ‘we may state confidently that for this book at least there was a conscious redactional decision to delete all mention of bodily resurrection [contained in 2 Maccabees 7] and substitute a version of the doctrine of the immortal soul, or at least souls that could become immortal through the pursuit of wisdom.’¹¹⁵ Perhaps 4 Maccabees 18.17–19 is an exception to this rule. That said, at the very least Ezekiel 37.1–14 is being used to support post-mortem life. This is fitting in light of the martyrdom of the brothers and mother.¹¹⁶ Here, then, is more evidence of Ezekiel 37.1–14 being thought of as describing eschatological resurrection, or eternal life more generally, rather than national restoration. A prophecy about national restoration and transformation has been given an individual application.

1 Enoch 90

The Book of Dreams (1 En. 83–90) was likely written during the Maccabean period (second century BCE).¹¹⁷ The animal apocalypse (1 En. 85–90) recounts Israel’s history in the form of a conflict of various animals. This vision contains some language reminiscent of Ezekiel 37.1–14:

I kept seeing till those sheep were eaten by the dogs, the eagles, and the kites; and they left neither flesh, nor skin, nor sinew on them

¹¹⁴ So Manning Jr., *Echoes of a Prophet*, 96–97.

¹¹⁵ Wright, *Resurrection*, 143.

¹¹⁶ David DeSilva notes: ‘The ability of the fire to consume the flesh of the faithful does not signal its ability to consume the faithful themselves, for God is able to keep their lives into eternity, as the climactic verse in this catena will conclude’ (David deSilva, *4 Maccabees*, Septuagint Commentary Series [Leiden: Brill, 2006], 264).

¹¹⁷ See George W. E. Nickelsburg, *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 361; Daniel Olson, *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: ‘All Nations Shall Be Blessed’* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 1.

absolutely, until their bones stood there bare; then their bones fell to the ground, and the sheep became few. (1 En. 90.4)¹¹⁸

1 Enoch 90.2–5 likely describes the period from the conquest of Alexander the Great to the rule of the Ptolemies over Judah (since 90.6–12 seems to describe the period of the Seleucids).¹¹⁹ The language used to describe the oppression of Judah is noteworthy: the removal of flesh, skin and sinews until only bones remain. The author is likely alluding to Ezekiel 37.1–14. However, whereas Ezekiel 37 describes the putting *on* of flesh, skin and sinews onto dry bones, this passage describes the *removal* of flesh, skin and sinews. It is a *reversal* of Ezekiel 37.1–14.¹²⁰

If this is indeed a verbal echo of Ezekiel 37, why has the author chosen to do this? At a minimum, the writer may simply be making a linguistic connection to illustrate the scale of the oppression. It is possible, though, that the writer understood Ezekiel 37.1–14 to refer to eschatological resurrection and uses its language in reverse to hint at the possibility of future resurrection for the victims of oppression during the Hellenistic period: just as they had been left as bare bones, so they would be re clothed with flesh and raised. Indeed, later in the passage, those sheep that were destroyed are gathered into the house of the Lord (90.32–36), a possible hint of resurrection.¹²¹ As Manning Jr notes, ‘as their bodies were disassembled, so they will be reassembled (1 En. 90.32).’¹²² At the very least, then, this is a reverse use of Ezekiel 37.1–14 to describe a time of national crisis. At the most, this is further evidence of these verses being applied to eschatological resurrection.

¹¹⁸ Trans. E. Isaac in *OTP* 1.

¹¹⁹ Olson, *Animal Apocalypse*, 201–14.

¹²⁰ There is also a possible allusion to Ezekiel 37 in 90.27 (‘thus I saw those sheep while they were burning—their bones also were burning.’). Mark Elliott suggests that this could be an allusion to Ezekiel 37 in order to deny resurrection to a group of rebellious Jews (since their very bones are destroyed): Mark A. Elliott, *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 80 note 89.

¹²¹ Several scholars see resurrection in this passage: e.g. Hans Clemens Caesarius Cavallin, *Life after Death: Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in I Cor 15: Part I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background*, *ConBNT* 7:1 (Lund: Gleerup, 1974), 40; Émile Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d’une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien*, 2 vols., *EBib* (Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 113; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36*, 405–6; Daniel Assefa, *L’apocalypse des animaux (1 Hen 85–90): Une propagande militaire?: Approches narrative, historico-critique, perspectives théologiques*, *JSJSup* 120 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 199–200; Olson, *Animal Apocalypse*, 227–28.

¹²² Manning Jr., *Echoes of a Prophet*, 98–99.

Sirach 49.10

The second-century BCE work of Sirach possibly alludes to Ezekiel 37.1–14. In 49.8–10 we read:

Ιεζεκιηλ ὃς εἶδεν ὄρασιν δόξης ἣν ὑπέδειξεν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ ἄρματος
χερουβιν καὶ γὰρ ἐμνήσθη τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐν ὄμβρῳ καὶ ἀγαθῶσαι τοὺς
εὐθύνοντας ὁδοὺς καὶ τῶν δώδεκα προφητῶν τὰ ὀστᾶ ἀναθάλοι ἐκ
τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν παρεκάλεσαν γὰρ τὸν Ιακωβ καὶ ἐλυτρώσαντο
αὐτοὺς ἐν πίστει ἐλπίδος

Ezekiel (who) saw a vision of glory which He showed him upon the chariot of the Cherubim, for he was also reminded of the enemies in a storm and to make good the straight paths. And may the bones of the twelve prophets revive from their place, for they exhorted Jacob and ransomed them by confidence of hope.

The Greek is difficult to understand but has the effect of making verse 10 follow on directly from a couple of verses on Ezekiel (whereas the extant Hebrew text mentions Job in 49.9). This close link with Ezekiel and the language of bones reviving and that of hope in verse 10 makes a connection with Ezekiel 37.1–14 possible, though not certain. But if there is a connection, it does not show how the author understood Ezekiel 37.1–14, especially since the rest of Sirach suggests that the author did not believe in eschatological resurrection.¹²³

Testament of Abraham 18

The Testament of Abraham is very difficult to date, and suggestions have ranged from the second century BCE to the second century CE.¹²⁴ The work exists in two recensions which probably originated from Egypt. A late first-century CE date is possible. Furthermore, despite some obvious Christian language at times, ‘the Testament of Abraham in both recensions remains unmistakably Jewish.’¹²⁵ The Testament includes an account of Death showing its true appearance to Abraham, a terrifying sight which leads to the death of 7000 people (in recension A). In response, Abraham and Death pray for their resurrection. In recension A, we read:

¹²³ See Wright, *Resurrection*, 136–37.

¹²⁴ See Sanders in *OTP* 2:874–75.

¹²⁵ Sanders in *OTP* 2:875.

καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα ζωῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς τελευτήσαντας, καὶ ἀνεζωοποιήθησαν (T. Ab. 18.11; Rec. A)¹²⁶

And God sent a spirit of life upon those who had died, and they were made alive again.

Yates suggests that there ‘is no clear tie to LXX Ezekiel in the text, although the correlation of the semi-technical πνεῦμα ζωῆς with resurrection of the dead does raise the possibility.’¹²⁷ In my view, the association of the language of πνεῦμα ζωῆς (a relatively rare expression in the LXX) with resurrection or revivification does make the influence of Ezekiel 37.1–14 very likely. Indeed, it only in Ezekiel 37.1–14 that this association takes place. That said, even if the influence of Ezekiel 37.1–14 could be shown more conclusively, the Testament of Abraham’s use of the text does not reveal anything particularly illuminating about his understanding of its meaning. The author is neither using the text eschatologically nor using it to refer to Israel’s national restoration. This may simply be a stylistic use of the language of Ezekiel 37 rather than evidence of the author’s understanding of the text.

3.4 Excursus: The Dura-Europos Ezekiel Cycle

This chapter has focused on the reception of Ezekiel 36–37 in Second Temple Jewish literature. I include here a brief excursus on the Ezekiel painting in the Dura-Europos synagogue. Although this painting post-dates the Second Temple period, it provides further evidence for how Ezekiel 37.1–14 was understood by certain Jewish communities within the first few centuries of the common era.

The ruins of Dura Europos, located on a cliff above the Euphrates in Syria, were discovered in 1920 and include a third-century CE Jewish synagogue, which was excavated in 1932–1933.¹²⁸ The synagogue walls were covered in intricate paintings,

¹²⁶ Greek text from Montague Rhodes James, ed., *The Testament of Abraham*, TS 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1892).

¹²⁷ Yates, *Spirit and Creation*, 55.

¹²⁸ Edna Garte, ‘Theme of Resurrection in the Dura-Europos Synagogue Paintings’, *JQR* 64.1 (1973): 1.

likely executed between 245 and 256 CE,¹²⁹ of biblical and extra-biblical narratives.¹³⁰ The symbolism in the paintings provides evidence not only of communal worship practices, but also of the artist's (and possibly a Jewish community's) understanding of various biblical narratives.

The largest of the paintings is a depiction of the vision of the valley of dry bones in Ezekiel 37.1–14.¹³¹ The size of the painting demonstrates its clear significance for the artist (and presumably those who worshipped in the synagogue). As Erwin Goodenough notes, '[t]o have been given so much space it must have had great importance in the mind of the person who designed the decoration.'¹³²

There are several aspects of the Ezekiel painting which suggest that Ezekiel 37.1–14 was understood as a prophecy of eschatological resurrection rather than an image of the return of Israel to the land. Firstly, the painting contains a section which depicts a mountain which has been split in half, with a tree on both sides of the split. This is likely to be a depiction of the Mount of Olives. The idea of the Mount of Olives splitting in half is an eschatological motif. Zechariah 14.4 notes that on the day of the Yahweh, 'his feet will stand ... on the Mount of Olives which is in front of Jerusalem on the east and the Mount of Olives will be split in the middle'. Furthermore, Harald Riesenfeld has apparently drawn attention to the Targum on Song of Songs 8.5 which notes that when the Mount of Olives splits, the dead come out of it and rise.¹³³

Secondly, the painting depicts 10 men clothed in white, Greek robes with their hands raised. This presumably represents those who have been raised to life from the

¹²⁹ See James A Fischer, 'Synagogue Paintings of Dura-Europos', *CBQ* 17.2 (1955): 70; Marc Philonenko, 'De Qoumrân à Doura-Europos: La vision des ossements desséchés (Ézéchiél 37,1-4)', *RHPR* 74.1 (1994): 2.

¹³⁰ On the paintings, see for example Erwin R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, Bollingen Series 37 (New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1964), vols 9–11; Fischer, 'Synagogue Paintings'; Rachel Hachlili, 'The Dura-Europas Synagogue Wall Paintings: A Question of Origin and Interpretation', in *Follow the Wise: Studies in Jewish History and Culture in Honor of Lee I. Levine*, ed. Zeev Weiss et al. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 403–20.

¹³¹ Colour photographs of the Ezekiel painting are readily available online. They are also reproduced in Jeffrey M Bradshaw, 'The Ezekiel Mural at Dura Europos: A Witness of Ancient Jewish Mysteries?', *BYUSQ* 49.1 (2010): 22–23 (taken from Goodenough).

¹³² Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols*, 10:179.

¹³³ According to Philonenko, 'De Qoumrân à Doura-Europos', 7: 'H. Riesenfeld a eu le mérite d'éclairer ce motif iconographique par un passage du targoum du *Cantique des Cantiques* 8,5, selon lequel, quand le mont des Oliviers se fendra, tous les morts d'Israël en sortiront pour ressusciter.' Philonenko draws on Harald Riesenfeld, *The Resurrection in Ezekiel XXXVII and in the Dura-Europos Paintings*, UUA (Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistika Bokhandeln, 1948), 30.

dry bones. Their posture indicates that they are blessing God. This is a detail which is absent in Ezekiel 37.10, which simply states that those raised were a great host. However, in Pseudo-Ezekiel, those who are raised ‘blessed Yahweh of hosts wh[o] [had made them live]’ (4Q385 frag. 2, 8–9). We noted above that Pseudo-Ezekiel interprets Ezekiel 37.1–14 as a promise of eschatological resurrection. It is possible that the artist was aware of the tradition associated with Pseudo-Ezekiel.¹³⁴

Finally, at the feet of the 10 resurrected men, there remain dismembered body parts. Ezekiel 37.1–14 gives the impression that all the dry bones are raised. Why, then, are there still non-resurrected individuals in this painting? It is likely that they represent the unrighteous who do not participate in the eschatological resurrection.¹³⁵ This, again, is a detail which suggests that the artist saw Ezekiel 37.1–14 as a prophecy of end-time resurrection and not (only) an image of national restoration to the land.

Much more could be said concerning the Ezekiel painting at Dura-Europos.¹³⁶ What we have seen, though, is evidence from very early Jewish art of an eschatological understanding of Ezekiel 37.1–14. For this to be such a prominent feature in a third-century CE synagogue is surely significant and shows that the eschatological understanding of Ezekiel 37.1–14 was not an isolated phenomenon.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter has explored the reception of Ezekiel 36–37 in early Jewish writings. We began by focusing on the text of Ezekiel in its own literary context. Ezekiel 36.16–37.14 forms a clear unit in which 36.16–38 and 37.1–14 are mutually explanatory. They both describe the restoration of Israel to the land after their exile. But the climax of these prophecies is not a mere physical restoration to the land. Rather, it is the giving of God’s Spirit to his people. This is described in Ezekiel 36.26–27 using the image of a heart of flesh, rather than a heart of stone. Ezekiel 37.1–14 employs the image of resurrection. But the reality envisaged is the same. After exile, Israel would be infused

¹³⁴ See Philonenko, ‘De Qoumrân à Doura-Europos’, 10. Philonenko also makes (e.g. on 7) the link between the tree imagery in the painting and the statement in Pseudo-Ezekiel that ‘I said, “Yahweh when will these things be?” and Yahweh said to [me “as long as – and from the time of d]ays when a tree shall bend and stand up”’ (4Q385 frag. 2, 9–10).

¹³⁵ ‘Ce sont là, apparemment, les restes des impies qui n’ont pas été appelés à la résurrection’ (Ibid).

¹³⁶ One particularly fascinating aspect of the painting is the depiction of the four winds of heaven seemingly as Greek figures of *Psyche*. See, for example Ibid., 8–9.

with the divine Spirit, leading them (in line with Deuteronomy 30 and Jeremiah 31) to be able to walk in obedience to God.

When it comes to the reception of Ezekiel 36–37 in early Judaism, it became clear that despite a relative paucity of citations, these chapters influenced various writers and groups in early Judaism. In the texts surveyed, a couple of major trajectories have become clear. Firstly, there seems to have been a trend in early Jewish writings to think of Ezekiel 36–37 *eschatologically*. This is most obvious in reworkings of Ezekiel 37.1–14. The vision of the valley of dry bones, a metaphor for national restoration and transformation in the MT, was increasingly being applied to eschatological resurrection. This is the case explicitly in Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Sibylline Oracles, and possibly in some other writings. In light of the sheer physicality of the language of Ezekiel 37.1–14, it is not surprising that the passage was taken to refer to eschatological resurrection at a time when this belief was growing.

A second trajectory seems to have gone hand in hand with the “eschatologising” just noted. Various texts seem to envisage the promises of Ezekiel 36–37 as having a double or, perhaps more precisely, inaugurated fulfilment. In some cases, perhaps most clearly in Pseudo-Ezekiel and Lives of the Prophets, the emphasis on national restoration in the present age has not been done away with. The authors of these texts read Ezekiel 37.1–14 as a prediction of both national restoration and eschatological resurrection. In other cases, particularly in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the writers drew on the theme of the giving of Yahweh’s Spirit from Ezekiel 36–37 to refer to a reality that was already inaugurated – though not fully realised – within their own lives and their own community. On the one hand, I have noted how the writers of the Hodayot described themselves as possessing a heart of stone, clearly showing that the promise of Ezekiel 36 was awaiting fulfilment. On the other hand, these writers gave thanks to God for having given them a spirit of knowledge. In some sense, then, the sectarian writers were able to see both an inaugurated fulfilment of Ezekiel 36–37 and a further fulfilment in the future.

As we turn now to explore allusions to Ezekiel 36–37 in Pauline texts, we should bear in mind this two-pronged reception of Ezekiel 36–37 as an eschatological prediction, but also sometimes as an inaugurated reality.

Chapter 4: Ezekiel 36–37 in Pauline Literature

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter explored how Ezekiel 36–37 was received by early Jewish writers. This broader context is important for this study for a couple of reasons. Firstly, for at least the first few decades after Jesus' death and resurrection, early Christianity did not see itself as breaking away from Judaism. As such a study of earliest Christian belief belongs more broadly within the world of early Jewish beliefs. Secondly, exploring the earliest Christian understanding(s) of Ezekiel 36–37 against the broader backdrop of early Judaism allows us to see in what ways this early Jewish group may have lined up with and diverged from other Jewish groups.

In this chapter, we explore how Ezekiel 36–37 has influenced Paul's letters. I am interested not only in what Paul makes explicit (e.g. definite quotations) but also in whether there is anything which Paul *assumes* in his letters that can be traced back in some way or another to the influence of these chapters. Did Paul understand Ezekiel 36–37 to have been fulfilled in the pouring out of God's Spirit on believers? If so, it could have significant implications for deciding whether early Christians thought of themselves as having already experienced a form of resurrection. After all, as we saw in the previous chapter, Ezekiel 37.1–14 described the giving of God's Spirit using the image of resurrection. It remains to be seen, then, whether the evidence in Paul's letters suggests that he did indeed see the giving of the Spirit in terms of the promises of Ezekiel 36–37.

4.2 Ezekiel in the New Testament

Before exploring Paul's letters, I will make a few comments on the use of Ezekiel in the New Testament more broadly. Ezekiel is not the most-quoted book in the New Testament and most of its explicit uses are in Revelation.¹ Nonetheless, despite the paucity of explicit quotations, the book of Ezekiel seems to have exercised a significant

¹ In Nestle-Aland's (27th edition) table of citations, it is striking just how high a proportion of the citations of Ezekiel are found in Revelation.

influence over the New Testament and early Christianity.² It is likely that this influence goes back to Jesus himself and the earliest Christian traditions about him. Indeed, C. Hassell Bullock has argued that Ezekiel provides a background to Jesus' ministry and that the prophet 'builds a prophetic bridge between the Testaments and makes the passage far smoother than it would have been without him.'³ In fact, he claims that Ezekiel is 'as NT-oriented as any [other Old Testament prophet] and more so than most.'⁴

Bullock notes several ways in which Ezekiel furnishes a background to Jesus' own ministry. For example, Ezekiel's call and Jesus' baptism share strong similarities. Both contain an instance of an open heaven, and in 'no other OT prophetic call do we have the associations with the "spirit" as we do in Ezekiel's experience.'⁵ Ezekiel was also known for using allegories and parables and is even called a 'maker of allegories' (Ezek 20.49; 21.5 in the MT and LXX).⁶ The parable was a distinctive marker of Jesus' teaching, making the connection between him and Ezekiel stronger.⁷ Ezekiel also used signs which would result in the people knowing that Yahweh was God (see the recognition formula, 'you will know that I am Yahweh' – וידעתם כי אני יהוה). In John's Gospel in particular, Jesus' signs have the purpose of bringing people into knowledge of God.⁸ Additionally, although Jesus' 'Son of Man' language is usually traced back to Daniel 7, the expression is overwhelmingly more common in Ezekiel.⁹ Bullock makes the case that Jesus was more indebted to Ezekiel than to the apocalyptic tradition in this regard.¹⁰ All of this shows Ezekiel's significance for Jesus' self-perception and the understanding of the Gospel writers.

Of all New Testament writings, it is Revelation which not only alludes to Ezekiel the most, but also owes a part of its very structure to the prophet. Indeed, the four main visions of Revelation (Rev 1.9–3.22; 4–16; 17–21.8; 21.9–22.5) are signalled

² See for example Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 57.

³ C Hassell Bullock, 'Ezekiel, Bridge Between the Testaments', *JETS* 25.1 (1982): 31.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 24. This is true if we are considering the writings of the prophets. The idea of the spirit is present in Elisha taking over from Elijah in 2 Kgs 2 though this is not a prophetic "call" as such.

⁶ In fact, in the LXX the term παραβολή is used in this verse.

⁷ Bullock, 'Ezekiel, Bridge', 25.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 26–27.

⁹ In the MT, the expression בן אדם is used 93 times in Ezekiel (out of a total of 107 times in the Hebrew Bible).

¹⁰ Bullock, 'Ezekiel, Bridge', 27–29.

using an ‘in the spirit’ formula drawn from Ezekiel.¹¹ Revelation is also replete with the language and symbolism of Ezekiel. For example, the vision of the heavenly throne room in Revelation 4 draws heavily on Ezekiel 1. The sealing of the 144,000 in Revelation 7 clearly draws on Ezekiel 9. John eating the scroll in Revelation 10 is clearly modelled on Ezekiel eating a scroll in Ezekiel 2.8–3.3. The vision of the resurrection of the two witnesses in Revelation 11 clearly draws on Ezekiel 37.1–14 (37.10 in particular).¹² These are just a few examples amongst many others.¹³

Thinking more thematically than simply textually, it seems almost inconceivable that Ezekiel did not exercise a profound influence on early Christian *pneumatology*. As noted in the previous chapter, Daniel Block has argued, with good reason, that Ezekiel could be called ‘the prophet of the spirit.’¹⁴ So it would be very unusual for the prophet to have not exercised a profound influence on early Christians in their understanding of the giving of and role of the Holy Spirit. The following analysis of Paul will show the clear influence of Ezekiel in this regard.

But is this assumption that Ezekiel must have strongly influenced the New Testament writers’ view of the Holy Spirit warranted? After all, in Acts 2.11–21 it is not Ezekiel which Luke records Peter citing at Pentecost to speak of the pouring out of the Holy Spirit, but Joel 2.28–32 (MT & LXX 3.1–5). But despite the pride of place that Joel 2.28–32 receives at the start of Acts, it does not seem to have exercised as formative an influence on the New Testament (and particularly Pauline) conception of the Holy Spirit as Ezekiel has. This chapter is intended to explore the clear influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on Pauline texts, and, as we shall see, it is almost exclusively in discussions of the role and nature of the Holy Spirit that we find Ezekiel 36–37 alluded to.

¹¹ On this phrase as a structural marker, see Richard Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 3.

¹² For a recent study on the use of Ezekiel 37.1–14 in Revelation 11, see Bossu, *Une prophétie*, 181–224.

¹³ See for example the classic study of Albert Vanhoye, ‘L’utilisation du livre d’Ézéchiél dans l’Apocalypse’, *Bib* 43.3 (1962): 436–76.

¹⁴ Block, ‘Prophet of the Spirit’.

4.3 Ezekiel 36–37 in Paul’s Letters

4.3.1 Paul’s Familiarity with Ezekiel

Before we explore Paul’s specific use of Ezekiel 36–37, is there anything to suggest that Paul was particularly familiar with the writings of Ezekiel? If there is evidence for Paul having a good knowledge of the prophet, then it is in principle more likely that he would allude to chapters 36–37. To put it in terms from chapter 2, can Paul pass Hays’ *availability* test? Of course, in a general sense, from Paul’s letters and his background we can assume a very good knowledge of and familiarity with the Hebrew Scriptures, and so he would likely be well-versed in Ezekiel.¹⁵

We can go further, though. Paul’s letters contain concrete evidence for his familiarity with Ezekiel. Outside of chapters 36–37 (which will be explored presently), Paul alludes to the prophet several times in his writings.¹⁶ In terms of clear quotations, we find Ezekiel 20.34, 41 quoted in 2 Corinthians 6.17 and Ezekiel 37.27 in 2 Corinthians 6.16. Admittedly, this is not the most impressive list of allusions and quotations, but it does nonetheless indicate Paul’s familiarity with Ezekiel more broadly.

Allusions and quotations aside, it is also possible that Paul’s personal experience points to an intimate knowledge of the prophet. 2 Corinthians 12 shows that Paul was clearly familiar with visionary experiences.¹⁷ Visionary, mystical experiences

¹⁵ A quick browse of the indices of allusions and quotations in a standard edition of the Greek New Testament (UBS or Nestle-Aland) shows the sheer quantity of Old Testament source material drawn upon by Paul. Rikk Watts has recently issued a helpful reminder (and corrective) to scholars that it is not simply that the Old Testament scriptures were the main literary influence on the New Testament writers. Rather, ‘[t]he NT authors’ hermeneutic reflects a “red-blooded” conviction that the living God himself continued to speak with creational immediacy through Scripture. That we so often discuss the NT authors’ engagement with the Scriptures in merely literary and often detached terms says, I suspect, far more about us and our situation than it does about them and theirs’ (Rikk Watts, ‘Rethinking Context in the Relationship of Israel’s Scriptures to the NT: Character, Agency and the Possibility of Genuine Change’, in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*, ed. David Allen and Steve Smith, LNTS [London: T&T Clark, 2019], 167). See also the helpful article by Stanley Porter on Paul’s likely educational background and access to Scriptural texts: Porter, ‘Paul and His Bible’.

¹⁶ Likely allusions would include Ezek 1.26 in 2 Cor 3.18 & 4.6; Ezek 20.41 in Phil 4.18; Ezek 28.24 in 2 Cor 12.7.

¹⁷ Most commentators agree that Paul is referring to his own experience in 2 Corinthians 12.2–4: see C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, BNTC (London: A. & C. Black,

were a common emphasis in certain Jewish groups in Paul's day.¹⁸ It was often Ezekiel, and the vision of Ezekiel 1 in particular, that provided much of the background to these experiences.¹⁹ This mystical component of Judaism, in which students would meditate on the *merkabah*, the throne-chariot vision of Ezekiel, is well documented in later Rabbinic writings, but there is ample evidence that it had its origins far earlier. Indeed, the visionary text 4QShirShabb discovered at Qumran, and dated prior to Paul's time, contains elements clearly drawn from Ezekiel 1.²⁰ If Paul were familiar with, or perhaps even sought out, such visionary experiences prior to his conversion, it is likely that he would have been intimately familiar with the *merkabah* vision of Ezekiel 1. As such, the experience described in 2 Corinthians 12, although played down by Paul, could indicate an intimate familiarity with *merkabah* mysticism, itself deeply rooted in Ezekiel 1.²¹ In fact, many have made the plausible case that Paul's own conversion experience itself is indebted to the vision of Ezekiel 1 and *merkabah* mysticism.²² This link was made most famously by Alan Segal in his 1990 book, *Paul the Convert*.²³

1973), 307; Mark A. Seifrid, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 438 ('it quickly becomes clear that it was Paul himself who received this vision'); Murray J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 834–35; Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), 542 ('It is now generally agreed that Paul is describing one experience in these verses, not two').

¹⁸ See, recently, Christopher Rowland and Christopher R. A. Morray-Jones, *The Mystery of God: Early Jewish Mysticism and the New Testament*, CRINT 12 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

¹⁹ Edith M. Humphrey, 'Ambivalent Apocalypse: Apocalyptic Rhetoric and Intertextuality in 2 Corinthians', in *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament*, ed. Duane F. Watson, SBL Symposium Series 14 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 123: 'Ezekiel was the source par excellence of later mystic and apocalyptic experiences/writings.'

²⁰ See Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 40.

²¹ Paul's use of the plurals ὀπτασίας and ἀποκαλύψεις suggests that there were probably more than only one such experience.

²² Although he does not provide the same level of exegetical support that others have, Robin Griffith-Jones offers a vivid possible retelling of Paul meditating on the *merkabah* vision on his way to Damascus, only to realise that the one seated on the throne is, in fact, Jesus. See Robin Griffith-Jones, *The Gospel According to Paul: The Creative Genius Who Brought Jesus to the World* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 78–88.

²³ Segal, *Paul the Convert* (particularly 34–71). Segal was not the first to posit this connection. See for example J. W. Bowker, "'Merkabah' Visions and the Visions of Paul', *JSS* 16.2 (1971): 159: 'The comparison of Paul's visions with the material published here suggests that the visions of II Cor. xii. i ff., and on the road to Damascus, arose from a base of *merkabah* contemplation.'

Whether or not Paul was a throne-chariot, or *merkabah*, mystic, as Segal suggests, he is right to claim that ‘Ezekiel 1 was one of the central scriptures that Luke, and Paul, used to understand Paul’s conversion.’²⁴ The strongest case for this from Paul’s letters is from 2 Corinthians 4.6:

ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν· ἐκ σκοτῶν φῶς λάμψει, ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ [Ἰησοῦ] Χριστοῦ.

Because God is the one who said, ‘let light shine out of darkness’, who has shone in our hearts [to bring about] the illumination of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of [Jesus] Christ.

Although Paul is speaking of the conversion of any believer here, it is surely not accidental that he draws on the language of light. Indeed, if Luke’s account of Paul’s conversion/call goes back in any way to Paul himself, as seems likely, there is perhaps a somewhat autobiographical element at play in 2 Corinthians 4.6, which Paul then makes almost paradigmatic for all believers’ conversions.²⁵

When compared with Ezekiel’s vision in Ezekiel 1, this statement is striking. In Ezekiel 1, the climax of the vision of the glory of God comes in the likeness of a human one sitting on a throne (Ezek 1.26–28). Ezekiel concludes: ‘this was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord (αὕτη ἡ ὄρασις ὁμοιώματος δόξης κυρίου)’ (Ezek 1.28 LXX). In both 2 Corinthians 4.6 and Ezekiel 1.26 the glory of the Lord is shown by the appearances of a humanlike one. For Paul, it is in the face of Jesus Christ (ἐν προσώπῳ [Ἰησοῦ] Χριστοῦ) that the knowledge of the glory of God is seen. In Ezekiel’s vision, the likeness of the glory of God seems to be seen through the human one sitting on the throne. However, as Humphrey points out, in 2 Corinthians 4.6 Paul is reversing the more esoteric idea of *merkabah* mysticism in which only the prepared few can gaze on the throne-chariot. For Paul, it is all who turn to Christ who come to a knowledge of the glory of God.²⁶ It is possible that for Paul Jesus Christ is the one seated on the throne of Ezekiel 1 and who displays the glory of God.

²⁴ Segal, *Paul the Convert*, 39.

²⁵ Murray J. Harris certainly thinks so and notes the parallels between Paul’s conversion in Acts 9, 22 and 26 and this text: Harris, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 336–37.

²⁶ Humphrey, ‘Ambivalent Apocalypse’, 123–25.

This reality is also visible in Luke's account of Paul's conversion. Indeed, Dale Allison has convincingly shown how these accounts draw on Ezekiel 1–2.²⁷ Allison shows that each account on its own (Acts 9, 22 and 26) contains allusions to Ezekiel 1–2. In isolation, the allusions from each conversion account are not loud enough to clearly hear (and have eluded many commentators). However, when all the allusions are combined (as Allison does in a table in his article), the overlap is striking.²⁸ But why would Luke, Allison asks, who so regularly and clearly alluded to the Scriptures, have spread the allusions to Ezekiel across all three conversion accounts, thereby eluding readers? Allison suggests that it is because Luke is working with source material, itself going back to Paul himself, which he has reworked for his purposes.²⁹ As such, we are not hearing Luke's own echoes of Ezekiel 1, but Paul's.

Allison's suggestion seems at least plausible.³⁰ In light of both Acts and Paul's writings it seems that Paul reflected on his conversion in light of Ezekiel's *merkabah* vision, whether or not he was meditating specifically on Ezekiel 1 on the road to Damascus. This suggests, again, that the prophet was familiar to the apostle.

Having shown that the criterion of availability is amply satisfied, we now turn to the use of Ezekiel 36–37 in Paul's writings. It is necessary to decide how to proceed. Many surveys of themes within Pauline literature proceed broadly chronologically, beginning with Paul's earliest letters and exploring how a given theme develops over time. There is some merit to this approach as the reader can observe a relatively clear progression of thought. However, I have chosen to approach this task by starting with the writing in which allusions to Ezekiel 36–37 are clearest and most undisputed: 2 Corinthians. Having explored how Paul uses these chapters of Ezekiel in this letter, I then move to the letters which are most closely linked with 2 Corinthians, both in terms of geographical location and themes: 1 Corinthians and Romans. I will show that the way Paul uses Ezekiel 36–37 in 2 Corinthians can be seen in embryonic form in 1 Corinthians, and subsequently in a more developed form in Romans.

²⁷ Dale C. Allison, 'Acts 9:1–9, 22:6–11, 26:12–18: Paul and Ezekiel', *JBL* 135.4 (2016): 807–26.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 823.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Allison (*Ibid.*, 821–22) provides other reasons for seeing the echoes of Ezekiel as going back to Paul rather than Luke: (1) the absence elsewhere in Acts of Ezekiel 1; (2) the overlap of much of Acts 9, 22 and 26 with Paul's own accounts; (3) both Paul and Luke also echo Isaiah and Jeremiah in descriptions of Paul's conversion. This makes it more likely that the Ezekiel echoes are not Luke's own invention.

Having established this core use of Ezekiel 36–37 in the Corinthian correspondence and Romans, I then consider whether we can hear (admittedly much fainter) echoes elsewhere in Paul’s undisputed letters. Finally, I explore the use of Ezekiel 37 in Ephesians 2.

4.3.2 2 Corinthians 2–7

Second Corinthians, most likely written in about 55 CE from Macedonia,³¹ contains some of the clearest allusions to Ezekiel 36–37 in the New Testament. This is most obvious in chapters 2–7. In these chapters, Paul gives a defence of his apostolic ministry. In doing so, he draws on Ezekiel 36–37, sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly.

In 2 Corinthians 3, Paul contrasts the old (Mosaic) covenant and the new covenant. To do this he alludes to several Old Testament texts. The primary text is Exodus 34, which describes Moses’ face shining as he exits the tent of meeting. Alongside this, Paul also draws on Jeremiah 31 (LXX 38) and Ezekiel 36–37. In 3.1, Paul denies that he must provide letters of recommendation for or from the Corinthians to validate his ministry. Instead, the Corinthians themselves are a letter ‘written on our hearts’ (ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν – 2 Cor 3.2). Paul is alluding to Jeremiah 38.33 LXX: διδοὺς δώσω νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν γράψω αὐτούς (‘I will surely put my laws in their understanding, and I will write them upon their hearts’). Paul then combines the language and themes of Jeremiah 38.31–34 (LXX) with those of Ezekiel 36 (and possibly 37). Whereas in 2 Corinthians 3.2, the Corinthians are a letter written on Paul’s and his co-workers’ hearts, in verse 3 the focus falls squarely on the Corinthian church itself: they are a letter of *Christ*, written not with ink, but with ‘the Spirit of the living God’ (πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος). This expression looks forward to verse 6, which states that ‘the Spirit gives life’ (τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα

³¹ On dating and provenance see Ralph Philip Martin, *2 Corinthians*, WBC 40 (Waco, TX: Word, 1986), xxxiv–xxxv. The integrity of 2 Corinthians is often disputed. See the helpful summaries of scholarship in e.g. Frank J. Matera, *II Corinthians: A Commentary* (Louisville: Presbyterian Publishing Corporation, 2013), 24–29. However, complex partition theories are less common in scholarship now. See the defences of the integrity of the letter in Ibid., 29–32; Seifrid, *Second Letter to the Corinthians*, xxx–xxxi; Harris, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 8–51. At the very least, the section of interest to us (2.14–7.4) is usually considered a unity (with the exception of 6:14–7.1 – see below). Furthermore, there is no need to see 2.14–7.4 as an interpolation. It is perfectly explicable as a typical Pauline digression (so e.g. Ibid., 11–14).

ζωοποιεῖ). In fact, Margaret Thrall suggests that verse 3 is a reference to the 'life-giving Spirit'.³² This will be important to bear in mind as we look at the second half of the verse.

In the second half of 3.3, Paul moves from what Christ's letter (the Corinthians) is written *with* to what the letter is written *on*. Based on his contrast of ink and spirit in the previous clause, one might expect Paul to contrast parchment, or papyrus, with human hearts. However, he makes the rather surprising leap of contrasting 'stone tablets' (πλαξὶν λιθίναις), not parchment, with 'tablets of fleshly hearts' (πλαξὶν καρδίας σαρκίνας). In doing so, Paul draws on Ezekiel 11.19 and/or 36.26 LXX.³³ The verbal correspondence is clear, as is the thematic overlap: in Ezekiel 36.26, a lost Israel is told that its heart of stone (τὴν καρδίαν τὴν λιθίνην) will be replaced with a heart of flesh (καρδίαν σαρκίνην). In 2 Corinthians 3, the new covenant community have had their hearts of flesh written on by the Spirit of God. As Harris notes, '[t]he letter is the Corinthian church as a whole as transformed by the gospel in fulfillment of Jeremiah 31 (38 in the LXX) and Ezekiel 11 and 36.'³⁴ Ezekiel 36.26, amongst other Scriptures, has been fulfilled, Paul suggests, in the Corinthian community.

In 3.6, Paul notes that the New Covenant, unlike the Old, is marked, not by the letter (γράμμα) but by the Spirit (πνεῦμα). Jeremiah 38.31 is the only place in the LXX to use the expression διαθήκην καινὴν so it is beyond doubt that Paul is still alluding to Jeremiah. But Jeremiah 38 does not refer to the πνεῦμα, Spirit, of God, as Paul does here. Ezekiel 36–37 does, though. Aernie rightly notes: 'In contrast to the idea that Paul moves away from the framework of Ezekiel, the apostle's immediately subsequent assertion [in 2 Corinthians 3.6] concerning the life-creating power of the Spirit makes

³² Margaret E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 1:227.

³³ Most scholars recognise the link: Harris, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 265; Carol Kern Stockhausen, *Moses' Veil and the Glory of the New Covenant: The Exegetical Substructure of II Cor. 3,1–4,6*, AnBib 116 (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1989), 47 ('In fact the phrase is so unmistakably tied to these Ezekiel passages that once again Paul's unusual expression leads directly to the Old Testament itself as its source.'). Seifrid acknowledges the allusion, but claims that the meaning is different to Ezekiel's. In Ezekiel, the heart of flesh is the work of God, whereas in 2 Corinthians they are 'the place of human fallenness upon which God performs his saving work' (Seifrid, *Second Letter to the Corinthians*, 117). There is nothing in context, though, that suggests that Paul means 'human fallenness' when he refers to hearts of flesh. Rather, in light of the ensuing verses, it is more natural to assume that he does indeed view the promises of Ezekiel 36.26 and 11.19 as fulfilled in the Corinthians.

³⁴ Harris, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 265.

it clear that the pneumatology of Ezekiel remains in view.³⁵ Paul, then, combines both Jeremiah 38.31–34 LXX and Ezekiel 36–37 to describe the reality of the new covenant. This is not unusual since, as we saw in the previous chapter, Jeremiah 31 (MT) and Ezekiel 36–37 share a common theme.

Paul continues: this new covenant is characterised by the Spirit because (γάρ) the letter kills but ‘the Spirit makes alive’ (τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ – 2 Cor 3.6). Having drawn on Ezekiel 36 in 3.3, Paul now alludes to Ezekiel 37.1–14. The verb ζωοποιέω does not appear in Ezekiel, but Ezekiel 37.5 refers to the Spirit of life (πνεῦμα ζωῆς), an expression which appears only in Genesis (twice) and Ezekiel (4 times) in the LXX.³⁶ It seems that Ezekiel 37 has furnished Paul with the language and ideas to think of the Holy Spirit giving life under the New Covenant. Paul is not simply proof-texting.³⁷ Rather, the linguistic and thematic links between 2 Corinthians and Ezekiel show that Paul is drawing on the whole context of Ezekiel 36–37. This is an instance of metalepsis, something we noted in chapter 2 that we should expect someone steeped in Israel’s scriptures to do. Paul presumably read both Ezekiel 36 and 37 as referring to the New Covenant in which God would give his Spirit to his people. Richard Hays rightly notes: ‘Ink and stone and Ezekiel’s bones are deathly until God, in accord with Ezekiel’s word, breathes the spirit ... (Ezek. 37:5–6). That prophecy, Paul believes, finds its fulfilment in the church.’³⁸ Yates adds that Paul’s explicit quotation of Ezekiel 37.27 (conflated with Leviticus 26.11 – see below) in 2 Corinthians 6.16 adds weight to the idea that Paul has Ezekiel 37 in mind throughout this passage.³⁹ Furthermore, the

³⁵ Jeffrey W. Aernie, ‘Tablets of Fleshly Hearts: Paul and Ezekiel in Concert’, *JSPL* 6.1 (2016): 60.

³⁶ Outside of Ezekiel, the expression appears in Genesis 6.17; 7.15. It appears 4 times in Ezekiel (1.20, 21; 10.17; 37.5)

³⁷ Stockhausen’s comments are helpful here: ‘For many commentators on II Cor. 3:1–6, Paul merely mentions a variety of scriptural passages as he pursues his own line of argument, as a form of decoration or secondary support, much as a modern preacher might do today. On the contrary, these verbal traces of the biblical texts assembled above are not random or secondary in II Cor. 3:1–6. *There is no line of argument without the full force of this scriptural background*, as the scholarly confusion over Paul’s meaning amply attests. Jeremiah 38 (LXX) and Ezekiel 11 and 36 have affected Paul’s composition, not only on the level of vocabulary, but on the levels of structure and content as well’ (Stockhausen, *Moses’ Veil*, 54 [emphasis in original]).

³⁸ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 129–30. See also Harris (*Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 265): ‘The letter is the Corinthian church as a whole as transformed by the gospel in fulfilment of Jeremiah 31 (38 in the LXX) and Ezekiel 11 and 36.’ See also Humphrey, ‘Ambivalent Apocalypse’, 122: ‘It is indeed a variation of this story [Ezekiel’s description of the ‘vivification’ of Israel] that we have heard Paul telling in his recontextualization and alternate underlying narrative about the community of Christ.’

³⁹ Yates, *Spirit and Creation*, 111.

reference to the Spirit giving life is to a *present* activity. Ezekiel 37.1–14 is alluded to here to describe an *already present* (inaugurated) reality in the lives of believers.

The clearest allusions to Ezekiel 36–37 are in 3.1–6. Nonetheless, the themes and language of Ezekiel 36–37 permeate the rest of 2 Corinthians 2–7 – particularly the language of death and life. In 3.7–8, Paul contrasts the ministry of death with the ministry of the Spirit, demonstrating again that the Spirit is thought of as the Spirit of life.⁴⁰ Again, this is not mere proof-texting: this fits with exactly what we find in Ezekiel 37.1–14: the Law (through Israel's disobedience) has brought death to Israel; their hope has perished. But God brings life to dead bones through his Spirit, the Spirit of life (πνεῦμα ζωῆς – Ezek 37.5).⁴¹

In context, it is perhaps not a coincidence that Paul speaks of hope (ἐλπίς) in 2 Corinthians 3.12. In Ezekiel 37.11 Israel claims, ἀπόλωλεν ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν ('our hope has perished'). God responds by sending his Spirit to give his people life, thereby giving hope back to his people. The hope of Ezekiel (transformative life by the Spirit) is precisely Paul's hope in 2 Corinthians 3.12. Guthrie notes:

The message that the ministry of the new covenant is “much greater” than the old-covenant ministry of Moses, therefore, gives hope because it demonstrates that Paul's ministry rests on the ongoing and developing work of God in the world, which is carried out by the new-covenant power of the Spirit (3:17–18).⁴²

Another major theme which links 2 Corinthians 2–7 with Ezekiel 36–37 is the association of the Spirit and knowledge. As we shall see below, Paul had already made this link in 1 Corinthians, so it is not surprising to find it here again. In 3.14, Paul notes that the minds of the Israelites were hardened under the Old Covenant: 'their minds were hardened' (ἐπωρόθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν). The same is true for those who reject the Gospel (4.4). The darkening of minds is also described as hearts being veiled (e.g. 3.14–15). But when one turns to the Lord, 'the veil is lifted' (3.16) and God shines into believers' hearts 'to make clear the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of [Jesus] Christ' (πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ [Ἰησοῦ] Χριστοῦ – 4.6). Knowledge of God is a key theme in both Jeremiah 38.31–34 (LXX) and Ezekiel

⁴⁰ Harris, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 286.

⁴¹ On the connection between the Spirit and obedience in Ezekiel 37.1–14, see Robson, *Word and Spirit*, 224–52 and particularly 230.

⁴² George H. Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 217–18.

36–37. In Ezekiel 36.38, God notes that when he restores Israel, they shall know that he is the Lord (καὶ γνώσονται ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος). In 37.13–14, he states that after he puts his Spirit within them, Israel will ‘know that I am the Lord’ (γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος – Ezek 37.13 LXX; see also 37.14). The ideas in Ezekiel 36–37 and 2 Corinthians 3–4 are very similar: the new covenant, accompanied by the giving of the Spirit, leads to the knowledge of God; or to paraphrase Paul, when one turns to the Lord (who is the Spirit) the veil over hearts and minds is lifted.

In 2 Corinthians 4.10–18, the themes of death and life, already highlighted above, continue to permeate the text. There is no clear allusion to Ezekiel 37 in these verses, nor is the Spirit explicitly mentioned. However, in chapter 3, Paul set up the contrast between life and death so strongly in terms of Ezekiel 36–37 that this is presumably still in his mind. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the ongoing general theme of life and death.

The second half of 2 Corinthians 4 and the first half of chapter 5 move from present realities (the Spirit giving life, the life of Christ being manifest amongst the Corinthians) to the future. For example: ‘the one who raised the Lord Jesus will also raise us up and present us with you’ (2 Corinthians 4.14). There is a general movement in chapters 3–5 from the present to the future. This is a movement we will observe in Romans 8 as well. We have seen that Ezekiel 37 was commonly used in Jewish writings to refer to eschatological resurrection. Therefore, we might have expected Paul to draw heavily on Ezekiel when he refers to future resurrection. It is therefore noticeable that the clearest allusions to Ezekiel 36–37 in 2 Corinthians are used to refer not to future resurrection, but to the *present* reality of God’s action in believers. Paul presumably saw the prophecy of Ezekiel 36–37 as having *already* been fulfilled in the Corinthians rather than primarily at the Parousia. This is a typical instance of inaugurated eschatology, an eschatology which is inaugurated by the ministry of the Holy Spirit.

2 Corinthians 5.14–15 moves back to present realities. Paul offers a contrast:

ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει ἡμᾶς, κρίναντας τοῦτο, ὅτι εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον· καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἵνα οἱ ζῶντες μηκέτι ἑαυτοῖς ζῶσιν ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι.

For the love of the Christ constrains us, having concluded this: that one died for all, so all died. And for all he died, so that those who live might no longer live for themselves but for the one who died and was raised for them.

The expression οἱ ζῶντες ('those who live') in verse 15 is interesting here. On the face of it, this could refer to all living human beings. However, the fact that οἱ ζῶντες are to live not for themselves but for 'the one who died and was raised for them' (5.15) suggests that the expression refers to believers.⁴³ Considering the argument so far, οἱ ζῶντες must be those who have been made alive specifically by the Spirit, since it is the Spirit that gives life. Paul likely still has the argument of Ezekiel 37.1–14 in mind here.⁴⁴

The language of new creation (καὶνὴ κτίσις) in 5.17 is also significant. The phrase itself cannot be traced back to the Old Testament. Nonetheless it is consistent with the themes that one would associate with the new covenant.⁴⁵ Ezekiel 37.1–14 envisages the giving of the spirit as a form of re-creation by drawing on the language of Genesis 1–2. In fact, John Yates has shown that new creation in 5.17 is linked with the theme of the Spirit, by pointing to the preceding verses.⁴⁶ Firstly, Yates notes, as I have above, that the death/life contrasts in 5.14–15 could echo the contrast given in 3.6 between the Spirit giving life but the letter killing. Secondly, 2 Corinthians 5.16 describes the idea of no longer knowing Christ κατὰ σάρκα. This 'instantly recalls the πνεῦμα/σάρξ contrast developed by Paul elsewhere.'⁴⁷ Yates follows Hubbard in seeing the Spirit/flesh contrast as not between different perspectives (i.e. fleshly knowledge vs. spiritual knowledge), but between two *states* or *identities* (κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα) which lead to different ways of knowing.⁴⁸ It is interesting that Paul uses the language of new creation in the context of the work of the spirit and suggests a link

⁴³ So Harris, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 422–23.

⁴⁴ Of course, the simple mention of οἱ ζῶντες cannot be used to suggest an allusion to Ezekiel 37.1–14. Rather it is in light of *the whole argument* that such language could be evidence of the influence of Ezekiel 37 on Paul.

⁴⁵ There is debate as to whether Paul is making a statement about individuals in this verse ('if anyone is in Christ then he/she is a new creation') or about a new creation in general ('if anyone is in Christ then there is a new creation'). The second option has been argued for by a number of scholars: e.g. Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 314; Paul Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 296 (though he does not dismiss the personal dimension by implication); Ralph Philip Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 2nd Ed., WBC (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2014), 311. However, I would agree with Murray J. Harris that 'the εἰ and τις combine to give καὶνὴ κτίσις a personal reference relating to the individual's faith-union with Christ' (Harris, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 432).

⁴⁶ Yates, *Spirit and Creation*, 118–19.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 119.

⁴⁸ See Moyer V. Hubbard, *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought*, SNTSMS 119 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 183–84.

between the two. If this is so, Ezekiel 37 and the concept of life by the Spirit was likely still in Paul's mind as he wrote this.

Towards the end of his apostolic defence, Paul quotes Ezekiel 37.27 in 6.16.⁴⁹ He does so to encourage the Corinthians not to be 'unequally yoked' (ἐτεροζυγοῦντες) with unbelievers (6.14). It is not certain what specific practice is in mind.⁵⁰ The most likely option is that Paul is encouraging the Corinthians to stay away from cultic pagan practices. This would fit with Paul's reference to idols (εἰδώλων) in 6.16. William Webb suggests that the most likely manifestations of 'unequally yoked' would involve partaking in pagan temple meals or visiting cult prostitutes, two problems Paul had already treated in 1 Corinthians.⁵¹ Paul notes that there can be no agreement or union (συγκατάθεσις) between the sanctuary of God and idols. As in 1 Corinthians 3.16, Paul defines the ναὸς θεοῦ ζῶντος as the church.⁵² He then supports this statement (and his argument about avoiding idolatry) with a catena of Old Testament quotations. The first of those is important for our purposes:

ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεὸς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μου λαός. (2 Cor 6.16)

I will dwell in/amongst them, and I will walk (amongst them), and I will be their God and they shall be my people.

⁴⁹ The section 6.14–7.1 is often considered an interpolation by scholars, perhaps even of a previous letter by Paul. But it is unclear why a later redactor would insert this section seemingly so jarringly after 6.13. I agree with Harris who notes, 'we might argue that it is more appropriate to suppose that Paul himself, known for his propensity to digress as he dictated his letters, has abruptly digressed at 6:14 than that some unknown editor, devoid of literary sensibilities, has awkwardly interpolated the passage at this point in Paul's letter' (Harris, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 24–25).

⁵⁰ Although the argument has been made that the ἄπιστοι are false apostles, it is most likely that Paul has unbelievers or pagans in mind. See Ibid., 499; and particularly William J Webb, 'Unequally Yoked Together with Unbelievers, Part 1: Who Are the Unbelievers (Ἄπιστοι) in 2 Corinthians 6:14?', *BSac* 149.593 (1992): 27–44. For the view that Paul's opponents are in mind, see Seifrid, *Second Letter to the Corinthians*, 289–90.

⁵¹ William J Webb, 'Unequally Yoked Together with Unbelievers, Part 2: What Is the Unequal Yoke (Ἐτεροζυγοῦντες) in 2 Corinthians 6:14?', *BSac* 149.594 (1992): 162–79. Harris broadly agrees, although he does suggest that it is possible that this is a broader appeal to 'avoid any public or private relationship with unbelievers that was incompatible with or would compromise Christian standards, Christian adherence to monotheism, and Christian witness' (Harris, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 501).

⁵² If the reading ἡμεῖς in 6.14 is preferred over the variant ὑμεῖς (which is presumably due to a scribe being influenced by 1 Cor 3.16), then Paul is not simply making the point that the Corinthian assembly is the temple of God, but that the whole people of God is his temple (since he includes himself in the statement).

It is likely that Paul has combined Leviticus 26.11 and Ezekiel 37.27 LXX. These texts are reproduced below:

Καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μου λαός (Lev 26.11 LXX)

And I will walk amongst you, and I will be your God, and you will be my people.

καὶ ἔσται ἡ κατασκήνωσίς μου ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς θεός καὶ αὐτοὶ μου ἔσονται λαός (Ezek 37.27 LXX)

and my dwelling will be in/amongst them, and I will be God to them, and they will be my people.

The use of ἐμπεριπατήσω suggests that the closest parallel is with Leviticus 26.11. However, whereas Leviticus addresses the people directly, using second-person plural pronouns, Paul here uses third-person pronouns. If Paul were quoting only Leviticus 26.11 there would be no obvious reason to change pronouns. Indeed, the remaining Scriptures in verses 17–18 use the second person. It would have made for a smoother catena of quotations had Paul stuck with Leviticus' second-person pronouns. The use of the third person suggests that Paul is also alluding to Ezekiel 37.27.⁵³ The statements καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς θεός καὶ αὐτοὶ μου ἔσονται λαός ('and I will be God to them, and they will be my people' – Ezek 37.27) and καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεός καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μου λαός ('and I will be their God and they will be my people' – 2 Cor 6.16) are almost identical. Furthermore, there is no Old Testament correspondence for the statement in 6.16, ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς ('I will dwell in/amongst them'). However, in Ezekiel 37.27 LXX there are words to the same effect: ἔσται ἡ κατασκήνωσίς μου ἐν αὐτοῖς ('my dwelling will be in/amongst them').⁵⁴ Additionally, the context of Ezekiel 37.27, just like that of 2 Cor 6.16, contains temple language: 'I will place my holy things in their midst' (θήσω τὰ ἅγια μου ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν – 37.26). Here, the LXX uses the slightly ambiguous τὰ ἅγια μου ('my holy things'). However, the MT is clearer: והיה משכני עליהם ('my sanctuary will be over/upon them'). Furthermore, both the statements from Leviticus 26 and from Ezekiel 37 come off the back of a promise that God would make his covenant with his people (Lev 26.10; Ezek 37.26). In the context of Ezekiel, though,

⁵³ So Harris, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 505.

⁵⁴ If the Göttingen LXX reading of σκηνήν is taken over διαθήκην then it could also be a paraphrase of Leviticus 26.11.

it is much clearer that this covenant has an eschatological nature to it. Perhaps Paul is combining two quotations but is taking advantage of the eschatological context of Ezekiel 37. In conclusion, the similarity of wording, the odd change of pronouns, the shared temple-language and the eschatological context make it likely that Paul is quoting Ezekiel 37.26 and not just Leviticus 26.11.

Paul's conclusion at the end of this catena of quotations is interesting as well. He notes: 'Therefore, since we have these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves (καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς) from every pollution (μολυσμοῦ) of flesh and spirit, bringing about holiness in the fear of God' (2 Cor 7.1). As Harris notes, Paul cannot be referring to a ceremonial washing because it is both flesh and spirit that are to be cleansed.⁵⁵ So Paul must be saying something to the effect that believers should steer clear of anything that would defile their flesh and spirit. There is a possibility that this injunction shows the ongoing influence of Ezekiel 36–37. The language of flesh and spirit is very common in Ezekiel 36–37 as is the language of cleansing (καθαρ-). Furthermore, it is specifically from their idols that Israel is cleansed in Ezekiel 36–37 (e.g. 36.25; 37.23). This provides another point of connection between 2 Corinthians 6.14–7.1 and Ezekiel 36–37. Both the explicit quotation in 6.16 and the language of 7.1 make it more likely that Paul earlier had Ezekiel 36–37 in mind in chapters 3–5.

Several conclusions can be drawn from Paul's use of Ezekiel 36–37 in 2 Corinthians 2–7. Firstly, Paul seems to think of the two chapters as a unit (perhaps he even recognised Ezekiel 34–37 as a unit). He alludes to and echoes both chapters within a few verses in 2 Corinthians 3.1–6 and the themes from both chapters permeate this section of the letter. We could think of this, in terms we explored in chapter 2, as a metaleptic use of Scripture by Paul – an allusion to one part of Ezekiel 36–37 conjuring up the whole. Secondly, the idea of life given by the Spirit, clearly drawn from Ezekiel 37.1–14 is primarily thought of in *present* terms. Throughout these chapters, Paul notes that it is life in the Spirit which marks out the new covenant. This is a reality which is already true. However, this is not a *realised* form of eschatology. Indeed, Paul still has an eye on the future, as shown by 2 Corinthians 4.13–5.10. As such we might speak of an *inaugurated* reality. Thirdly, the use of Ezekiel 37.27 in 2 Corinthians 6.16 shows that there are *ethical* consequences to the reality of the promises of Ezekiel 36–37. This is true in the context of Ezekiel 36–37: the gift of the Spirit is given to cleanse Israel

⁵⁵ Harris, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 511–12.

from its idols and enable them to walk in God's commands. That is true in 2 Corinthians 2–7 as well. We will observe this ethical implication even more prominently in Romans 7–8. Finally, a point assumed so far, but important to make explicit here: Paul draws on Ezekiel 36–37 to refer to realities which have happened not just to Jewish believers but also to *Gentiles*. Most, or at least many, of the Corinthian believers would have been Gentiles. Paul therefore applies promises made to Israel to all those in Christ, both Jews and Gentiles.⁵⁶

The use of Ezekiel 36–37 in 2 Corinthians 2–7 is clear, and I have drawn several preliminary conclusions. Although Paul's use of Ezekiel 36–37 is most explicit in 2 Corinthians (in that there are clear quotations), there is similar reflection in 1 Corinthians and a further development of Paul's use of these chapters in Romans 7–8. I now explore these two letters.

4.3.3 1 Corinthians

To what extent was Paul's use of Ezekiel 36–37 novel when he wrote 2 Corinthians? As noted at the start of this chapter, the influence of Ezekiel on Jesus' ministry and the emphasis on the Spirit which the prophet displays make it likely that he would have influenced early Christian pneumatology. Since Paul's understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit was central to his theology, it is natural to expect him to have reflected on Ezekiel's description of the gift of the Spirit prior to him writing 2 Corinthians.

This is clear in 1 Corinthians, written only shortly before 2 Corinthians.⁵⁷ The influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on Paul's thinking is clear in several sections of the letter. Additionally, the language of spirit (πνεῦμα) is prominent in this letter. Of course, the scriptural background to the Christian conviction that God had given his Spirit cannot be reduced to Ezekiel 36–37. Nonetheless, the way in which the Spirit of God is

⁵⁶ Paul Duff, exploring the allusion to Ezekiel 36.26 in 2 Corinthians 3.3, argues that Paul read Ezekiel 36 (which was originally about the restoration of Israel from among the nations) as a description of *Gentiles* coming in from the nations and being converted from paganism: Paul B. Duff, *Moses in Corinth: The Apologetic Context of 2 Corinthians 3* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 127–30.

⁵⁷ 1 Corinthians is usually dated to 54 or early 55 CE and written from Ephesus (1 Cor 16.8). See Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, HTANT (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 2006), 38–39; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2nd ed., BNTC (London: A. & C. Black, 1971), 5; Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 3; Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 29–32.

described as working in 1 Corinthians is analogous to the way in which Yahweh's Spirit acts in Ezekiel 36–37.

In 1 Corinthians 2.6–16, God's Spirit is linked with understanding and knowledge of God's gifts and activities. That which was not comprehensible, namely the activity of God in the cross, has been made known by God's Spirit: 'to us God has revealed this through the Spirit' (ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος – 1 Cor 2.10). In the short section in 2.10–16, the language of πνεῦμα or related vocabulary (e.g. πνευματικός) appears a dozen times and the Spirit is linked with understanding and knowledge. The one who is natural (ψυχικός) cannot understand the things of the Spirit of God (2.14). However, the one who has received the Spirit of God, the spiritual person (πνευματικός – 2.15), understands (or at least is able to) the things of God. Understanding being linked with the Spirit of God is present in a number of places in the Old Testament,⁵⁸ but it is particularly prominent in Ezekiel 36–37 with the use of the recognition formula, and 'you will know that I am Yahweh' (וידעתם כי אני יהוה; LXX: καὶ γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος).⁵⁹ Israel's reception of the Spirit of God leads to them knowing him. In the same way, believers receiving the Spirit enables them to understand the things of the Spirit of God (1 Cor 2.14–15)

1 Corinthians also contains much of Paul's temple-language. The church in Corinth is God's temple, his ναός, and his Spirit dwells amongst them (3.16–17). Furthermore, God's temple is holy (ἅγιος). This idea is repeated in 2 Corinthians, as seen above. Again, there are similarities with Ezekiel 36–37. God dwells in the Corinthian church by his Spirit, just as he promised to dwell amongst a renewed Israel:

θήσω τὰ ἁγία μου ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἔσται ἡ κατασκήνωσίς μου ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς θεός καὶ αὐτοὶ μου ἔσονται λαός

I will place my holy things in their midst forever and my dwelling shall be amongst them, and I shall be to them a God and they shall be my people. (Ezek 37.26–27 LXX)

Temple-specific language is more explicit in the MT. There, God states that he will put his שְׁכֵנִי amongst them (Ezek 37.26), rather than the more generic ἅγια (LXX).⁶⁰ The

⁵⁸ E.g. Exod 31.1–5; Isa 11.2; Dan 5.12.

⁵⁹ E.g. Ezek 37.13, 14.

⁶⁰ Ciampa and Rosner include Ezekiel 37.26–27 in a list of Scriptures which form part of the Old Testament background to the idea of God dwelling amongst his people and not just in a temple (Ciampa

temple language reappears again in 1 Corinthians 6.19 to refer to the bodies of individual Christians as indwelt by the Holy Spirit. Of course, we may simply be hearing echoes of a general Old Testament temple-theme, but it is significant that God's Spirit is never directly linked with his glory which dwells in the temple in the Old Testament.⁶¹ In Ezekiel 36–37, though, God promises to give his spirit to his people and also to put his sanctuary in their midst. As such the ideas of God's Spirit and temple intersect in these chapters more than any other. This makes an echo of Ezekiel possible here: the community has received the Spirit of God and become a sanctuary (שְׁמִי) in fulfilment of Ezekiel 37.

1 Corinthians 6.11 offers another possible point of contact with Ezekiel 36–37. In 6.10, Paul lists people who will not inherit God's kingdom. He notes that some of the Corinthians used to be these kinds of people. But a dramatic change has taken place in their lives:

ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

But you were washed, but you were made holy, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by/in the Spirit of our God.
(1 Corinthians 6.11)

It seems possible, even likely, that Paul's use of ἀπολούω is meant to remind the Corinthians of their baptism. Indeed, the only other place in which the term is used in the New Testament is in Acts 22.16 to refer to Ananias encouraging Paul to be baptised and wash away (ἀπόλουσαι) his sins. The expression ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ perhaps also adds weight to a baptismal understanding of the phrase ἀπελούσασθε. We consider this further in chapter 7.

Baptism or not, several elements of this verse point towards the influence of Ezekiel 36–37. Firstly, 1 Corinthians 6.11 deals with the general theme of being cleansed from one's old lifestyle, as does Ezekiel 36.25–26. Secondly, idolators (εἰδωλολάτραι) are explicitly mentioned in the list of vices in 1 Corinthians 6.9–10, and Ezekiel 36.25 states that Israel will be cleansed from their idols. Thirdly, although the

and Rosner, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 158) They also cite Exod 25.8; 29.45; Lev 26.11–12; Ezek 11.16; Ps 114.2.

⁶¹ In Josephus, *A.J.* 8.114, Solomon is recorded as having asked God to send μοῖραν τινα τοῦ σοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὸν ναόν ('a portion of your Spirit into the temple').

term ἀπολούω is not used in Ezekiel 36–37, God promises that he will sprinkle clean water on Israel and cleanse them: ‘and I will sprinkle upon you clean water and you will be cleansed from all of your impurities’ (καὶ ῥανῶ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ὕδωρ καθαρὸν καὶ καθαρισθήσεσθε ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀκαθαρσιῶν ὑμῶν – Ezek 36.25). Fourthly, cleansing (and sanctifying and justifying) takes place ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν (‘by/in the Spirit of our God’ – 1 Cor 6.11). In Ezekiel 36.25–27, it is presumably the giving of God’s Spirit which counts as the sprinkling with clean water. The combination of the language of washing and the language of πνεῦμα is found in Ezekiel 36 very clearly. All these contact points make it at least plausible that Ezekiel 36 exercised an influence on Paul as he wrote this. Paul was perhaps thinking explicitly of God’s promise to cleanse Israel of their idolatry by his Spirit and applying this promise to his Gentile converts.⁶²

Resurrection and Ezekiel 36–37 in 1 Corinthians 15

1 Corinthians 15 is the resurrection chapter of Paul’s writings *par excellence*. It also contains the clearest allusion to Ezekiel 37 in 1 Corinthians. The cluster of verses of most interest is 15.42–49, particularly verses 44–46. In verses 35–41, Paul answers the objection of a hypothetical sceptic concerning the possibility of bodily resurrection. He uses the analogy of seeds and plants to explain discontinuity and continuity between the body at death and the body in resurrection (vv.36–38). He also alludes to the variety of bodies and “fleshes” in creation (vv.39–41). In verses 42–44 he combines these ideas: the body is sown (i.e. dies) in one way (ἐν φθορᾷ; ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ; ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ), but is raised in another (ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ; ἐν δόξῃ; ἐν δυνάμει).⁶³ This comes to a climax in the opposition of the two kinds of bodies: the body which dies is a σῶμα ψυχικόν. It is raised as a σῶμα πνευματικόν. Few of Paul’s expressions have generated more scholarly discussion than these two. There are several factors that help in understanding what Paul has in mind in these two expressions.

⁶² Ciampa and Rosner draw attention to the Old Testament background of cleansing by the Spirit (and include Ezekiel 36.23–27 as an example of this): ‘God’s establishment of the Messiah (Christ) as Lord over all and his transformation of his people by the cleansing and renewing power and presence of the Holy Spirit were both part of the Old Testament picture of the wonderful changes that would be introduced with the in-breaking of the age to come and its overcoming of this present evil age’ (Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 244–45 [see 245 footnote 96]).

⁶³ Ware has compellingly shown that the grammar of 15.36–49 shows that it is the *same* body which is sown and which is raised: Ware, ‘Understanding of the Resurrection’.

The contrast between ψυχικόν and πνευματικόν appears earlier in the letter. This should inform any discussion of the meaning of σῶμα ψυχικόν and σῶμα πνευματικόν. In 2.14 the natural, or soulish, person (ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος) is unable to receive the things of the Spirit of God because these things are ‘spiritually discerned’ (πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται – 2.14). This idea of ‘spiritually discerned’ should not be taken to refer to a hermeneutical approach (e.g. spiritual vs. literal). Rather it is a discerning which is enabled *by* the Holy Spirit. This is confirmed by the statement earlier in 2.10 (ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος – ‘to us God has revealed [this] through the Spirit’). The ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος, then, is presumably a person who has not been given the Spirit of God, who operates under the guidance of his or her ψυχή, soul. By contrast, the spiritual (πνευματικός) person is someone who has been given the Spirit of God and is able to operate under the Spirit’s guidance.

If Paul’s usage of πνευματικός and ψυχικός is consistent, we would expect his use of the terms in chapter 15 to carry a similar idea.⁶⁴ In this sense, it is not so much the *constitution* of the body which is in view (after all, the present body is surely not *constituted of* ψυχή), but the *animating principle* or, even better, the *suitability* of the body.⁶⁵ A σῶμα ψυχικόν is a body which is only *suitable* to be animated by the human soul. A σῶμα πνευματικόν is a body which is *suitable* to be fully animated by the Spirit of God.⁶⁶

In verses 44b–45, Paul continues. The contrast between the present body and the future body is also a contrast between the first and the last Adam. Paul provides an interpretative gloss on Genesis 2.7: ‘the first human, Adam, became a living soul; the last Adam a life-giving Spirit’ (1 Cor 15.45 – ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχήν ζῶσαν, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζῳοποιοῦν). In the place of a straightforward quotation of Genesis 2.7, Paul reinterprets this passage in light of Christ: Adam is not

⁶⁴ So e.g. Thiselton, confidently: ‘I have no doubt whatever that Paul uses the adjective πνευματικός in its regular Pauline sense to denote *that which pertains to the Holy Spirit of God*’ (Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1275).

⁶⁵ See Wright, *Resurrection*, 354: ‘It is the most elegant way that [Paul] can find of saying both that the new body is the *result* of the Spirit’s work (answering “how does it come to be?”) and that it is the appropriate *vessel* for the Spirit’s life (answering “what sort of a thing is it?”).’

⁶⁶ I use the language of suitability here to agree with the point made by Frederick Tappenden that it is not merely that which animates or rules the body which is in view. This view (put forward by Thiselton and others) is ‘problematic for the simple reason that ... Paul’s focus throughout 15:35–50 is squarely on the somatic exterior’ (Frederick S. Tappenden, *Resurrection in Paul: Cognition, Metaphor, and Transformation*, ECL 19 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2016], 117).

just ὁ ἄνθρωπος, but ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος. Paul expands on his creative quotation of Genesis 2.7 by describing the last Adam as ‘a life-giving spirit’ (πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν). How has Paul come to this conclusion? Many scholars have suggested a Philonic influence, which is of course possible, but it does not fully explain the contrast here.⁶⁷ Instead, it is more likely that Paul has been influenced by Scripture. In the LXX, the term πνεῦμα is never used in conjunction with ζωοποιέω.⁶⁸ However, the combination of ζάω or ζωή along with πνεῦμα appears more in Ezekiel than in any other writing, and this combination is clearest in Ezekiel 37.1–14, where resurrection and the giving of God’s Spirit are intimately linked. Paul’s reading of Genesis 2.7 has likely been influenced by his understanding of Ezekiel 37.1–14. With his conviction of Christ as the last Adam, his reading of Ezekiel 37.1–14 led him to see an eschatological dimension to the Genesis story. Ciampa and Rosner rightly note:

The idea of a life-giving spirit comes from reading Genesis 2:7 in light of Ezekiel 37 (esp. vv. 6, 9, 10, 14). In Genesis 2:7 it is when God breathed into the man that he came to life. In Ezekiel 37: 6, 9, 10, 14 God repeatedly says, echoing Genesis 2, that it is by putting his breath or Spirit ... in his people that they would be brought to life.⁶⁹

Paul, then, thought of the Spirit as the agent which gives life at the eschaton and this understanding most likely comes from a combination of Genesis 2.7 and Ezekiel 37.1–14. We noted in the previous chapter that Ezekiel 37.1–14 was regularly applied to eschatological resurrection in early Judaism. The emphasis in this chapter is eschatological, bodily resurrection, so for Paul to draw on Ezekiel 37 would be in line with much Jewish thinking of the time.

Nonetheless, it is important to note that there is a *present* dimension to Paul’s thinking here. Indeed, although the believer awaits eschatological resurrection, Christ

⁶⁷ Drawing on Schrage, Schnabel lists the key differences between Philo’s and Paul’s treatment: (1) Genesis 1.27 plays no role in Paul’s treatment; (2) the heavenly man is not some timeless ideal for Paul, but a historical person; (3) The last Adam has an eschatological dimension for Paul which is completely absent in Philo; (4) Resurrection plays no role in Philo; (5) Paul is interested in the contrast between ψυχικός and πνευματικός whereas Philo is interested in how they correspond to each other: Schnabel, *Der erste Brief*, 972.

⁶⁸ In fact, ζωοποιέω only appears 8 times in the LXX: Judg 21.14; 2 Kgs 5.7; Ezra 9.8, 9; Neh 9.6; Job 36.6; Ps 70.20; Eccl 7.12.

⁶⁹ Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 820. Maston agrees and notes: ‘Although Paul does not “cite” Ezekiel in 1 Cor 15.45, it seems highly likely that his phrase πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν is reflecting Ezekiel’s vision of the Spirit’s work’ (Maston, ‘Anthropological Crisis’, 546).

himself is *already* a life-giving Spirit. He does not become so at the eschaton. Eckhard Schnabel notes:

Das Ptz. Präs. ζωοποιῶν ist in seinem Gegenwartsbezug Ernst zu nehmen, gerade im Kontext der Imperative in V. 33–34. Der lebensschaffende Geist des Herrn wirkt bereits in der Gegenwart: Jesusbekenner leben in der wirkmächtigen Gegenwart der “Herrlichkeit des Herrn” und werden dadurch in das Bild Christi verwandelt, “von Herrlichkeit zu Herrlichkeit, durch den Geist des Herrn” (2Kor 3,18). Die Neue Welt Gottes, die mit der leiblichen Auferstehung der Toten einsetzt, ragt in die Gegenwart hinein: “Wenn also jemand in Christus ist, dann ist er eine neue Schöpfung: Das Alte ist vergangen, Neues ist geworden” (2Kor 5,17).⁷⁰

As Schnabel explains, the life-giving work of the Spirit is something which is described as a present reality elsewhere in Paul. This was clear from our discussion of 2 Corinthians. Although the emphasis of 1 Corinthians 15 is on the future resurrection of believers, Paul clearly understood Christ to *already* be a life-giving Spirit. Crucially, as we have seen, this life-giving role of the Spirit is drawn from Ezekiel 37.1–14.

In conclusion, 1 Corinthians as a whole and 1 Corinthians 15 in particular suggest that Ezekiel 36–37 had an important role to play in the development of Paul's understanding of the Holy Spirit. This was not as obvious at first sight as in 2 Corinthians, but the influence of these chapters can be felt in 1 Corinthians in ways very similar to 2 Corinthians. This suggests that Paul's reflection on Ezekiel 36–37 was not brand new when he wrote 2 Corinthians. Furthermore, several conclusions we drew from 2 Corinthians can be drawn from 1 Corinthians as well: Paul mainly draws on Ezekiel 36–37 to describe a *present* reality. Even his use of Ezekiel 37 in 1 Corinthians 15.45 is a description of an already-present reality (Christ is already a life-giving Spirit). He also uses Ezekiel 36–37 in descriptions involving ethics (for example, 1 Cor 6.11). Finally, the promises of these two chapters are applied to all in Christ and not only Jewish believers.

4.3.4 Romans 7–8

The clear influence of Ezekiel 36–37 which was detected in 2 Corinthians 2–7 is visible in Romans 7–8 as well. Many scholars have already drawn attention to the connections

⁷⁰ Schnabel, *Der erste Brief*, 972.

between Romans 8 and Ezekiel 36–37, although they have often not explored the full significance of this link.⁷¹ Few, however, if any, have made the connection between Romans 7 and Ezekiel 36–37. In this section, I will suggest that, directly or indirectly, Ezekiel 36–37 influenced Paul as he composed Romans 7–8.

Preliminary Factors Suggesting the Likelihood of Influence

There are a few factors that make the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 in Romans 7–8 likely. As we shall see below, Romans 7.5–6 presents, in summary form, what is expanded upon in the remainder of the two chapters. This is important because Paul notes the following in Romans 7.6:

νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ
κατειχόμεθα, ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ
παλαιότητι γράμματος

But now we have been released from the Law, having died to that by
which we were confined, so that we would serve in newness of the
Spirit and not oldness of the letter.

Believers, according to Paul, have been set free from bondage to the Torah. They no longer serve in the ‘oldness of the letter (παλαιότητι γράμματος)’. Instead, they serve ‘in the newness of the Spirit (ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος)’. This contrast between πνεῦμα and γράμμα is central to 2 Corinthians 2–7. We saw that in those chapters Paul’s thinking, particularly the role of the Spirit in giving life and the letter bringing death, had been formed by Ezekiel 36–37. Before writing Romans, then, Paul had clearly reflected long and hard about this contrast between letter (Law) and Spirit. Furthermore, this was presumably a topic which was fresh in his mind since Paul likely wrote Romans during his stay in Corinth shortly after he had written 2 Corinthians from Macedonia.⁷²

But it is not simply that the topic would have been fresh in Paul’s mind. Paul may also have written Romans in the hearing of and partly for the benefit of the Corinthians amongst whom he was staying. This is the argument advanced by Charlotte

⁷¹ As noted by Yates, *Spirit and Creation*, 143. Writing after Yates’ study was published, G. K. Beale does note strong parallels between Romans 8 in particular and Ezekiel 36–37, drawing some clear implications: Beale, *New Testament Biblical Theology*, 252–54. See also Maston, *Divine and Human Agency*, 160–61.

⁷² Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 1–3; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, xliii–xliv.

Hartwig and Gerd Theissen.⁷³ They claim that the oral nature of composition in the ancient world makes it almost inconceivable that the Corinthian churches were not exposed to Paul's thinking as he planned and composed Romans. It is even possible that Paul composed certain parts of Romans in part to aid the Corinthians in their own thinking. Hartwig and Theissen suggest that Paul introduces the contrast of letter and Spirit in 7.6 to help correct a misunderstanding of 2 Corinthians 3 in which the Law itself could be seen as sinful. Paul explains in Romans 7.7–25 that it is sin, using the Law, and not the Law *per se* which kills.⁷⁴ If Theissen and Hartwig's thesis is correct, and it has much to commend it, it is even more likely that Paul was reflecting on the very things he had dealt with earlier in 2 Corinthians 3–5. Since Ezekiel 36–37 formed such a key component of his thinking in 2 Corinthians, it is likely that it also does in Romans 7–8, especially when Paul is treating a similar topic. It remains to see whether this is borne out by the textual evidence of Romans.

Who is ἐγώ in Romans 7.7–25?

To appreciate the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on Romans 7–8 most fully, it is necessary to ask who Romans 7.7–25 is speaking of. This is, however, not a straightforward task, as any student of Romans will be aware.⁷⁵ Who is the ἐγώ experiencing the internal struggle described in these verses? Is Paul depicting his own present experience? Is it his pre-Christian experience? Is ἐγώ being used as a rhetorical device to refer to a group of people? The answer to these questions has significant implications for understanding Romans 7–8 and for detecting the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on this chapter. In what follows, I argue that Romans 7.7–25 is not a description of Christian experience, nor is it likely to be Paul's *felt* experience prior to coming to know Christ. Instead, the most likely understanding of ἐγώ here is that put forward by Douglas Moo and others: Paul is primarily describing the plight of Israel as they encounter the Torah at Sinai and is,

⁷³ Charlotte Hartwig and Gerd Theissen, 'Die korinthische Gemeinde als Nebenadressat des Römerbriefs. Eigentextreferenzen des Paulus und kommunikativer Kontext des längsten Paulusbriefes', *NovT* 46.3 (2004): 229–52. This notion of *Nebenadressat* has been drawn upon particularly by Douglas Campbell in his reconstruction of Paul's travels and letter-writing. See Campbell, *Framing Paul*, 52–55.

⁷⁴ Hartwig and Theissen, 'Die korinthische Gemeinde', 242–43.

⁷⁵ See John Ziesler's stark assessment: 'If Paul was clear what he wanted to say in the rest of Romans 7 [vv7–25], then it must be confessed that he failed to communicate that clarity to later readers. Few sections of any of his letters can have received so much scholarly attention with so little resulting agreement' (John A. Ziesler, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, TPINTC [London: SCM, 1989], 179).

by extension, describing the experience of Torah-observant Jews with the hindsight of having come to know Christ.

Before making the case for Moo's reading, I will comment on some weaknesses of alternative views. One common view is that Romans 7.7–25 represents the eschatological tension (the now and not yet) within which all Christians live.⁷⁶ This is initially an attractive reading (as well as borne out by the experience of many Christians). Despite the initial attraction of this reading, it does not do justice to the argument of the text in the context of Romans more broadly. If Paul were describing his own present experience, in common with that of all Christians, 7.7–25 would not merely be in tension with what Paul writes elsewhere in Romans, not least in chapters 6 and 8, it would be a flat-out contradiction of Paul's previous assessment of believers. Indeed, only a chapter earlier, Paul had explained that believers are dead to sin and should count themselves as such (6.2, 11). His exhortation to live as those who are dead to sin and alive to God would be baseless if Romans 7.7–25 were a description of believers. Furthermore, Romans 8.1–11 paints a thoroughly different picture of Christian life to what is described in Romans 7.7–25.

But one of the strongest exegetical reasons to disagree with this view comes not from outside of the text, but from Romans 7 itself. In 7.5, Paul notes 'for when we were in the flesh, the passions of the sins which were through the Law were at work in our limbs, leading to bearing fruit to death.' This is clearly a description of a time prior to coming to Christ: being in the flesh, sin working through the law, sin being at work in our limbs... This is precisely what Paul describes in 7.14–25. As Chang notes, 'what is compactly expressed in the past tense in v. 5 ... is exactly represented at length in the present tense in vv. 14–24a, 25b.'⁷⁷ Furthermore, in 7.6 Paul describes what has

⁷⁶ E.g. Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 375–413. Particularly representative are statements like the following (on 7.15): 'As the γὰρ indicates, this verse begins the explanation of what it means to be "sold under sin" (v 14) – that is, not an abject, unquestioning servitude, but a slavery under protest, the frustrated impotence of one who has to live "in newness of Spirit" while still "in the flesh"' (389)

⁷⁷ Hae-Kyung Chang, 'The Christian Life in a Dialectical Tension?: Romans 7:7–25 Reconsidered', *NovT* 49.3 (2007): 272. Seifrid astutely notes: 'Rom 7:7–25 and 8:1–30 develop 7:5 and 7:6 respectively, where the state of believers prior to faith is set in contraposition to Christian existence: "once (7:5)...but now (7:6)"; Mark A. Seifrid, 'The Subject of Rom 7:14–25', *NovT* 34.4 (1992): 319. Eckhard Schnabel notes that the majority of interpreters now agree that 7.7–25 is an expansion of the idea found in 7.5: Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer: Kapitel 6–16*, HTANT (Witten: Brockhaus, 2015), 121. So also Michael Wolter, *Der Brief an die Römer*, EKKNT (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie, 2014), 1:417, 465.

happened to him and other (Jewish?) believers: freedom from the Law and new life in the Spirit – exactly what we then find in Romans 8. Romans 7.7–25 must therefore describe a state prior to being joined to Christ, and Romans 8 must describe new life in Christ. The ἐγώ, then, is clearly not representative of Paul's (and other Christians') present experience. Otherwise, it would be inconsistent with Paul's argument elsewhere in Romans and within Romans 7 itself.

An alternative would be to see this section as a description of Paul's felt experience *prior* to knowing Christ – namely Paul's experience as a non-Christian, Torah-observant Jew. Initially, this view seems more appealing as it does justice to the clear break in a believer's relationship to sin noted in Romans 6 and 8. However, it still does not do justice to the language of 7.7–25 itself. Firstly, 7.7–12 deals with the arrival of the Law. It is difficult to see how Paul can speak of the Law arriving within his lifetime, and the view which claims that Paul is speaking of his Bar Mitzvah is unsatisfactory.⁷⁸ Secondly, the pessimistic language of 7.13–25 is difficult to reconcile with the confident language Paul uses to describe his previous life in Philippians 3.4–6 and Galatians 1.13–14. If there is any autobiographical element of Romans 7 (and I think that there is) it must be with the benefit of hindsight. A purely autobiographical description of Paul's felt struggle with sin prior to his encounter with Jesus cannot fully account for the language of Romans 7.

The best solution is to understand ἐγώ as predominantly speech-in-character, a way of referring *primarily* to someone, or a group of people, other than Paul himself.⁷⁹ The most likely version of this view is that suggested by Douglas Moo: ἐγώ is partly a personification of Israel as it encounters the Law. Moo made this case strongly for 7.7–12 in a 1984 article and maintained it in his 1996 commentary on Romans.⁸⁰ Moo's overall case rests on (1) the use of νόμος to refer to the Jewish Torah and (2) the narrative flow of the passage.

⁷⁸ See Schnabel, *Römer: Kapitel 6–16*, 122: 'Die autobiographische Deutung (1) scheidet aus, weil kein Jude jemals sagen konnte, dass er einst ohne das Gesetz lebte (V. 9a): Für jüdische Kinder war auch die Zeit vor der Bar Mitzwa keine Zeit ohne Gesetz.'

⁷⁹ That ἐγώ can be used as a rhetorical device has been commonly accepted since Kümmel's study: Werner Georg Kümmel, *Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus*, UNT 17 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1929).

⁸⁰ Douglas J. Moo, 'Israel and Paul in Romans 7.7–12', *NTS* 32.1 (1986): 122–35; Moo, *Romans*. Others have broadly followed Moo with slight differences. For example, Wolter opts for a Jewish, pre-Christian understanding of ἐγώ under the Law, though with less emphasis on the personification of Israel (Wolter, *An die Römer*, 1:465–67).

Moo rightly argues that νόμος refers to the Jewish Law throughout 7.7–12.⁸¹ Paul has used νόμος so far in Romans to refer to the Jewish Law, and nothing suggests that this has changed. In Romans 7.1–6 he is clearly writing of the Torah. Paul also chooses οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις ('you shall not covet') as an example commandment in 7.7. This commandment is repeated twice in Exodus 20.17 and Paul likely has this commandment in mind. Furthermore, his description of the commandment as εἰς ζωὴν in 7.10 likely alludes to Leviticus 18.5, a key verse in Paul's understanding of the Mosaic Law (see Rom 10.5; Gal 3.12). All of this makes it overwhelmingly likely that it is specifically the Torah which Paul means by νόμος in these verses.

The fact that Paul has the Jewish Law in mind here makes another couple of views on the identity of ἐγὼ very unlikely. The first unlikely view is that the ἐγὼ refers to all non-Christians in the sense that rules have the potential of awakening disobedience.⁸² As true as this may be psychologically, Paul's use of νόμος as Torah suggests that this is not what is in view. A second unlikely view is that which sees ἐγὼ as a reference to Adam, because the Torah is in view and Adam did not possess the Torah. For some who hold this view, this is not a major issue. Dunn, for example, sees a clear allusion to Adam, despite understanding νόμος to mean Torah. He claims that it is likely that the view (evidenced from the Rabbis) that Adam possessed the Torah was around in Paul's time.⁸³ However, there is no concrete evidence for this belief in Paul's day. Paul's own assessment of the Law, death, Adam and sin in 5.12–14 also militates against this view: according to Romans 5.13 sin was in the world 'until the Law' (ἄχρι ... νόμου). In other words: the Torah appeared *after* Adam. Paul does not believe that Adam possessed the Torah. Quite the opposite. Goodrich agrees with Moo: 'For Paul, then, the experience of ἐγὼ is not timeless and universal, but restricted to those who live under the Law of Moses.'⁸⁴ The ἐγὼ is very much a non-Christian *Jewish* ἐγὼ.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Moo, 'Israel and Paul', 123–25.

⁸² Contra e.g. Schnabel, *Römer: Kapitel 6–16*, 123 who opts for seeing the ἐγὼ as a reference to universal, non-Christian humanity.

⁸³ Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 379.

⁸⁴ John K. Goodrich, 'Sold under Sin: Echoes of Exile in Romans 7.14–25', *NTS* 59.4 (2013): 490. Goodrich, however, gives priority to the autobiographical reading of Paul's pre-conversion and only by extension to Israel.

⁸⁵ Wolter, helpfully, notes that the seeming allusion to Adam in 7.11 does not mean that Paul is not speaking of Israel. Instead, 'er deutet die Begegnung mit der Rechtsforderung der Tora als Reprise der Geschichte Adams und Evas, wie sie ab Gen 2,16 erzählt wird' (Wolter, *An die Römer*, 1:467).

This brings us to Moo's second major argument: the narrative flow of the passage. Moo admits that it is this narrative flow that makes the ἐγώ-as-Adam view appealing. This is because the idea of sin coming to life (ἀνέζησεν – 7.9) and the idea of sin killing the ἐγώ (7.10) can be given their full theological force when Adam's fall is in view. However, for Moo, this is not decisive. The ἐγώ-as-Israel view also accounts for this language. Indeed, sin in some sense coming alive at the giving of the Law is consonant with what Paul says elsewhere. Moo points to Romans 5.20 and other texts to support this view.⁸⁶ The idea of the Torah bringing death also makes sense if Israel *as a whole* is being referred to. As Moo puts it:

while ἀπέθανον cannot designate the initial sentence of death imposed upon individual Israelites, it can be suggested that Paul views the law as that instrument which brought the sentence of death to Israel as a collective body, formed definitively in and through the Sinai experience.⁸⁷

Considering the use of νόμος and the narrative flow, Romans 7.7–13 makes sense as a description of the corporate death of Israel as they encountered the giving of the Law at Sinai.

Can this make sense of 7.14–25 as well? There is a transition from 7.7–13 to 7.14–25.⁸⁸ The topic moves from a past reality to a present conflict. We have already shown above that this section cannot be a description of Christians' present experience or of Paul's past *felt* experience. But can 7.14–25 realistically apply to Israel under the Law? Several aspects of the passage suggest that it can, but with a more specific focus on individual Israelites.

We must remember that Paul is referring to the Jewish law throughout this passage (with the possible exceptions of the ἕτερον νόμον in verse 23 and the νόμος ἁμαρτίας in verse 25).⁸⁹ Since it is unlikely that Paul is referring to Jewish Christians

⁸⁶ Moo, 'Israel and Paul', 127. He also points to Gal 3.19; 2 Cor 3.6–7; 1 Cor 15.56.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 127–28.

⁸⁸ The exact break in this chapter is a matter of debate, with some placing it after verse 12 and others after verse 13. Deciding on this issue is not crucial for our purposes. However, I suggest that a new section starting with verse 14 makes most rhetorical sense: each of these sections (7.7–13 and 7.14–25) begins with a question followed by an immediate μὴ γένοιτο and a clarification beginning with ἀλλά. This structural marker has the effect of starting a new sub-section within Paul's argument. Furthermore, there is a clear change of tense from verse 14 onwards.

⁸⁹ Not all commentators see these as exceptions. Some think that Paul is still referring to the Torah, but the Torah as used by sin. See especially Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 394–95 (somewhat cautiously); N. T.

here, this leaves the option of non-Christian Jews. This would account for several details in the passage. Firstly, if Paul primarily has corporate Israel in view in 7.7–13, a focus on individual non-Christian Jews sharing this plight in 7.14–25 would not be strange. Secondly, to claim that a non-Christian Jew delights in the Law would be expected (7.22). Finally, Paul's references to limbs and flesh suggest that there is a focus on individuals rather than simply Israel as a whole. An autobiographical element of some kind must be in view. This is a description of Paul, and other Jews, prior to coming to Christ.

But here an important qualification is needed. We noted above that this cannot be autobiographical of Paul's *felt* experience prior to Christ, because of such passages as Philippians 3.6 where Paul betrays no sense of struggle with sin prior to his conversion. The contrast between Romans 7 and the passage in Philippians seems too strong to be explained by different rhetorical purposes in the two letters. However, it does make sense to see Romans 7 as a description of the *reality* of Paul's life prior to Christ. Paul may not have subjectively experienced this struggle, but with hindsight he recognises the reality of it. As Moo notes:

I think that Paul is looking back, from his Christian understanding, to the situation of himself, and other Jews like him, living under the law of Moses. Of course, Paul is not giving us a full picture of that situation; he is concentrating on the negatives because that is what he must do to prove how useless the law was to deliver Jews from their bondage to sin. We might say, then, that Rom. 7:14–25 describes from a personal viewpoint the stage in salvation history that Paul delineates objectively in Gal. 3:19–4:3.⁹⁰

But it is important to note, and Moo is at pains to point this out, that Paul speaks this way throughout the passage because he speaks in solidarity with all Jews. What happened at Sinai to the whole Jewish people works itself out in the lives of individual non-Christian Jews, whether they would describe it in this way or not. So, Paul is writing both of the plight of Israel as a whole in its encounter with the Torah and of the objective reality of individual non-Christian Jews.

Wright, 'The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections', in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, ed. Leander E. Keck (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 10:570–71.

⁹⁰ Moo, *Romans*, 447–48.

Romans 7–8 and Ezekiel 36–37

With the above in mind, I will explore the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on Romans 7–8. As noted above, several scholars have already pointed out that much of Romans 8 is indebted to Ezekiel 36–37. However, it does not seem that many, if any, scholars have made the same case for Romans 7. If my reading of Romans 7.7–25 is correct, though, and it is a reference to Israel's encounter with Torah and to the reality of Jews under the Law, then it will become clear that the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 can be felt in Romans 7–8 in its entirety, and not just in chapter 8. Ezekiel 36–37 shows both the plight of Israel and its solution. Romans 7–8 does so as well. Crucially, both texts present the same plight and the same solution.

Romans 7 contains very little direct verbal overlap with Ezekiel 36–37. Paul may not be expecting his hearers to overhear Ezekiel. Nonetheless there are several key themes that both texts share. The first is Israel's inability to obey the Torah. I argued above that Romans 7.7–25 describes the plight of Israel when faced with the law and that this plight works itself out in the lives of individual Jews under the Law. The result of sin's usurping of the Torah is Israel's inability to obey the very Law that promised them life. So, Paul notes, 'sin, through the commandment, worked every covetousness in me' (Rom 7.8) and 'that which I want I do not do, but I do what I hate' (Rom 7.15). Furthermore: 'the willingness [to do good] is available to me, but the [ability] to do it isn't, for the good that I want I do not do, but the evil I do not want I do' (Rom 7.18–19). Sin has "hijacked" the Law to prevent those under the Law from obeying it.

The same plight is implied in Ezekiel 36. Exile was the result of Israel's idolatry and impurity (Ezek 36.16–21). The curse of exile as a punishment for failing to keep Torah had already been predicted in Deuteronomy 28.64–68, so Ezekiel's assessment of the reasons for exile is to be expected. But so is his promise of a return from exile and transformed living, which were also described in Deuteronomy 29–30. In Ezekiel 36.27 LXX God promises the following:

καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά μου δώσω ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ποιήσω ἵνα ἐν τοῖς δικαιώμασίν μου πορεύησθε καὶ τὰ κρίματά μου φυλάξησθε καὶ ποιήσητε

And my Spirit I will give in you, and I will make it so that you will walk in my decrees and keep my judgements and do them.

Ezekiel's assumption here is that prior to God giving his Spirit, Israel was *incapable* of keeping God's Torah.⁹¹ Otherwise, what need would there be for the divine enabling predicted here. This is the same situation which is faced by the ἐγώ in Romans 7. If our corporate understanding of ἐγώ-as-Israel is correct, the parallel with Ezekiel 36.27 is even stronger. Both passages betray a similar understanding of Israel's inability to obey God's Law without divine assistance.⁹²

It is not just the inability of Israel to obey the Torah which links Ezekiel 36–37 and Romans 7.7–25. The repercussions of failing to obey are the same in both texts. In Ezekiel 36.16–21 the punishment for Israel's idolatry is exile. In the vision of dry bones, a chapter later, the historical punishment of exile is recast with the image of death: Israel is described as a multitude of dry bones (Ezek 37.11). This is analogous to what happens in Romans 7. Sin worked through the Law to bring about the death of those under the Law (7.11, 13). In fact, the cry of despair is cast specifically in terms of a call for liberation from the body of death (τίς με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου – Rom 7.24). So then, just as in Ezekiel 37 Israel encountered death through the Law, in Romans 7.7–25 Israel encounters death through the Law. Death is figurative or “spiritual” in both passages, not only physical.

A final thematic link between Ezekiel 36–37 (37.1–14 in particular) and Romans 7.7–25 is the use of body-language to describe the plight of Israel. In Ezekiel 37.1–14, both Israel's deadness and the subsequent life through the Spirit are described through the language of dead and living bodies. Israel has been reduced, so to speak, to dry bones. It is perhaps not coincidental that when Paul speaks of sin operating through the Law, he describes it in very physical, bodily terms. The ἐγώ knows that no good dwells in his flesh (οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοί, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, ἀγαθόν – Rom 7.18). There is another νόμος at work in the ἐγώ's limbs (ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου – Rom 7.23). Furthermore, as we have just noted, the cry for deliverance in 7.24 takes the form of a cry for rescue from the body of death (τίς με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου – 7.24). Resurrection of some form is needed. This is also what is needed to solve the plight of Israel in Ezekiel 37.1–14.

⁹¹ So Mein, *Ethics of Exile*, 246.

⁹² Of course, a similar assessment would be shared by other texts, notably Jeremiah 31.31–34 and there is no need to assume that Paul had a single text in mind. As we saw in chapter 2, it is just as likely that Paul has a matrix of texts or even a tradition drawn from multiple texts in mind.

In isolation, these links between Romans 7.7–25 and Ezekiel 36–37 are perhaps too faint to make much of. But when these verses are put into the context of Romans 7–8 as a whole, the case becomes much stronger. Israel's failure to obey Torah is a common theme in the Old Testament. God transforming his people's heart to enable them to follow Torah is also a common theme (particularly in Deuteronomy 29–30 and Jeremiah 31.31–34). However, casting this plight and solution in terms of death, life and the giving of God's Spirit is unique to Ezekiel 36–37. As we shall see, Romans 8 presents the solution to the plight of Romans 7 in terms that clearly draw on Ezekiel 36–37. This makes the possible allusions and echoes of Ezekiel in Romans 7 more plausible.

From plight to solution: in Romans 8.1–4, Paul answers the question raised by the ἐγώ of Romans 7.24.⁹³ God must breathe his Spirit into dead people to give them life. 'The Law of the Spirit of life' (ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς) has freed the ἐγώ from the Law of sin and of death (Rom 8.2).⁹⁴ As in Ezekiel 37.1–14, the answer to death is for God to give his Spirit.⁹⁵ In both Ezekiel 37 and Romans 8.2, the Spirit is called specifically 'the Spirit of Life' ([τὸ] πνεῦμα [τῆς] ζωῆς).⁹⁶

In fact, the strange expression ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς may provide further evidence for the influence of Ezekiel 36–37. Stanislas Lyonnet has plausibly argued that Paul has brought together the New Covenant promises of Jeremiah 31.31–34 and Ezekiel 36–37.⁹⁷ Lyonnet notes, as we have also shown above, that in 2 Corinthians 3.1–6, Paul had thought of both Jeremiah 31.31–34 and Ezekiel 36.23–32 as referring to the same reality.⁹⁸ Since Jeremiah describes the new covenant in terms of God's laws being written on the heart and Ezekiel describes it in terms of the Spirit

⁹³ Moo, *Romans*, 469: 'we cannot ignore the way in which 8:2-4 sketches the solution to the dilemma of ἐγώ in 7:7-25.'

⁹⁴ The use of the singular σε suggests that the answer to the question in 7.24 is being given in the form of a dialogue. If the textual variant με is original the sense is still the same.

⁹⁵ See Maston, *Divine and Human Agency*, 160: 'the background [of Ezekiel] should be clear enough.'

⁹⁶ Fee claims that the expression 'the Spirit of life' is 'perhaps the single most significant designation of the Spirit in the Pauline corpus' (Gordon D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994], 525). Wolter also references Ezek 37.5 in terms of the language of the Spirit of life, here (Wolter, *An die Römer*, 1:473 note 14).

⁹⁷ See Stanislas Lyonnet, 'Rom 8,2-4 à la lumière de Jérémie 31 et d'Ézéchiél 35-39', in *Etudes sur l'Épître aux Romains*, 2nd ed., AnBib 120 (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003), 231–41.

⁹⁸ As I pointed out in chapter 3, this was not an unusual association to make.

(of life) being given to God’s people, it is likely, Lyonnet argues, that Paul has combined both into the expression ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς. So Lyonnet writes:

If suffit ... d’avoir présent à la pensée les deux oracles de Jérémie et d’Ézékiel, — qui en fait constituaient un tout et que Paul était habitué à combiner, comme le prouve 2 Cor 3,1-6 —, pour que la formule de Rom 8,2 devienne aussi naturelle que riche de signification.⁹⁹

Considering what we observed in 2 Corinthians 3.1–6, Lyonnet’s suggestion is surely correct.¹⁰⁰ Paul has combined both Jeremiah 31.31–34 and Ezekiel 36–37 to refer to the reality of the new covenant as the Law of the Spirit of life.¹⁰¹ Furthermore, if our conclusions above regarding Romans 7.7–25 are accurate, then the mention of πνεῦμα ζωῆς and the likely allusion to Ezekiel 37.1–14 in Romans 8.2 are all the more significant. Just as Israel was dead in exile and in need of resurrection through the Spirit of Life (Ezek 37.1–14), so those who were dead through the Law (Rom 7.7–25) experience life and restoration through the giving of the Spirit of life (Rom 8.1–4).

Although it is rarely picked up on, it is also likely that Ezekiel 36.25–27 is alluded to in Romans 8.4: τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα (‘the regulation of the Law might be fulfilled in us who do not walk according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit’).¹⁰² When this verse is compared with Ezekiel 36.27 LXX and the broader context of both passages is considered, the similarities are striking. Ezekiel 36.27 LXX reads as follows:

τὸ πνεῦμά μου δώσω ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ποιήσω ἵνα ἐν τοῖς δικαιώμασιν μου πορεύησθε καὶ τὰ κρίματά μου φυλάξησθε καὶ ποιήσητε

⁹⁹ Lyonnet, ‘Rom 8,2-4’, 233.

¹⁰⁰ See also Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 417; Moo, *Romans*, 475 who suggests this as a possibility but isn’t particularly convinced.

¹⁰¹ It is worth reiterating again how the expression πνεῦμα ζωῆς is almost unique to Ezekiel, and in this context would be evidence of Paul’s mind being drawn to Ezekiel 37.1–14. Thomas Schreiner rightly notes: ‘An OT antecedent is found in Ezekiel, where the “breath of the Lord,” that is, his Spirit, produces life (Ezek. 37:5–6, 9–10, 14), and Paul saw the prophecy of Ezekiel as being fulfilled in his gospel, since the resurrection was now assured for believers (cf. Rom. 8:10–11) and its power had invaded the present age’ (Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, 2nd ed., BECNT [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018], 396).

¹⁰² The link between Ezekiel 36.27 and Romans 8.4 is often not picked up on by commentators. E.g. Dunn, *Romans 1–8*; Schreiner, *Romans*; Moo, *Romans*; Ziesler, *Romans*. It is picked up on, though, by Yates, *Spirit and Creation*, 144–45; Maston, *Divine and Human Agency*, 160; Wolter, *An die Römer*, 1:481.

My Spirit I will put in you, and I will make it so that you may walk in my regulations and that you keep and do my judgements.

The logic and themes of both Romans 8.4 and Ezekiel 36.27 are broadly similar. In Romans 8.1–4, the δικαίωμα of the law is fulfilled in those who walk by the Spirit. In Ezekiel 36.27 the Spirit of God is given to enable obedience to God's δικαιώματα. There is clearly a passive aspect to this in Romans 8.4 (the δικαίωμα *is* fulfilled in believers), but the second half of the verse indicates that walking according to the Spirit is a necessary outcome. Although for Paul the emphasis is clearly on what *God* has done (hence the passive voice), Paul has a change of *lifestyle* in mind, not only of status.¹⁰³ This makes the link with Ezekiel 36.27 stronger. Furthermore, in both passages, the Spirit is given by God. Finally, both passages use travel-imagery of speak of living righteously: περιπατέω in Romans 8.4; πορεύομαι in Ezekiel 36.27. All of this shows that an allusion to Ezekiel 36.27 is likely – Paul saw Ezekiel's promise as being fulfilled in believers.

The first four verses of Romans 8.1–4 show how Paul has brought together the roles of the Spirit in Ezekiel 36 (moral transformation) and Ezekiel 37 (giving life). The twin problems of Ezekiel 36–37 are the twin problems highlighted in Romans 7: inability to obey God's Laws and the death which ensues. The twin solution of Ezekiel 36–37 is also the twin solution of Romans 8: the Spirit gives new life and enables the fulfilling of the Torah's requirements.

This twin solution (life and divine enablement) continues in the following verses, and this highlights the formative influence of Ezekiel 36–37 for Paul's thinking on this subject. There is a continuous contrast in verses 5–9 (and beyond) between those who are in the flesh and those who are in the Spirit. The two problems for those in the flesh according to these verses are, again, (1) the inability to please God and submit to his Law and (2) the resulting death (8.6; repeated by implication in 8.13).¹⁰⁴ But again, as in verses 1–4, this twin problem is met with a twin solution: (1) those in the Spirit have minds set on the things of the Spirit (8.5) and (2) the result is life (8.6). Once more,

¹⁰³ So, broadly, Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 424; Thomas R. Schreiner, 'The Abolition and Fulfillment of the Law in Paul', *JSNT* 11.35 (1989): 60. Wolter (*An die Römer*, 1:480–81) agrees that a change of lifestyle is in view. However, he notes that πληρωθῆναι 'ist kein *passivum divinum*' (480 note 42).

¹⁰⁴ In 8.6 and 8.13, death is probably used 'in the fullest eschatological sense' (Schreiner, *Romans*, 406 [414 on 8.13])

the problem and solution are the same as in Ezekiel 36–37: inability to obey God’s Law and death are met, through the Spirit, with divine enablement and life through the Spirit.

The life-giving power of the Spirit is again in view in Romans 8.10: ‘if Christ is in you, although the body is dead because of sin, the Spirit is life because of righteousness (τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην)’ (Rom 8.10). An important question here is whether πνεῦμα in this verse refers to the human spirit or to the divine Spirit. On the one hand, the contrast with σῶμα would suggest the latter option (the human spirit). However, there are indications that a reference to the divine Spirit is likely. Firstly, so far in chapter 8, πνεῦμα has been used exclusively to refer to the divine Spirit. Secondly, the divine Spirit is explicitly associated with life (ζωή) in the immediate context (8.1–4). Thirdly, if Paul wanted to say that the human spirit is *alive*, he could have said τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζῶν. By saying τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωή, Paul seems to be making a statement about the life-giving nature of the Spirit of God. Fourthly, in the verse immediately following, Paul talks about the πνεῦμα of God living in Christians. This makes it likely, then, that this is a reference to the Spirit of God being life despite death being at work in believers’ bodies.¹⁰⁵ Although believers live in bodies subject to death, God’s Spirit is life in them.¹⁰⁶ Importantly, this is a *present* reality.

Although the emphasis so far has been on the present reality brought about by the Spirit of Life, at this point in the chapter Paul moves from present to future: the Spirit will also bring about eschatological resurrection. We have seen this move from present to future happen in 2 Corinthians 3–5 already and it is even clearer in Romans 8. In 8.11, Paul notes:

If the Spirit of he who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will also make alive (ζωοποιήσει) your mortal bodies through his Spirit who lives in you.

Interestingly, in Romans 8, Paul does not use the explicit language of resurrection to refer to believers’ future hope; he uses the language of life.¹⁰⁷ Life by the Spirit is

¹⁰⁵ So Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 431–32; Moo, *Romans*, 492; Wolter, *An die Römer*, 1:489.

¹⁰⁶ It does not seem likely that Paul is referring to the body dying at baptism, as some have suggested: e.g. Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 491.

¹⁰⁷ Most commentators see a clear reference to eschatological resurrection in 8.11: e.g. Ulrich Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, EKKNT (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980), 2:133; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 432; Moo, *Romans*, 492–93. Some disagree, however. Jewett (*Romans*, 492–93) suggests that Paul does not refer to resurrection in 8.11 precisely because he uses the term ζωοποιέω. But this ignores that Paul uses ζωοποιέω in the context of eschatological resurrection in 1 Cor 15.45.

already a present reality for the believer, but there is a greater degree of life to come at the eschaton. With the likely influence of Ezekiel 37.1–14 at play,¹⁰⁸ and the overlap of language for present life and future life, would it not be possible that Paul sees believers as those who have both been raised and await resurrection? After all, Ezekiel 37.1–14 clearly describes resurrection (even if as a metaphor for restoration) without using the specific language of resurrection. This seemingly obvious point will be important when we explore in the next chapter whether we can detect a reference to inaugurated resurrection without explicit resurrection terminology being used.

Conclusion

If our reading is correct, Romans 7–8, like 2 Corinthians 3–5, is influenced by the logic and language of Ezekiel 36–37. In fact, Romans 7–8 represents an expansion of what Paul had explained in 2 Corinthians and earlier in 1 Corinthians. Romans 7.7–25 likely describes the collective experience of Israel encountering death through the Law as well as the experience of individual non-Christian Jews (from a Christian perspective). As a result, Israel is unable to obey God's Torah despite delighting in it. This maps precisely onto the situation in Ezekiel 36–37: Israel finds itself unable to obey God's Law and has experienced the curse of death (exile). The only solution, in both Romans 7–8 and Ezekiel 36–37, is the life-giving power of the Spirit which will enable Israel to live and to walk in God's statutes.

In 2 Corinthians 2–7 I noted several ways in which Ezekiel 36–37 was being used by Paul. To reiterate, I noted that (1) Paul conceived of Ezekiel 36 and 37 together, by drawing on both chapters in a similar context; (2) Paul moves from present life by the Spirit to future life, but Ezekiel 36–37 is mainly used to refer to present existence; (3) there are ethical implications to the Spirit being given; (4) the promise has been expanded to include Gentiles.

All four of these elements are again visible in Paul's use of Ezekiel 36–37 in Romans 7–8. Firstly, Paul alludes to both Ezekiel 36 and 37 as he explores the implications of the Spirit being poured out. The Spirit is both the Spirit of Life (as envisaged in Ezekiel 37.1–14), and the Spirit at work in those in whom the δικαίωμα of the Law has been fulfilled (language alluding to Ezekiel 36.27). As such there is,

¹⁰⁸ Wolter (*An die Römer*, 1:490) certainly sees Paul, in Rom 8.11, as in line with a Jewish tradition, rooted in Ezek 37.4–14, in which the Spirit raises the dead.

again, evidence that Paul thought of these chapters as a unit. It further supports the idea put forward in chapter 2 that Paul would use metalepsis: referring to one part of Ezekiel 36–37 to bring up the whole context. Secondly, whereas Ezekiel envisages a future reality from his perspective, Paul, in Romans 7–8, deals with a mixture of present and future realities. The same Spirit brings life in the present (Romans 8.1–10) and life at the eschaton (Romans 8.11). But, as in 2 Corinthians, the clearest allusions to Ezekiel 37.1–14 are with reference to *present* realities. The reality of life in the Spirit, envisaged in line with Ezekiel 36–37, is therefore *inaugurated*. Thirdly, receiving the Spirit leads to an ethical outworking. Just as Israel, according to Ezekiel 36, would be enabled by God’s Spirit to follow his Law, so those in Christ no longer live in the dilemma of Romans 7.7–25. Instead, they are those who put to death the deeds of the body by the Spirit (see Rom 8.13). Although Ezekiel 36.27 (LXX) and Paul use different Greek words (πορεύομαι in Ezek 36.27 vs. περιπατέω in Rom 8.4), the result of the Spirit being given is for God’s people to walk in his ways (defined by Paul as walking according to the Spirit). Finally, the promise of Ezekiel 36–37 has been widened to include Gentiles who are in Christ. There is nothing in the context of Romans as a whole to suggest that Romans 8 should be restricted to Jewish believers. Rather, the promises of Ezekiel 36–37 have received a proleptic fulfilment not only in a remnant of Jews (as in the Hodayot), but also in many non-Jews.

4.3.5 1 Thessalonians

I have shown how the use of Ezekiel 36–37, which is clearly seen in 2 Corinthians, is also already visible in 1 Corinthians and then elaborated on in Romans. There are also possible allusions to Ezekiel 36–37 elsewhere within the Pauline corpus. Taken on their own, these allusions and echoes may be too faint to note. It is important not to overstate the likelihood or significance of these faint echoes. However, the clear use of Ezekiel 36–37 in the Corinthian correspondence and Romans makes the (admittedly fainter) echoes and allusions in other Pauline letters more likely, especially if Ezekiel is being used in the same way. This fits with one of the methodological tests for detecting an echo or allusion, drawn from Hays in chapter 2, that *recurrence* makes an allusion more likely (is the same passage alluded to much elsewhere in an author’s writings?).

There is possibly an echo or allusion to Ezekiel 36–37 in 1 Thessalonians 4. In 4.7–8. Paul writes:

οὐ γὰρ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσία ἀλλ' ἐν ἁγιασμῷ.⁸
τοιγαροῦν ὁ ἀθετῶν οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀθετεῖ ἀλλὰ τὸν θεὸν τὸν [καὶ]
διδόντα τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τὸ ἅγιον εἰς ὑμᾶς.

For God did not call us in impurity but in holiness.⁸ Therefore the
one who rejects [this] rejects not a human being but God who gives
his Holy Spirit to you.

There is a clear verbal overlap between the statement τὸν [καὶ] διδόντα τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τὸ ἅγιον εἰς ὑμᾶς ('who gives his Holy Spirit to you') and Ezekiel 36–37.¹⁰⁹ The idea of God giving (specifically δίδωμι) his spirit, or a spirit is not an uncommon expression in the LXX,¹¹⁰ but the strongest verbal correspondence by far is with Ezekiel 36.26–27 and 37.6, 14. In Ezekiel 36.27, God tells Israel: τὸ πνεῦμά μου δώσω ἐν ὑμῖν ('I will give my Spirit in you'). A chapter later in Ezekiel 37.6 and 37.14, the similarity is even stronger: δώσω πνεῦμά μου εἰς ὑμᾶς ('I will give my Spirit into you'). The idea of God giving (δίδωμι) his own spirit *into* (εἰς) a group of people appears only in Ezekiel 37.1–14 in the LXX. This makes the presence of an allusion in 1 Thessalonians 4.8 more likely.¹¹¹

There is possibly more than verbal overlap to this potential allusion. The themes in both passages are also similar. In 1 Thessalonians 4.7–8, Paul links the giving of God's Spirit with the call to live, not in ἀκαθαρσία but in ἁγιασμῷ. The giving of Yahweh's Spirit in Ezekiel 36.16–32 is also for the purpose of cleansing Israel from ἀκαθαρσία, and this term (and cognates) appears a number of times in these verses.¹¹² The term ἁγιασμός does not appear in Ezekiel 36, but Yahweh notes that he will 'sanctify' (ἁγιάζω) himself/his name (36.23). Just as Israel would be cleansed from its ἀκαθαρσία by the giving of God's Spirit, so Paul's converts were called not to ἀκαθαρσία but to ἁγιασμῷ. To reject this was to reject the one who gives the Holy

¹⁰⁹ Some commentators do not pick up on the possible allusion: e.g. F. F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, WBC 45 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982).

¹¹⁰ E.g. Num 11.29; 1 Kgs 22.23; 2 Kgs 19.7; 2 Chr 18.22; Neh 9.20; Eccl 12.7; Isa 42.1; 42.5; Ezek 11.19.

¹¹¹ Charles Wanamaker notes the similarity, but notes: 'that need not be intentional since the idea was certainly well-known in Jewish thought and became foundational for the early Christians': Charles A. Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 158. Other commentators, however, note the strong verbal overlap and conclude that Paul has Ezekiel 36 and 37 in mind: e.g. Jeffrey A. D. Weima, *1–2 Thessalonians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 282–83.

¹¹² Ezek 36.17 (twice), 25, 29.

Spirit. If Paul is indeed drawing on Ezekiel 36–37, then he sees the prophecy as being fulfilled in his (gentile) converts. Gordon Fee rightly notes:

This usage reflects a Pauline understanding of the gift of the Spirit as the fulfilment of Old Testament promises that God's own Spirit will come to indwell his people, "and you shall live" (Ezek 37:14; cf. 11:19).¹¹³

Furthermore, whereas Ezekiel 36–37 dealt specifically with Israel, Paul understands it as applying also to Gentiles who have received the Spirit. God's promises to Israel were being fulfilled in the Gentile church's reception of the Spirit.¹¹⁴

Paul alludes to Ezekiel 36–37 to refer to the giving of the Spirit without argument in one of his earliest extant letters.¹¹⁵ This suggests that the connection was already well established in Paul's mind and possibly in the mind of the Thessalonians as well. The giving of the Spirit had brought about at least an inaugurated fulfilment of Israel's hopes as expressed in Ezekiel 36–37. Strikingly, as noted above and as we shall see again below, this promise has been fulfilled in Gentiles.

4.3.6 *Galatians*

Galatians draws on a major theme which is particularly central to Ezekiel 36–37 (and 37.1–14 in particular): the idea of the giving of God's Spirit bringing life. We noted that by the time Paul wrote the Corinthian correspondence and Romans, this theme was clearly drawn from Ezekiel 36–37. We have also seen a likely allusion to Ezekiel 36–37 in similar terms in 1 Thessalonians. This makes it at least possible that the connection was in Paul's mind when he wrote Galatians, whether the letter predates or postdates the Corinthian letters.¹¹⁶

¹¹³ Gordon D. Fee, *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 154.

¹¹⁴ Jeffrey Weima notes (having specifically referred to Ezekiel 37): 'It seems clear, therefore, that Paul views the conversion of Gentiles at Thessalonica as a fulfilment of the eschatological promises made to Israel' (Weima, *1–2 Thessalonians*, 283).

¹¹⁵ 1 Thessalonians is usually dated quite early in comparison to most of other Paul's letters, especially the *Hauptbriefe*. Douglas Campbell has recently dated the Thessalonian correspondence particularly early, as early as 40–42 CE (Campbell, *Framing Paul*, 190–253). Although 1 Thessalonians is not usually dated quite as early it is often placed in the very early 50s CE (see Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, xxxv).

¹¹⁶ Galatians is difficult to date in relation to the rest of Paul's letters. A judgement depends on which geographical location we have in view for the recipients. On the assumption that Paul is writing to churches in southern Galatia, the letter could be dated as early as 48–49 CE. If, however, Paul is writing

In Galatians 2.19–20 Paul uses ζάω five times to describe a believer's present existence.¹¹⁷ Although the Spirit is not mentioned explicitly in these verses, it seems almost certain that Paul is thinking of the life-giving power of God's Spirit. Firstly, the rest of the argument of Galatians highlights the vital role of the Spirit for the Christian and the vital role of the Spirit in giving life (see particularly 5.25).¹¹⁸ Secondly, a few verses later, when Paul reminds the Galatians of the moment they turned to Christ, he asks them specifically how it is that they *received the Spirit* (3.2 – τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε). Finally, although the word πνεῦμα does not appear in verses 19–20, the Spirit is presumably referred to when Paul notes ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός ('Christ lives in me' – 2.20). How else could Christ live in Paul if not by his Spirit?¹¹⁹ Therefore it is likely that Paul has in mind a Spirit-wrought life in 2.19–20.

The Spirit is implicitly linked with life elsewhere in Galatians, too. In 3.21 Paul notes: εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, ὄντως ἐκ νόμου ἂν ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη ('if a law was given which could make alive, then truly righteousness would be from the Law'). The law cannot make alive (ζωοποιῆσαι). This begs the question: what can? Presumably it is the Spirit, the promise given to those who hear by faith (3.14).¹²⁰

The fact that God has given his Spirit is again explicitly noted in 4.6:

Ὅτι δὲ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν κρᾶζον· αββὰ ὁ πατήρ.

to churches in the northern region of Galatia, the dating would be later, possibly as late as 57 CE. My own judgement is that Galatians is an early letter, but nothing in this thesis rests on this. For discussion of dating and destination, see Longenecker, *Galatians*, lxi–lxxxviii; Moo, *Galatians*, 2–18.

¹¹⁷ It is possible that ζήσω in verse 19 is a temporal future referring to life at the eschaton, but the description of life in the following verse (which is clearly a present phenomenon) makes it far more likely that the future in verse 19 is logical.

¹¹⁸ Craig Keener notes that 'living *by the Spirit* [5.25] is equivalent to Christ living in and through believers (2:20) and thus living to God (2:19)' (Craig S. Keener, *Galatians: A Commentary* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019], 526). So also Longenecker, *Galatians*, 265.

¹¹⁹ See Longenecker, *Galatians*, 93; Keener, *Galatians*, 195: 'As Paul will go on to speak of the Galatians having received the Spirit (Gal. 3:2), and he will speak of all believers living by the Spirit (5:25), Christ living in a person is clearly associated with the Spirit living in a person.' Shauf notes: 'This statement [about the Spirit of God's Son being sent into believers' hearts] has to be viewed as equivalent to the ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός, but in 4.6 Paul uses the Spirit language that he avoids prior to ch. 3' (Scott Shauf, 'Galatians 2.20 in Context', *NTS* 52.1 [2006]: 100). Elsewhere Paul refers to God's Spirit and Christ's Spirit interchangeably: especially Rom 8.9. See also 1 Cor 15.45.

¹²⁰ Notice how the Spirit is the content of promise (τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος) in 3.14. In 3.21, the promises are contrasted with the Law. The Law is said to be unable to give life. The implication would be that the promise, namely the Spirit, is able to give life.

Because you are sons, God sent the Spirit of his son into our hearts,
crying out, ‘Abba! Father!’

The influence of Ezekiel 36–37 (perhaps alongside other Old Testament texts) is possible here. The terms πνεῦμα and καρδιά are sometimes used as anthropological references almost interchangeably in the Psalms.¹²¹ In Ezekiel 36.26–27, however, the language of the new heart (καρδιά) is interpreted as the equivalent of God giving *his* spirit (πνεῦμα) to Israel.¹²² Louis Martyn notes:

In referring to the invasion of the heart, Paul embraces—via the baptismal formula—a motif established by the Hebrew prophets. Both Jeremiah and Ezekiel contrast obdurate and immutable stone with the malleable and permeable human heart (the will, the passion, the intellect).¹²³

The link between the Spirit and life, which was implicit earlier, is made explicit in 5.25: Εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν (‘if we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit’). The contrast between ζάω and στοιχέω in this verse suggests that the first clause (‘we live by the Spirit’) refers to an ontological reality: the believer has been given life by the Spirit. As Schreiner notes: ‘The word “live” (ζῶμεν) refers to eschatological life that now belongs to believers.’¹²⁴ The believer is, in the present, alive because of the work of the Spirit. Consequently, those who live by the Spirit must also walk (στοιχέω) by the Spirit.¹²⁵ This new life by the Spirit is not simply the act of living righteously. It refers to an ontological transformation, which itself leads to ethical outworking, empowered by the same Spirit.¹²⁶ This is what is in view in Ezekiel 36–37 and elsewhere in Paul, as we have seen.

But giving life is also a future role of the Spirit. The one who walks according to the Spirit and sows to the Spirit will ‘from the Spirit reap eternal life’ (ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον – 6.8). Although he does not state it in such terms,

¹²¹ E.g. Ps 50.12, 19; 76.7; 77.8; 142.4 (LXX).

¹²² Some commentators draw attention to the language of Ezekiel 36.26–27, without necessarily explicitly stating that Paul is alluding to this text: e.g. Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011), 265.

¹²³ J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 391. Louis Martyn goes on to associate this specifically with Ezekiel 36.

¹²⁴ Thomas R. Schreiner, *Galatians*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 356.

¹²⁵ John M. G. Barclay, *Obedying the Truth: A Study of Paul’s Ethics in Galatians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 155.

¹²⁶ So broadly *Ibid.*, 213–14 (countering Bultmann).

Paul presumably believes the Spirit to be the one who will bring about the resurrection of believers at the eschaton.¹²⁷

It seems clear from Galatians, particularly in the broader context of Paul's theology, that the giving of God's Spirit leads to life in the present and in the future. The verbal overlap of Galatians with Ezekiel 36–37 is not particularly striking. However, when one considers the Scriptural background to the idea of God's Spirit giving life, Ezekiel 36–37 (and 37.1–14 in particular) stands out. In several of Paul's later letters, the theme of the Spirit giving life in the present and enabling ethical living is tied more explicitly to the language of Ezekiel 36–37. But even in Galatians, the theme is present. This begs the question: where other than Ezekiel 36–37 would Paul find an adequate Scriptural background for this?

4.3.7 Ephesians 2

It is important to justify the inclusion of Ephesians in a chapter on Pauline literature, since the authorship of Ephesians is disputed. In this study, I do not make an explicit judgement about the authorship of Ephesians (or Colossians in chapter 6). Although I am personally persuaded that both letters can be traced to Paul himself, a decision on the matter is not necessary at this stage. Indeed, one of the key reasons for doubting the Pauline authorship of Colossians and Ephesians is the undisputed presence of inaugurated resurrection in these letters (and its supposed absence in the undisputed Pauline letters). However, part of the burden of the next chapter is to show that Romans 6.1–14 clearly describes inaugurated resurrection. If this is so, it has significant implications for the question of authorship of Colossians and Ephesians. I will draw these implications out in a subsequent chapter, but a conclusion on their authenticity is not necessary at this stage.

The use of Ezekiel 36–37 in Ephesians 2 is still significant for our purposes, whether or not it is pseudonymous. If Ephesians is authentic, it counts as more evidence of Paul drawing on the prophet. If Ephesians is pseudonymous, it demonstrates how a later author within the broader Pauline tradition continued to maintain Paul's view that

¹²⁷ A comparison with Romans 8.11–17 shows that this logic is not alien to Paul. John Yates notes: 'Not only is present life rooted in the spirit, but future, eternal life will come as a result of the indwelling spirit' (Yates, *Spirit and Creation*, 121).

Ezekiel 36–37 had been fulfilled. For the sake of ease, I will refer to the author as ‘Paul’, but this must not yet be seen as a judgement on the authorship of the letter.

Robert Suh on the Influence of Ezekiel 37 in Ephesians 2

At first sight, Ephesians does not draw on Ezekiel 36–37. However, a closer look at Ephesians 2 shows that Ezekiel 37 is a major scriptural influence in this chapter. This has mainly gone unnoticed by scholars. Robert Suh, though, has made a very strong case for seeing Ephesians 2 as drawing on Ezekiel 37 in a substantial way.¹²⁸ What follows draws heavily on Suh’s own treatment.

Suh spends a large portion of a chapter of his doctoral thesis cataloguing connections between Ezekiel 37 and Ephesians 2. I will broadly outline his treatment, noting particularly salient examples. Suh picks up on 3 kinds of parallels between Ezekiel 37 and Ephesians 2: (1) Verbal parallels; (2) structural parallels and (3) conceptual/thematic parallels.

Concerning *verbal parallels*, Suh finds many similar or identical terms used in both Ezekiel 37 and Ephesians 2.¹²⁹ Admittedly, many of these terms are commonly found in biblical texts. But Suh notes that Paul uses some of the overlapping vocabulary in distinctive ways, ways which suggest that he was using Ezekiel 37 as a source text. Suh lists 3 shared terms which are used in such distinctive ways as to suggest influence. Firstly, the LXX of Ezekiel 37.7 renders the Hebrew (וַתִּקְרְבוּ עֲצֻמוֹת עֵצִים אֶל עֲצָמוֹ) as προσήγαγε τὰ ὅστ’ ἑκάτερον πρὸς τὴν ἁρμονίαν αὐτοῦ. The term ἁρμονία is only used in Ezekiel 23.42 and 37.7 in the LXX and nowhere in the New Testament. But Ephesians 2.21 (and 4.16) uses a compound verbal form of this noun: συναρμολογέω. In light of the thematic and structural similarities between Ephesians 2 and Ezekiel 37 (see below), this could suggest a direct influence. Another distinctive verbal parallel is προσαγωγή/προσάγω. In both Ezekiel 37.7 and Ephesians 2.18, the terms (which are rare elsewhere in the New Testament, though common in the LXX) are used in the context of body language, suggesting a possible influence. Finally, Suh points to the use of the term ἐλπίζ. The term is very common in the New Testament, but Suh notes that it is only used twice to describe something negative (Eph 2.12 and 1 Thess 4.13).

¹²⁸ See the extended treatment in Suh’s PhD thesis: Robert H Suh, ‘One New Humanity in Christ: The Use of Ezekiel 37 in Ephesians 2’ (The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2006). See also Robert H Suh, ‘The Use of Ezekiel 37 in Ephesians 2’, *JETS* 50.4 (2007): 715–33.

¹²⁹ See Suh, ‘One New Humanity’, 55–65.

This negative use of the term (lack of ἐλπής) is like that in Ezekiel 37.11. There are many more shared terms between the two passages which Suh picks up on,¹³⁰ but these three distinctive uses suggest that the common vocabulary may be more than a coincidence.

Much stronger than the verbal parallels are the *structural parallels* between Ezekiel 37 and Ephesians 2.¹³¹ Suh notes that Ephesians 2 and Ezekiel 37 share the very same structure. We reproduce Suh's table detailing structural similarities below:¹³²

	Ezekiel 37		Ephesians 2
37.1–10	Bring alive the dead bones	2.1–7	Bringing alive the sinners who were once dead for their transgressions and sins
37.11–14	Explanation	2.8–10	Explanation
37.15–23	Unification of Judah and Israel	2.11–18	Unification of Jews and Gentiles
37.24–28	Looking forward to the establishment of the new sanctuary in a single Davidic Rulership	2.19–22	Looking forward to the final establishment of the new sanctuary in the rulership of Christ.

The parallels are striking. Both chapters progress from the theme of death and life to the theme of the union of two separate entities and climax with the building of a temple and the Messiah. It is difficult to believe that this is mere coincidence. It suggests some form of direct influence.

Finally, Suh notes *thematic parallels* (3) between the two chapters.¹³³ The themes which Suh identifies are:

- (1) 'New creation from death to life'. Both Ephesians 2.1–10 and Ezekiel 37.1–14 describe a change from death to life. Although Suh doesn't note this here, we have seen in the previous chapter that Ezekiel 37.1–14 uses new-creation language by reminding the reader of Genesis 2.7. In Ephesians 2.10, those who are raised with Christ are said to be κτισθέντες ('created'), a creation term.¹³⁴

¹³⁰ Ibid., 56–62.

¹³¹ Ibid., 65–67.

¹³² Ibid., 67.

¹³³ See the extensive treatment in Ibid., 67–82.

¹³⁴ The terms κτισθέντες and ποίημα here are primarily a reference to God's act of new creation in Christ, rather than a reference to original creation. This is confirmed by the use of κτίζω in 2.15 to refer to God's

- (2) ‘Walking in the way of the Lord’. Both Ezekiel 37.24 and Ephesians 2.10 use walking-related language (περιπατέω & πορεύομαι) to refer to obeying God.
- (3) ‘Covenant’. Both Ezekiel 37.26 and Ephesians 2.12 speak of the idea of covenant. Furthermore, Suh notes that the theme, despite not being mentioned many times ‘supplies the framework for understanding the messages of Ezekiel 37 and Ephesians 2.’¹³⁵
- (4) ‘Peace’ is a common theme in the two passages, and Suh notes that in both Ezekiel 37.26 and Ephesians 2, the term is used in a horizontal sense (peace with one another) as well as a vertical one (peace with God).
- (5) ‘[T]he promised Messiah of David/Jesus.’
- (6) ‘The temple (sanctuary/dwelling place) of God’. In Ezekiel 37.26–28, Yahweh promises that his dwelling (יְהוָה/ἡ κατασκήνωσίς μου) will be over his people. In Ephesians 2.19–22 it is the people, both Jews and Gentiles, who form the dwelling (ναός/κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ).
- (7) ‘Unity’ is another major theme in both passages. Ephesians 2.11–22 describes the unity in Christ between Jews and Gentiles, whereas Ezekiel 37.15–28 describes the union of Judah and Israel.
- (8) ‘The people of God’. In Ezekiel 37.23, 27 Israel is referred to as the people (λαός) of Yahweh. Surprisingly in Ephesians 2.11–22 this is expanded to include Gentiles in Christ.
- (9) The ‘Holy Spirit’ is a major part of God’s purposes in both Ezekiel 37.1–14 (as the agent of resurrection) and in Ephesians 2.18 and 2.22.

These parallels, verbal, structural and thematic, between Ephesians 2 and Ezekiel 37 seem compelling. Whether Suh is correct in every detail, his overall case for the influence of Ezekiel 37 on Ephesians 2 is convincing.

It remains to see what implications this has. It is not enough to establish dependence. As I have done for other Pauline passages in this chapter, I now ask *how* Paul makes use of Ezekiel 36–37. Although Ezekiel 37 as a whole has influenced Paul in Ephesians 2, I will look mainly at Ephesians 2.1–10 in light of Ezekiel 37.1–14 as this fits with the emphasis of this study on present resurrection.

creation of one new man in Christ. See Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, WBC 42 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1990), 113–14.

¹³⁵ Suh, ‘One New Humanity’, 71.

Inaugurated Resurrection in Ephesians 2.1–10 in Light of Ezekiel 37.

In the next two chapters, I will explore the classic present resurrection texts in Paul. Ephesians 2.1–10 is one of those texts. But what is particularly significant about Ephesians 2 is that it speaks of present resurrection whilst drawing so heavily on Ezekiel 37.1–14. Therefore, I explore this text in this chapter. Ephesians 2.5–6 clearly refers to present resurrection:

καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ, – χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι – καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

and whilst we were dead in (our) transgressions (God) made us alive with Christ – by grace you have been saved – and raised us up with him and seated us with him in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus.

No one denies that this is a reference to a present resurrection in the life of the believer (though many will argue that Paul did not write this). As such defending the presence of inaugurated resurrection in Ephesians will not be necessary, as it will be for Romans 6.1–14. In what follows, though, I will explore some of the ways in which Paul uses Ezekiel 37 as he describes the inaugurated resurrection of believers.

The first thing to note is that, just as in several other places, Ezekiel 37 is being drawn on to refer to a *present* phenomenon. This fits broadly with what we have seen already in other Pauline writings: when Ezekiel 36–37 is drawn on, the emphasis is primarily on the present reality of God making his people alive through the life-giving Spirit.¹³⁶ In a number of passages we observed that Paul often moves on to speak of future resurrection, but the language and themes of Ezekiel 36–37 are less pervasive when he does so. If Paul is drawing on Ezekiel 37 in Ephesians 2, then he must have understood Ezekiel 37 to refer to an already-inaugurated reality, or at least he has reapplied Ezekiel 37 in this way.

Secondly, Paul's comment about the spirit which is at work in unbelievers in 2.2 is interesting. It doesn't so much show Paul's direct use of Ezekiel 37 as much as display a similarity with something we noted in the Dead Sea Scrolls in the previous chapter. Paul describes Satan as τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος ('the ruler of the power of the air'). The expression is surprising and probably the ἄρη is to be thought

¹³⁶ This is the case even in 1 Corinthians 15.45 in which Christ is called πνεῦμα ζῳοποιούν. The focus of 1 Corinthians 15 may be on the future for believers, but Christ is *already* a πνεῦμα ζῳοποιούν. See above.

of as interchangeable with or contained within the heavenly realms, or possibly the lower realm of the heavenlies.¹³⁷ This phrase is immediately followed by ‘of the spirit which is now working amongst the sons of disobedience (τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας)’. What is τοῦ πνεύματος attached to? Is it (1) in apposition to τὸν ἄρχοντα and another way of referring to Satan? In this case, why is τοῦ πνεύματος genitive when it should be accusative? Is it (2) in apposition to τοῦ ἀέρος as a way of referring to the air which is at work in the sons of disobedience? Or is it (3) in apposition to τῆς ἐξουσίας, in which case the ruler of the power of the air is also the ruler of the spirit at work amongst the sons of disobedience? Option (1) is probably the simplest (the ruler *is* the spirit at work), but as noted already it is difficult to maintain grammatically.¹³⁸ Option (2) is possible grammatically, but unlikely within the cosmology of Ephesians. In this letter, spiritual powers “dwell” in the heavenlies. It is unlikely that ἀήρ is being used interchangeably with πνεῦμα. It is most likely then that τοῦ πνεύματος is controlled by τὸν ἄρχοντα (as in meaning 3). In other words, the ruler of the power of the air is also the ruler of the πνεῦμα that dwells in, or amongst, the sons of disobedience.

The idea that those outside of Christ have a πνεῦμα at work in them is similar to the view expressed in a number of the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹³⁹ We explored in the previous chapter how the language of spirit (πῑר) was used in the Hodayot in particular in both a negative and positive way. The solution to the corruption of humanity by a wicked spirit, according to the Hodayot, was the giving of spirits from God.¹⁴⁰ In Ephesians 2.1–10, the Holy Spirit’s role is not emphasised (although it is in 2.18 and 2.22). The Holy Spirit has been referred to already in chapter 1, though. By explaining part of the predicament of humanity as being influenced by a πνεῦμα ruled by Satan, Paul may be envisioning the Holy Spirit’s role in Ephesians 2.1–10. Paul changes from second-person plural to first-person plural in 2.3 in order to emphasise that Jewish believers were also in the same predicament prior to their coming to know Christ. As in the Hodayot, the solution to corruption through a wicked spirit is the solution

¹³⁷ See for example Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 96.

¹³⁸ See for example Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 100.

¹³⁹ Lincoln, for example, points to the two-spirit treatise (1QS III, 13–IV, 26): Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 96–97.

¹⁴⁰ For example: 1QH^a V, 35–36; VI, 22–24; VIII, 29; XX, 14–15; XXI, 34.

promised by Ezekiel 36–37: the giving of a spirit from God. Put in the language of Ephesians 2, it is being made alive by God.

Thirdly, Ephesians 2.1–10 goes further than other passages on inaugurated resurrection in the Pauline tradition. Not only are believers made alive and raised, but they are also seated in the heavenlies (2.6).¹⁴¹ Perhaps this two-step process (resurrection and seating) is partly a result of the influence of Ezekiel 37.¹⁴² In Ezekiel 37.1–14, there is a two-step process of resurrection and dwelling in the land of Israel (37.12–13). It is possible that being seated with Christ in the heavenlies is an inaugurated fulfilment of the territorial element of Ezekiel 37 in Paul's mind. Admittedly this is hard to prove, but it is possible.

Fourthly, just as in Ezekiel 36–37 and in Paul's other letters, there is an ethical outworking of being made alive (by the Spirit). Here, in Ephesians 2.10, believers are said to have been created in Christ Jesus for good works (κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς). God's act of new creation, defined here as resurrecting his people from the dead, leads to a new ethical lifestyle.

Finally, and significantly, Paul has again expanded the focus of Ezekiel 37 to include Gentiles. This is most obvious in his reapplication of Ezekiel 37.15–28 in Ephesians 2.11–22. Whereas Ezekiel 37.15–28 refers to the reunification of Judah and Ephraim, Ephesians 2.11–22 refers to the reconciling of Jews and Gentiles. In the prophetic act of the two staffs, Ezekiel is to take the two sticks (one for Judah and one for Joseph) and put them together: καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ῥάβδον μίαν ('and they shall become one staff' – Ezek 37.19). Using very similar language, Paul notes that Christ has abolished the Law of commandments in ordinances, ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον ('that might create the two in him into one new man/humanity' – Eph 2.15). Paul has taken a prophecy about the reunification of Judah and Israel and has applied it to the unification of Jews and Gentiles. He is thereby expanding the focus of Ezekiel's prophecy.

¹⁴¹ Though we must not dismiss the possibility that Romans 8.30 ('those whom he justified, these he also glorified') be given its full temporal weight. Many commentators see here a reference to future glorification (the aorist being used as a way of showing its certainty). See Moo, *Romans*, 535–36; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 485–86; Ziesler, *Romans*, 227–28. However, it is possible that Paul has in mind an inaugurated reality, as he does here in Ephesians. So for example Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1993), 536 (who sees this as a prophetic statement of something which is already true to a certain extent).

¹⁴² So, it seems, Suh, 'One New Humanity', 114–15.

Although the application of Ezekiel 37 to Gentiles is most clearly seen in Ephesians 2.11–22, it is also clear in Ephesians 2.1–10. According to Ezekiel 37.11, the vision of the valley of dry bones concerns πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ('all the house of Israel'). In light of 37.15–28, it is likely that this means all tribes and not just Judah. But the focus is very much Israel, not Gentiles. In Ephesians 2.1–10, though, the focus is *primarily* on Gentiles, with Jews included, rather than the other way round. When Paul notes καὶ ὑμεῖς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν ('and you, being dead in your transgressions and sins...' – 2.1), the parallel statement in 2.11 (ὕμεῖς τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί – 'you gentiles in the flesh') suggests that Paul has Gentiles primarily in mind in 2.1. Of course, Paul is not dismissing Jews (and includes them by using first-person plural from 2.3), but he is reworking Ezekiel 37.1–14 to refer not only to Jews but to all humanity. Paul presumably saw all of humanity as experiencing some form of exile, as did Israel according to Ezekiel 37.¹⁴³ Only resurrection could undo this predicament.

Conclusion

Whatever one's position on authorship, Ephesians 2 seems to be indebted to Ezekiel 37. Furthermore, it is influenced by Ezekiel in at least the same four ways we have observed in the undisputed Pauline letters: (1) Paul is not simply proof-texting; he displays an appreciation for the wider context of Ezekiel 36–37 (though in this case, it is more specifically Ezekiel 37 as a whole in view). (2) Ezekiel 37 is used here to refer most clearly to a *present* phenomenon. We will see in chapter 6 that Ephesians still includes a future hope. However, it is with reference to a present reality that Ezekiel 37 is most clearly drawn upon. (3) There is an ethical outworking to the new life which is promised in Ephesians 2, just as there is in Ezekiel 36–37. (4) The promise of Ezekiel 36–37 has been expanded to Gentiles. In fact, in Ephesians 2 this is a key part of Paul's argument and not simply an assumption he makes. The way that Ezekiel 36–37 has

¹⁴³ See for example David I. Starling, *Not My People: Gentiles as Exiles in Pauline Hermeneutics* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 193: 'The appropriation of the end-of-exile promise of Isa. 57:19 in Eph. 2:17 and its application to the Gentiles is therefore best understood in the light of the writer's reminder in 2:1–3 of the solidarity of Jew and Gentile in the spiritual death that was the continuation or the antitype of Israel's exile. Gentiles can find themselves addressed in a promise originally given to exiled Israelites because the predicament of exile which the promises addressed corresponded so precisely with their own predicament as Gentiles spiritually dead and far off from God.'

influenced Ephesians is clearly consistent with the way it has influenced Paul's undisputed letters.

4.4 Conclusion: Ezekiel 36–37 in Pauline Literature

This chapter has explored at length how the promises of Ezekiel 36–37 influenced Paul. Ezekiel 36–37 is not extensively quoted in the New Testament. Nonetheless, we have seen evidence from Paul's letters that these two chapters played a formative role in his thinking about the Christian life. Paul understood that believers had received the Spirit of God, and this reception of God's Spirit was often cast in the language and logic of Ezekiel 36–37.

Although each text explored in this chapter has its own distinctives, there are several ways in which Paul uses Ezekiel 36–37 which run through his letters. Firstly, Paul rarely seems to simply "proof-text". He often draws on themes which run through both chapters. He moves from speaking of a new heart (Ezekiel 36) to speaking of the Spirit giving life (Ezekiel 37) and to the Spirit enabling obedience (Ezekiel 36). Clearly these oracles of Ezekiel were understood by Paul to be mutually-interpreting. Secondly, Paul associates the Spirit with life, just as Ezekiel did. Particularly in the Corinthian correspondence and Romans, Paul notes that one of the key markers of the Holy Spirit (as was predicted by Ezekiel) is its life-giving power. Even Ephesians 2, which drew on Ezekiel 37 without mentioning the Holy Spirit giving life explicitly, speaks of the believer being made alive. Thirdly, the giving of the Spirit of life in both Ezekiel and Paul's letters leads to a transformed life, a new ethical lifestyle. For Paul, as for Ezekiel, the key to living in a way which honours God is to receive the Spirit. Divine empowerment through the Spirit of life is needed.

Fourthly, Pauline texts which draw on Ezekiel 36–37 often move from present to future. However, the clearest references to Ezekiel are in descriptions of a *present* reality, and not a future one. This is a clear difference between how most non-Christian Jewish texts of the time understood Ezekiel 36–37. In the previous chapter I argued that in early Jewish texts, the promises of Ezekiel 36–37 were mainly seen as awaiting fulfilment, though some texts (the Hodayot in particular) allowed for a limited and partial fulfilment of Ezekiel 36.25–27 in the community. In Paul's writings, though, most allusions to Ezekiel 36–37 deal with something which has *already* happened. Paul saw the promises of Ezekiel 36–37 as having a major inaugurated fulfilment in the lives

of believers through the giving of the Spirit. In a sense this should be expected. Even the writer(s) of the Hodayot did not seem to think that the eschatological outpouring of God's Spirit had happened quite in the way that early Christians did. In this sense, although he is not unique, Paul is certainly distinctive in comparison with non-Christian Jewish writers.

Finally, whether explicitly or by implication, Paul has reworked the promises of Ezekiel 36–37 to apply them to all believers, both Jewish and Gentile. In fact, as he shows in 2 Corinthians 3 and Romans 7–8, Gentiles who received the Spirit are recipients of the promise of Ezekiel 36–37, whereas many Jews do not experience the fulfilment of this promise. This is another clear difference with other early Jewish texts, which restrict Ezekiel 36–37 to Jews. For Paul, though, the Spirit of life had been given not only to Jews, but also to Gentiles. In the case of Ephesians 2, Paul even understood the reconciliation of Israel and Judah (described in Ezekiel 37.15–28) to have been expanded to include reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles in one Spirit. Again, this was a reality which Paul very much saw as inaugurated. It had already begun fulfilment.

As we move in the next two chapters to the classic 'present resurrection' texts in Paul's letters, the findings of this chapter are very significant. Discussions of whether Paul saw Christians as having already experienced some kind of resurrection often reach a stalemate, based often on assumptions about whether Paul would use any other language than *ἀνάστασις* or *ἐγείρω* to speak of resurrection. The evidence of how Ezekiel 36–37 shaped Paul's thinking, though, could provide more evidence in favour of seeing the reality of inaugurated resurrection in Paul. After all, Paul considered the most graphic vision of resurrection in the Hebrew Scriptures (Ezek 37.1–14) to have been fulfilled in the pouring out of God's Spirit. To see the giving of the Spirit as a form of resurrection is completely logical when Ezekiel 37.1–14 is considered. After all, resurrection there involves the breathing of breath, or spirit, into a dead body. If Paul saw receiving the Holy Spirit as a fulfilment of Ezekiel 36–37 (as I have shown in this chapter), and receiving the Spirit is spoken of as resurrection in Ezekiel 37.1–14, then it logically follows that believers have already experienced a resurrection of some kind. We might even say that the reception of the Spirit *is* inaugurated resurrection. With this background in mind, we now move on in the next chapter to explore Romans 6.1–14 and to ask the question: does Paul think that believers have experienced inaugurated resurrection?

Chapter 5: Inaugurated Resurrection in Romans 6

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I demonstrated how Ezekiel 36–37 shaped the way that Paul understood the reception of the Holy Spirit in Christians' lives. He understood the promises of Ezekiel 36–37 to have come to pass in the pouring out of the Holy Spirit upon believers. For Paul, receiving the Spirit, in line with the promises of Ezekiel, involved both new life and power to follow God's commands. To call this new life a form of resurrection would be fitting, especially given the background of Ezekiel 37.1–14.

It remains to be seen, though, whether this is visible in Paul's explicit present-resurrection texts. In those texts, does Paul envisage believers as having been, in some way, raised? Furthermore, is the pattern of new life followed by ethical empowerment, in line with Ezekiel 36–37, visible in these texts as well? These questions are dealt with in the following two chapters. In chapter 6, I will focus on Colossians and Ephesians, without prior judgement on authorship. The present chapter focuses on the undisputed Pauline text at the centre of the debate on the question of inaugurated resurrection: Romans 6.1–14.

Does Paul, in Romans 6.1–14, describe inaugurated resurrection? The last hundred or so years have seen a variety of answers to that question. We surveyed these in more detail in chapter 1, but I provide a short summary here. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, scholars mostly assumed that Romans 6 *did* describe present resurrection. Many pointed to the Hellenistic mystery cults as a background for this belief, though some pointed elsewhere. But there was clear agreement: Romans 6.1–14 was a description of *present resurrection*. However, in the second half of the twentieth century this consensus began to shift. Scholars began to view Romans 6.1–14 as an explicit *denial* of present resurrection. In fact, by the time Wedderburn published his study on baptism and resurrection in 1987,¹ many scholars assumed that Colossians and Ephesians (considered deuterio-Pauline) preserved an earlier, Hellenistic-Christian view in which the believer had experienced resurrection already.

¹ Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*.

Paul, far from adhering to this view, actually *opposed* it in Romans 6.1–14. Believers were to walk in newness of life, but they had not yet experienced resurrection.

Towards the end of the twentieth century, though, the view that Paul was intentionally *countering* present resurrection in Romans 6.1–14 was found wanting. Instead, an increasingly popular view was that of gradual development. Paul himself, in Romans 6.1–14, avoided using the language of resurrection to refer to a present experience. Paul's language was further developed in the (pseudonymous) letters of Colossians and Ephesians. In this view, whereas Paul thought of believers as experiencing life, but not resurrection, his later followers made clear that believers had *already* experienced a kind of resurrection. This seems to now be the predominant view in scholarship amongst those who view Colossians and Ephesians as pseudonymous. Those who view Colossians and Ephesians as authentic tend to disagree and point out that one would only read Romans 6.1–14 with such reticence if one had already concluded that Colossians and Ephesians were deuterio-Pauline. Currently, this debate seems to be at something of a stalemate.

In this chapter, I explore Romans 6.1–14 afresh and seek to move the debate forward. I argue that Paul describes an experience of inaugurated resurrection for the believer. Many of the arguments I marshal are not new. But in addition to responsible exegesis, there are three additional factors that can be brought to bear on Romans 6.1–14 which tip the balance in favour of inaugurated resurrection:

- (1) *It is important not to overly restrict the language of resurrection.* Much exegesis of Romans 6.1–14 is constrained by the assumption that certain key words in the passage *cannot* refer to resurrection. Before moving to exegesis, therefore, I provide clear evidence that Paul used a variety of terms to refer to resurrection. The relative absence of terms such as ἐγείρω or ἀνάστασις in Romans 6.1–14 is not a particularly strong argument against inaugurated resurrection.
- (2) *Assumptions about the authorship of Colossians and Ephesians* have a bearing on whether Romans 6.1–14 describes inaugurated resurrection. On the one hand, the authorship of Colossians and Ephesians does not change what Romans 6.1–14 *states*. On the other hand, denying the Pauline authorship of Colossians and Ephesians can lead to an assumption that the true Paul *could not* believe in inaugurated resurrection, since this belief features explicitly in these two letters. We will approach Romans on its own terms, without any prior assumptions

based on the supposed pseudonymity of other letters. In other words, we cannot assume that Paul *would not* believe in inaugurated resurrection, just because possibly pseudonymous letters affirm that belief.

- (3) *The influence of Ezekiel 36–37* is significant for understanding Romans 6.1–14. In the previous chapter, I suggested that the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 provides a framework in which inaugurated resurrection would make sense: believers have received the Spirit of life, a reality which Paul envisaged in terms of the prophecies of Ezekiel 36–37. In light of Ezekiel 37.1–14, it would not be odd for Paul to think of receiving the Spirit as a form of resurrection. This could provide a crucial assumption as we approach Romans 6.1–14. We should be alert to ways in which Romans 6.1–14 draws on the framework we saw in the previous chapter.

In this chapter, I undertake a careful reading of Romans 6.1–14, with these three factors taking into consideration, to answer the question: does Paul describe inaugurated resurrection?

5.2 Paul's Language of Resurrection

As noted above, it is unhelpful to overly restrict the language of resurrection when approaching Romans 6.1–14. To make this clear, I will highlight the variety of terms which Paul uses to refer to resurrection in his letters. The following tables provide a count of verbs and nouns used in Paul's letters to refer to resurrection (or resurrected life), whether of Christ or of believers. To avoid building an argument on disputed data, only instances where resurrection is relatively clearly in view have been used. This survey will ensure we do not adopt an overly narrow approach to resurrection-language in the New Testament (for example, only acknowledging the use of ἐγείρω and ἀνάστασις, but discounting uses of ζάω, ζωή and cognates).

5.2.1 Vocabulary Used to Refer to Jesus' Resurrection or Resurrected Life

Verb Used	ἀνάγω ²	ἀνίστημι ³	ἐγείρω ⁴	ζάω ⁵
Undisputed	1	1	22	3
Ephesians			1	
Colossians			1	
2 Thessalonians				
Pastorals			1	
Total	1	1	25	3

Table 1: Verbs Used to Refer to Jesus' Resurrection

Noun Used	πρωτότοκος ⁶	ζωή ⁷	ἀνάστασις ⁸
Undisputed		3	3
Ephesians			
Colossians	1		
2 Thessalonians			
Pastorals			
Total	1	3	3

Table 2: Nouns Used to Refer to Jesus' Resurrection

5.2.2 Vocabulary Used to Refer to Believers' Resurrection

Verb Used	ἄγω ⁹	ἀνίστημι ¹⁰	ἐγείρω ¹¹	ἐξεγείρω ¹²	ζάω ¹³
Undisputed	1	1	12	1	3
Ephesians		1	1		
Colossians					
2 Thessalonians					
Pastorals					

² Rom 10.7.

³ 1 Thess 4.14.

⁴ Rom 4.24, 25; 6.4, 9; 7.4; 8.11 (twice), 34; 10.9; 1 Cor 6.14; 15.4, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20; 2 Cor 4.14; 5.15; Gal 1.1; Eph 1.20; Col 2.12; 1 Thess 1.10; 2 Tim 2.8.

⁵ Rom 6.10; 14.9; 2 Cor 13.4.

⁶ Col 1.18.

⁷ Rom 5.10; 2 Cor 4.10, 11.

⁸ Rom 1.4; 6.5; Phil 3.10.

⁹ 1 Thess 4.14.

¹⁰ Eph 5.4; 1 Thess 4.16.

¹¹ 1 Cor 15.15, 16, 29, 32, 35, 42, 43 (twice), 44, 52; 2 Cor 1.9; 4.14; Eph 5.14.

¹² 1 Cor 6.14.

¹³ Rom 6.13; 2 Cor 13.4; 1 Thess 5.10.

Total	1	2	13	1	3
Verb Used	ζωοποιέω ¹⁴	συζάω ¹⁵	συζωοποιέω ¹⁶	συνεγείρω ¹⁷	
Undisputed	3	1			
Ephesians			1	1	
Colossians			1	2	
2 Thessalonians					
Pastorals		1			
Total	3	2	2	3	

Table 3: Verbs Used to Refer to Believers' Resurrection

Noun Used	ἀνάστασις ¹⁸	ἀπολύτρωσις ¹⁹	ἐξανάστασις ²⁰	ζωή ²¹
Undisputed	3	1	1	1
Ephesians				
Colossians				
2 Thessalonians				
Pastoral	1			
Total	4	1	1	1

Table 4: Nouns Used to Refer to Believers' Resurrection

These tables demonstrate a couple of important points. Firstly, ἐγείρω is clearly the most common word to describe resurrection in Paul's writings. Secondly, Paul uses a variety of terms beyond ἐγείρω and ἀνάστασις to refer to resurrection. This is true even if only the undisputed Pauline letters are considered. Particularly noteworthy is the relatively common use of ζάω, ζωή and cognates. Additionally, most uses of ἐγείρω – by far the most common resurrection-word in Paul – come from one single chapter, 1 Corinthians 15. Outside of this chapter, the vocabulary used is much more varied. This all shows: the absence of ἐγείρω or ἀνάστασις from a passage does not entail absence of resurrection.

¹⁴ Rom 4.17; 8.11; 1 Cor 15.22.

¹⁵ Rom 6.8; 2 Tim 2.11.

¹⁶ Eph 2.5; Col 2.13.

¹⁷ Eph 2.6; Col 2.12; 3.1.

¹⁸ 1 Cor 15.12, 13, 21; 2 Tim 2.18.

¹⁹ Rom 8.23.

²⁰ Phil 3.11.

²¹ 2 Cor 5.4.

5.2.3 Ezekiel 37.1–14 and the Question of Resurrection-Language

The vocabulary of Ezekiel 37.1–14 (LXX) is relevant to the question of Paul’s resurrection-language. I showed in chapter 3 that Ezekiel influenced early Jewish beliefs on eschatological resurrection. I also demonstrated in chapter 4 the prophet’s influence on Paul. Even though resurrection (or possibly revivification) is used as a metaphor for national restoration and renewal in Ezekiel 37.1–14, it is the lengthiest description of resurrection in Israel’s Scriptures. What Ezekiel actually *sees* is a literal resurrection.²² As such, the passage is relevant to understanding what language someone like Paul could use to refer to resurrection.

Surprisingly, Ezekiel 37.1–14 lacks “typical” resurrection terminology: the terms ἀνάστασις and ἐγείρω are completely absent. The verb ἵστημι is used in 37.10 to refer to those who had been raised standing up, but the verb seems to carry a middle sense (i.e. those who had been brought to life ‘stood up’). Therefore, it does not refer to the act of resurrection itself. The predominant vocabulary in these verses to describe resurrection is that of life: ζάω and ζωή. Resurrection can be, and is, referred to explicitly (and exclusively) with life-language. This is pertinent in Romans 6.1–14, which is replete with the language of life.

5.3 Christ’s Resurrection and Salvation in the Present.

One final piece of preliminary work before we engage with Romans 6.1–14: it is helpful to note that for Paul, Christ’s resurrection has *present* salvific effects, quite apart from the reality of inaugurated resurrection. It is not merely a guarantee of future salvation. Nor is it only a confirmation of the efficacy of the death of Christ. In fact, the resurrection of Jesus is central in many of Paul’s statements of the Gospel (e.g. Rom 1.3–4; 10.9–10; 1 Cor 15.3–8).²³ The past and present effects of the resurrection of

²² To use the language of Richards, the ‘tenor’ (what the language actually refers to) of this metaphor is national restoration and renewal, whereas the ‘vehicle’ (what the language usually refers to) is literal resurrection (or revivification, if everlasting life is not in view). See I. A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (London: Oxford University Press, 1936), 96–97. G. B. Caird draws on Richards’ terminology in Caird, *Language and Imagery*, 152.

²³ See Michael F Bird, “‘Raised for Our Justification’: A Fresh Look at Romans 4:25”, *Colloq* 35.1 (2003): 31.

Christ in Paul's theology should caution us against too quickly dismissing the possibility of present resurrection for the believer.

The resurrection of Christ is associated with Paul's understanding of justification. It is not simply that the cross leads to justification and the resurrection ratifies the verdict. Paul notes in Romans 4.25 that Christ 'was handed over for our transgressions (διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν) and raised for our justification (ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν).' Considering the use of διὰ in verses 23–24, the term is meant to carry the sense of 'for the sake of'.²⁴ The resurrection of Jesus, then, 'possesses a genuine soteriological function in relation to producing justification.'²⁵

Furthermore, the resurrection of Christ guarantees the legal preservation of believers. Speaking of those who have been justified by God (Rom 8.33), Paul asks, rhetorically, 'who will condemn? Christ [Jesus] is the one who died. Rather, he is the one who was raised, who is at the right hand of God, who also intercedes on our behalf (ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν)' (Rom 8.34). Although in Hebrews Christ's intercessory work is associated with his priestly role, in the context of Romans 8.31–39 the image seems to be that of a court 'where accusations and requests are heard and the person closest to the throne usually has the most influential word.'²⁶ Christ's role in interceding for those whom God has justified is a direct result of his resurrection and ascension. The justified status of God's elect (8.33) is secure, in large part because of the resurrected Christ's intercession.²⁷ So then, not only does Christ's resurrection lead to justification (Rom 4.25), it also leads to his *present* intercession on behalf of the justified.

The importance of the resurrection for present salvation is also visible in 1 Corinthians 15.17:²⁸ 'if Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile; you are still in your sins.' It is possible that Paul is speaking of believers being in their sins in a judicial sense. The resurrection, then, would be a validation of Christ dying for their sins (15.3).²⁹ It is also possible, though, that Paul was thinking of the resurrection in terms

²⁴ Bruce A Lowe, 'Oh Διὰ!: How Is Romans 4:25 to Be Understood?', *JTS* 57.1 (2006): 150–53.

²⁵ Bird, "'Raised for Our Justification'", 44.

²⁶ Jewett, *Romans*, 542.

²⁷ So Moo, *Romans*, 542: 'he has "been raised" and has also ascended to the right hand of God, so that he may intercede for us, ensuring that the justifying verdict for which he died is applied to us in the judgement.'

²⁸ So Bird, "'Raised for Our Justification'", 31.

²⁹ E.g. Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 757.

of believers living free from sin: ‘If Christ was not raised, believers would still be living in their sins like any pagan. But they have a new power over sin, stemming from faith in the living Christ.’³⁰ In this case, not only does the resurrection of Christ bring about and secure justification (as in Rom 4.25; 8.34), but it also enables believers to live free from sin (this is something which we will observe in Romans 6.1–14).

Another passage which relates Christ’s resurrection to present effects for the believer is 2 Corinthians 5.14–15. Paul explains that Christ’s death means that all (presumably those in Christ) have died (5.14). He then moves on to state: ‘and he died on behalf of all, so that those who live might not live for themselves, but for the one who died and was raised on their behalf (τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι)’ (5.15). Paul’s language clearly shows that both the death and resurrection are *vicarious*. Although it is only the death of Christ that is explicitly linked with Christians living for him, the description of Christ as the one who died and was raised shows that Paul thinks of the resurrection as linked with this.

More could be said, but for our purposes it is sufficient to note that Paul sees the resurrection of Christ as having *present*, salvific implications. It is not simply that the cross guarantees justification in the past, whilst resurrection guarantees life in the future. Both cross and resurrection have consequences which are already true for the believer. Furthermore, cross and resurrection are inseparable. One without the other would be ineffective. Since Paul ties present realities to the resurrection, there is nothing *a priori* that should predispose us to think that Paul would not speak of those in Christ having already experienced an inaugurated reality. After all, even with justification, we are dealing with an eschatological verdict which has been brought into the present.³¹ It would not be strange then, provided it is exegetically warranted, to see resurrection as having also received a proleptic fulfilment in the believer’s life.

³⁰ Leon Morris, *1 Corinthians*, 2nd ed., TNTC (Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985), 204. Thiselton seems to opt for a view encompassing both judicial and ethical aspects: ‘without the resurrection of Christ, Christ’s death alone as has no atoning, redemptive, or liberating effect in relation to human sin’ (Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1220).

³¹ So Geerhardus Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952), 55: ‘the Apostle made the act of justification to all intents, so far as the believer is concerned, a last judgment anticipated.’

5.4 Romans 6.1–14 and Inaugurated Resurrection

5.4.1 Text and Translation³²

¹ Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ἐπιμένωμεν³³ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ; ² μὴ γένοιτο. οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν³⁴ ἐν αὐτῇ; ³ ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι, ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν; ⁴ συνετάφημεν οὖν³⁵ αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν. ⁵ εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα. ⁶ τοῦτο γινώσκοντες ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. ⁷ ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. ⁸ εἰ δὲ³⁶ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν³⁷ αὐτῷ, ⁹ εἰδότες ὅτι Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει, θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει. ¹⁰ ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· ὁ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ. ¹¹ οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίξεσθε ἑαυτοὺς

³² Greek text taken from NA²⁸. Major text-critical questions will be dealt with in footnotes, drawing particularly on Richard N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 606–8.

³³ The subjunctive reading is the most likely and occurs in uncials A B C D F G (L) and Ψ as well as in several minuscules. The alternative present reading (ἐπιμένομεν – e.g. in κ K P) makes less sense (Longenecker suggests it could be down to an interchange of ο and ω which is also a possibility in 5.1 – Ibid., 606) The future alternative (ἐπιμένουμεν), which is not strongly attested, leads to a similar meaning to the subjunctive. Cranfield notes that neither of the variant readings ‘seems likely to be original’ (C. E. B Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, ICC [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975], 1:297 note 2).

³⁴ This future reading is very strongly attested, including in uncials κ A B D, the majority text (including Byzantine Koine) and the majority of Latin manuscripts. The subjunctive alternative (ζήσομεν) is less well attested. It does, however, appear in P46 and several uncials and minuscules. It is possible, as Longenecker suggests, that the change comes down to an involuntary exchange of ο and ω and/or a desire to make the verb form conform with ἐπιμένωμεν in 6.1 (Longenecker, *Romans*, 607. So also Jewett, *Romans*, 390; Schnabel, *Römer: Kapitel 6–16*, 21) Again, the meaning is not much affected.

³⁵ The weakly-attested textual variant γάρ (or the complete omission of any conjunction) would change the logic of the passage slightly. However, the text as it stands in NA²⁸ is attested in most witnesses.

³⁶ The variant γάρ, though attested in P46 F G, is clearly ‘an endeavor to match the wording of v.7’ (Longenecker, *Romans*, 607. See also Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1:311 note 3).

³⁷ The subjunctive variant συζήσομεν is less well attested in the textual tradition (though it appears in uncials C K P). It is possible that it is an attempt to reflect the variant ζήσομεν in verse 2 (see Longenecker, *Romans*, 607; Schnabel, *Römer: Kapitel 6–16*, 21).

[εἶναι]³⁸ νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτία ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.³⁹

¹² Μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ,⁴⁰ ¹³ μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτία, ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὥσει ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας⁴¹ καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ. ¹⁴ ἁμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει· οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν.

¹ What therefore will we say? ‘Let us remain in sin so that Grace might abound’? ² May it not be! As many of us as have died to sin, how will we still live in it? ³ Or are you unaware that as many of us as were baptised into Christ Jesus were baptised into his death? ⁴ Therefore, we were buried with him through baptism into death, so that just as Christ was raised out from the dead through the glory of the Father, we also might walk in newness of life. ⁵ For if we have become united to the likeness of his death, we shall also be to that of his resurrection, ⁶ knowing this: that our old person was crucified, so that the body of sin might be abolished, so that we might not serve sin any longer. ⁷ For the one who died has been liberated from Sin. ⁸ Now if we died with Christ, we believe that we will also live with him, ⁹ knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, no longer dies; death no longer rules him. ¹⁰ for that which he died, he died to sin once for all, but that which he lives, he lives to God. ¹¹ In the same way, consider yourselves [to be] dead to sin, but living to God in Christ Jesus.

Therefore, let not sin reign in your mortal body so as to obey its passions, ¹³ nor present your limbs [as] instruments of unrighteousness to sin, but present yourselves to God as those who are alive out from the dead and your limbs as instruments of righteousness to God. ¹⁴ For Sin will not rule you for you are not under Law but under grace.

³⁸ Although εἶναι is omitted in a few significant witnesses (possibly P46, but certainly A D [corrected] F G), its presence or absence is mainly stylistic and does not affect the meaning of the sentence.

³⁹ The addition of τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν in several manuscripts does not affect the meaning of the passage for our purposes.

⁴⁰ Several manuscripts (e.g. P46 D F G) have αὐτῇ (referring to sin) instead of ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ. As Metzger suggests, this is ‘probably under the influence of the repeated mention of ἁμαρτία in the following verses’ (Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament*, 3rd ed. [Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1971], 513).

⁴¹ The accusative is the most well attested form. The nominative ζῶντες is attested in P46 D* F G, but not elsewhere, making it less likely to be the original reading (Schnabel, *Römer: Kapitel 6–16*, 22: ‘der Akkusativ ist besser bezeugt’).

5.4.2 An Overview of Romans 6.1–14

Romans 6.1–14 is a discreet unit within the larger argument of Romans 1–11. Although some have made verse 11 the major turning point of chapter 6, we will, along with most, include verses 12–14 in this section. This is because verses 12–14 provide a fitting answer to the original question posed in 6.1 and because verse 15 launches another question beginning with τί οὖν.⁴²

Towards the end of the previous section of Romans (5.12–21) Paul explains: ‘where sin increased, grace abounded even more’ (5.20). Paul therefore asks in 6.1, ‘What therefore will we say? “Let us remain in sin so that Grace might abound?”’ His response to this hypothetical question is unequivocal: μὴ γένοιτο (‘may it not be!’): the believer has died to sin and therefore cannot live in it (6.2). This death to sin took place in baptism (6.3). There, the believer was buried with Christ in baptism and now lives a new life (6.4). The old human/humanity (ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος) was crucified with Christ so that the body of sin might be abolished/brought to nothing, since one who dies is set free (or justified) from sin (6.6–7). The death and new life of the believer are modelled on Christ’s death and resurrection (6.8): Christ has been raised to immortal life; he died to sin once for all and now lives to God (6.9–10). In the same way, believers are to reckon themselves as dead to sin and alive to God in Christ (6.11). The correct response for believers, then, is to not allow sin to reign in their bodies, but rather to act as those who have been made alive from the dead (6.12–13). Paul finishes by giving a definitive answer to the question posed in verse 1 (shall we remain in sin?): ‘Sin will not rule you’ (6.14). In short: believers are not to live in sin since they have, through baptism, died to sin with Christ and now live to God.

Paul considered new life to be part and parcel of the Christian life. That is not in dispute. The question is whether Paul, in this passage, uses the language and concept of *resurrection*, and not just life in a more general sense, to describe what has happened to believers. Can the two even be divorced from each other? As noted already, many do not think that Paul describes inaugurated resurrection in Romans 6.1–14. However, a closer analysis of Romans 6.1–14 shows that this is a hasty conclusion. It is very difficult to make sense of the language of Romans 6.1–14 if Paul did not believe that believers had already, in some sense, been raised with Christ.

⁴² Against, for example, Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 305–6; Wolter, *An die Römer*, 1:367.

5.4.3 A Common Tradition?

Did Paul expect his audience to already be familiar with his argument? Indeed, Paul's treatment of dying (and rising?) with Christ in baptism is introduced by ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι ('or are you unaware that') in verse 3. This phrase raises a couple of questions: (1) is this a rhetorical device or is Paul appealing to a common Christian understanding? (2) If the latter, how much of the content of verses 4–14 is included in this common Christian understanding? Since Paul did not found the Christian community in Rome, the answers to these questions have a bearing on how widespread the concept of inaugurated resurrection might have been amongst early Christians.

(1) It is possible that ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι does not assume a shared tradition but instead indicates that the audience does not understand something as well as the speaker thinks it should. Robert Jewett argues for this view and lists several parallels of the use of ἀγνοέω in classical texts in which a shared knowledge is not assumed.⁴³ But the examples which Jewett provides do not always prove his point: in some cases that he draws on, shared knowledge does in fact seem to be assumed. Furthermore, many of Jewett's examples are not questions, nor is the construction the same as in Romans 6.3. His overall claim (ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι can indicate a lack of understanding in the audience, rather than common tradition) is correct, but the evidence he has provided does not show that this is *usually* the case, especially when phrased as a stark question. The classical parallels on their own are not enough to make the case either way.

The question must be answered based on Paul's usual use of the expression as well as the logic of his argument. Paul uses the verb ἀγνοέω several times in his letters. He often uses the phrase οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν (or similar) to fill in information which the readers either could not know or which they are unlikely to fully know already.⁴⁴ These instances clearly do not indicate a common understanding – quite the opposite. However, Paul only uses the phrase in the interrogative (ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε) in Romans 6.3 and 7.1. In Romans 7.1, Paul clearly assumes shared understanding: Jewish Christians' knowledge of the Torah (γινώσκουσιν γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ – 'for I am speaking to those who know the Law'). So then, Paul's only other use of ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε introduces shared knowledge, rather than new information.

⁴³ Jewett, *Romans*, 396–97. So also Wolter, *An die Römer*, 1:371: 'Er [Paulus] will die erstmals hier vorgetragene Taufdeutung als selbstverständlich charakterisieren.'

⁴⁴ See Rom 1.13; 11.25; 1 Cor 10.1; 12.1; 2 Cor 1.8; 1 Thess 4.13.

Much more common for Paul than ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε is the question οὐκ οἶδατε. It mostly occurs in 1 Corinthians.⁴⁵ This question seems to refer to something which the readers should know already. Perhaps οὐκ οἶδατε was deemed a more direct phrase and therefore appropriate for a community which Paul knew directly (Corinth). If it is in any way like ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε, and in light of Romans 7.1, we can assume that at the very least ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε indicates something with which the readers *should* be familiar. This might not suggest shared tradition in the technical sense, but it does imply knowledge which should already be familiar to the readers.

The logic of Romans 6.1–3 also supports this conclusion. The argument of verses 4–14 depends on the truth that baptism involves dying with Christ, as the use of οὖν in verse 4 shows. If verse 3 is not shared knowledge, the first link in the argument falls apart.⁴⁶ This supports the idea of ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε indicating shared knowledge.

So then, the phrase likely implies shared knowledge. But do we see evidence of this link between baptism and death outside of Paul's writings? One might expect this idea to appear elsewhere if this knowledge were truly shared. Although the link between *Christian* baptism and Christ's death is not made elsewhere, the language of baptism and Jesus' death are linked in both Mark 10.38–39 and Luke 12.50. This could be evidence of a broader association of Christ's death and baptism in early Christianity, an association that Paul expected his readers to be familiar with.⁴⁷ So then, Paul assumes that his statement in Romans 6.3 would be familiar to the Roman Christians.

(2) Can the same be said for the rest of his argument in verses 4–14? Would Paul's readers have been broadly familiar with everything Paul states in verses 3–14, or would he simply have expected them to make the link between baptism and Christ's death more generally?

The rest of Paul's treatment (vv.4–14) logically follows from his statement in v.3, with the rest of the argument being introduced by οὖν in verse 4. This does not mean that Paul's readers were completely ignorant of the ideas in verses 4–14.

⁴⁵ Rom 6.16; 11.2; 1 Cor 3.16; 5.6; 6.2–3, 9, 15–16, 19; 9.13, 24.

⁴⁶ Lars Hartman argues that Paul's argument doesn't work if the audience didn't share some knowledge of baptism and communion with Christ: Lars Hartman, *'Into the Name of the Lord Jesus': Baptism in the Early Church*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 71.

⁴⁷ This seems to be the position of a large number of commentators: see Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1:300; Käsemann, *Romans*, 165; Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 40–43; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 308; Ziesler, *Romans*, 156; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 433; Moo, *Romans*, 359; Hartman, *Into the Name of the Lord Jesus*, 71; Colin G. Kruse, *Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 260.

However, it does mean that the argument of these verses is not *built* on a shared knowledge beyond that given in verse 3. Rather, it is an argument which logically follows from the premise in verse 3, a premise which Paul assumes is shared knowledge. Some have attempted to expand this common knowledge further than verse 3. For example, Robert Tannehill has argued that the εἰ + indicative structure of verses 5 and 8–9 as well as the participle γινώσκοντες in verse 6 suggests that Paul expected the readers to know the protasis of these arguments (being united with Christ's death; our old self being crucified; we have died with Christ).⁴⁸ This may well be true, but Paul is not assuming much more than what he had stated in verse 3 in these protases.⁴⁹ From what I argued in the previous chapter, it is likely that Paul expected the churches he founded to be familiar with the concept of new life in Christ. However, it is impossible to tell whether Paul expected his (new) Roman readers to be familiar with everything he was arguing for in verses 1–14. As such, all we can conclude with relative confidence is that Paul expected his hearers to make the connection between baptism and union with Christ's death.

This is quite a minimalist conclusion. However, since the death *and* resurrection of Jesus formed the core of early Christian kerygma, the logical implications of dying with Christ in baptism should not be overlooked. It does not take a major imaginative step to go from union with Christ's death in baptism to some form of union with his resurrection. After all, baptism by immersion involves both descent and ascent. If the descent into the water was likely the part of baptism visually associated with the death of Jesus, it is surely a logical conclusion to come to that the ascent involves resurrection.⁵⁰ It would be possible for Paul's readers to have already made that link for themselves.

⁴⁸ Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 12–14.

⁴⁹ Wedderburn is uncertain how much Tannehill's thesis really goes beyond ideas that would not have been naturally assumed from a general association of baptism and Christ's death, to which Paul adds (Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 48; Wedderburn, 'Hellenistic Christian Traditions', 340).

⁵⁰ The visual link between baptism and resurrection will be explored more in chapter 7.

5.4.4 Exegesis of Key Phrases

We now move to exegesis of Romans 6.1–14. Rather than perform a verse-by-verse analysis of this passage, I focus here particularly on the most pertinent statements in verses 4–5, 8, 11 and 13, in context.

Verses 4–5

Based on the shared understanding of baptism as union with the death of Christ, Paul builds his argument in verses 4–5:

συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν. εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα·

⁴ Therefore, we were buried with him through baptism into death, so that just as Christ was raised out from the dead through the glory of the Father, we also might walk in newness of life. ⁵ For if we have become united to the likeness of his death, we shall also be to that of his resurrection.

These verses contain several exegetical difficulties. Therefore, they require a longer treatment than the others in this section. Having stated that the believers were baptised into Christ's death (6.3), Paul draws out a logical implication (οὖν):⁵¹ through baptism the believer is co-buried with Christ.⁵² Somehow, in baptism, the believer participates in *Christ's* burial. Beasley-Murray rightly claims:

Paul's first thought in this passage (and he has others!) is not that the believer in his baptism is laid in his own grave, but that through that action he is set alongside Christ Jesus in *His*; in baptism he is reckoned as occupying that grave as he was not before, just as an effective relationship with the Lord on the cross is assumed which did not exist before.⁵³

⁵¹ The textual variant γάρ is unlikely. It is supported only by the Vulgate and in Origen. The Peshitta lacks a logical connector completely.

⁵² The term συνθάπτω here could signify being buried in a shared grave. Jewett, *Romans*, 398. Jewett cites: Aelian, *Nat. an.* 7.40.10; Diodorus Siculus, *Hist.* 12.22.8; Lycurgus, *Leoc.* 50.5; Herodotus, *Hist.* 5.5.7. LSJ has 'bury together, join in burying'.

⁵³ George R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1962), 130.

As is clear from 1 Corinthians 15.3–5, Christ's death and burial formed a foundational part of the earliest Christian tradition.⁵⁴ It is therefore notable that Paul refers both to death and to burial in Romans 6. By claiming that the believer was baptised into Christ's death and buried with him, Paul associates the believer with Christ's salvific act in the strongest of ways.

Death is not the final goal, though. Life is, as shown by use of ἵνα in verse 4. The following ὥστε ... οὕτως ('just as ... so') construction in verse 4b–c indicates a clear parallel between Christ's resurrection and the believer's walking in newness of life. On the face of it, this suggests that Paul sees 'newness of life' as a way of referring to an inaugurated resurrection with Christ. But there is a problem: Paul does not complete the parallelism as we might have expected him to: he does not state explicitly that the believer has already been raised with Christ.⁵⁵ Instead he claims that believers 'walk in newness of life' (ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν). Why the apparent broken parallelism? Earlier scholars had argued that Paul was modifying and correcting a tradition of present resurrection in baptism, a tradition which was preserved in the deutero-Pauline epistles of Ephesians and Colossians.⁵⁶ Jewett's earlier work is somewhat representative of this view: 'Paul always sets the resurrection in the future (Rom 6:1–7; Ph. 3:10, 21) in contrast to the Deutero-Pauline epistles (Col. 2:12ff.; Eph. 5:14) in order to dampen the claims of those enthusiastic Christians who fancied that they had already attained immortality.'⁵⁷ So Paul's reserve here was a corrective against a form of over-realised eschatology.

However popular such a view was during the mid-twentieth century, nothing in this text points to the existence of such a group, or such a belief.⁵⁸ Also, Paul's language later in this passage, particularly in 6.11 and 6.13, is very clumsy if he wished to

⁵⁴ On the idea of 1 Corinthians 15.3–5 as early Christian tradition see Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1186–89 and references cited; see also references in Ware, 'Understanding of the Resurrection', 475 note 1.

⁵⁵ As noted by many commentators: e.g. Käsemann, *Romans*, 167; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 316; Moo, *Romans*, 367.

⁵⁶ See for example Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 10. He states: 'That we find the more primitive form of this baptismal motif in Col. 2 rather than Rom. 6 is shown by the fact that Paul presupposes this past resurrection with Christ even though he chooses to speak of rising with Christ as still future.' See also Käsemann, *Romans*, 166; and the helpful summary of scholarship in Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 1–6.

⁵⁷ Robert Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*, AGJU 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 215.

⁵⁸ So Wolter, *An die Römer*, 1:375.

dampen the beliefs of these so-called enthusiasts. It is therefore unlikely that Paul stops short of the parallelism to counter the beliefs of those who thought they had already gained immortality. As such, this line of reasoning has become discredited and Jewett himself in his 2007 commentary on Romans seems to have abandoned this emphasis on eschatological caution.⁵⁹

Although the specific reasoning just highlighted has become largely discredited, many (most?) scholars still maintain that Paul avoids completing the parallelism because for him resurrection is *always* a future event. As such, although he speaks of ‘life’ in the present, he does not use the language of resurrection.⁶⁰ This caution (for some) or resistance (for others) to seeing resurrection here is understandable, but I do not think it is warranted. Several details in the text indicate that Paul intends his readers to see themselves as having participated in Christ’s resurrection in advance of the eschaton.

Firstly, as noted already, the ὥστερ ... οὕτως construction indicates a clear parallelism between Christ’s resurrection and the believer’s new life.⁶¹ This parallelism should not be too quickly dismissed. Although the two clauses do not need to refer to identical realities, the construction does link Jesus’ resurrection and the believer’s newness of life extremely closely. So then, although Paul does not use the term ‘resurrection’ (ἀνάστασις or equivalent) to refer to believers’ new lives, the construction of the verse shows a strong similarity between the believers’ new life and Jesus’ resurrection. As such, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Paul sees this new life as a form of resurrection with Christ.

Secondly, there may be some clear reasons for Paul to use a different verb than ἐγείρω. For one, it is stylistically awkward to use the same verb in both clauses. To speak of believers walking in newness of life could in part simply be a stylistic choice.

⁵⁹ Although he still argues that Paul places resurrection in the future, Jewett states that Paul does not use the expression ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν due to eschatological caution, but in order to explain that new behaviour is possible through Christ: Jewett, *Romans*, 399.

⁶⁰ For example, although he sees new life with Christ as a strongly ontological reality, John Barclay notes ‘[t]his new creation life begins ... this side of their mortality; hence it is not quite describable as ἀνάστασις, which remains a future hope (6:5)’ (John M. G. Barclay, ‘Under Grace: The Christ-Gift and the Construction of a Christian Habitus’, in *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5–8*, ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013], 65. See also John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015], 500–501).

⁶¹ Fitzmyer points out that ὥστερ ... οὕτως reminds us of the epochal shifts in 5.12–21: Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 434.

Perhaps modern interpreters have read too much into Paul's choice of wording. Additionally, a complete (and stylistically awkward) parallelism would not achieve much within Paul's argument. His point throughout this passage is not to offer an abstract treatise on dying and rising with Christ. His point is that believers should not live in sin. An expression which implies a new kind of lifestyle is much more appropriate.

Thirdly, the phrase which Paul uses should not be robbed of its power. It is unwarranted to think of the metaphor of walking in newness of life as a reference only to unaided righteous living. Rather, the phrase implies the breaking-in of the eschatological age into the present. This can be seen in part by Paul's use of *καιν*-language elsewhere. Paul sometimes uses the adjective *καινός* to refer to something that is related to the new age that has already begun. In particular, the expression *καινή κτίσις*, clearly related to eschatology, is used twice in Paul.⁶² Cranfield suggests that Paul uses *καινότης* in Romans 6.4 in its fullest sense (as opposed to *νέος*) to denote something which is completely new and unprecedented.⁶³ The expression *καινότητι ζωῆς* refers to an eschatologically new way of life, a way of life which is clearly meant to be modelled on Christ's resurrection.⁶⁴ This is not simply about living a moral life, but also about the eschatological change which leads to that life.⁶⁵

We can go further than this. The expression also links Paul's thinking to the role of the Holy Spirit, particularly in bringing about the reality described in Ezekiel 36–37.⁶⁶ In its only other occurrence in the New Testament, Romans 7.6, the term *καινότης*

⁶² 2 Cor 5.17; Gal 6.15. The other occurrences of *καινός* in the undisputed Pauline letters are in 1 Cor 11.25; 2 Cor 3.6 (both referring to the new covenant). See also Eph 2.15 and 4.24 (in the expression *καινὸν ἄνθρωπον*).

⁶³ Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1:305.

⁶⁴ Dunn thinks that *ζωή* is 'thought of as derivative from Christ's risen life'. However, he points out that Paul does stop short of a complete parallelism and sees this as a characteristically Christian eschatological reserve. This reserve is not polemic though, in Dunn's view, since it would be clearer if this were so: Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 316.

⁶⁵ See Barclay, 'Under Grace', 74: 'Since the "newness of life" by which the believer now lives is a miraculous gift, there is no possibility of imagining their resulting obedience as their own achievement, self-initiated or independently governed. Their new competence is wholly dependent on the life of Christ, present within.'

⁶⁶ Schnackenburg does not mention Ezekiel 36–37, but he does contend that, although Paul does not mention the Spirit in Romans 6, the passage must be describing something brought about by the Spirit: 'In our passage, therefore, the fact of the possession of the *Pneuma*-life is only apparently concealed' (Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 163).

is used specifically to contrast the newness of the Spirit (ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος) with the oldness of the letter (παλαιότητι γράμματος).⁶⁷ We have seen this contrast already in 2 Corinthians 3.1–6. I argued in the previous chapter that Romans can and should be read in light of the Corinthian correspondence. As such, it is appropriate to understand Paul's language of ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς (Rom 6.4) and καινότητι πνεύματος (Rom 7.6) in light of his reflection in 2 Corinthians 3. Therefore, this is not simply about living righteously. This is in fact a reality which is brought about by the Holy Spirit.

If it is appropriate to read Romans 6.4 in light of 2 Corinthians 3, it is significant that in 2 Corinthians, Paul's thinking on the role of the Spirit was clearly formed by Ezekiel 36–37. In the previous chapter, I also noted the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on Romans 7–8. It seems likely, therefore, that this would also be in Paul's mind as he wrote Romans 6. After all, the role of the Spirit in Ezekiel 36–37 is both to give life and to enable obedience. Is that not precisely what is in view in Romans 6.1–14: new life and living free from sin? Again, this is not simply about ethical living in itself; this is a description of the kind of life which is made possible by the Spirit of life.

I return to the larger question: does verse 4 imply inaugurated resurrection? The answer, I suggest, is yes. The structure of the verse supports this, as does the description of walking in newness of life. There are multiple factors I have highlighted that suggest that Paul is not intentionally avoiding the language of resurrection. The reality that the believer is to walk in newness of life involves a Spirit-wrought form of inaugurated resurrection. As we shall see below, the logic of verse 5 supports this.

The next stage of Paul's argument, verse 5, contains a few interpretive difficulties: (1) What does σύμφυτος mean? (2) What does ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ refer to? (3) Most importantly for this study: is ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα a reference to something which is still future for believers (i.e. eschatological resurrection) or is it a description of something which is already true (inaugurated resurrection). I deal with these questions in order.

(1) The meaning of the term σύμφυτος in verse 5 here is somewhat debated. The term can have the agricultural sense of 'grown together' and some commentators have opted for this meaning here.⁶⁸ It is not exactly clear why the context of Romans 6

⁶⁷ Wolter (*An die Römer*, 1:374) notes that καινότητι ζωῆς in 6.4 is to be understood as equivalent to καινότητι πνεύματος in 7.6.

⁶⁸ So Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 435. Cf. LSJ and BDAG.

demands an agricultural connotation though, particularly when the word can have the more basic sense of ‘pertaining to being associated in a related experience’.⁶⁹ It is therefore preferable to opt for a generic sense such as ‘united with’ or ‘identified with,’ here, as there are no clues in context to suggest a more specific meaning.⁷⁰

(2) The phrase τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ presents two main issues. Firstly, we must decide whether the expression is instrumental (requiring the addition of αὐτῷ prior to τῷ ὁμοιώματι) or the object of σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν? Secondly, what does the expression refer to? With regards to the first question, the instrumental meaning fits the context well since in verses 4 and 8, the believer is buried *with* Christ and dies *with* Christ.⁷¹ However, it is necessary to provide an absent αὐτῷ for the instrumental reading to make sense. It is telling though that no extant manuscripts have provided this additional αὐτῷ to clarify this reading. Additionally, the proximity of the dative τῷ ὁμοιώματι to σύμφυτοι militates against the instrumental reading. Indeed, σύμφυτος followed by a dative is an attested construction.⁷² It is much better, along with most commentators, to take τῷ ὁμοιώματι as the dative object of σύμφυτοι.⁷³ The believer is united (generic meaning of σύμφυτος) to the form/likeness of Christ’s death.

The second question (what is the meaning of τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ?) is much more difficult to answer. The answer depends primarily on the meaning of the term ὁμοίωμα here. The word only appears in the New Testament 6 times, and 5 of those appearances are in Paul’s letters.⁷⁴ There seem to be two broad meanings of the term which are relevant here: (1) it can refer to a ‘copy’ or ‘image’ in the sense of something which resembles a reality, but which is separate to the reality itself (this is what Sorin Sabou calls a ‘corresponding reality’).⁷⁵ (2) The word can mean

⁶⁹ BDAG. Cranfield judiciously wonders whether exegetes are sometimes guilty of reading more into a verse than is really there – a very helpful warning (Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1:306–7).

⁷⁰ So Moo, *Romans*, 368 n.76; Jewett, *Romans*, 400.

⁷¹ Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1:307. Cranfield does, however, ultimately opt for a non-instrumental meaning. Fitzmyer is representative of the instrumental view: Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 435.

⁷² BDAG.

⁷³ William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1895), 157–58; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 134–35; Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1:307; Moo, *Romans*, 368; Jewett, *Romans*, 400.

⁷⁴ Rom 1.23; 5.14; 6.5; 8.3; Phil 2.7. Outside of Paul, the only appearance is Rev 9.7.

⁷⁵ Sorin Sabou, ‘A Note on Romans 6:5: The Representation (‘ΟΜΟΙΩΜΑ’) of His Death’, *TynBul* 55.2 (2004): 220. This is often the meaning in the LXX when idols are referred to (e.g. Exod 20.4; Ps 105.20). Amongst those who see this as the meaning of ὁμοίωμα in Romans 6.5 are Käsemann, *Romans*, 168; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 316–37; Jewett, *Romans*, 401.

‘form’ in the sense of the appearance of the actual reality itself.⁷⁶ Deciding between the two is not easy, as the differences of opinions amongst commentators suggest.⁷⁷ To make matters more difficult, Paul does not always seem to use the word with the same meaning.⁷⁸

In Romans 6.5, if ὁμοίωμα refers to an image, or copy, but not the reality itself, the term could refer to baptism.⁷⁹ This is doubtful, though. Baptism could provide an image of burial,⁸⁰ but baptism is not an adequate image of the death which Jesus died (crucifixion vs. drowning).⁸¹ Even though the term βάπτισμα is used in Mark 10.38–39 to describe the experience Jesus would undergo, the term is clearly not being used there to speak of the external likeness. Another, perhaps more significant, objection is the tense of γεγόναμεν. If Paul had meant that the act of baptism is the ὁμοίωμα of Christ’s death, then we would have expected him to use an aorist, since the believer’s union to baptism happened as a discrete, past event. Of course, the event itself has ongoing repercussions, but the believer was united to that symbol at a specific, finite time in the past.⁸² It is unlikely, then, that baptism itself is the ὁμοίωμα of Christ’s death.

It is better here to see ὁμοίωμα as referring to the ‘form’ of Christ’s death itself rather than to a copy of it. There are several reasons for this. Firstly, this meaning of ὁμοίωμα is attested in the LXX, and in Philippians 2.7 and Romans 8.3. Secondly, in the rest of the paragraph, Paul speaks of direct union with Christ’s death (vv.3, 8) and direct burial with him (v.4), not with a copy. As such it would be odd (although admittedly not impossible) for Paul to suddenly introduce an intermediary. Finally, translating τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ as ‘with the form of his death’ or even more helpfully ‘with such a death as his one’ makes perfect sense of the logic of the

⁷⁶ This meaning is also sometimes attested in the LXX when referring to Israel not seeing the ‘form’ (ὁμοίωμα) of God at Horeb (Deut 4.12, 15) and when referring to the altar of witness built by the eastern tribes in Joshua 22.28: καὶ ἐροῦσιν Ἴδετε ὁμοίωμα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κυρίου, ὃ ἐποίησαν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. See for this view Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 134; Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1:307–8; Moo, *Romans*, 368–70.

⁷⁷ For a helpful survey of the two views, see Sabou, ‘A Note on Romans 6:5’, 220–25.

⁷⁸ See the different meanings in Rom 1.23; 5.14; 8.3; Phil 2.7.

⁷⁹ So e.g. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 435.

⁸⁰ See chapter 7 on this.

⁸¹ E.g. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 34; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 316–17; Sabou, ‘A Note on Romans 6:5’, 222.

⁸² Dunn asks the question, in light of the perfect tense, of whether the believer is ‘still under water,’ which is what would be implied if baptism itself were the likeness of Jesus’ death (Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 317).

verse, especially considering the second half, where it is necessary to repeat part of the previous clause: ἀλλὰ καὶ (σύμφυτοι τῷ ὁμοιώματι) τῆς ἀναστάσεως (αὐτοῦ) ἐσόμεθα.

Why then does Paul mention ὁμοίωμα at all if Christ's death itself is referred to, rather than an image or copy of it? Perhaps the term helps to differentiate between the external appearance of Christ's death and the believer's death through baptism. The form here is one of quality, not merely of external resemblance. As Jewett points out, the believer is not literally crucified with Christ.⁸³ Rather, he or she is joined to such a death as Christ's because, as Paul will explain, Christ's death was to sin, and his resurrection was to God (v.10). In this sense, the believer is united to Christ's own death inasmuch as it is a death to sin (v.10). This understanding of ὁμοίωμα also fits with the perfect γεγόναμεν: the believer's union to Christ's death is not an isolated event in the past but has ongoing implications. Perhaps, though, when all is said and done, we should not place too much interpretative weight on this term. The point is clear from this verse and others in the paragraph: the believer, through baptism, has died and been buried with Christ and become united with such a death to sin as Christ's.

(3) I now deal with the most significant issue in this verse for this study. Having stated that we have become united with such a death as Christ's, Paul writes ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα ('we shall also be to that of his resurrection'). The structure of the verse requires the repetition of σύμφυτοι, τῷ ὁμοιώματι and αὐτοῦ and so should probably be rendered, 'we shall also be joined to such a resurrection as his.' The main question which faces us here is what the force of the future ἐσόμεθα is: is it referring to an event in the eschatological future, or is it a reference to something which has already happened?

Some comments on Greek tenses will be helpful, here. In the last few decades, there has been a large amount of discussion on *verbal aspect* in Greek. The traditional view is that Greek tenses are *intrinsically* (or semantically) linked with questions of time. However, this view has recently been questioned.⁸⁴ Constantine Campbell notes

⁸³ Jewett, *Romans*, 401.

⁸⁴ Stanley Porter and Buist Fanning are usually considered the two main contributors to this debate. Both writers were dealing with the question of verbal aspect at the same time and independently. Both authors agree on much, and significantly agree that verbal aspect is the main semantic component of Greek tenses. They differ, though, in the extent to which they consider time to be a semantic component in Greek tenses. Porter argues that Greek tenses do not carry any temporal component *in and of themselves* (time is indicated by contextual factors, rather than by the verbal form). Fanning, however, still considers there to be a temporal component to the Greek tenses. See Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek*

that a slight majority of scholars who are involved in this debate (as opposed to commentators or teachers of New Testament Greek) opt for the view that Greek verbs do not *in and of themselves* contain temporal references.⁸⁵ This should caution us that a future tense need not necessarily imply a temporal future component.⁸⁶

That said, despite advances in the study of verbal aspect, and an overall agreement that aspect is a more intrinsic element of Greek verbs than tense, the future indicative presents major difficulties. There is debate about whether temporal reference is intrinsic to the future indicative. Some do not think the future tense encodes temporality. For example, Teresa Tsui, drawing on Stanley Porter, argues that the future tense is closely related to the aorist subjunctive and that temporal reference is not the defining feature of this tense.⁸⁷ Rather, a sense of expectation or intention seems to form part of the future indicative in Greek. However, for most, this sense of expectation implies an intrinsically temporal nature to the future: ‘Because an expectation relates to something that has not yet occurred, the future tense-form primarily refers to a future time frame from the author’s perspective’.⁸⁸ Even Constantine Campbell, who does not think Greek verbs are intrinsically related to time, sees the future as something of an exception:

Furthermore, the future tense-form is a real tense. That is, future temporal reference is a semantic feature of the form. This is easily derived by the fact that all futures refer to the future. There are no past-referring futures; there are no present-referring futures. The future always refers to the future.⁸⁹

Is this correct, though? Does the future indicative *always* refer to a future time? There seem to be enough examples of the future indicative in the New Testament which are not temporal to question this judgement. Romans 5.7 is one clear example (μόλις γάρ

of the New Testament: With Reference to Tense and Mood, Studies in Biblical Greek 1 (New York: Peter Lang, 1989); Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspects in New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

⁸⁵ Constantine R. Campbell, *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 32. Campbell argues that commentators and teachers of New Testament Greek need to start seriously reckoning with the advances in the study of verbal aspect in Greek.

⁸⁶ This is a point which is made by Tsui: Teresa Kuo-Yu Tsui, ‘Some Observations on the Use of the Future in Rom 6,5.8’, *ZNW* 100.2 (2009): 287–94.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 289–91.

⁸⁸ Andreas J. Köstenberger, Benjamin L. Merkle, and Robert L. Plummer, *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek: An Intermediate Study of the Grammar and Syntax of the New Testament*, Rev. ed. (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2020).

⁸⁹ Campbell, *Verbal Aspect*, 39.

ὕπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται – ‘for rarely will someone die for a righteous person’). This seems to be a non-temporal statement, and one which carries a subjunctive quality. This may be an expectation, but it does not imply a *time* in the future. Particularly relevant for the purpose of this study is πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ in Romans 6.2 (‘how will we still live in it [i.e. sin]?’). Clearly ζήσομεν is not referring to something temporally in the future, but something which is (or at least should be) already true. Francis Pang wisely notes, ‘the scholars who argue for a temporal interpretation [of the future indicative] have to come up with an explanation of the various non-future, non-Indicative uses of the Future in the NT.’⁹⁰

It is probably wisest, then, to leave the question of the temporal nature of the future indicative aside and agree with what Porter notes most scholars could affirm: that the future indicative denotes ‘a volition, a desire, an aim toward a goal, a prediction, an intention, an expectation.’⁹¹ This emphasis on expectation is able to account for the majority of cases in which the future is used to refer to a temporal reality without making a judgement on whether temporality is encoded within the future form itself.

In light of this brief discussion of verbal aspect, I am asking whether the future ἐσόμεθα in Romans 6.4 implies an expectation which will take place in the future (a temporal future), or whether it is a reference to that which is already true for those who have died with Christ (a number of grammarians call this a *gnomic*, or logical, future). Most scholars over the last few decades have tended to argue for a temporal future, here, claiming that it is odd to use a future when a present, or aorist would have been much clearer.⁹² Those who argue for a logical future point to the context of the passage. It would be unusual, they claim, in a paragraph which refers to the present life and ethical walk of believers, to suddenly refer to eschatological resurrection. For example, Johannes Schneider, drawing on the idea of believers living to God (ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ) states: ‘The thought that the baptised cannot remain in death suggests that we have in the ἐσόμεθα a logical future.’⁹³

⁹⁰ Francis G. H Pang, ‘Aspect, Aktionsart, and Abduction: Future Tense in the New Testament’, *FN* 23 (2010): 156.

⁹¹ Porter, cited in *Ibid.*, 155.

⁹² E.g. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 10; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 318; Jewett, *Romans*, 402; Wolter, *An die Römer*, 1:377.

⁹³ Johannes Schneider, ‘Ομοίωμα’, *TDNT* 5:195.

Against this, Tannehill suggests that there are three reasons to see in ἐσόμεθα a temporal future:⁹⁴ (1) The lordship of death (which the Christian is still under) and the lordship of sin (which he or she is not) are closely related in Paul's mind, as shown by 5.21 and 6.9. (2) Present newness and future resurrection can be brought together in Paul's mind (e.g. 2 Cor 4.10–14; Phil 3.10–11). (3) Paul apparently had good reasons to play down the idea of present resurrection since Paul often tries to deter his readers from boasting in present possessions by pointing to his sufferings (e.g. 1 Cor 4), and in 2 Corinthians he uses the motif of dying and rising to refer to his sufferings, emphasising that he still participates in Christ's death but still awaits his resurrection. It makes sense, Tannehill argues, to avoid referring to resurrection with Christ as a past event and instead to restrict it to the future.

Tannehill's arguments are not convincing. Regarding (1), although it is true that Paul does associate the lordship of sin and death in 5.12–21, the reason he gives for not sinning in 6.1–14 is not that the lordship of death will be defeated in the future but rather that the believer has died to sin – been transferred outside of its realm. As such the mere association of the lordship of death and of sin which Paul does make elsewhere does not provide a context for future resurrection in this passage. Reason (3) seems to be founded on the assumption that Paul is looking to counter a realised eschatology, something which is not clear at all from this passage. Furthermore, to claim that Paul had reasons to play down the idea of present resurrection because of his emphasis on suffering is speculative. Paul, in 2 Corinthians 3–5 combines some of the strongest language of life with some of the strongest language of death and suffering. We must be very wary of dictating what Paul is or isn't allowed to say. Reason (2) is true: Paul often does bring together present newness and future resurrection. However, this does not prove that he is doing so here. It merely shows that it is possible, not necessarily likely in context.

The syntax and logic of verses 4–5, as well as the argument of this whole passage make better sense if ἐσόμεθα is a logical, or gnomic, future. Firstly, as Morales points out, the whole of this section is hortatory:

The general thrust of Rom 6:1–11, indeed, of Romans 6 as a whole, is hortatory, as is evident from the statement that introduces the train of thought in vv. 2–11 (“How can we who died to sin continue to live

⁹⁴ Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 11–12.

in it?") and the exhortation of v. 11 ("So also you, consider yourselves dead to sin but alive to God in Christ Jesus").⁹⁵

Since Paul's overall aim to assert that believers should not continue (in the present) in sin, it is *a priori* more likely for Paul to be referring to something which is *already* true of believers. A purely future resurrection does not contribute to Paul's argument as strongly, nor does it build the case for Paul's climactic exhortation in verse 11.⁹⁶

Secondly, the logical connection between verses 4 and 5 supports a gnomic future. The connecting γάρ at the beginning of 6.5 shows that Paul is providing an explanation for why a believer walks in newness of life.⁹⁷ It would be odd to support a statement about present life (ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν) with an assertion about future resurrection.

Thirdly, and closely related, the structure of verse 5 parallels and expands on verse 4. The parallel ideas can be represented in the table below and suggests that verse 5 is referring to the same reality as verse 4.

v.4	συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον	ἵνα ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν.
v.5	εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ	ἀλλὰ καὶ (σύμφυτοι τῷ ὁμοιώματι) τῆς ἀναστάσεως (αὐτοῦ) ἐσόμεθα

The context, the structure and logic of verses 4–5 all point to a logical future. This is not a reference to the future resurrection of believers, but to a resurrection which accompanies their union with the likeness of Christ's death.

At this point, it is worth introducing another possible subtlety of the future tense in this verse. Søren Agersnap argues for the use here of what he calls the 'certainty future'.⁹⁸ This is a future which implies something which is already true, but which continues to be in the future. This may initially seem like a way of having the best of both worlds, but there is much to be said for Agersnap's suggestion. As he notes:

⁹⁵ Isaac Augustine Morales, 'Baptism, Holiness and Resurrection Hope in Romans 6', *CBQ* 83.3 (2021): 470.

⁹⁶ Admittedly, Paul does base ethics on the reality of future resurrection elsewhere (e.g. 1 Corinthians 15.58). But Paul's argument in Romans is not based on a future event, but on a present reality: the believer has died to sin and now lives to God.

⁹⁷ Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1:306; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 316.

⁹⁸ Agersnap, *Baptism*, 290–94.

This is in fact an obvious way to employ the future. As we know, in Greek the future refers to the ingressive and the durative aspects. That is to say, the future does not always have an ingressive meaning, and does not always concern something which occurs only sometime. It may just as well have a durative meaning, and apply to what will be in the future. And then the certain course of events can be emphasised.⁹⁹

Agersnap provides a couple of examples of this ‘certainty future’ within the immediate context of Romans 6.1–14. In verse 2, the believer is told: οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ; this is clearly a durative action rather than an ingressive one. Furthermore, the future phrase in Romans 6.14 (ἁμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει) fulfils a similar function. This understanding of the future in verse 5 makes good sense.

Another advantage of this view is that it can help explain the use of the perfect tense γεγόναμεν (note the shift from the aorist in the previous verse). Daniel Wallace notes of the perfect that there ‘is a basic agreement among grammarians about the force of the perfect (viz., that two elements are involved, completed action and resultant state).’¹⁰⁰ Putting aside the ongoing debates about the *aspect* of the perfect (is it perfective-stative, stative...), if the *Aktionsart* of the perfect in Romans 6.5 is a past event with a resultant state, it would make sense of the specific durative use of the future we have suggested. If the perfect γεγόναμεν carries the idea of a past event with an ongoing result, then for the future ἐσόμεθα to refer to something which is already true, but which also continues would make sense. Verse 5 could be paraphrased as follows: ‘for if we have become united with such a death as his (with all that this implies) we shall also continue to be united to such a resurrection as his.’¹⁰¹

In summary, Romans 6.4–5 implies a strong parallel between the death and resurrection of Christ and that which has happened to believers. I argued that the idea of believers walking in newness of life was most likely a way of referring to the life which the Holy Spirit gives. Paul, it seems, envisaged the Holy Spirit’s role in line with

⁹⁹ Ibid., 293.

¹⁰⁰ Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 573.

¹⁰¹ So Robert Baulès, *L’évangile puissance de Dieu: commentaire de l’épître aux Romains* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968), 184: ‘S. Paul veut dire qu’à aucun moment du déroulement de notre existence notre identification actuelle au Christ vivant ne pourra être remise en question : tout au long de notre existence nous serons conformés à la ressemblance de sa résurrection (5), tout au long de notre existence nous vivrons avec lui car il ne meurt plus (8).’

Ezekiel 36–37 (as he had done in 2 Corinthians 3 and as he would do in Romans 7–8): providing resurrection and empowerment for ethical living. Furthermore, the reference to resurrection in verse 5 is best understood as something which is already true, and possibly something which is certain to continue (if Agersnap’s suggestion of the ‘certainty future’ is valid). As such, Romans 6.4–5 is a description of inaugurated resurrection. And this resurrection, it seems, is something brought about by the Holy Spirit.

Verse 8

Off the back of verses 4–5, Paul expands the idea of dying with Christ in verses 6–7. He notes that the old person (ὁ παλαιὸς ... ἄνθρωπος) was crucified. As a result, the body of sin is nullified, and we are no longer enslaved to sin (verse 6). Indeed, one who has died is freed (δεδικαίωται) from sin (verse 7).¹⁰² This leads to Paul’s next statement of dying and living with Christ in verse 8:

εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ
Now if we died with Christ, we believe that we will also live with
him.

This statement is similar to verse 5. For most commentators, it is a clear reference to future, not inaugurated, resurrection. The future συζήσομεν, here, is usually taken as temporal rather than logical or gnomic. For example, Tannehill states, ‘in vs. 8 Paul makes quite clear that this is a real reference to the future by the addition of πιστεύομεν. This shows that life with Christ is an object of faith, not of sight.’¹⁰³ Dunn writes: ‘It is almost impossible to take the future here as merely logical ... it must refer to a still future sharing in Christ’s resurrected life’¹⁰⁴ Sanday and Headlam argue that Paul alternates between the physical and future, and the present and spiritual, but that in this verse the physical and future is clearly in view.¹⁰⁵ Even Fitzmyer, who had argued for a logical future in verse 5, admits that here Paul looks to the eschatological future.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰² This is admittedly an unusual use of δικαίω, but not unattested: see BDAG; Moo, *Romans*, 376–77; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 320–21. Dunn gives the term a slightly more forensic sense, suggesting the term could be rendered as ‘no longer has to answer for sin’.

¹⁰³ Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 10.

¹⁰⁴ Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 322.

¹⁰⁵ Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 159.

¹⁰⁶ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 437. He does admit that Christians enjoy a foretaste of this life in advance though. So also Moo, *Romans*, 377: ‘this future life of resurrection casts its shadow into the believer’s present

It is therefore surprising (and perhaps telling) that Robert Jewett, who so strongly argues for a temporal future in verse 5, claims that to ‘restrict συζήσομεν to an eschatological future is unduly to limit the effect of dying with Christ, which in Paul’s theology determines the nature of life from the moment of conversion until the end of time (2 Cor 4:10–11; 6:17).’¹⁰⁷ Jewett claims that the argumentative context (particularly v.11b) suggests that συζάω is in fact a logical future. Furthermore, he argues that if an eschatological future were in view, Paul would probably have used a verb more obviously related to resurrection.

Whilst, as I will show, Jewett is right to see συζάω as a logical future, there are a couple of problems with his view that Paul is not dealing with resurrection of some kind, here. Firstly, his assumption that συζάω is not an adequate term to refer to resurrection is questionable, to say the least. I have already shown above that verbs such as ζάω and cognates are used by Paul to refer to resurrection. Again, in Ezekiel 37.1–14 LXX, the key terminology is that of ζάω and ζωή. When the most detailed description of resurrection in the LXX does not employ terms such as ἀνίστημι or ἐγείρω we should avoid assumptions about what the absence of those terms entails. Secondly, Jewett is operating with a false dichotomy: for him, either Paul is referring to eschatological resurrection, in which case συζήσομεν must be a temporal future, or he is referring to life, but not resurrection, in the present, in which case συζήσομεν is a logical or gnomic future. The possibility which Jewett dismisses is that συζήσομεν is both a logical future *and* a description of resurrection – that is, it is a reference to *inaugurated* resurrection.

It remains to test this possibility. I argued above that the future in verse 5 is most likely a logical future (or ‘certainty future,’ following Agersnap) referring to inaugurated resurrection. If this is true, then it is *de facto* likely that συζήσομεν in verse 8 is also a logical future.¹⁰⁸ I have already shown above that the future indicative does not in and of itself suggest a temporal reference. Rather, the type of future in view depends on the context. And the context here is key. In verse 8, as in verse 5, the context

experience, and it is clear from the sequel that Paul wants us to see the present implications of this promise of future resurrection life.’ See also Ziesler, *Romans*, 161.

¹⁰⁷ Jewett, *Romans*, 406.

¹⁰⁸ That said, it is in theory possible that Paul has moved from a description of present life to an allusion to future hope. A handful have suggested a gnomic future in verse 5 and a temporal one in verse 8: Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 437; Morales, ‘Baptism, Holiness and Resurrection’. As we have seen, Jewett proposes the opposite (i.e. temporal future in v.5 and logical future in v.8)

favours a gnomic future. Living with Christ is certain because (εἰδότες ὅτι – v.9) Christ has been raised from the dead. Were Paul to finish his argument there, it could be argued that Paul is arguing for our *future* resurrection based on Christ's resurrection (something which he clearly does in 1 Cor 15 and 1 Thess 4). However, the remainder of the argument puts the emphasis on Jesus' present life and the *present* implications for believers (in v.11). It is not clear why Paul would support a statement about the believer's future hope with a discussion of Jesus' present life and its implications for believers in the *present*. Contextually, a temporally future understanding of συζήσομεν would be odd. It is not clear how it would contribute to the overall argument of Romans 6.1–14 in which the emphasis is squarely on the present life of believers.

So the argument and the similarity with verses 4–5 point to a logical future. But there is one aspect of verse 8 which is more difficult to explain if συζήσομεν is a logical, or gnomic, future: the use of πιστεύομεν to introduce the clause. Had Paul simply stated, 'if we died with Christ, we will also live with him' (εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ), the case for a logical future would be simpler. But Paul notes 'we believe that we will also live with him (πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ)'. Eschatological resurrection can be an object of faith. But it is less clear why inaugurated resurrection, something which has already happened to believers would be. Does not πιστεύομεν ὅτι imply that we are dealing with something which has not yet happened?¹⁰⁹

I am not convinced it does necessarily imply this.¹¹⁰ Indeed, belief, or trust, is not always directed towards a future reality. In fact, in the New Testament, the construction πιστεύω ὅτι followed by the content of belief is almost never followed by a future reality. It is much more common for the object of belief to be a present or past reality.¹¹¹ As such it is possible that πιστεύομεν ὅτι in Romans 6.8 is speaking of a

¹⁰⁹ So e.g. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 10; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 322; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 437.

¹¹⁰ So Agersnap, *Baptism*, 327: 'The use of πιστεύομεν does *not* in itself mean that the statement concerns something "merely believed", of the future, eschatological and contrary to something already certain or present. In the context, the whole emphasis is on the positive conviction that results from the new departure which has occurred.'

¹¹¹ Outside of Rom 6.8, the only places in the New Testament which I could find in which πιστεύω ὅτι was followed by a future expectation is: Mark 11.23 (present tense but future meaning); Luke 1.45 (future tense); 4.21 (present tense but future meaning); Acts 27.25 (future tense). In all other instances that which is believed is either a present reality or a past event: Matt 9.28; 11.24; John 6.69; 8.24; 9.18; 11. 27, 42; 13.19; 14.10, 11; 16.27, 30; 17.8, 21; 20.31; Acts 9.26; Rom 10.9; 1 Thess 4.14; Heb 11.6; James 2.19; 1 John 5.1, 5.

belief in something which is already true. It does not in and of itself imply something which is future. Furthermore, if the future συζήσομεν can be viewed as another instance of what Agersnap calls ‘the certainty future’ (i.e. a durative reality which can already be true), then the use of πιστεύομεν ὅτι is less problematic still. In fact, the following verses add weight to the idea that Paul is speaking of a reality which is already true and also durative, rather than something which has yet to happen.

Verse 8 is the statement within Romans 6.1–14 which is the most difficult to understand as a logical future, and it is important to note that my overall argument does not rest on Romans 6.8 alone. In fact, if Romans 6.8 were in fact a temporal future, it would not weaken the overall case that Romans 6.1–14 refers to inaugurated resurrection since the strongest evidence for inaugurated resurrection in this passage comes from other verses. Nonetheless, as I have shown, a strong case can be made for a logical, or gnomic, future in verse 8. We turn now, though, to what is a much clearer reference to inaugurated resurrection: Romans 6.11.

Verse 11

Verses 11 and 13 are the clearest statements in this passage concerning inaugurated resurrection. Unless one approaches these verses with an assumption that Paul *could not* have believed in inaugurated resurrection, it is difficult to see how they could be understood any other way. C. E. B. Cranfield’s words are instructive here. Cranfield acknowledges that the slightly reserved way in which Paul speaks in verses 5 and 8 could indicate his awareness of the dangers of a fully realised eschatology. Nonetheless, concerning verses 11 and 13, Cranfield rightly states:

[the idea] that Paul, at the time of the writing of Romans, did not think that there is any sense in which believers have already been raised with Christ seems to me to be disproved by these two verses.¹¹²

Paul notes in verses 9–10 that Christ has been raised to everlasting life, having himself died to sin (clearly Christ’s death is parallel to that of the believer). He now lives to God (ζῇ τῷ θεῷ). In verse 11, Paul emphasises the strong parallel between the believer’s life and Christ’s resurrection:

οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς [εἶναι] νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ
ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

¹¹² C.E.B. Cranfield, ‘Romans 6:1–14 Revisited’, *ExpTim* 106.2 (1994): 41.

In the same way, consider yourselves [to be] dead to sin, but living to God in Christ Jesus.

The opening οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς (as in v.4 with ἡμεῖς) emphasises the clear similarity which Paul sees between what has happened to Christ and what has happened to believers. In light of Jesus' death and resurrection, and their inclusion in him, Paul exhorts the Romans to reckon themselves to be dead to sin and alive to God.¹¹³ Some understand λογίζομαι here to mean acting *as if* something were the case,¹¹⁴ but what Paul states elsewhere in this passage, particularly verses 12–14, show that it is reckoning what is actually true.¹¹⁵ In Cranfield's words, this is 'a deliberate and sober judgement on the basis of the gospel.'¹¹⁶

Therefore, believers are to realise that what is true of Christ in verse 10 is also true of them. But does this imply a form of resurrection? I think it does. Indeed, Paul uses the same language to refer to Christ's resurrected existence as he does to refer to believers' present life. Paul may not have explicitly completed the parallelism as expected in verse 4, but he does here. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that in verses 10–11 Paul sees a *direct* parallel between Christ's death and the believer's (τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν // νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ) and between Christ's resurrected life and the believer's (ζῆν τῷ θεῷ // ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ).¹¹⁷ Paul's language would be clumsy if he

¹¹³ Taking, as most commentators do, λογίζεσθε as an imperative (e.g. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 160; Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1:315; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 323; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 438; Moo, *Romans*, 380) Pace Jewett, *Romans*, 408.

¹¹⁴ Bruce writes: 'In other words, live as though you had already entered the resurrection life' (F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary* [London: Tyndale Press, 1963], 139). His comments about baptism and rising with Christ through it suggest that he does not view this as pretending, though.

¹¹⁵ See Moo, *Romans*, 354: 'That this "regarding" is no mere mental state is made clear in vv.12-14.'

¹¹⁶ Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1:315. So also Käsemann, *Romans*, 171; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 324; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 438; Moo, *Romans*, 380; Wright, 'Romans', 541. Dunn (*Romans 1–8*, 324) claims that the use of λογίζομαι implies 3 things: (1) the believer is not merely a passive object in the death he died; (2) death is not complete because the believer has to reckon himself still; (3) the reckoning is part of sharing Christ's death. Whilst (1) seems warranted it is hard to find any exegetical basis in this passage for (2) and (3).

¹¹⁷ Ziesler does pick up on the idea of resurrection here but claims that it remains future. They are not yet raised but '[t]hey are to think of themselves always in the light of that destiny' (Ziesler, *Romans*, 162). This goes against the plain meaning of the text.

did not intend to communicate that believers had experienced some form of resurrection.¹¹⁸

Believers are to consider themselves alive to God, specifically, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (in Christ Jesus). It is through their union with Christ that they live to God. What is true of Christ becomes true, through union with him, of the believer. This expression has the effect of reinforcing the idea that Paul is speaking of something which is substantively true and not simply a way in which believers should act. It is not that resurrection is being used here simply to refer to righteous living. Rather, an ontological change has happened to believers through their union with Christ. They have experienced inaugurated resurrection.

Verse 13

If verse 11 tips the argument in favour of inaugurated resurrection, verse 13 confirms its presence:

μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀλλὰ
παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὥσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας καὶ τὰ μέλη
ὑμῶν ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ.

nor present your limbs [as] instruments of unrighteousness to sin, but
present yourselves to God as those who are alive out from the dead
and your limbs as instruments of righteousness to God.

In verses 12–14, Paul applies what he has stated in verses 1–11 to the Roman believers.¹¹⁹ Paul is still explaining that believers are no longer under the rule of sin. As a result, they should not let sin rule in their physical bodies, nor offer their limbs to serve sin.¹²⁰ Instead they should present themselves to God ‘as those who are alive out

¹¹⁸ Wolter uses helpfully nuanced language by noting that it is the bodily (*leiblich*) sharing in Christ’s resurrection that is still future: e.g. Wolter, *An die Römer*, 1:383.

¹¹⁹ Jewett, characteristically, sees Paul’s command in verse 12 as a direct command to the Roman Christians to stop their divisive attitude rather than as a general prohibition: Jewett, *Romans*, 409.

¹²⁰ Dunn suggests that τὰ μέλη is not so much a reference to physical body-parts, but rather to ‘faculties’ in the broadest sense: Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 337. So also Moo, *Romans*, 384. Jewett (*Romans*, 410) argues, against this, that Paul does have physical members in mind because (1) μέλη has this meaning elsewhere in Greek and (2) physical members fits better with ὅπλα (weapons).

from the dead' (ὥσεί ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας).¹²¹ This expression is key in our argument.¹²² On the face of it, the phrase suggests a present, inaugurated resurrection. Some happily admit this: Moo argues that although bodily resurrection is still a future reality, a spiritual resurrection has already occurred.¹²³ Others are still unconvinced. Dunn, for example, claims that the slight difference between ὥς and ὥσεί could prevent us from understanding resurrection as having already taken place.¹²⁴ Käsemann denies resurrection by dampening the ontological reality of this verse by restricting it to obedience: 'Christians participate provisionally in the resurrection of their Lord only in the form of new obedience.'¹²⁵ These are not particularly strong objections to inaugurated resurrection, particularly in light of what we have already seen. I have already shown above (and in the previous chapter) that this new way of living is the result of an inner change: the giving of the Holy Spirit. As such, something substantive has happened which is referred to as life. It is not simply that new life is interchangeable with righteous living.

A. J. M. Wedderburn offers a lengthy rebuttal of inaugurated resurrection in verse 13.¹²⁶ Wedderburn admits that the parallel between verses 13 and 9 could suggest that Paul does in fact think that believers have been raised. However, he does not think that ἐκ νεκρῶν means the same thing here as when it is used with a verb which means 'raise' (such as ἀνίστημι or ἐγείρω). He suggests the translation '(passed) from (the

¹²¹ The term παρίστημι could connote a slave-owner relationship, a king-subject, or a military one (see Dunn, *Romans* 1–8, 337; Jewett, *Romans*, 409). The latter is probably more likely in view of the term ὅπλα and its military use.

¹²² Wayne H. Hagen's unlikely suggestion that verse 13 is a post-Pauline interpolation need not concern us here. He argued this for a number of reasons: (1) the change of subject of the verbs between verses 12 and 13; (2) verse 13 supposedly disrupts the unity of verses 12–14; (3) verse 13 introduces a shift in theological perspective: whereas verses 12 and 14 speak of the impossibility of sin reigning (βασιλευέτω as 'sin must not reign' rather than 'let not sin reign'), verse 13 introduces the idea of the believer being able to decide: Wayne H. Hagen, 'Two Deutero-Pauline Glosses in Romans 6', *ExpTim* 92.12 (1981): 364–65. His reasons have failed to persuade commentators.

¹²³ Moo, *Romans*, 386.

¹²⁴ Dunn, *Romans* 1–8, 338.

¹²⁵ Käsemann, *Romans*, 177. Käsemann's language is confusing, though, because in his next sentence he claims that 'resurrection power has already taken possession of them and set them in new life and the new aeon'. Exactly what the difference is between resurrection with Christ (as in Col 2 and Eph 2) and resurrection power taking possession of a believer is not clear to me. Käsemann appears to be splitting hairs where Paul does not split them.

¹²⁶ Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 44–46.

state of) the dead.’ So, this verse is not, Wedderburn argues, so much about leaving the *realm* of the dead (i.e. resurrection) but leaving a *state* (deadness).

Several points can be made by way of response. Firstly, there is no evidence that ἐκ νεκρῶν accompanied by another verb than ἀνίστημι or ἐγείρω would not connote resurrection. In fact, there is specific evidence of ἐκ νεκρῶν being used with other verbs to refer to resurrection. For example, in Romans 10.7 Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν (‘to bring Christ up again from the dead’) clearly refers to Christ’s resurrection, despite ἀνίστημι or ἐγείρω not being used. Also, although its Pauline authorship is disputed, Colossians 1.18 calls Christ the πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν (‘firstborn out from the dead’). In isolation, πρωτότοκος is certainly not resurrection-language. Nonetheless it is used in combination with ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν to refer specifically to resurrection.

Secondly, with only one possible exception, every other instance of the phrase ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν in the New Testament is an unambiguous reference to resurrection.¹²⁷ If Wedderburn is correct, Romans 6.13 would be a very rare exception to this. Thirdly, within the context of Romans 6.1–14 itself, ἐκ νεκρῶν is used twice (vv. 4, 9) to unambiguously refer to Christ’s resurrection. Why would it suddenly refer to something other than resurrection? Finally, even if ἐκ νεκρῶν were a reference to a state of deadness rather than the realm of the dead, it is not clear why this would not count as resurrection. Resurrection does involve rising out of the realm of the dead, but it also involves coming to life from a state of deadness. The phrase seems too pregnant with meaning to not imply resurrection. It is difficult to not see Wedderburn’s argument as special pleading.

If Paul did not intend the reader to believe that a proleptic form of resurrection had taken place in their lives, the language he uses in verse 13 would be quite clumsy.¹²⁸

¹²⁷ The only possible exception is Rom 11.15: ‘if their [the Jews] rejection is reconciliation for the world, what will their acceptance be but life from the dead (ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν)’. The expression ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν could be a metaphor to describe something wonderful, or it could be a reference to the eschatological resurrection (which the salvation of unbelieving Jews would usher in). Even if it is the former option, the vehicle of the metaphor is nonetheless a literal resurrection (on vehicle and tenor in metaphors see 152 footnote 22).

¹²⁸ Gundry agrees that ‘the repeated exhortation to consider oneself “alive to God in Christ Jesus” (v. 11) “as men who have been brought from death to life” (v. 13) “so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life” (v. 4) – that exhortation implies the historicalness of the believer’s resurrection with Christ’ (Robert Horton Gundry, *Soma in Biblical*

Rather, the expression ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας should be taken in its fullest sense: believers have been raised out of the realm of the dead in advance of their full resurrection at the eschaton. Paul is more than happy to use the language and imagery of resurrection to refer to believers' lives.

5.5 Concluding Thoughts: What is the Nature of this Present Life?

In this chapter, I have made the case that Romans 6.1–14 describes inaugurated resurrection. Against older commentators, there is no evidence that Paul is trying to dampen eschatological enthusiasm. Paul is also not as reserved in his language as many modern scholars claim. Appealing to the use of ζάω and cognates is not a strong argument against inaugurated resurrection: Paul used a wide range of terms to refer to resurrection. Certainly, Romans 6.1–14 does not state explicitly, as Colossians 2 does, that believers have been *raised* with Christ, but it does claim that they 'walk in newness of life,' that they will (continue to) share in the likeness of his resurrection, that they will (continue to) live with Christ, that they are alive to God (just as Christ is) and that they are alive 'out from the dead' (ἐκ νεκρῶν). Paul, it seems, sees believers as resurrected in some way. Frank Tappenden rightly concludes:

The conceptual matrices of death/resurrection and death/life are lurking in the metaphorical intertextures of this passage. While such descriptions are not linguistically identified as ἀνάστασις, they nonetheless suggest (even presume) *some kind* of present resurrection experience. Rather than taking the linguistic sign as the sole indicator of Paul's soteriological ideals, we do far better to explore how the entire resurrection gestalt is brought to bear on Paul's address in Rom 6.¹²⁹

This is perceptive. Too often treatments of Romans 6.1–14 put too much emphasis on the presence or lack of specific terminology and not enough on the concepts which Paul's language creates. To repeat, Ezekiel 37.1–14 graphically describes resurrection despite the absence of the terms ἀνάστασις and ἐγείρω. There is no reason to play down the idea of resurrection in Romans 6.1–14.

Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976], 57).

¹²⁹ Tappenden, *Resurrection in Paul*, 136.

I stress, though, that I am not arguing for *realised* resurrection. Paul clearly believed that Christian would experience individual, bodily resurrection at the eschaton.¹³⁰ There is more to come. Nonetheless, he is happy to describe the existence of believers using the imagery and language of resurrection. A resurrection of some kind has already happened.

The question I now ask at the conclusion of this chapter is: what *kind* of resurrection has happened to the believer, according to Romans 6.1–14? Indeed, it does not match the definition of resurrection I provided towards the beginning of this study: *the bringing back of the whole individual to everlasting life*. It is clearly not bodily, at least in the sense of believers' individual bodies.¹³¹ But what does it mean to say that the believer has already been raised when no externally observable change has occurred?

The phrase 'so that ... we might walk in newness of life (ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν)' in verse 4 provides a major clue. Taken in isolation, the phrase could simply refer to righteous living. However, I argued above that καινότητι ζωῆς, particularly in light of Romans 7.6, refers to something which is brought about by the Holy Spirit. In other words: newness of life is such precisely because it is life brought about by the Spirit. Furthermore, I argued that the phrase is likely linked with the broader Pauline understanding (as expressed in 2 Corinthians 3–5) of the Spirit's work as envisaged in Ezekiel 36–37: the Holy Spirit gives life, and the Holy Spirit enables ethical living (defined as obeying God's commands).

The twin theme of new life in the Spirit followed by ethical living, which is present in Ezekiel 36–37, is also present in Romans 6.1–14. In other words, although the verbal overlap with Ezekiel 36–37 is not as clear as in, say, 2 Corinthians 3–5, or even later in Romans 8, the framework is the same. Paul does not explicitly mention the role of the Spirit in our passage, but he does so by implication. After all, what else leads to καινότητι ζωῆς in Paul's understanding other than the reception of the Spirit, the marker of the new age?

Inaugurated resurrection in Romans 6.1–14, then, refers to an ontological reality which leads to ethical change. In line with Ezekiel 37.1–14, the concept of resurrection is drawn on to describe the reception of the Holy Spirit. As we have seen, Paul expands

¹³⁰ E.g. Rom 8.23; 1 Cor 6.14; 15.1–58; Phil 3.20–21; 1 Thess 4.13–17.

¹³¹ See chapter 7 for the possibility of inaugurated resurrection still being bodily in a corporate sense.

upon this in Romans 8 in more detail, but the framework is present in Romans 6: new life, wrought by the Spirit, leads to living (walking) in a new way. Resurrection, here, is not a literal raising of the whole individual (body and soul) to everlasting life. This form of resurrection still awaits. In that sense, resurrection is being used as a metaphor, here. But it is not being used as a metaphor simply to describe a righteous lifestyle. It is being used to speak of what the Holy Spirit has brought about: an ontological reality described as life. This ontological reality has major implications for one's lifestyle, but the reality of inaugurated resurrection cannot be collapsed into lifestyle. One leads to the other, but they are not the same. Believers are alive out from the dead (i.e. raised in some way) because of the work of the Spirit; because of this, they are called to a new lifestyle.

Chapter 6: Inaugurated Resurrection in Colossians and Ephesians

6.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I argued that in Romans 6.1–14 makes the claim that believers have experienced inaugurated resurrection with Christ. This resurrection is described in a way that shows similarities with what was observed in chapter 4 – new life in the Spirit in light of Ezekiel 36–37. Just as Ezekiel 36–37 envisaged a two-fold work of the Holy Spirit (resurrection and empowerment for obedience) so the reception of the Spirit by believers has the same two-fold result: new life (inaugurated resurrection) and ethical empowerment.

In this chapter, I turn my attention to Colossians and Ephesians, two letters from the Pauline tradition which clearly describe inaugurated resurrection. As noted already, the Pauline authorship of these letters is disputed. For the purposes of this study, I will not make any prior judgement on the authorship of these letters. My aim is to explore whether the presentations of inaugurated resurrection in Romans 6.1–14 and those in Ephesians and Colossians are consistent. This will have implications for the question of authorship, since supposed inconsistency on resurrection is a common argument in favour of pseudonymity. However, I will reserve these implications for the conclusion of this chapter. Nonetheless, for the sake of ease, I will refer to the author(s) as ‘Paul’.

As with Romans 6.1–14, I will explore whether the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 can help to explain the nature of inaugurated resurrection in Colossians and Ephesians.

6.2 Colossians

6.2.1 Inaugurated Resurrection in Colossians 2.11–13

Two passages in Colossians are particularly relevant, here: Colossians 2.11–13 and 3.1–4. Both texts clearly describe a kind of resurrection which has already taken place. Furthermore, in combination, they teach a similar reality to Romans 6.1–14: new life followed by a change of lifestyle.

Colossians 2.11–13 reads:

¹¹ Ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ¹² συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. ¹³ καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν, συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα.

¹¹ In him [lit. whom] you were circumcised by a circumcision not made with hands, by the putting off of the body of flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, ¹² having been buried with him in baptism, in which you were also raised [with him] through faith in the working of God who raised him from the dead. ¹³ And you, being dead [in] your transgressions and the uncircumcision of your flesh, he made you alive with him, having forgiven us all our transgressions.

Even at a glance, there are striking similarities with Romans 6.1–14. Both texts refer to baptism (even if it is not the main theme); both mention burial in baptism; both mention new life in some form; both ground new life in the resurrection of Jesus.

According to verse 11, believers have been circumcised by a circumcision made without hands (ἀχειροποιήτῳ). Something supernatural has happened to the Colossians. This idea of a non-physical circumcision is something which the undisputed Paul speaks of elsewhere and I shall elaborate on this below. A question which emerges here, though, is how περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ relates to the two final clauses of his verse: ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ('by/in the putting off of the body of flesh, by/in the circumcision of Christ'). The repetition of ἐν at the start of each clause, suggests that the second clause is epexegetical: the circumcision of Christ *is* the putting off of the body of flesh. But what is the circumcision of Christ (τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ)? It could be a reference to Christ's own death which would have counted as a putting off the body of flesh.¹ In this case, the circumcision performed upon believers (περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ) would be made possible by Christ's death (his circumcision), but the two would not be identical.

¹ See for example, Bruce's earlier view in E. K. Simpson and F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), 234–35. He subsequently preferred the view that it is 'the circumcision which he [Christ] effects': F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 104. On the former view, see also C. F. D Moule, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, CGTC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), 94–96; Dunn, *Colossians and Philemon*, 157–58; David W. Pao, *Colossians and Philemon*, ZECNT 12 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 166.

However, a subjective genitive (i.e. a circumcision which Christ performs) seems preferable for a few reasons. Firstly, it would make sense for the two occurrences of περιτομή in this verse to have the same referent. The first occurrence (περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ) is clearly a circumcision which happens to believers; it makes sense for the second occurrence to refer to the same reality. Secondly, the syntax of verse 11 suggests that ‘the body of flesh’ (τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός) being referred to is that of the Colossians and not that of Christ.² To this, the objection is sometimes raised that the previous occurrences of σάρξ have all referred to physical flesh (1.22, 24; 2.1; 2.5). Therefore, it should be seen as (Christ’s) physical flesh here. But elsewhere in the epistle there are clearly non-physical references to σάρξ (2.18; 2.23) and Paul famously regularly uses σάρξ in the non-physical sense of human weakness, or sinful nature.³ Thirdly, it is not at all clear, against Dunn, that stripping off the body of flesh ‘can hardly mean anything other than literal death.’⁴ Not only is the term ἀπέκδυσις, as Dunn acknowledges, not used in the New Testament outside of its occurrence here, but the verb from which it is clearly derived, ἀπεκδύομαι, is used *only* in a non-physical sense in Colossians (2.15; 3.9). Stripping off the body of flesh is probably akin to abolishing the body of sin in Romans 6.6.⁵ Fourthly, circumcision as death is itself an odd metaphor. Moo points out that it doesn’t sit well with the actual ritual itself.⁶ This would be an unprecedented use of the language of circumcision. As such, it is better to understand ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ as the circumcision which Christ performs, or at least brings about, on the believer rather than Christ’s own death.

Why did Paul choose the language of circumcision to describe what has happened to the Colossians? Perhaps the false teachers whom Paul counters in Colossians were promoting circumcision, much like the teachers addressed in Galatians

² Douglas J. Moo, *The Letters to the Colossians and to Philemon*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 199. Even Dunn, who opts finally for the objective genitive, notes this: ‘The lack of an αὐτοῦ, “his flesh,” would normally indicate that the phrase should be rendered “the body of the (= your) flesh.”’ (Dunn, *Colossians and Philemon*, 157).

³ This point is relevant whether Colossians was written by Paul or not. Even if Paul did not write Colossians, it was clearly written by someone familiar with his work.

⁴ Dunn, *Colossians and Philemon*, 157.

⁵ So Moo, *Colossians*, 200: “‘Body of flesh,’ on this view, will be equivalent to “body of sin” in Romans 6:6. In both verses Paul intends to describe the body not as sinful in itself but as under the domination of sin/the flesh’.

⁶ Moo, *Colossians*, 200.

and Philippians 3.⁷ If so, Paul's insistence that his (Gentile) audience had been circumcised would have encouraged his hearers not to undergo physical circumcision. His hearers' lack of circumcision may well have been a problem in the past, Paul explains. Indeed, the Colossians used to be 'dead ... in the uncircumcision of their flesh' (2.11). But this is no longer a problem, Paul notes, since they have experienced the circumcision of Christ.

But this polemical use of circumcision is unlikely to only be an *ad hoc* argument. It is likely deeply rooted in clear theological reflection. Paul is most likely drawing on the scriptural language of circumcision of the heart.⁸ Most clearly, Deuteronomy 30.6 promises Israel that after their exile, Yahweh would gather them back to their land and circumcise their heart:⁹

ומל יהוה אלהיך את לבבך ואת לבב זרעך לאהבה את יהוה אלהיך בכל לבבך ובכל
נפשך למען חיך

And Yahweh your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of
your offspring to love Yahweh your God with all your heart and with
all your life for the sake of your life.

It is clear from Paul's discussion on circumcision in Romans 2 that this passage was significant to him, and our author, whether Paul or not, would presumably have been aware of this. In Romans 2.29 it is not circumcision of the flesh which truly makes one a Jew, but circumcision of the heart by the Spirit (περιτομή καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι). It seems likely that Paul also had the promise of Deuteronomy 30.6 in mind when he referred to the circumcision of Christ in Colossians 2.11: the end-of-exile promise of heart-circumcision has taken place in the Colossian gentile Christians.¹⁰

But Paul's reference to heart-circumcision in Romans 2.29 may take us a step further in discerning his thinking. What is significant in Romans 2.29 is that Paul is not simply drawing on the promise of Deuteronomy 30.6. He does not limit himself to speaking of circumcision of the heart (as Deuteronomy 30.6 does). Instead, he describes circumcision of the heart as ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι ('by the Spirit, not the letter').

⁷ On circumcision possibly forming part of the Colossians heresy, see Pao, *Colossians and Philemon*, 164 (Pao thinks we cannot dismiss the idea of it being part of the false teaching).

⁸ See Lev 26.41; Deut 10.16; Jer 4.4; 9.9; Ezek 44.7,9.

⁹ Interestingly, the LXX of Deut 30.6 has περικαθαριεῖ (cleanse) instead of the expected περιτέμνω.

¹⁰ It is common to see the link with Deuteronomy. See Moo, *Colossians*, 197; Joel White, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Kolosser*, HTANT (Witten: Brockhaus, 2018), 229; Pao, *Colossians and Philemon*, 164–65.

The Spirit/letter contrast is central to much of Paul's thinking, as we have seen, and I have already shown that one of the sources of this thinking would have been Ezekiel 36–37 (in combination with Jeremiah 31.31–34).¹¹ Jeremiah 31, Ezekiel 36–37 and Deuteronomy 30 were very closely associated in terms of describing the reality of the new covenant which Israel expected. According to Paul, the circumcision of the heart described by Deuteronomy has taken place in believers by virtue of the reception of the Spirit, and this heart-circumcision leads to obedience to God's commands.¹² This is also clear in Philippians 3.3 where Paul notes 'we [i.e. believers] are the circumcision (ἡ περιτομή), we who serve God by the Spirit (πνεύματι)'.

Considering Paul's broader treatment of circumcision as the work of the Spirit, the author of Colossians, whether Paul or a student of his, likely envisaged the circumcision of Christ in terms of reception of the Spirit. It also seems likely that Paul's reflection on Ezekiel 36–37 in conjunction with Deuteronomy 30.6 and Jeremiah 31 provided some of the Scriptural impetus for thinking of heart-circumcision in terms of the work of the Spirit. As such, as with Romans 6, we again have a passage dealing with baptism and present resurrection which is likely conceived of as a work of the Spirit, despite this not being explicitly stated.

The circumcision which Christ effects is appropriated through baptism (συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ – Col 2.12).¹³ The participial phrase suggests that '[b]elievers at Colossae were circumcised either "when" they were baptized, "because" they were baptized or "by means of" their baptism.'¹⁴ Through baptism, the believer is co-buried with Christ and united to his death with the result that the body of flesh/body of sin is put off. In Colossians 2.11–12, as in Romans 6, the believer participates in the death of Christ through baptism, a participation which leads to putting off the body of

¹¹ Barclay notes that the association between the Spirit and heart-circumcision was already visible in Jub. 1.23 and notes that the 'concatenation [was] no doubt facilitated by the association of heart and Spirit in Ezek 36.25–7' (John M. G. Barclay, 'Paul and Philo on Circumcision: Romans 2.25–9 in Social and Cultural Context', *NTS* 44.4 [1998]: 553).

¹² 'Thus the OT idea of circumcision of the heart takes on a new nuance; it is not just a spiritual circumcision of the human heart, but one that springs from the Spirit of Christ himself. Recall Jer 31:33, "I shall put my law within them; I shall write it on their hearts"; Ezek 36:27, "I shall place my spirit within you and cause you to walk by my statutes."' (Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 323).

¹³ If the expression 'the circumcision of Christ' is a reference to Christ's own death, then this verse would be saying that the Christian is united with the death of Christ (i.e. his circumcision) by being co-buried with him in baptism.

¹⁴ Joshua Garroway, 'The Circumcision of Christ: Romans 15.7-13', *JSNT* 34.4 (2012): 314.

flesh. It seems unwarranted, as Lohse does, to call this participation in Christ's death 'just a cursory remark in the development of thought.'¹⁵

Baptism itself is probably not the circumcision made without hands. Paul does not equate the two explicitly, despite what some have suggested.¹⁶ He claims that believers have been circumcised, 'having been buried' (συνταφέντες) with Christ through baptism. This implies that baptism is the *locus* or means of circumcision, but not that baptism *is* the circumcision. Also, this circumcision is said to be ἀχειροποιήτος and therefore something wrought by God, or Christ, himself. This cannot therefore be the ritual act of baptism itself. Rather, the rite of baptism is presumably *the means by which* God brings about this circumcision made without hands. In the following chapter, we will explore the close connection between receiving the Spirit and baptism. If this circumcision is in fact a reference to the activity of the Spirit, then it is understandable that it happens in the context of baptism.

Paul moves on in the second half of verse 12: 'in which (ἐν ᾧ) you were also raised [with him] through faith in the working of God who raised him from the dead.' The antecedent of ἐν ᾧ is not immediately clear. It could be a reference back to Christ (i.e. the believer was raised 'in Christ'), or it could be a reference to βαπτισμῷ (the believer is raised in baptism just as he or she has been buried in baptism). The larger structure of the passage could suggest the former: the repetition of ἐν ᾧ would structure the sentence around two statements which are true in Christ: 'in him you were circumcised' (v.11) and 'in him you were raised' (v.12).

However, there are two disadvantages to this view. Firstly, it is more natural for ἐν ᾧ to refer to what comes immediately before, namely ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ. In fact, it would create a neat structure for this statement in which two συν- verbs are centred around baptism:

συνταφέντες αὐτῷ
ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ,
ἐν ᾧ καὶ (i.e. ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ)
συνηγέρθητε

This does not prove that ἐν ᾧ refers to baptism, but it does show that there are valid alternative ways of structuring the passage. Secondly, baptism as the antecedent avoids

¹⁵ Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon*, 104.

¹⁶ Lohse states, 'Baptism is called circumcision here' (Ibid., 101)

(as Moo points out) stating the awkward idea: ‘you were raised with him in him.’¹⁷ Some commentators that take ἐν ᾧ as a reference back to Christ seem to render συνεγείρω as if it were simply ἐγείρω.¹⁸ But this removes the force of the συν- in συνεγείρω. In other cases, συνεγείρω is rendered correctly but ἐν ᾧ is not translated at all.¹⁹ It has been pointed out that in Ephesians 2.6 συνήγειρεν appears alongside ἐν Χριστῷ. However, as Moo rightly points out, the construction of Ephesians 2.6 makes this a less awkward sentence than Colossians 2.12.²⁰

On the balance of probabilities, ἐν ᾧ most likely refers to baptism. As such, this resurrection happens in baptism.²¹ That said, even if the antecedent of ᾧ is Christ, it would be going too far to claim, as Dunn does, that Paul does not link resurrection and baptism.²² Indeed, the close association of baptism and inaugurated resurrection both here and in Romans 6.1–14 is telling. As Sumney notes: ‘With either rendering [...] believers are raised with Christ in baptism and through this rite begin to exist in the realm of Christ.’²³ Therefore, whatever the grammatical antecedent of ἐν ᾧ, baptism is likely thought of as the moment or locus of this resurrection.

Resurrection is clearly a past event in Colossians 2.12, as indicated by the aorist συνηγέρθητε.²⁴ If our understanding of the antecedent of ἐν ᾧ is correct, inaugurated resurrection takes place in baptism. But, as we have noted above, this does not mean that the believer has no future resurrection to look forward to (see below on 3.1–4). Both past resurrection in baptism and future resurrection at the Parousia are held together in this letter. This is inaugurated, rather than realised, resurrection. Furthermore, the believer’s present resurrection, as in Romans 6.1–14, parallels Christ’s own resurrection: ‘through faith in the working of God who raised him from

¹⁷ Moo, *Colossians*, 203.

¹⁸ For example Jerry L. Sumney, *Colossians: A Commentary*, NTL (London: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 139 though he does acknowledge that inserting ‘in him’ makes the sentence ‘rough’ (139); Pao, *Colossians and Philemon*, 167.

¹⁹ See for example CEB; CEV (not correctly rendering συνεγείρω either); HCSB; NET; NRSV.

²⁰ Moo, *Colossians*, 203 footnote 60.

²¹ So Murray J. Harris, *Colossians and Philemon*, 2nd ed. (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2010), 153–54.

²² James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today* (London: SCM, 1970), 154–56.

²³ Sumney, *Colossians*, 139.

²⁴ This is true even if temporality is not a semantic property of the aorist since there are contextual indicators that this is a past action. Indeed, baptism would have been a past moment for Paul’s readers.

the dead' (διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν – 2.12).

The idea of inaugurated resurrection is repeated in verse 13, although here the emphasis is on resurrection out of deadness, rather than death and burial with Christ.²⁵ The term used to refer to resurrection differs from that in verse 12 (here it is συζωοποιέω). The two terms are clearly used interchangeably to refer to resurrection, and not just to a general bringing-to-life that doesn't involve resurrection (if that were even possible in an early Christian context). As shown in the previous chapter, Paul (and other New Testament authors) uses several terms other than ἐγείρω, ἀνίστημι and cognates to refer to resurrection. Colossians 2 shows, again, that ζωή and ζάω-related terminology should not be excluded from the vocabulary of resurrection. This is particularly noteworthy in a passage which unequivocally refers to inaugurated resurrection.

So then, in Colossians 2.11–13 the believer has already experienced a form of resurrection. As in Romans 6.1–14, this resurrection took place in baptism. Although the focus of 2.11–13 is the reality of resurrection, not so much its implications, the language of circumcision suggests that we are to think of the outworking of this resurrection as transformed ethics, in line with the metaphor of heart-circumcision in the Hebrew Scriptures. If ethical transformation is indeed linked with inaugurated resurrection in Colossians, it would fit with what we have seen elsewhere in Paul, which itself fits with the framework of Ezekiel 36–37.

6.2.2 Resurrection Ethics in Colossians 3.1–4

The two steps of dying and rising with Christ are expanded upon in 2.20–23 and 3.1–4. According to 2.20, believers have died with Christ from the elements of the world (ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου). It is therefore inappropriate to live as if 'living in the world' (ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ). The idea is very similar to that expressed in Romans 6.1–14, where believers have died to sin and therefore should not live in it.

But Paul moves from death to life in Colossians 3.1–4:

¹ Εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθημένος· ² τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε, μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ³

²⁵ The idea of dying with Christ is clearly expressed in 2.20 and as such Paul can here hold together both deadness in sin (2.13) and the action of dying with Christ in baptism (2.11, 20).

ἀπεθάνετε γὰρ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ·
⁴ ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῇ, ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν, τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ
 φανερωθήσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ.

¹ If therefore you were raised with Christ, seek the things above, where Christ is seated at the right hand of God. ² Think about the things above and not the things upon the earth ³ for you died and your life has been hidden with Christ in God. ⁴ When Christ (your life) is revealed, then you also will be revealed with him in glory.

According to 3.1, believers are not simply dead; they have also been raised with Christ (συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ). Paul does not envisage converts existing in some liminal state of death until the Parousia. Rather, death is *with respect to* sin and the world (2.20–23). Resurrection is *with respect to* God. Furthermore, this reality leads to living in a different way. Believers are called to seek that which is above (τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε – 3.1) as well as to think about that which is above (τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε – 3.2). This is reminiscent of Romans 8.4–9, where Paul describes the mindset of believers as set on the Spirit and roots that in the reality that they are now ‘in the Spirit’ (ἐν πνεύματι – Rom 8.9). Although the language of the Spirit has not directly been used in this regard in Colossians, the prior language of circumcision suggests that Paul could be thinking in terms of the activity of the Spirit. Inaugurated resurrection, in both Romans and Colossians, leads to ethical change.

The fact that the believer’s inaugurated resurrection with Christ leads to a change of lifestyle completes the link with Romans 6.1–14. In Romans 6, Paul noted both the reality of present resurrection and the change of lifestyle which it should lead to. The *reality* of present resurrection is described in Colossians 2.11–13. In Colossians 3.1–4, Paul refers to the *lifestyle* it should lead to: seeking and thinking about that which is above. This then leads to a strongly practical section in 3.5–4.6. So then: inaugurated resurrection is followed by ontological-ethical change. It would be overly bold to suggest a direct link with Ezekiel 36–37 – clearly the link with Romans 6.1–14 is strongest. Nonetheless, the double reality of new life by the Spirit and ethical change which we have seen elsewhere in Paul, and which is strongly influenced by Ezekiel 36–37, is present again in Colossians.

As noted already, Colossians 3.1–4 clearly shows that Paul is writing of *inaugurated* resurrection and not *realised* resurrection. Verse 4 shows that Colossians

still operates with a futuristic outlook.²⁶ Future resurrection is assumed only a few lines after present resurrection has been referred to. It is clearly not an issue of present resurrection *or* future resurrection, but of present resurrection *and* future resurrection. If the supposed purely futuristic outlook of the undisputed Pauline letters and the supposed over-realised eschatology of Colossians were not exaggerated, there would be no reason not to consider *both* present and future resurrection as central Pauline concepts.

6.2.3 Conclusion

Colossians, then, is similar to Romans 6.1–14 in its presentation of inaugurated resurrection. The believer, through baptism, has died with Christ, been buried with him, and been raised with him. Although (the rite of baptism aside) these are not externally visible events (unlike future resurrection), they are nonetheless real – they refer to an ontological change in the believer's life. Otherwise, Paul could not base his ethical exhortations on these changes. I have suggested that the language which Paul uses shows that he envisaged this ontological change to be the result of receiving the Spirit. As in Ezekiel 36–37 and elsewhere in Paul, receiving the Spirit is seen as a form of resurrection and leads to ethical change. This resurrection is not (yet) the literal and bodily raising of the whole individual. In that sense, it is, strictly-speaking, a metaphorical use of the concept of resurrection.²⁷ But it is not simply a pedagogical tool to teach converts how to act. It is a description of a significant ontological change brought about by the Spirit.

Furthermore, Colossians still contains a futuristic outlook: the believer will be revealed in glory with Christ when he appears at the eschaton (3.4). The supposed over-realised eschatology of Colossians and the supposed purely futuristic eschatology of Romans should not be over-pressed.²⁸ Colossians, then, presents a typical already/not-yet view of eschatology, and inaugurated resurrection forms a key part of this.

²⁶ Moo, *Colossians*, 245: 'v.4 in this very paragraph continues unambiguously to affirm the temporal category of a future sharing with Christ in glory.'

²⁷ See Dunn, *Colossians and Philemon*, 203: 'the language is metaphorical and not literal. The resurrection with Christ in a resurrection like Christ's still lay as much in the future as it had in the earlier treatment in Romans 6'.

²⁸ Campbell also makes a valid challenge against this 'sum-zero' way of thinking about eschatology. He notes that if we assume that a believer is a certain percent 'Adamic' and a certain percent 'in Christ' then

6.3 Ephesians 5.14b

Several relevant features of Ephesians have already been dealt with. Due to the very significant way the author draws on Ezekiel 37.1–14 in Ephesians 2, it was fitting to deal with Ephesians 2.1–11 in chapter 4. In this section, I explore the remaining evidence for inaugurated resurrection in this letter: Ephesians 5.14b.

6.3.1 *A Baptismal Hymn?*

Outside of chapter 2, the most significant reference to present resurrection in Ephesians is in 5.14b where Paul states the following:

ἔγειρε, ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφάνσει σοι ὁ Χριστός.

Arise, o sleeper, and rise from the dead, and Christ will shine on you.

The phrase διὸ λέγει shows that Paul is quoting something. In 4.8 this phrase introduced a Scriptural quotation. Some have suggested that Paul is doing that here by creatively reworking Isaiah 26.19 and 60.1–2.²⁹ However, it is more likely that this is an excerpt from an early Christian liturgy or hymn, itself perhaps based on these Scriptures. Moritz gives several reasons for this, some stronger than others:³⁰ (1) the rhythm of the passage and the rhyming of the first two lines; (2) the likely semitic order of the verbs;³¹ (3) the

if we assume that Romans presents, say, a 50/50 split, and we then read Colossians as giving us a more 10/90 or 0/100 split, then we will assume that these views are incompatible. Campbell notes that this way of thinking is anachronistic since *theological language* does not operate on the same quantitative assumptions (take the trinity, for instance). Campbell notes that possibly a better analogy is that of two pieces of music played at the same time in different parts of the room. One piece may be more dominant, depending on the volume, but both are ‘fully present’ (Campbell, *Framing Paul*, 299–302).

²⁹ E.g. Jonathan Lunde and John Anthony Dunne, ‘Paul’s Creative and Contextual Use of Isaiah in Ephesians 5:14’, *JETS* 55.1 (2012): 87–110.

³⁰ Thorsten Moritz, *A Profound Mystery: The Use of the Old Testament in Ephesians*, NovTSup 85 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 100. In addition to this, see the reasons (most of which are similar) given in Michel Gourgues, “‘Réveille-toi...’ (Ep 5,14): de l’évocation de la Pâque baptismale à la motivation parénétique”, *ScEs* 63.3 (2011): 369–70. Other, less likely, options put forth as to the origin are an apocryphal saying of Jesus or a Christianised version of an early Jewish apocalypse. See the succinct but helpful overview in John Muddiman, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, BNTC (London: Bloomsbury, 2006), 242–43.

³¹ Lincoln also notes the possible semitic influence: ‘It has a Semitic style with the verbs at the beginning of the lines, the two imperatives linked by καί, and then the καί leading into the future tense of the third line’ (Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 318).

fact that it is quite suitable for use in worship due to its ‘brevity, introduction and concise nature’; (4) ἐπιφάσκω is a New Testament *hapax legomenon*; (5) a change from second person plural before the quotation to second person singular in the quotation; (6) the introductory formula διὸ λέγει and conclusion, οὖν.

That Paul is citing an early Christian hymn or saying is relatively clear. However, many scholars have suggested a more specific original setting for this source: an early Christian baptismal liturgy, perhaps that the community would chant to the newly baptised initiate.³² If this is correct, it would have significant implications for our treatment of inaugurated resurrection as it would involve early and possibly pre-Pauline evidence for a form of resurrection in baptism.³³ As Gourgues notes:

Puisqu’il s’agit d’un formulaire traditionnel, Ep 5,14 manifeste que la représentation du baptême comme mort et résurrection avec le Christ s’est esquissée tôt aux origines, avant Paul lui-même, semble-t-il³⁴

To support the link with baptism, some have pointed to the supposed similarities between this hymn and initiation chants or hymns of Hellenistic cults. In his earlier work, F. F. Bruce noted that the suggestion that early Christians took over these chants is ‘more probable than any other.’³⁵ But the alleged parallels between Ephesians 5.14b

³² Some have suggested other settings as well. For example, Hoehner suggests that ‘it may well be a hymn of repentance and encouragement sung regularly by earlier believers’ (Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002], 687). Others, though, have expressed understandable reserve at attempting to find an original setting, noting that this is ultimately speculative: Stephen E. Fowl, *Ephesians: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 172. The speculative nature of this exercise should indeed caution us against building too strong a conclusion on the possible setting of this hymn.

³³ That it is not Pauline is almost certain regardless of our conclusions on the authorship of the letter. If Paul is the author of Ephesians and is quoting a Christian hymn, then the hymn is, of course, not Pauline. If, however, Ephesians is deuterio-Pauline and the author is quoting a hymn, it is unlikely that he is citing a hymn composed by Paul himself. If Ephesians is deuterio-Pauline it would need to be dated very late for this hymn to have been composed after Paul’s death. As such, it is most likely earlier than much of Paul’s writing.

³⁴ Gourgues, ‘Réveille-toi...’, 382.

³⁵ F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Ephesians: A Verse-by-Verse Exposition* (London: Pickering & Inglis, 1961), 108. See the references to Firmus Maternus, *Error of Profane Religions* 18 and Clement of Alexandria, *Exhortation to the Greeks* 2.14. Bruce seems to have revised this view in his later commentary, noting that ‘[S]uch formal parallels are difficult to establish, and throw no light on the meaning of what is, in context and content, an explicitly Christian composition’ (Bruce, *Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians*, 377).

and initiation chants are not very strong,³⁶ nor would they suffice to establish a baptismal setting. Others have pointed to the prevalence of light terminology, both in the citation and in the surrounding context of Ephesians 5.14b, and noted that baptism is often associated with light or illumination.³⁷ However, the first explicit association of light terminology and baptism comes from Justin Martyr in the mid-second century.³⁸ The possible references to baptism in Hebrews 6.4 and 10.32 by use of the word φωτισθέντες are also speculative.³⁹ There is nothing explicit in Ephesians 5.14b or in the surrounding context to link this hymn to the practice of baptism.⁴⁰

That said, a baptism ceremony would nonetheless be a fitting context for such a liturgical statement. This saying is not directed to God, but to an individual, so it is more likely to be a liturgical saying than a hymn. This begs the question of who the implied speaker(s) and recipient are. Most likely, the implied recipient is a new convert. It is easy to imagine the implied speaker being a congregation, or perhaps a specific individual within the congregation, speaking to this new convert. But what context would be an obvious setting for such a liturgical saying? It is difficult to think of a more fitting setting than that of baptism. Whatever we conclude about early Christian belief on the efficacy of baptism, it clearly formed the moment of entry into the community, was the most public element of initiation, and (as we will see) was associated closely with the reception of the Holy Spirit. Again, to reemphasise, there is nothing explicit in the text which suggests a baptismal setting. As such, this must be a tentative, and somewhat speculative, suggestion. Nonetheless, there is a fittingness to this saying being pronounced at baptism. It is therefore possible that this is evidence of a pre-Pauline association of resurrection with baptism. At the very least, it is evidence of a likely pre-Pauline understanding of inaugurated resurrection.

³⁶ See Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 52–53.

³⁷ For example, Rudolf Schnackenburg (drawing on F. J. Dölger) points to the Syriac *Did. apost.* 21 (apparently a baptismal text) in which Jewish Christians are told, ‘You have seen the great light, our Lord, Jesus Christ’ and the gentiles are told, ‘A great light has arisen over you’ (Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Ephesians: A Commentary* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991], 229).

³⁸ *I Apol.* 61.12; 65.1.

³⁹ Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 141: ‘prior to the middle of the second century there is no clear evidence that φωτίζειν means “to baptize.” In the NT the term is used metaphorically to refer to spiritual or intellectual illumination that removes ignorance through the action of God or the preaching of the gospel’. Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), 169: ‘there may be an allusion to baptism, but the term “enlightened” does not yet function as a technical designation for the ritual.’

⁴⁰ Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 52, 80 (see references on 80 note 1).

Before moving on, it is worth noting that some have suggested that this saying originally referred to *future* resurrection of the dead in Christ and that the author has reappropriated it for a present context. This has apparently been argued by Bent Noack.⁴¹ Wedderburn has broadly supported Noack's view, noting that the earlier this tradition is dated, the less likely it is to refer to resurrection in a figurative way.⁴² However, this view is unlikely for a couple of reasons. Firstly, the quotation is used in Ephesians to refer to what has *already* happened to a Christian. Someone may use a source in a different context to its original one, but if Paul is drawing on a well-known saying it is less likely that he would change its meaning. Paul's use of the phrase (introduced by διὸ λέγει) suggests some level of familiarity with the saying on the part of the Ephesians. It would be odd for Paul to take a saying that the church knew was referring to future resurrection and apply it to inaugurated resurrection. Secondly, is an original eschatological context *likely*? Lincoln points out that if the hymn were eschatological in content, the verbs would probably be plural since we would be dealing with the general resurrection of the dead. Additionally, there is a practical question: 'what sort of purpose would have been served in the community's gathering for worship by the singing of such a hymn ...?'⁴³ It is not impossible for the saying to have an original eschatological context, but it seems more likely that it was a reference to what occurred at baptism/conversion.⁴⁴ In addition to these two reasons, Wedderburn's suggestion that an early source is less likely to refer to present resurrection is based on flawed methodology: it involves reading a piece of evidence (5.14b) in light of a particular assumption (inaugurated resurrection is a late development) rather than allowing this new piece of evidence to inform the overall assumption. Unless we begin with the *assumption* that an early text is unlikely to refer to present resurrection (and our reading of Romans 6.1–14 show that this is a flawed assumption), there is no reason why this hymn could not refer to resurrection as an inaugurated reality.

It is noteworthy that this saying is quoted in a context dealing with Christian ethics. Paul's main concern since at least Ephesians 4.1 and especially since 4.17 has

⁴¹ Bent Noack, 'Das Zitat in Ephes 5:14', *ST* 5.1 (1951): 52–64.

⁴² Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 81–82.

⁴³ Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 319.

⁴⁴ 'Conversion' can be quite a slippery term and requires definition. I use the term to refer to the whole complex of responding to the proclamation of the Gospel, however complex that response would have been. I also recognise that one element of this conversion (e.g. baptism) could be used to refer to the whole.

been the conduct of his addressees. As part of his exhortation to godly conduct he encourages his hearers to ‘not be deceived by empty words’ (5.6) nor to become partakers with the ‘sons of disobedience’ (5.7). Instead, they are to ‘walk as children of light’ (5.8) and by their conduct to expose the works of darkness (5.11–13). It is in this context that Paul quotes this saying. He then immediately encourages his hearers to walk wisely. Again, the reality of inaugurated resurrection is linked with a change of behaviour. The resurrection envisaged in 5.14b is not explicitly described as the reception of the Spirit, but Paul’s exhortation in 5.18, off the back of quoting this Christian hymn, to ‘be filled with the Spirit’ (πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι) is perhaps not a coincidence. Being filled with the Spirit is itself strongly linked with ethics. Paul is again operating within a two-fold framework: present resurrection (ontological change) leads to a new lifestyle. As in Colossians, there is not an explicit reference to Ezekiel 36–37 here, but the general framework of new life (in the Spirit?) followed by ethical change is present. We have seen elsewhere that Paul’s thinking on that matter had clearly been shaped in part by Ezekiel 36–37.

So then, Ephesians 5.14b most likely preserves an early Christian liturgy, or at least an early Christian tradition, which describes what has happened *in the past* to the believer. Although there is no explicit evidence of its use in a baptismal context, the baptismal rite is a very fitting and likely setting for this saying. Therefore, Ephesians 5.14b is an early, and likely pre-Pauline, tradition which saw the believer as having already been raised with Christ, possibly at baptism. Furthermore, the framework of present resurrection and the work of the Spirit followed by ethical change, central elsewhere in Paul’s writings, is again at work here.

6.3.2 *Realised or Inaugurated?*

Is resurrection in Ephesians *inaugurated* or *realised*? Does Ephesians envisage or assume that there is still a final, general resurrection at the return of Christ (in which case, Ephesians 2 and 5 describe inaugurated resurrection), or is the only form of resurrection the believer can expect that which has already happened (in which case we are speaking of realised resurrection).

Ephesians does not explicitly refer to the general resurrection, nor does it mention the Parousia (unlike Colossians 3.4). Nonetheless, there is sufficient evidence that the author, whether Paul or not, assumed that there was a further resurrection still

to come; he expected a coming day of denouement. The eschatology of Ephesians is not fully realised, despite the higher emphasis on that which is already true for believers.⁴⁵

Indications of a future state for the cosmos and for believers are peppered throughout the letter. The role of the Holy Spirit as a seal in 1.14 and 4.30 is associated with a coming day of redemption.⁴⁶ The only other passage in Paul which speaks of future ἀπολύτρωσις in conjunction with the Holy Spirit is Romans 8.23. There, it is specifically the redemption of believers' bodies (i.e. resurrection) which is in view. Ephesians 1.14 and 4.30 do not mention the general resurrection explicitly, but clearly the Parousia is in view and there is no reason to think that this did not include resurrection in the author's mind.

Ephesians 1.21 speaks of Christ being seated in the heavenlies, οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι ('not only in this age but also in the one to come'). Despite his emphasis on the already-present nature of eschatology, our author clearly operates with a distinction between the current age, and the age to come. This is not a fully realised eschatology. Ephesians 2.7 refers to God showing his kindness ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις ('in the coming ages'). Lincoln notes, 'the new order which has begun has a future. The writer knows himself to be in the decisive period of God's redemptive activity, which was inaugurated by Christ's resurrection and exaltation, but which is yet to reach its consummation in the coming ages.'⁴⁷ Furthermore, Ephesians also speaks of the idea of having 'an inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God' (5.5) and the accompanying reality of God's wrath coming upon those who are disobedient (5.6). This does not make sense within a fully realised form of eschatology.⁴⁸

In summary, although Ephesians does emphasise the inaugurated aspect of eschatology and of resurrection more strongly than many of Paul's other letters, it does not offer a realised eschatology. A future consummation is still in view. Since there is

⁴⁵ So Lincoln, *Ephesians*, lxxxix–xc: 'The distinctive emphasis of Ephesians is on realized eschatology, but it does retain some future elements (cf. 1:14; 2:7; 4:30; 5:5; 6:8, 13).'

⁴⁶ See Bruce, *Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians*, 265.

⁴⁷ Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 111. It is, however, possible to see this expression not so much as a reminder of the two-age scheme, but as a general description of the idea of God's ongoing goodness throughout eternity (see Bruce, *Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians*, 288).

⁴⁸ It is in fact very similar to Paul's treatment of the unrighteous not entering God's kingdom in 1 Corinthians 6.

no evidence to the contrary, there is no reason to assume that bodily resurrection does not feature as part of this. As such, Ephesians describes inaugurated, not realised, resurrection.

6.3.3 Conclusion

Whether Ephesians was written by Paul or by one of his followers, its author thought that believers had already been in some way raised from the dead with Christ. Although the eschatology of Ephesians feels more realised, it still preserves the early Christian expectation of a day of consummation. As such, we cannot preclude the view that the believer *also* awaited an eschatological resurrection. I showed in chapter 4 that Paul had been heavily influenced by Ezekiel 37 when he wrote Ephesians 2, a passage which indisputably refers to inaugurated resurrection. Furthermore, the quotation in 5.14b, both in the context of the letter, and likely in its original context, seems to be a reference to what has *already* happened to believers. If this is a relatively early tradition, then we have an early, possibly pre-Pauline, attestation of inaugurated resurrection. In both Ephesians 2 and 5, present resurrection leads to ethical change. The former passage refers to good works (ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς) prepared for believers (2.10); the latter passage deals primarily with Christians living as light. Ephesians' understanding of inaugurated resurrection, then, is in line with what Paul states elsewhere: an ontological change (resurrection, likely a reference to receiving the Spirit) which leads to empowering for ethical living.

6.4 Conclusion and Implications for Authorship

In Romans 6.1–14 Paul claims that believers, through baptism, have experienced a kind of death and resurrection with Christ. An ontological change has taken place which can be described as inaugurated resurrection. Furthermore, this ontological change leads to a change of lifestyle. Finally, we saw implied in Romans 6 that this ontological-ethical change was a result of the work of the Holy Spirit, in line with Ezekiel 36–37. Paul used the language and imagery of resurrection to refer to the transformation brought about by the Holy Spirit.

The same scheme is present in Colossians and Ephesians. Despite claims that Colossians and Ephesians differ from Romans in presenting a more realised view of

resurrection, this is not what we have observed. Instead, just like Romans 6, Colossians and Ephesians describe the believer as having already been in some sense raised with Christ. In Colossians 2, this resurrection takes place specifically in baptism. In Ephesians, baptism is not explicitly associated with this resurrection, but we saw that the pre-Pauline liturgy in 5.14b would fit naturally in a baptismal context.

Additionally, in both Colossians and Ephesians present resurrection leads to transformed ethics. Colossians 3.1–4 explains the consequences of inaugurated resurrection in language reminiscent of Romans 8: the mind set on things above. Colossians goes on to exhort believers to a new way of life. As we saw in chapter 4, Ephesians 2 describes inaugurated resurrection and subsequently the outcome of ‘good works’ (Eph 2.10). Inaugurated resurrection in 5.14b comes in the context of exhortations to live in a way which is pleasing to God. This framework of resurrection followed by a new lifestyle is consistent with what we saw of Paul’s understanding of reception of the Spirit in light of Ezekiel 36–37: receiving the Spirit is envisaged as a form of resurrection which leads to empowerment to obey God. The link between present resurrection and the Spirit was not as explicit in Colossians and Ephesians, but in Colossians in particular, the idea of believers being circumcised by Christ, particularly in light of Romans 2.29, creates an implicit link with the role of the Spirit.

There is, then, a remarkable continuity between what we observed in Romans 6.1–14 and what we have explored in Colossians and Ephesians. Literal, bodily resurrection in the sense of *the bringing back of the whole individual to everlasting life* has not yet come to pass. However, the language and idea of resurrection are used to describe an ontological transformation brought about in the life of the believer in advance of the eschaton. In other words, this is inaugurated resurrection.

This has implications for the question of authorship. In this study so far, I have not argued for or against the Pauline authorship of Colossians and Ephesians. I have simply shown consistency and continuity between the descriptions of inaugurated resurrection in Romans 6, and in Colossians 2–3 and Ephesians 2 and 5. This continuity should give us pause before we too quickly describe these two letters as deutero-Pauline.

In recent years the scholarly consensus on the authorship of Colossians and Ephesians has been slowly changing. Whereas, previously, both letters were almost

unanimously considered pseudonymous, scholars are now more split on the question.⁴⁹ Obviously, a case for authenticity based on a shift in scholarly opinion is not a genuine argument. However, the shift in consensus seems to be an indication that several of the usual arguments in favour of pseudonymity are not as compelling as once thought. This is particularly true of the supposedly different styles of Colossians and Ephesians, on the one hand, and the undisputed Pauline letters on the other hand. Clearly, the styles of Colossians and particularly Ephesians are different to that of Romans, for example. But these differences are not as significant as was once assumed. Douglas Campbell has recently shown how stylometric analyses on Colossians and Ephesians are, at best, inconclusive.⁵⁰ The question of Ephesians' supposed dependence on Colossians is also increasingly deemed inconclusive or irrelevant to the question of authorship.⁵¹

⁴⁹ During a survey done at the 2011 British New Testament Conference, Paul Foster surveyed approximately 109 British Pauline scholars' views on the authorship of the different Pauline letters. On Colossians, a slight majority opted for Pauline authorship (56), only 17 opted against and 36 were uncertain. On Ephesians 39 opted for Pauline authorship, 42 opted against and 28 were uncertain (see the results in Paul Foster, 'Who Wrote 2 Thessalonians? A Fresh Look at an Old Problem', *JSNT* 35.2 [2012]: 171).

⁵⁰ The strongest case for the non-Pauline style of Colossians was apparently made by Walter Bujard (*Stilanalytische Untersuchungen zum Kolosserbrief als Beitrag zur Methodik von Sprachvergleichen* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973]). See Campbell's rejection of Bujard and others' stylistic arguments in Campbell, *Framing Paul*, 286–92. John Barclay notes, judiciously, that statistical analyses 'confirm the presence of stylistic difference, and thus suggest the possibility of another author, without being able to provide decisive proof' (John M. G. Barclay, *Colossians and Philemon* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997], 33).

In the case of Ephesians, Campbell notes that some stylometric analyses consider the differences between Ephesians and the undisputed Paulines to be significant; others do not: Campbell, *Framing Paul*, 334–36. See also Fowl, who points out that the statistics on uniqueness in vocabulary with Ephesians are almost the same as with Galatians: Fowl, *Ephesians*, 20–21.

⁵¹ Firstly, demonstrating literary dependence would demonstrate just that: literary dependence. It would not in and of itself suggest a different author. If Paul was the author, he could well have had reasons for drawing so heavily on Colossians in Ephesians. Secondly, it is usually claimed that the order of influence was from Colossians to Ephesians (if Colossians were pseudonymous this would automatically make Ephesians pseudonymous). But it isn't clear that this is necessarily the case. E. Best has drawn on Mitton's study of the authorship of Ephesians and has shown that in each instance in which Mitton demonstrates Ephesians' dependence on Colossians, things are not that clear: E. Best, 'Who Used Whom? The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians', *NTS* 43.1 (1997): 72–96. In fact, Best argues that, outside of Ephesians 6.21–22 and Colossians 4.7–8, 'there are difficulties in assuming that one writer used the letter of the other. There are a number of passages which look alike in translation but are much less alike in Greek because synonyms or verbal equivalents have been used' (Ibid., 92). Thirdly, it is possible that Colossians and Ephesians were composed alongside one another, making the similarities between the two letters more understandable. On this last possibility, see the recent suggestion by

Supposed theological differences usually form the strongest case against the authenticity of Colossians and Ephesians. Much of the theology these letters display is said to be inconsistent with the theology of the undisputed Pauline letters. In particular, the eschatology of Colossians and Ephesians is often thought to differ significantly from Paul's own eschatology, with the former being more realised than Paul's more futuristic one.⁵² Colossians and Ephesians' unambiguous references to present resurrection are often taken as evidence of this more realised form of eschatology, in comparison with the supposed lack of inaugurated resurrection in Romans 6.

But it is precisely this point that this chapter and the previous one disprove. I have shown that Romans 6.1–14 does in fact assert that those who have been baptised have also been raised with Christ. There is a danger of major circularity in the argument of many scholars who deny the Pauline authorship of Colossians and Ephesians: Colossians and Ephesians are assumed to be non-Pauline; since inaugurated resurrection is a key component of both letters, scholars are predisposed to think of it as a non-Pauline belief; the presence of inaugurated resurrection in Romans 6.1–14 is then often dismissed with a simple appeal to vocabulary; this then reinforces the case for Colossians and Ephesians' pseudonymity.

Hopefully this thesis can help dispel some of the circularity in arguments against the authenticity of Colossians and Ephesians and against present resurrection in Romans. After all, we have seen a remarkable continuity between the understandings of inaugurated resurrection in Romans 6.1–14, on the one hand, and Colossians and Ephesians, on the other hand. All three letters describe believers as having already experienced a form of resurrection, a resurrection which is best understood as a way of speaking of new life wrought by the Holy Spirit, in line with Ezekiel 36–37. This is an ontological transformation, one which empowers believers to live righteously. This remarkable consistency on the question of inaugurated resurrection should give scholars pause before they assert that the eschatologies of Colossians and Ephesians are incompatible with that of the undisputed Pauline letters. If the eschatologies of the three

Douglas Campbell that Ephesians is in fact the lost letter to the Laodiceans, composed alongside Colossians: Campbell, *Framing Paul*, 309–38.

⁵² Even if this were true, it begs the question of how much development or flexibility an ancient author is allowed. Concerning Colossians, Barclay admits a variation in eschatology, but notes, 'the question is *how different* it is and whether it is unthinkable that it derives from the mind of Paul' (Barclay, *Colossians and Philemon*, 26).

letters are consistent, can we still confidently assert that Colossians and Ephesians are pseudonymous?

The argument of this study is almost complete. We have explored how the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 on Paul’s understanding of the Spirit helps to make sense of the reality of inaugurated resurrection as a work of the Spirit giving new life and leading to ethical change. This is a framework which is reflected in Romans 6.1–14, a text which I have argued should be read as a reference to inaugurated resurrection. This is also a framework which is present in Colossians and Ephesians, indicating a strong continuity with the undisputed Paul and with implications for their authorship. Clearly Paul’s understanding of Ezekiel 36–37 has provided a background which can help to explain the emergence of a belief in present resurrection. There are two final questions, though, which will now be dealt with: (1) why is inaugurated resurrection commonly linked with baptism? (2) is inaugurated resurrection truly non-bodily?

Chapter 7: Baptism, Body and Resurrection

7.1 Introduction

Most of the passages explored that deal with inaugurated resurrection (Rom 6.1–14; Col 2.8–15; possibly Eph 5.14b) connect it with baptism. Why is this? The aim of this chapter is, in part, to answer that question. I suggest that, despite protests from some, the visual symbolism of baptism naturally lent itself to viewing it in terms of death and resurrection. However, on its own, this was probably not enough to make the link so strongly. Instead, the close link between baptism and the gift of the Holy Spirit may have contributed to linking baptism and the language of resurrection. After all, I have made the case so far that the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 (and 37.1–14 in particular) led Paul to view the reception of the Holy Spirit as a form of resurrection. If baptism was indeed associated with the reception of the Spirit, it would naturally make the rite the locus of inaugurated resurrection. In the first part of this chapter, then, I demonstrate that baptism and receiving the Holy Spirit were closely linked, at least in Paul's mind.

In the remainder of this chapter, I explore another, related, question. Resurrection in early Judaism and Christianity, as noted in the introduction, was a bodily phenomenon. It was, as I have defined it, *the bringing back of the whole individual to everlasting life*. Was inaugurated resurrection an exception to this rule (a non-bodily form of resurrection)? After all, believers' bodies were not outwardly transformed through baptism. Nonetheless, there is possibly a sense in which inaugurated resurrection is still bodily, though not in an individual sense. I note that in 1 Corinthians in particular, the language of Spirit, baptism and body converge. But the body in view is the corporate body of Christ. I ask, then, in the last part of this chapter, whether inaugurated resurrection is in fact, in some sense, a bodily phenomenon: through baptism one is joined to the church, the resurrected body of Christ.

7.2 Baptism and Inaugurated Resurrection

Why did Paul closely associate baptism and inaugurated resurrection? In what follows, I explore two likely reasons for this: (1) the visual, symbolic aspect of the rite of baptism; (2) the link between baptism and the reception of the Holy Spirit.

7.2.1 The Symbolism of Burial and Resurrection in Baptism

At a very obvious level, baptism by immersion visually resembles going down into a grave (i.e. the water) and then rising from that grave in resurrection.¹ The visual similarity could easily have contributed to the association of dying and rising with baptism. However, some have questioned whether the visual link is as clear as it might seem to be. Commenting on Romans 6, James Dunn notes:

Despite frequent assertions to the contrary ... baptism was *not* an obvious symbol for death ... The symbolism of cleansing was much more obvious; and since death did not necessarily mean burial under the surface of the earth (but typically in tombs and caves) the symbolism of immersion provided no self-evident link.²

Dunn is not completely dismissive in his assessment and suggests that burial in catacombs may have become an established practice by Jews in Rome, but he does question the obvious symbolism. Similarly, Douglas Moo notes that ‘there is no evidence in Rom. 6, or in the NT elsewhere, that the actual physical movements —

¹ Here, I am assuming that the earliest Christians practised baptism by full immersion, as opposed to sprinkling or pouring. It is worth briefly making the case for this assumption. The Greek terminology of baptism (most commonly βαπτίζω) itself points to the reality of immersion (see Albrecht Oepke, ‘Βάπτω Κτλ.’, *TDNT* 1:530; George R. Beasley-Murray, ‘Baptism, Wash’, *NIDNTT* 1:144; Everett Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 38–59. *Pace* Howard I. Marshall, ‘The Meaning of the Verb “Baptize”’, in *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, JSNTSup 234 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002], 8–24). Furthermore, it is generally agreed that Christian baptism took John’s baptism as its starting-point: ‘John’s baptism was the basis for later Christian baptism’ (Joan E. Taylor, *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism*, *Studying the Historical Jesus* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 52. See also Hartman, *Into the Name of the Lord Jesus*, 29–35). John’s baptism, in line with Jewish purification rituals, was clearly a baptism by full immersion. It is reasonable to assume that early Christian baptism followed suit. This is certainly the case in the baptism of the Ethiopian Eunuch in Acts 8.36–39 (note: ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος in v.39). In the Didache, baptism by sprinkling is seen as a valid, but less than ideal alternative (Did. 7.1–4). Indeed, Stephen Holmes notes that ‘this appears to be the earliest reference to the Christian use of a mode of baptism other than immersion’ (Michael W. Holmes, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007], 355). Joan Taylor notes ‘we should probably assume that it became the norm in the (Gentile) Church to “immerse” people by means of pouring out water over their heads’ (Taylor, *The Immerser*, 53). That baptism was practised primarily by pouring water seems to have been the case later than the New Testament era (and Taylor has provided clear evidence for this). However, it seems that the clearest evidence from earliest Christianity is that baptism was practised in continuity with John’s baptism, i.e. by full immersion.

² Dunn, *Romans* 1–8, 312.

immersion and emersion — involved in baptism were accorded symbolical significance.’³

This caution seems to be unwarranted. The evidence suggests that baptism would, in fact, have been a pregnant symbol of burial (and then resurrection). Of course, in isolation, immersion would be (as Dunn claims) be more readily associated with cleansing than with dying. However, when baptism by immersion is linked with the early kerygma of Jesus’ death, burial and resurrection, it becomes an obvious symbol of these events. Immersion in water *per se* would probably not have evoked dying. But when it is a response to the message of Christ’s death, burial and resurrection, it does seem to be a potent visual symbol. There is no major reason to deny a symbolic, *visual* link between the two.

But what of Dunn’s contention that the kind of burial carried out in the ancient world would not readily associate it with baptism? Dunn rightly claims that corpses were often buried in tombs and caves, and not in a coffin under the earth. However, he appears to overlook that these stone-cut tombs were usually underground.⁴ Accessing them would have involved descending downwards into the earth. Since the Jewish custom of burying the dead in an underground cave was so established, Paul presumably had this mode of burial in mind when he wrote Romans 6.1–14. But it is not only the physical layout of tombs that matters, here. More important is how death and burial were conceived of in the Jewish mind. In the Hebrew Bible, death itself is pictured as a descent into *Sheol* (e.g. Gen 37.35; Num 16.30; 1 Sam 2.6; Isa 5.14; Ezek 31.15). Whether this was understood literally or figuratively, there was clearly a *vertical* understanding of death: it involved going down. This biblical conception of death as descent is visible in Jesus’ own description of his death as being ‘in the heart of the earth’ (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς – Matt 12.40).

It is true that we are referring here to specifically Palestinian-Jewish modes of burial. Around the Roman world, burial rites and modes of burial differed widely.⁵ However, these alternative modes of burial are not as relevant, here. It is specifically the burial of *Jesus* which provides the template for baptism, and Jesus’ own burial would have been according to Jewish-Palestinian custom. 1 Corinthians 15.3–4

³ Moo, *Romans*, 362.

⁴ B. R. McCane, ‘Burial Practices, Jewish’, *DNTB*, 173–75.

⁵ A classic study of burial in the Roman world is Jocelyn M. C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1971).

suggests that the tradition of Jesus' death and burial was so established in early Christianity that it would be strange for Paul to think of baptism as burial with Christ without this tradition in mind.

So then, to reject the obvious symbol of burial in baptism does not fit with the evidence. In isolation, baptism would more likely be a symbol of cleansing. However, the ancient Jewish conception of death as a descent and the Palestinian-Jewish practice of burying in *underground* caves and tombs suggest that baptism, viewed in light of Jesus' death and burial, was an obvious and pregnant symbol of death. Consequently, rising back out of the water would have easily been associated with resurrection.

7.2.2 Baptism and the Gift of the Spirit

The visual symbolism of baptism may not be the only reason for its association with inaugurated resurrection. Another reason may have been the link between baptism and the gift of the Spirit. We have argued in this study that inaugurated resurrection was one way of referring to the reception of the Spirit, and that this may have been because of the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 (37.1–14 in particular). If baptism corresponded in some way to the reception of the Holy Spirit, this would create another link between baptism and inaugurated resurrection.

Scholars have often queried how closely early Christians associated the rite of water-baptism with the gift of the Holy Spirit. For some, genuine water-baptism and reception of the Spirit are a single event. Beasley-Murray argues that for Paul, 'baptism in the name of Christ, which is a "putting on" Christ and a setting of a man in Christ, cannot be other than a baptism in the Holy Spirit.'⁶ Others have strongly opposed this view. James Dunn, for example, claims that there is a clear distinction between baptism in water and baptism in/reception of the Spirit.⁷

Of course, if Beasley-Murray's view (that genuine baptism in water *is* baptism in the Spirit) is correct, then it could provide a clear explanation for the link between baptism and inaugurated resurrection.⁸ That said, in order for baptism to be linked with reception of the Spirit (and therefore inaugurated resurrection), we do not have to

⁶ Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 276.

⁷ Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*.

⁸ I should hasten here to note that Beasley-Murray does not argue that the act of immersion *in separation from* repentance and faith is efficacious.

collapse the rite of baptism and reception of the Spirit into a single, efficacious moment. What I am primarily interested in is whether baptism and reception of the Spirit were closely *associated* in early Christianity, not necessarily whether they were one and the same thing. Even scholars such as Dunn, who make a strong distinction between baptism in the Spirit and baptism in water, still note that baptism in water was often the *occasion* for the reception of the Spirit.⁹ In what follows I will briefly explore several Pauline texts which demonstrate a close connection, before showing this same connection in the Gospels and Acts.

Baptism and the Spirit in Paul

The main Pauline evidence connecting baptism and the reception of the Spirit comes from 1 Corinthians. There is a likely allusion to baptism in the use of ἀπολούω (to wash) in 1 Corinthians 6.11:

ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιασθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε ἐν τῷ
ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ
ἡμῶν (1 Cor 6.11)

But you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified
in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.

As Hays points out, these actions (washed, sanctified, justified) are probably not to be understood as a chronological sequence. Rather, they are ‘three descriptions of the one fundamental transformation that has occurred for those who now belong to Christ.’¹⁰ If the rite of baptism is referred to, it is not as an isolated ritual. Nonetheless, it is probable that ‘early Christians would naturally think of baptism when washing was mentioned’.¹¹ Additionally, the formula ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is likely a baptismal formula, as Lars Hartman contends,¹² or at least reminiscent of it.

⁹ For example, Dunn notes: ‘That the Spirit usually came at the event of baptism is probable, but it is on his coming alone that Paul fastens attention both here and in Eph. 1.13’ (Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 133).

¹⁰ Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians*, IBC (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 98.

¹¹ Thomas R. Schreiner, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Nottingham: InterVarsity Press, 2018), 123.

¹² Hartman, *Into the Name of the Lord Jesus*, 65: ‘Probably the first half of the phrase echoes a baptismal formula.’

The combination of the language of washing and the baptismal formula makes an allusion to baptism likely.¹³

Significantly, it is the cleansing work of the Holy Spirit that is primarily in view here, rather than the ritual act of baptism itself. Washing, sanctification and justification are carried out in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and ‘by/in the Spirit of our God’ (ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν – 1 Cor 6.11). Hartman argues convincingly that ‘Paul seems to take for granted that there is some connection between the gift of the Spirit and entrance into the church/baptism’, and he points to 1 Corinthians 12.13 as further evidence of this.¹⁴ In fact, he even suggests the possibility that 1 Corinthians 6.11 is indebted to texts such as Ezekiel 36.25. It would be going too far, based on this verse, to claim that Paul thought of the act of baptism as *effecting* washing by the Spirit. But at the very least the Spirit’s cleansing is likely linked with the ritual of baptism here. Possibly, the rite was a symbolic display of this reality.

In 1 Corinthians 10.1–2 Paul likely connects baptism and the Spirit:

Οὐ θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἦσαν καὶ πάντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διήλθον καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσθησαν ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ

I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, that our fathers all were under the cloud, and all went through the sea, and all were baptised into Moses in the cloud and in the sea.

The example of the Exodus generation is used to warn the Corinthians away from idolatry. But the warning is only effective if Paul can demonstrate a strong shared experience between the Exodus generation and the Corinthians.¹⁵ He does this through

¹³ Hays, *First Corinthians*, 99–100; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 258; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 163. Some are not as convinced. Eckhard Schnabel is doubtful that an allusion to baptism is present here. He concedes: ‘Dass die korinthischen Leser bei der Metapher des „Abwaschens“ an ihre Taufe erinnert wurden, kann man nicht ausschließen.’ However, he notes that if Paul had wanted to allude to baptism he would have used more baptism-specific language (Schnabel, *Der erste Brief*, 320–21 [quotation on 321]).

¹⁴ Hartman, *Into the Name of the Lord Jesus*, 65.

¹⁵ See for example Andrew J. Wilson, *The Warning-Assurance Relationship in 1 Corinthians*, WUNT 2/452 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 97: ‘If the Exodus generation, by virtue of being Jewish, or pre-Messianic, had a fundamentally different experience of God, such that their judgment need have no bearing on the Corinthians, then the warning that Paul plans to bring will not be compelling. If, on the other hand, he can show not only that some Israelites experienced God in an analogous way to the

explaining that the wilderness generation, just like the Corinthians, were ‘baptised’ (ἐβαπτίσθησαν). Baptism into Moses clearly parallels baptism into Christ, and most likely carries the idea of identifying with a particular figure.

But what of expression ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ (‘in the cloud and in the sea’)? Here, ἐν introduces the element, or milieu, in which baptism happens (it would be nonsensical to refer to being baptised *by* the sea or the cloud). Since Paul’s purpose is to draw as strong a parallel as possible between the Exodus generation and the Corinthians, it is likely that both elements map onto an analogous experience of the Corinthians. The sea presumably corresponds to the water used in Christian baptism. Typological references to water-baptism using an Old Testament parallel were not unusual for early Christians, as shown by passages such as 1 Peter 3.20–21.

What about baptism ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ (‘in the cloud’)? In the wilderness narratives in Exodus–Numbers, the pillar of cloud is associated with God’s presence with his people. That God’s Spirit and the pillar could be linked is shown by Nehemiah 9.20 which states, after referring to the pillar of cloud and fire, that God gave his ‘good Spirit’ (רוּחַ הַטּוֹבָה; LXX: τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἀγαθόν) to his people. It is therefore very likely then that baptism in the cloud for the wilderness generation parallels baptism in the Holy Spirit for the Corinthians. Not only does Paul explicitly refer to baptism ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι a couple of chapters later (12.13), but if the tradition associated with John the Baptist was in any way widespread amongst early Christians, they would be aware of the double concept of baptism in water and in the Holy Spirit. The tradition concerning Jesus’ own baptism contained the two components (see below). It would seem, then, that Paul’s purpose was to remind the Corinthians that the Exodus generation were baptised in the cloud and in the sea, just as they had been baptised in the Spirit and in water.¹⁶

Interestingly, baptism in the cloud and in the sea are both components of a single baptism εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν. Typology should not be pressed too far, but if the parallel with the Corinthian experience is strict, then this one baptism into Moses in two

Corinthian Christians, but that all of them did, then their destruction in the desert will have far more perceived relevance to his readers.’

¹⁶ Basil of Caesarea certainly understood the sea to prefigure water-baptism and the cloud to prefigure the gift of the Spirit, and according to Michael Haykin, this was a common patristic interpretation of this verse: Michael A G Haykin, “‘In the Cloud and in the Sea’: Basil of Caesarea and the Exegesis of 1 Cor 10:2”, *VC* 40.2 (1986): 138.

elements could parallel one baptism into Christ in the Spirit and in the water. Dunn notes, ‘Paul may have mentioned the cloud first because he is thinking of the whole as baptism in the Spirit, since according to Ex. 13.21; 14.24 the Lord was in the cloud’.¹⁷ Whether water-baptism was the *locus* of the gift of the Spirit, the two were intimately related for Paul.

1 Corinthians 12.13 makes an explicit connection between baptism and receiving the Spirit. Paul writes in 12.12–13:

Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστὶν καὶ μέλη πολλὰ ἔχει, πάντα δὲ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος πολλὰ ὄντα ἓν ἐστὶν σῶμα, οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ πάντες ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν. (1 Cor 12.12–13)

For just as the body is one and has many limbs (all of the limbs of the body, being many, are one body), so also is Christ: for we all also, in one Spirit, were baptised into one body – whether Jews, whether Greeks, whether slaves, whether free – and all of us were given one Spirit to drink.

Here, as above, baptism is closely associated with receiving the Holy Spirit. Although ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι (‘in one Spirit’) in verse 13 possibly refers to the Spirit as the *agent* of baptism (baptised *by* one Spirit), it is more likely to refer to the *medium* of baptism.¹⁸ This is consistent with Paul’s use of baptism in chapter 10, where Israel is baptised *in* (ἐν), not *by*, the sea and in the cloud.

The question, though, is whether Paul has the rite of water-baptism in mind at all as he refers to the Corinthians’ immersion in the Holy Spirit. Although he is speaking of baptism in the Spirit, does he link it with the act of water-baptism? Many think he clearly does. C. K. Barrett claims: ‘There is no reason to think that *we were baptized* refers to anything other than baptism in water (together with all that this rite

¹⁷ Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 127 note 34.

¹⁸ E.g. Hays, *First Corinthians*, 214: ‘The Spirit is not the agent who does the baptizing, but the figurative element into which the new converts were immersed, being plunged into a new world of Spirit-experience.’ D. A. Carson, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12–14* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995), 47: ‘whenever the verb *baptize* is used in the New Testament, it is the *medium* of the baptism—water, fire, cloud, and so forth—that is expressed using this preposition ἐν (*en*), not the agent.’

signified).¹⁹ However, Dunn and Fee, notably, have pushed back against this, claiming that Paul is using baptism *metaphorically* in this verse.²⁰

Paul's focus here is clearly not on water, but on the Corinthians' "immersion" in the Holy Spirit. But that does not mean that water-baptism is not in Paul's mind. With baptism forming the key initiatory rite for new believers, it would be strange for Paul to not at least be alluding to this. In fact, this verse is reminiscent of Galatians 3.27–28 in its emphasis on both baptism and the unity of different ethnic and social groups. There is nothing in Galatians 3.27–28 to suggest that Paul does not have water-baptism in mind.²¹ Concerning 1 Corinthians 12.12–13, Thiselton astutely concludes:

Dunn has performed an important service in disengaging assumptions in NT scholarship which appear to tie the Spirit *invariably* to water-baptism ... Nevertheless, *within its historical context at Corinth* Paul doubtless regards such a link as a *general* norm, which brings together the four elements of his argument in 12:12-13: Christ, one Spirit, one body, one single new *status*, in which all believers share.²²

Although baptism in the Spirit is in view in 1 Corinthians 12.13, it is almost inconceivable that Paul did not have water-baptism in mind. Even if we follow Dunn in assuming that this is a metaphorical use of the ritual, Paul clearly understood the ritual to demonstrate something of the gift of the Spirit. As the quote above by Thiselton states, Paul probably assumed that water-baptism would *usually* mark the moment of the reception of the Spirit.

I shall return to 1 Corinthians 12.13 below to consider the image of the body in association with baptism and the Spirit. At this stage, though, it is sufficient to conclude

¹⁹ Barrett, *First Epistle*, 289.

²⁰ Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 670: 'Both [water and Spirit-baptism] are assumed to be at the beginning of Christian experience, to be sure, but the two are never specifically tied together in such a way that the Spirit is received at baptism. This text supports such a view only on the unsupported grounds that Paul himself makes such an assumption.' Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 129: 'Paul is thinking of baptism in the Spirit; he is not speaking about water at all.'

²¹ Despite Dunn's protests (Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 109): 'In my opinion βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς Χριστόν is simply a metaphor drawn from the rite of baptism to describe the entry of the believer into Christian experience – or, more precisely, the entry of the believer into the spiritual relationship of the Christian with Christ, which takes place in conversion-initiation.'

²² Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1000.

that Paul associated baptism in water and baptism in the Spirit.²³ I will also make some comments below on the possible nature of this connection, but this close connection is true whether one views baptism in water as a symbol of the reality of Spirit-baptism, or whether one holds a sacramental view in which water-baptism *effects* Spirit-baptism.

In non-Pauline Texts

Paul, in 1 Corinthians in particular, closely links baptism in water and the reception of the Spirit, whether or not baptism was thought of as *mediating* the Holy Spirit. This close connection between baptism and the gift of the Spirit was certainly not unique to Paul. It is visible elsewhere in the New Testament, particularly the Gospels and Acts.

The synoptic Gospels all narrate Jesus undergoing John's baptism. On the one hand, we must be careful about positing too much from Jesus' own baptism by John. Although in many ways John's baptism became the precursor of Christian baptism, John's baptism was not baptism into (the name of) Christ.²⁴ On the other hand, it is *a priori* likely that Jesus' baptism was seen as, in some sense, a paradigm for Christian baptism, especially since in Acts, we notice a similar pattern with baptism (generally) being followed by reception of the Spirit. In Mark's Gospel, there is an immediate connection between Jesus coming out of the Jordan and his reception of the Spirit:²⁵

καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν

And immediately, coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opening and the Spirit like a dove coming down into him. (Mark 1.10).

The grammar and language (εὐθὺς and present participles) suggest that the descent of the Spirit coincided with Jesus coming up out of the water. This isn't a reception of the Spirit *in the act* of baptism, but a reception of the Spirit as immediately subsequent. The descent (καταβαῖνον) of the Spirit coincides with the ascent (ἀναβαίνων) of Jesus. Matthew also views Jesus' reception of the Spirit as coinciding with him coming up out

²³ See Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 83: 'That baptism and the reception of the Spirit are associated is not to be doubted, according to 1 Cor. Vi. 11; xii. 13.'

²⁴ This is clear from the distinction between John's baptism and baptism into the name of the Lord Jesus in Acts 19.1–7.

²⁵ Hartman notes: 'it is a reasonable assumption that he [Mark] and his readers shared the widespread early Christian belief that Christian baptism was somehow connected with the gift of the Spirit' (Hartman, *Into the Name of the Lord Jesus*, 17).

of the water (Matt 3.16) or very shortly afterwards. Luke, however, describes a slightly more delayed reception by noting that the Spirit came upon Jesus βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου ('having been baptised and whilst praying'). This, however, is hardly a major delay and in Luke's narrative context, Jesus' baptism is still broadly associated with his reception of the Holy Spirit.²⁶ If traditions about Jesus' own baptism were significant in shaping early Christian expectations of baptism, it is likely that early Christians understood receiving the Holy Spirit to be closely linked with water-baptism, perhaps immediately following, or shortly following.

This is certainly what we would expect based on Acts, if all we had on the matter were Peter's statement in Acts 2.38:

μετανοήσατε, [φησὶν,] καὶ βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν καὶ λήμψεσθε τὴν
δωρεάν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος

Repent [he said] and let each one of you be baptised in the name of
Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins and you will receive the
gift of the Holy Spirit.

This fits well with the synoptic tradition highlighted above. As the most programmatic statement on baptism in Acts, it suggests that the expectation was for reception of the Spirit to coincide with or shortly follow baptism. Nonetheless, Acts presents some well-known difficulties for associating reception of (or baptism in) the Spirit with water-baptism. We do not have space here to deal with all of the moments in Acts when reception of the Spirit precedes water-baptism (10.44–48) or when it post-dates it by a significant amount of time (e.g. 8.14–17). A good case can be made for understanding these instances as exceptional rather than typical within the narrative of Luke-Acts,²⁷ though we should heed Craig Keener's caution about writing off two thirds of Acts' references to receiving the Spirit as exceptions.²⁸ But the fact that (with the notable

²⁶ Darrell Bock notes that prayer is a major theme in Luke's Gospel (Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50*, BECNT [Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994], 337) This may play a role in this connection between Jesus praying and receiving the Spirit. Additionally, within the narrative of Luke-Acts, Jesus' experience of receiving John's baptism and then subsequently receiving the Spirit during prayer mirrors the experience of the disciples who receive John's baptism (implied in Acts 1.21–22) and then later receive the Holy Spirit.

²⁷ For some helpful discussion of these issues, see Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 104–22; Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 38–102; A. Andrew Das, 'Acts 8: Water, Baptism, and the Spirit', *Concordia Journal* 19.2 (1993): 108–34.

²⁸ Keener, *Acts 1:1–2:47*, 522–23.

exception of 8.14–17) baptism into Christ and baptism in the Spirit are still closely linked in Acts still shows a close connection between the two. Keener’s observation appears to be correct: ‘It seems no coincidence, then, that baptism becomes a normal prerequisite for the gift of the Spirit (though God did sometimes sovereignly vary the sequence, as in Acts 10:46–47).’²⁹ In Acts the rite of baptism does not seem to *effect* the giving of the Spirit, but the assumption is that the two events are very closely linked.

Does John’s Gospel associate baptism in water and the reception of the Spirit? This is more difficult to tell, because all explicit references to baptism in the fourth Gospel are to John’s baptism, rather than Christian baptism.³⁰ Clearly, we cannot come to any firm conclusions on the matter here. We will, however, briefly explore the possibility that John 3.5 contains a reference to baptism and the giving of the Spirit. During his discussion with Nicodemus, Jesus states:

ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος,
οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Amen, amen I say to you: unless you are born from water and Spirit,
you cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

Many commentators, both ancient and modern, see an allusion to water-baptism in the image of being born from water, with a number confidently claiming that this is self-evident.³¹ However, this is not as obvious as is often claimed. Indeed, Michaels, pointing to other mentions of water in John so far, notes that the language of water, ‘so far at least in the narrative, has no particular significance.’³² Furthermore, the expression ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος is most likely a hendiadys referring to a single birth because it is clearly parallel to the expression γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν (‘born again/from above’) in 3.3. As such it refers to a single, supernatural reality. Even if the reference to water is meant to allude to water-baptism, the emphasis of this passage is primarily

²⁹ Ibid., 976.

³⁰ John 1.25–26, 28, 31, 33; 3.22–23, 26; 4.1–2; 10.40. In some of these references, it is Jesus’ disciples who baptise, but the author distances Jesus himself from the baptising, perhaps since Jesus’ clear role is to be the one who baptises ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (John 1.33).

³¹ E.g. Schuyler Brown, ‘Water-Baptism and Spirit-Baptism in Luke-Acts’, *ATHR* 59.2 (1977): 140. ‘This phrase (without the article), refers to a rebirth which the early Church regarded as taking place through baptism (1 Pet 1.3, 23; Tit 3.5)’ (John F. McHugh, *John 1–4: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, ICC [London: T&T Clark, 2009], 227). ‘A birth by water can hardly refer to anything but baptism’ (Hartman, *Into the Name of the Lord Jesus*, 156–57).

³² J. Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 184.

on the second element of this expression: born of the Spirit. Indeed, there is no more mention of water, but an emphasis on the Spirit in the following verses. Despite all these objections, though, it is possible that John intends at least a subtle allusion to water-baptism, bearing in mind the common association of baptism in water and baptism in the Spirit we have observed in other texts. The emphasis, clearly, is on the Spirit, but an allusion to the rite of baptism in water is possible in the phrase ἐξ ὕδατος.

If it is uncertain whether water-baptism is alluded to, it is much clearer what Scriptures lie behind this expression. Ezekiel 36.25–27 clearly refers to a supernatural transformation which involves sprinkling with water and the giving of God’s Spirit. It is almost certain that this passage is behind the phrase ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος in John 3.³³ We have seen above in 1 Corinthians 6.11 that it is likely that Paul’s understanding of baptism was shaped by texts such as Ezekiel 36.25–27. If John’s Gospel has the rite of baptism in mind at all here, which we have cautiously noted is possible, then it would be further evidence not only of a close link between water-baptism and receiving the Spirit but also of Ezekiel 36.25–27 exercising a formative influence on the whole process.

In the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, then, water-baptism and receiving the Spirit were closely associated, as they were in Paul’s writings. This association is possibly visible in John 3.5 as well. The two (water and Spirit-baptism) were not, it seems, necessarily thought of as *one and the same*. However, the normal expectation was that the ritual of water-baptism would be closely accompanied by baptism in/the reception of the Holy Spirit.

The Link between the Spirit and Baptism

We have observed a clear connection between the rite of baptism in water and the reality of the gift of the Spirit. What is the nature of this connection? On the one hand, clarity on this question is not essential for our task (demonstrating a close connection, whatever the nature of that connection). I will, nonetheless, make a few comments, suggesting that we are not faced with an either/or choice between a purely sacramental view, in which baptism automatically confers the Spirit, and a purely symbolic view in which water-baptism is only a symbol of baptism in the Spirit.

³³ This is the position of a significant number of commentators: e.g. McHugh, *John 1–4*, 228; Carson, *John*, 195; Edward W. Klink, *John*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 198.

One of the strengths of Dunn's thesis on baptism in the Spirit is to emphasise that for the early Christians, it was the gift of the Spirit, rather than baptism *per se*, that marked out the new age. This is clear in Paul in particular. He refers to the reception and experience of the Spirit in the Christian's life far more than he does of baptism. But in distancing oneself from an overly sacramental view of baptism, one should not simply assume a modern, overly scientific viewpoint. Within about 150 years of Paul, Tertullian was able to write of the spiritual significance of water and speak of the Holy Spirit as hovering over the waters of baptism (*Bapt.* 4). This does not mean that Tertullian's understanding of baptism was the same as Paul's. It should, however, caution us against imposing a stark (somewhat modern and usually protestant) distinction between simple physical acts and spiritual efficacy.

Judaism of the time knew something of both the distinction between external ritual and internal reality and the link between the two. This theme is present in the community rule in Qumran. In 1QS II, 25–III, 6, someone who rejects God's laws cannot be atoned for:

לוא יזכה בכפורים ולוא יטהר במי גדה ולוא יתקדש בימים ונהרות ולוא יטהר בכול
מי רחץ. טמא טמא יהיה כול יומי מואסו במשפטי אל

He shall not be pure by atonements and shall not be cleansed with waters for impurity and he shall not consecrate himself in oceans and rivers and he shall not be cleansed with all rushing waters. Unclean, unclean he shall be all the days of his rejecting the decrees of God. (1QS III, 4–6)

What is needed for this person is repentance, humbling and the Spirit of the council of God (1QS III, 6–9). But this is not repentance and spiritual change *as opposed to* ritual cleansing.³⁴ Rather repentance leads to true ritual cleansing:

ובענות נפשו לכול חוקי אל יטהר בשרו להזות במי גדה ולהתקדש במי דוכי

By the humility of his soul to all the rules of God will his flesh be cleansed to be sprinkled with the waters for impurity and to consecrate himself with purifying waters. (1QS III, 8–9)

³⁴ This is consistent with what, in chapter 3, we saw Jonathan Klawans arguing, namely that in the sectarian writings of Qumran ritual and moral impurity were brought together and even identified (Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 75–88).

Here, repentance and internal change do not *replace* ritual cleansing, but make it possible. It is not that ritual cleansing automatically confers internal change, or that internal change gets rid of the need for ritual cleansing.³⁵

These two brief examples from Tertullian and the Community Rule do not tell us the exact nature of the connection between an external ritual and the work of God's Spirit. What they do show, though, is that early Jews and Christians were able to operate with an understanding of water-rites in which the ritual cleansing was not simply a symbol.

7.2.3 Conclusion: Baptism and Inaugurated Resurrection

We return to the original question of why inaugurated resurrection was so commonly linked with the ritual of baptism. I have suggested two likely reasons. Firstly, the symbolism of baptism easily lent itself to such an association: the actions of going down into the water and coming back out, when combined with belief in the events of Christ's own death, burial, and resurrection, would naturally symbolise death, burial, and resurrection. But additionally, the close association of baptism and the reception of the Spirit would have made the link easier: receiving the Spirit was linked both with baptism and with inaugurated resurrection. Since inaugurated resurrection was thought of as a way of speaking of receiving the Spirit, it would be natural to assume that this resurrection happens in baptism, the early Christian rite which was strongly associated with receiving the Spirit.

Both aspects of baptism (the visual symbolism and the connection with the reception of the Spirit) link closely with Ezekiel 36–37. Firstly, the visual aspect: the combination of burial-imagery and receiving the Spirit is present in both Paul's understanding of baptism and Ezekiel 37.1–14. In baptism one dies and is buried and then rises out of burial and receives the gift of the Spirit. In Ezekiel 37.13–14 Israel's tombs are opened and Yahweh raises them out of them and gives them his Spirit. Secondly, both Ezekiel 36.25–27 and Paul's understanding of baptism combine water and God's Spirit. In Ezekiel 36.25–27 Yahweh promises to sprinkle pure water on his people and give them his Spirit. It is likely, of course, that Ezekiel refers to a single

³⁵ So Taylor, *The Immerser*, 79. Taylor makes the case for a similar understanding of John the Baptist's practice in the context of Second Temple Judaism (Ibid., 49–100).

event using multiple images. Nonetheless, Ezekiel combines both a ritual image (sprinkling with pure water) and the reality of God giving his Spirit to his people. We observed a similar combination in Paul of ritual (baptism in water) and the giving of God's spirit to his people. As Fitzmyer, writing on 1 Corinthians 12.13, notes: '[Pauline teaching] is clearly a development of the OT teaching of Ezek 36:25–27, where “clean water . . . a new heart . . . and a new spirit” are promised.’³⁶ Once again, Ezekiel 36–37 proves to be a key to understanding Paul's views of the giving of the Spirit, and can help provide a background for the emergence of inaugurated resurrection.

7.3 Body, Church, Baptism and Resurrection

I now explore a second, but related, question. In the introduction to this study, I defined resurrection, in early Judaism and Christianity, as *the bringing back of the whole individual to everlasting life*. Resurrection was not another way of speaking of immortality of the soul. It involved the raising of the body. Was inaugurated resurrection an exception to this rule, a form of resurrection which does not involve a body? In the final section of this chapter, I will offer a tentative suggestion that inaugurated resurrection may not be a complete exception to this rule. Instead, it is possible that inaugurated resurrection is in fact bodily, though not in an individual sense. It is therefore, as noted in chapters 5 and 6, not a literal bodily resurrection as we have defined it above. Nonetheless, it may be thought of as bodily in the sense that the believer is united, through baptism and by the Spirit, to the corporate, resurrected body of Christ: The church.

This is not simply a clever theological move. It comes from recognising that just as inaugurated resurrection is associated with the reception of the Spirit and with baptism, so is Paul's understanding of the church as Christ's body.

Paul's description of the church as the body of Christ is well known. It is tempting to think of this as a simple analogy, but there are clues within Paul's writings that it is more substantive than this. For example, in 1 Corinthians 6.15–20, Paul establishes a surprisingly close link between believers and the body of Christ. He notes:

¹⁵οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; ἅρας οὖν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποιήσω πόρνης μέλη; μὴ γένοιτο. ¹⁶[ἦ] οὐκ οἶδατε

³⁶ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 478.

ὅτι ὁ κολλώμενος τῇ πόρνῃ ἐν σῶμά ἐστιν; ἔσονται γάρ, φησίν, οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. ¹⁷ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν πνεύμα ἐστιν. ¹⁸Φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν. πᾶν ἁμάρτημα ὃ ἐὰν ποιήσῃ ἄνθρωπος ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν· ὁ δὲ πορνεύων εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἁμαρτάνει. ¹⁹ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐστιν οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἑαυτῶν; ²⁰ἡγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς· δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν.

¹⁵Do you not know that your bodies are limbs of Christ? Therefore, having taken the limbs of Christ shall I make (them) limbs of a prostitute? By no means. ¹⁶Or do you not know that he who is joined to the prostitute is one body? For it says, they shall become one flesh. ¹⁷But he who is joined to the Lord is one Spirit. ¹⁸Flee from sexual immorality. Every sin which a person does is outside of the body, but the one who commits sexual immorality sins against his own body. ¹⁹Or do you not know that your body is a sanctuary of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which you have from God, and you are not your own? ²⁰For you were purchased at a price. So glorify God in your body.

The language here is striking and surprisingly physical. Believers' bodies are 'limbs' (μέλη) of Christ (v.15).³⁷ Paul highlights this to show how one type of bodily union (sexual union with a prostitute) is incompatible with another type of union (with the Lord). His argument relies on there being something substantive behind the language of the body. In other words, this description cannot be purely pedagogical or illustrative. There must be a sense in which the description of the believer as a limb of Christ refers to something ontologically significant, or Paul's warning would be baseless. That sense is clarified in verse 17: he who is joined to Christ is 'one Spirit' (ἐν πνεῦμα) with him. It is the fact that both Christ and the believer possess the Holy Spirit that makes this bodily union true. As Martin puts it:

The pneumatic union between the body of the Christian man and the body of Christ (6:17) is what identifies the Christian man. The man's body and Christ's body share the same pneuma; the man's body is therefore an appendage of Christ's body, totally dependent on the pneumatic life-force of the larger body for its existence.³⁸

³⁷ Morna Hooker points out how translating this term as 'member' robs the image of its power. The point is not that believers are members in the sense that one can be a member of a group, but limbs or organs of Christ: Morna D Hooker, "'The Sanctuary of His Body': Body and Sanctuary in Paul and John", *JSNT* 39.4 (2017): 351: 'The term μέλη Χριστοῦ is a strange one, whose peculiarity is disguised for us, both by its familiarity and by the usual translation 'members of Christ'. This translation fails to convey the down-to-earth character of the Greek word μέλη, which means literally "limbs" or "organs".'

³⁸ Dale B Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 176.

The idea of a person being animated by, or at least possessing, a spirit was common in early Jewish and Christian anthropology, particularly where some more Hellenistic texts might have referred to the presence of a soul, ψυχή.³⁹ Earlier in the letter Paul assumes this idea: ‘for who of human beings knows the things of the human if not the spirit of the human (εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) which is in him?’ (1 Cor 2.11). Paul’s logic, then, in 1 Corinthians 6.15–17 is straightforward: if one possesses the same Spirit as the risen Christ, one’s body must therefore be part of his – both share the same Spirit. This logic is apparent in Ephesians 4.4, whether written by Paul or one of his followers: ‘[there is] one body and one Spirit’ (ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα). The close pairing of both terms in the context of a discussion of unity (τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος – Eph 4.2) suggests the logical assumption: one body implies one spirit and vice versa. The believer, then, by virtue of possessing the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ, is not just *like* a limb of Christ’s body, he or she is, in some sense, *truly* a limb of Christ. As will be clear below, I do not mean this in a crude, literal sense. This is a metaphorical statement. Nonetheless, this metaphor involves a very high degree of correspondence between the image (limb animated by πνεῦμα) and the reality (the believer filled with Christ’s πνεῦμα), thereby making the line between metaphorical and literal appear quite blurry.⁴⁰

At this point, it is clear that Paul is not making a sharp distinction between the corporate body of Christ (i.e. the church) and Christ’s individual resurrected body. Paul’s treatment of Spiritual gifts and the body of Christ in chapter 12 is clearly an expansion of what he noted in 1 Corinthians 6, rather than a completely different entity. It is not that the church is a secondary body which *belongs* to Christ. For the purposes of what Paul is dealing with, Christ’s own body and the corporate body of the church are, in some sense, the same. We shall see that this is the case in 1 Corinthians 12, but it is perhaps even clearer here in chapter 6. Had Paul said here that the believer was a limb of Christ’s *body* we could perhaps argue that this corporate body is to be seen as separate from Christ’s own resurrected body. However, Paul notes that believers are

³⁹ See for example Tob 3.6; Esth 5.6 LXX; 8.24 LXX (possibly); Wis 2.3; 15.11, 16; 1 En. 20.3; 22; 67.8–13 (possibly); 71 (in which Enoch’s *spirit* is transferred to heaven); 98.3; 103.4; Jub. 10.3; 19.3; 23.31; 27.13; 34.3; 1QS V, 20–21; IX, 14; CD III, 2–3; VII, 3–4; 4Q186 frag. 1 II, 5–9; III, 3–4; frag. 2 I, 1–8. This anthropology seems to allow for the presence or influence of demonic, or angelic spirits in an individual. But there seems to be no sense in which a human being would share multiple *human* spirits.

⁴⁰ On the idea of metaphors with a high degree of correspondence, see above (17 note 22).

limbs of *Christ*. And this is so because Christ and believers are animated by the same Spirit (1 Cor 6.17). This does not mean that Paul must see a complete one-to-one correspondence in every area between the historical, resurrected body of Christ and the church. After all, the risen Christ sits at the right hand of the father in bodily form. But claims that Paul is using the language of the body of Christ simply as a pedagogical tool do not do justice to the realness of the language he uses. The metaphor points to a real and substantive union.

Paul will, in chapter 15, go on to explain that Christ's resurrection body is a σῶμα πνευματικόν ('spiritual body'), a body which is fully animated by the Holy Spirit. At the eschaton, the believer's own individual body will itself be transformed into a σῶμα πνευματικόν. In the present, though, he or she is already a limb of Christ's own spiritual body, by virtue of sharing in the same Spirit. This is emphasised a few verses later in 1 Corinthians 6.19, where individual believers' bodies are referred to as 'a sanctuary of the Holy Spirit' (ναὸς τοῦ ... ἁγίου πνεύματος). Their bodies are *already* part of the resurrected body of Christ in advance of their own individual resurrection. And this is the result of sharing the same Spirit as Christ.

The idea that belonging to the body of Christ is a result of sharing in the same Spirit is restated in 1 Corinthians 12.12–13, a passage I have already explored above with regards to the association of baptism and the gift of the Spirit. Here I focus on it again because of its emphasis on the idea of incorporation into the body of Christ:

¹²Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστὶν καὶ μέλη πολλὰ ἔχει, πάντα δὲ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος πολλὰ ὄντα ἓν ἐστὶν σῶμα, οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός·
¹³καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ πάντες ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν.

¹²For just as the body is one and has many limbs (all of the limbs of the body, being many, are one body), so also is Christ: ¹³for we all also, in one Spirit, were baptised into one body – whether Jews, whether Greeks, whether slaves, whether free – and all of us were given one Spirit to drink.

As already noted, Paul is not dealing with two different realities in chapters 6 and 12. It is not as if chapter 6 is a reference to the union of the believer to Christ himself, whereas chapter 12 is about the union of the believer to the church. The two are one and the same reality in Paul's mind. This is clear from a couple of details in 12.12–13. Firstly, Paul's comparison in verse 12 (signalled by *καθάπερ ... οὕτως*) does not

compare the unity and diversity of the body to the unity and diversity of the church. He does not state: οὕτως καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία ('so also is the church'), or even οὕτως καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ('so also is the body of Christ'). He simply states: οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός ('so also is Christ'). The church is not *like* the body of Christ, the church *is* the body of Christ. As Martin Wright notes:

The analogy [of the body] is so clear, the use of the body so plainly illustrative (with the talking foot, ear and eye), that it is unsurprising many interpreters have concluded Paul's somatic language is just a grand simile or metaphor. That interpretation, however, founders on the pivotal verses 12.12-13, the crux of the chapter and the one point where the two key terms of σῶμα and πνεῦμα [sic] are brought together.⁴¹

Secondly, just as in chapter 6 the Spirit makes a believer a limb of Christ, so in chapter 12 the believer is a limb of Christ's body because of his or her baptism 'in one Spirit' (ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι – v.13). The mention of the Spirit is not incidental in this passage. In verses 7–11, Paul refers to the agency of the Holy Spirit in enabling gifts multiple times, concluding that 'the one and same Spirit (τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα) empowers all of these (gifts), distributing to each person individually as he wishes' (v.11). The role of the Spirit is central in introducing Paul's discussion of the body of Christ. By virtue of receiving the Spirit, the believer is brought into the body of Christ. The same breath, πνεῦμα, which animates Christ's body is now present in the church.

A couple of other times in Paul's writings this link between the church as a body and the Spirit appears, whether explicitly or by implication. In Romans 12.4–8 refers to the church as 'one body in Christ' (ἐν σῶμα ... ἐν Χριστῷ – v.5). 'This passage does not refer directly to the Holy Spirit, but does speak about "spiritual service" [v.1], and to "gifts" (v. 6), presumably of the Spirit.'⁴² I have also already noted Ephesians 4.4, where the author notes that there is 'one body and one Spirit' (ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα). In the context of unity, the author closely associates the body (in the context of

⁴¹ Martin Wright, *The Dividing Wall: Ephesians and the Integrity of the Corpus Paulinum*, LNTS 646 (London: T&T Clark, 2021), 162. Martin seems to dismiss the language of metaphor, here, which we do not. However, he rightly notes the reticence of many scholars to see more than an illustration, here.

⁴² Hooker, 'The Sanctuary of His Body', 359.

Ephesians, the church) and the Spirit. Presumably this is because sharing a single spirit is part of what makes a body *one*.⁴³

In 1 Corinthians 12.13, Paul specifically links inclusion in the body of Christ with baptism.⁴⁴ This is significant. Firstly, it makes sense in terms of the connection with the reception of the Spirit. I outlined above that baptism and receiving the Spirit were linked in early Christian understanding. If it is the Spirit which makes an individual a limb of Christ, then it makes sense for this inclusion to be associated with baptism. After all, baptism in water and receiving the Spirit were closely linked. Secondly, it suggests that when Paul speaks elsewhere of baptism into Christ he is also thinking of the believer's inclusion in the body of Christ. This is visible in Galatians 3.27–28, which speaks of baptism not into one body, but εἰς Χριστόν (Gal 3.27). This statement is followed, just like in 1 Corinthians 12.13, by an acknowledgement of the unity of all in Christ.⁴⁵ This makes it possible, even likely, that in Paul's mind, baptism into Christ and baptism into his body were interchangeable ways of referring to the same reality.

This is particularly significant if this assumption is at play in Romans 6.3. Baptism into Christ is associated there, as I argued in chapter 5, with dying and rising with Christ as an inaugurated reality. If in Paul's mind baptism into Christ and baptism into his body were thought of as one and the same thing, it opens up the possibility that Paul envisages present resurrection as something which is true of the corporate body of Christ.

All of this is important. Conceptually, what is a resurrected body if not that which is made alive by breath, or πνεῦμα? Ciampa and Rosner observe, concerning 1 Corinthians 12.13:

⁴³ E. Best (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*, ICC [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998], 367) notes that the two are probably closely associated here because of the focus on spiritual gifts, not 'in anthropological terms of a spirit within a body'. But the two are not mutually exclusive.

⁴⁴ For Albert Schweitzer, baptism was one of the keys in establishing his understanding of how the believer was mystically united to Christ's body: 'Without baptism there is no being-in-Christ! The peculiarity of the Pauline mysticism is precisely that being-in-Christ is not a subjective experience brought about by a special effort of faith on the part of the believer, but something which happens, in him as in others, at baptism' (Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, 117).

⁴⁵ In fact Ciampa and Rosner suggest that 1 Cor 12.13 'may reflect very early baptismal tradition similar to that found in Galatians 3:27-28' (Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 595).

The new humanity into which we have been incorporated reflects standard biblical anthropology: it consists of one body indwelt by one spirit (which in this case happens to be the Holy Spirit).⁴⁶

Christ's own body is already a σῶμα πνευματικόν. Believers' individual bodies will be σώματα πνευματικά at the eschaton. But by virtue of their baptism in one Spirit into Christ, into one body, they belong already to a σῶμα πνευματικόν, a resurrected body. In that sense, inaugurated resurrection *is* bodily. It is not bodily in the sense of the transformation of individual believers' bodies. It is bodily in the sense that it involves union, by the Spirit, with the resurrected body of Christ. As we have seen, Paul's language defies a neat distinction between the church as the body of Christ and Christ's own resurrected body. That is not to say that Paul crudely thought of the church and the resurrected body of Christ as identical in every sense.⁴⁷ It is the Spirit specifically which makes the church Christ's body. Peter Orr helpfully makes this point in his study on Christ's absence and presence in Paul.⁴⁸ However, Orr posits too strong a distinction between the ecclesial body of Christ and Christ's own body. It seems that for Paul it is not simply that the church is a completely distinguished body of Christ by virtue of the presence of the Spirit. Rather, the Spirit also joins believers to Christ so that they become limbs.⁴⁹ We do not need to posit a crude, perhaps overly naïve, collapsing of

⁴⁶ Ibid., 593.

⁴⁷ In that sense, despite similarities, I do not line up with John Robinson's conclusions in *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology*, SBT 5 (London: SCM, 1952). In many ways, what I am arguing for lines up with a number of Robinson's conclusions, particularly in his insistence that the idea of the body of Christ is not simply an analogy (Robinson objects to calling this reality a 'metaphor' [51]. This can be misleading, as if a metaphor is not referring to something real. I take his point, though, that the idea of the body of Christ is a substantive spiritual reality). However, in my view, Robinson went too far in his complete equation of the church and the resurrection body of Christ. What I am arguing for is a substantive reality, based on the sharing of the same *pneuma*. I am not arguing for a crude one-to-one correspondence as if Paul envisaged the resurrected Christ as literally made up of believers' bodies. I also differ majorly from Robinson in his deindividualization of believers in resurrection. Robinson attempts to distance the idea of believers' resurrection bodies from any sense of individuality. Resurrection of the body is 'fundamentally social' (82). However, Paul envisaged the future, bodily resurrection of believers as something which is specific to individuals, and not purely a social reality.

⁴⁸ Peter Orr, *Christ Absent and Present: A Study in Pauline Christology*, WUNT 2/354 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 189–99.

⁴⁹ Orr engages with 1 Corinthians 6.15 in a lengthy footnote. He is correct to emphasise that Paul is not positing a *somatic* union between the believer and Christ, but a *pneumatic* one. He concludes: 'This passage speaks of the relationship between the bodies of believers and Christ in terms of ownership and lordship rather than any materiality or physicality' (Ibid., 201 [footnote 93]). This is a preferable conclusion to that of Robinson or Engberg-Pedersen. However, there seems to be a real and substantive union of the believer's body to Christ by the Spirit which Orr's language doesn't quite do justice to.

Christ's exalted body and his ecclesial body. But neither should we separate them. They exist, in one sense, as discreet entities, but since they are animated by one and the same Spirit, they are also – in a mysteriously real sense – one.

Exegetically, it is difficult to prove that Paul thought of inaugurated resurrection as a reality pertaining to the church as the body of Christ. Conceptually, though, the idea makes sense, and this opens at least the possibility that inaugurated resurrection is in fact a bodily reality insofar as it pertains to the corporate body of believers.⁵⁰ Believers, through baptism into one Spirit are incorporated into the spiritual, resurrected body of Christ.

7.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I asked why inaugurated resurrection was associated closely with baptism in Romans 6.1–14, Colossians 2 and possibly Ephesians 5. I suggested that the visual imagery of baptism (descent and ascent), when associated with the basic tents of the Christian message, visually portrayed dying and rising with Christ. But this is not the only link between resurrection and baptism. I also argued that the rite of water-baptism and the gift of the Spirit were associated very closely in early Christianity (even if they were not necessarily seen as the same thing). Both baptism and inaugurated resurrection relate to the reception of the Spirit. After all, part of the claim of this study is that inaugurated resurrection is a way of describing the gift of the Spirit. If the gift of the Spirit was usually experienced at baptism, then clearly inaugurated resurrection would be linked with baptism. Baptism becomes then the assumed *locus* of inaugurated resurrection – the reception of the Holy Spirit.

This emphasis on baptism and the Spirit led to one final suggestion, which I explored at the end of this chapter: the idea that inaugurated resurrection is bodily in a corporate sense. By virtue of the gift of the Spirit, the believer is a limb of Christ's body. Whilst we cannot claim that Paul literally thought of Christ's own resurrected

⁵⁰ This was a conclusion that Albert Schweitzer came to, albeit through a different path. His understanding of Pauline mysticism led him to conclude: 'All attempts to distinguish in the relevant passages between the personal (historical) and the mystical body of Christ are inevitably doomed to failure. The obscurity was intended by Paul. The body of Christ is no longer thought of by him as an isolated entity, but as the point from which the dying and rising again, which began with Christ, passes over to the Elect who are united with Him; just as, on the other hand, the Elect no longer carry on an independent existence, but are now only the Body of Christ' (Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, 118).

body as *constituted* of believers, the idea of the church as the body of Christ is more than an illustration for Paul. It is a substantive reality. By baptism into Christ and receiving the Spirit, the believer is joined to Christ's spiritual body. The church is itself a spiritual body by virtue of sharing Christ's Spirit. Whilst believers await their own individual resurrection bodies at the eschaton, they are limbs of an already resurrected body. Baptism, then, marks the moment when individual believers not only die with Christ, but are raised with him by virtue of receiving the Spirit that joins them to the resurrected community, the church, the body of Christ.

Chapter 8: Conclusions and Implications

8.1 Summary

This study has sought to answer two questions related to the belief in present, or inaugurated, resurrection in earliest Christianity. Firstly, did this belief emerge early in Christianity, or was it a later development? More specifically, is this a belief which can be found within Paul's undisputed letters, notably Romans 6.1–14? Secondly, bearing in mind that this was a novel use of the language and concept of resurrection, in that it was seemingly non-bodily, what led to its emergence? Is there a background or context which explains how early Christians concluded, not only that they would be raised in the future, but also that they have, in some sense, already been?

Recognising that the answer to the first of these questions (does inaugurated resurrection appear in Paul's letters?) was far from agreed upon in scholarship,¹ I decided to first approach the second of these questions, asking what kind of context could have led to the emergence of such a belief. Building on the recent work of John Yates,² I explored the possibility that Paul's understanding of the role of the Spirit had been significantly influenced by Ezekiel 36–37. After all, these chapters envisage God giving his Spirit to his people, a reality which Ezekiel 37.1–14 described using the image of resurrection. Was it possible that Paul understood Ezekiel 36–37 to have *already* been fulfilled? If so, perhaps the reception of the Holy Spirit was seen as a form of resurrection, as Ezekiel 37.1–14 suggests. It remained to see whether there was evidence of these chapters shaping Paul's understanding of the Holy Spirit and, if so, to explore whether this could shed any light on passages which seem to describe present resurrection.

Since much of this study would explore the reception of Ezekiel 36–37 in Paul's writings, chapter 2 sought to clarify some methodological assumptions which would undergird the work of the first few chapters. Drawing on Richard Hays' work on intertextuality, I argued for the importance of metalepsis, the idea that a brief reference or allusion to a source text can invoke the wider context of that source text. Following Hays, I argued that Paul's allusions to Scripture should not be seen as evidence of

¹ As shown in the literature review in Chapter 1.

² Yates, *Spirit and Creation*.

cherry-picking texts out of context. Rather, it is possible and even plausible that Paul could echo and allude to whole sections of Scripture, and even traditions, with just a few words. In practice, this meant that an allusion to any part of Ezekiel 36–37 (specifically 36.16–37.14) could conjure up the whole.

In chapter 3, I explored how non-Christian Jewish contemporaries and predecessors of Paul had understood Ezekiel 36–37. I first analysed Ezekiel 36–37 itself, arguing that the two chapters complement each other, describing identical realities (God giving his Spirit to his people) in different ways. As such, building on the ideas laid out in chapter 2, it is likely that early Jewish interpreters, including Paul, would have thought of these two chapters as a unit. As I then explored the reception of these chapters in early Jewish writings, it emerged that many Jewish writers had “eschatologised” this section, particularly 37.1–14. Whereas in its original context, the vision of resurrection in Ezekiel 37.1–14 was an image for the restoration of the whole nation, in many Second Temple writings the vision had been transformed into a prediction of eschatological resurrection. Some authors, particularly those of some of the sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls, seemed to envisage themselves as recipients of a partial fulfilment of chapter 36 in particular.

With this background in mind, I explored in chapter 4 how Paul had been influenced by Ezekiel 36–37. The influence is felt most strongly in the Corinthian correspondence and Romans, although there are apparent allusions and echoes elsewhere. I concluded that there were at least five aspects to how these chapters were used by Paul. Firstly, Paul seems to have seen these chapters as a unity. Both chapters would regularly be drawn on by Paul in the same context. Secondly, Paul drew on Ezekiel 36–37 to associate the Spirit and life: the result of receiving the Spirit, in Ezekiel and in Paul, was life. Linking receiving the Spirit and inaugurated resurrection would therefore be an easy step to make. Thirdly, Paul, in line with Ezekiel, understood new life by the Spirit to empower a new way of acting, a new ethical lifestyle. Fourthly, in arguments where Paul drew on Ezekiel 36–37, there was often a gradual move from present life to future hope. However, it is in Paul’s descriptions of the *present* that he draws most strongly on Ezekiel 36–37; this suggests that for Paul these chapters were primarily associated with what had *already* happened to believers. Finally, whereas Ezekiel and his Second Temple interpreters applied his oracles to Jews, or even a subset or remnant of Jews, Paul understood Gentiles to be recipients of the same promises.

Unlike other Jewish writers (e.g. the writers of the Hodayot) who restricted these promises to their own circles, Paul expanded them to a far wider community.

This background offered a framework within which receiving the Spirit could be thought of as inaugurated resurrection. I turned in chapter 5 to explore whether this reality was visible in Romans 6.1–14. I noted that the usual objections to seeing inaugurated resurrection in these verses were often based on overly restricting the vocabulary of resurrection (only focusing on ἐγείρω and ἀνάστασις and neglecting ζάω and cognates). I demonstrated that this restriction of language is unwarranted. When Romans 6.1–14 is read carefully and without the assumption that Paul *cannot* have spoken of present resurrection, it becomes clear that these verses envisage the believer experiencing an *inaugurated* resurrection. Furthermore, although Paul does not explicitly mention the role of the Spirit in Romans 6.1–14, the language hints at the key role of the Spirit in bringing about this inaugurated resurrection. The outcome of this new life, Paul notes, is righteous living. This framework of new, present life followed by ethical change matches Paul's understanding of the role of the Spirit elsewhere, an understanding that I demonstrated was influenced by Ezekiel 36–37.

This framework is also visible in Colossians 2–3 and Ephesians 2 and 5, which I explored in chapter 6 (although Ephesians 2 was dealt with in chapter 4). I made no *a priori* judgement on authorship in chapter 6, but what emerged from exploring inaugurated resurrection in Colossians and Ephesians was a remarkable consistency with Romans 6.1–14: new life (present resurrection), wrought by the Spirit, which effects a new lifestyle. In the case of Ephesians, I argued, following the work of Robert Suh, that one of the key inaugurated resurrection passages (Ephesians 2) was modelled on Ezekiel 37.³

Finally, in chapter 7, I asked: why is inaugurated resurrection so regularly associated with baptism? I argued that both the symbolism of baptism by immersion and the association of baptism and the reception of the Holy Spirit helped to make a clear link between the rite and inaugurated resurrection. After all, this thesis has shown that receiving the Spirit, when seen in light of Ezekiel 36–37, was considered to be a form of resurrection. Since the rite of baptism was so closely connected with the reception of the Spirit, it was natural for the link between baptism and inaugurated resurrection to be made. This led to an additional suggestion in this chapter. I showed

³ Because of the clear allusion to Ezekiel 37, I made this case in chapter 4, rather than chapter 6.

that by virtue of baptism in one Spirit, and sharing the same Spirit as Christ, believers come to belong to the body of Christ. Christ's own body is, according to Paul, a 'spiritual body' (σῶμα πνευματικόν – 1 Cor 15.44). I therefore suggested that, despite appearances, inaugurated resurrection is not, strictly speaking, non-bodily. It is in fact bodily, but in a *corporate* sense: through baptism and receiving the Spirit, the believer becomes a limb of the resurrected body of Christ.

We are now in a place to summarise the answers to the two questions which we posed at the outset of this study. Firstly, in response to the question of whether inaugurated resurrection is evidenced as early as Paul's writings, the answer is a resounding, yes. Romans 6.1–14 describes the believer's experience through the image and language of resurrection. It is clear from elsewhere in the letter and in Paul's writings that this resurrection is not realised – there is more to come at the eschaton. In that sense, as I defined resurrection in the introduction (*the bringing back of the whole individual to everlasting life*), it is not a literal, individual bodily resurrection to everlasting life. It is, strictly speaking, a metaphorical use of resurrection. Nonetheless, it is not simply a way of referring to believers living righteously. It involves a clear ontological transformation. What we see in Colossians and Ephesians is a further restatement of what we see in Romans 6.1–14, not a major development.

Secondly, in response to the question of what allowed for the growth of this belief, I have argued that it was, in part, reflection on the early Christian experience of the Holy Spirit, in light of Ezekiel 36–37, that led to this belief. Paul understood Christians to be the recipients of the promise of Ezekiel 36–37. In particular, the vision of the valley of dry bones (Ezek 37.1–14) was understood to have been fulfilled in the reception of the Holy Spirit. Inaugurated resurrection, I suggest, was not yet a further, separate experience. It was a way of referring to the gift of and transformation brought about by the Holy Spirit, the reality which marked out the new epoch in which Christians lived.

8.2 Implications and Further Research

I have shown that it is unwarranted to assume that earliest Christians, and Paul in particular, spoke of resurrection with Christ only as a future experience, and did not describe any present form of resurrection. Those who have been baptised into Christ

and have received the gift of the Spirit have already experienced an inaugurated form of resurrection.

Several questions emerge from the results of this study which would be fruitful avenues for future research. I list three of those below.

8.2.1 Did this Belief Originate with Paul?

In this study, I have focused primarily on Pauline literature. This is because Paul provides the earliest and clearest evidence for inaugurated resurrection. But there are hints that he may not have been completely innovating. For example, Paul seems to assume in Romans 6.1–14 that his recipients were at least familiar with dying with Christ in baptism. Furthermore, Ephesians 5.14b, if it is in fact a pre-Pauline saying, could be evidence that this belief was not restricted to Paul's own churches. The belief is visible in other New Testament writings. For example, 1 Peter 1.3 speaks of being 'born again to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.' John's Gospel clearly has an inaugurated view of resurrection, noting that 'the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God and those who have heard will live' (John 5.26). 1 John 3.14 claims that believers have 'passed out of death into life.'

These other writings could be evidence of a Pauline belief being adopted (and adapted) by other Christians, but they could also indicate that inaugurated resurrection, whilst given a particular emphasis by Paul, was a belief held more widely in early Christianity. Exploring this possibility could be an avenue for future research. It would be particularly interesting to see whether the influence of Ezekiel 36–37 played a role in thinking of inaugurated resurrection outside of Paul's writings.

8.2.2 The Authorship of Colossians and Ephesians

The argument of this thesis has not depended on a particular view of the authorship of Colossians and Ephesians. However, the results of this study do have significant implications for the question of the authorship of these letters. In chapter 6 we noted these implications. The case for the pseudonymity of Colossians and Ephesians is built in large part on the supposedly more realised eschatologies of these letters. The clear presence of present resurrection in these letters is often taken as evidence of a different

eschatological framework. However, this study has shown that the views of present resurrection in Colossians and Ephesians are consistent with the view which Paul expounds in Romans 6. As such, the supposed theological discontinuity between the “authentic” Paul and these letters is not as significant as has often been suggested. As noted already, it is becoming more common for scholars to argue for the authenticity of Colossians and Ephesians. The implications of this study can be brought to bear on this question.

8.2.3 Ezekiel 37 and Later Christian Writers

In Paul’s letters, Ezekiel 36–37 was drawn upon mainly to refer to a reality which had already happened: the giving of the Spirit. In the case of Ezekiel 37.1–14 this was a marked difference from how early non-Christian Jewish writers understood the prophet. In most of the early Jewish writings explored here, Ezekiel 37.1–14 was applied mainly to eschatological, bodily resurrection. It is therefore somewhat surprising that this was mostly not the case in Paul’s writings: Ezekiel 37.1–14 was understood as at least mostly fulfilled in the present through the giving of the Spirit. This understanding of Ezekiel 36–37 partly helped to explain the rise of the idea of inaugurated resurrection.

It is interesting that post-apostolic writers seem to have moved away from this present understanding of Ezekiel 37.1–14. From an initial reading of some of the major second-century Christian writers, the predominant understanding of this vision seems to be the same as that of Second Temple Judaism: it is a prophecy of eschatological resurrection. This is clear in Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Tertullian, who all draw on Ezekiel 37.1–14 to support the early Christian understanding of the future resurrection of the flesh.⁴ This is the case even though belief in present resurrection continued. This opens an interesting avenue for future research. What led to the move away from applying Ezekiel 37.1–14 to a present reality and instead exclusively to a future resurrection of the flesh? Why was Paul’s understanding of Ezekiel 37 as referring to the giving of the Holy Spirit later seemingly abandoned in favour of a view in which it refers to future resurrection?

⁴ Especially Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 52; *Dial.* 80 (possibly); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.15; Tertullian, *Res.* 30.

8.3 Conclusion

Whatever the views of later Christian writers, Paul at the very least understood Ezekiel 36–37 to have received an inaugurated fulfilment in the giving of God’s Spirit to his people. The early Christian experience of receiving the Spirit, particularly in light of Ezekiel 37.1–14 and the early kerygma of Jesus’ death and resurrection, indicated that the Spirit had brought about an inaugurated resurrection of God’s people. This inaugurated form of resurrection did not nullify the resurrection of the saints at the eschaton – a resurrection which would involve the transformation of their individual bodies. But it nonetheless referred to an actual reality: the giving of the Spirit. Inaugurated resurrection empowered believers to live righteously, but righteous living itself was not inaugurated resurrection. An ontological change had occurred in believers. They had received the same Spirit that had raised their Lord from the dead. Furthermore, by virtue of receiving the same Spirit as Christ, they had become part of his body. In advance of their own individual bodily resurrection, they experienced, through the Spirit, belonging to an already resurrected body, that of Christ.

Within a worldview where the language of ‘life’ cannot but remind the hearers of resurrection, Paul sums it up succinctly: τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ – ‘the Spirit makes alive’ (2 Cor 3.6).

Appendix: A Translation of Ezekiel 36.16–37.14

Here I provide a text and translation of Ezekiel 36.16–37.14 as represented in the MT. The Hebrew text is taken from *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*:

MT	Translation
¹⁷ 36.16 ויהי דבר יהוה אלי לאמר: בן אדם בית ישראל יושבים על אדמתם ויטמאו אותה בדרכם ובעלילותם כטמאת הנדה היתה דרכם לפני: ¹⁸ ואשפך חמתי עליהם על הדם אשר שפכו על הארץ ובגלוליהם טמאוה: ¹⁹ ואפיץ אתם בגוים ויזרו בארצות כדרכם וכעלילותם שפטתים: ²⁰ ויבוא אל הגוים אשר באו שם ויחללו את שם קדשי באמר להם עם יהוה אלה ומארצו יצאו: ²¹ ואחמל על שם קדשי אשר חללוהו בית ישראל בגוים אשר באו שמה:	^{36.16} And the word of Yahweh came to me saying, ¹⁷ ‘Son of man, the house of Israel was dwelling upon their land, and they defiled it with their conduct¹ and by their deeds; like the defilement of menstrual impurity was their conduct before me. ¹⁸ And I poured my wrath upon them because of the blood which they poured out upon the land, and by their idols they defiled it. ¹⁹ And I scattered them amongst the nations, and they were dispersed among the lands; according to their conduct and according to their deeds I judged them. ²⁰ And when they² went to the nations where they went, they profaned my holy name when they said of them “these are the people of Yahweh and from his land they went out!” ²¹ And I had concern for my holy name which the house of Israel profaned amongst the nations where they went.’
²² לכן אמר לבית ישראל כה אמר אדני יהוה לא למענכם אני עשה בית ישראל כי אם לשם קדשי אשר חללתם בגוים אשר באתם שם: ²³ וקדשתי את שמי הגדול המחלל בגוים אשר חללתם בתוכם וידעו הגוים כי אני יהוה נאם אדני יהוה בהקדשי בכם לעיניהם: ²⁴	²² ‘Therefore say to the house of Israel, “thus says Lord Yahweh: not for your sake am I acting, O house of Israel, but for my holy name which you profaned among the nations where you went. ²³ And I will sanctify my great name which has been profaned among the nations where you profaned it; and the nations will know that I am Yahweh,’ says the Lord Yahweh, ‘when I am sanctified by you in

¹ More literally, ‘way’.

² MT ‘he came’; LXX καὶ εἰσῆλθοσαν (‘they came’).

ולקחתי אתכם מן הגוים וקבצתי אתכם מכל הארצות והבאתי אתכם אל אדמתכם: ²⁵ וזרקתי עליכם מים טהורים וטהרתם מכל טמאותיכם ומכל גלוליכם אטהר אתכם: ²⁶ ונתתי לכם לב חדש ורוח חדשה אתן בקרבכם והסרתי את לב האבן מבשרכם ונתתי לכם לב בשר: ²⁷ ואת רוחי אתן בקרבכם ועשיתי את אשר בחקי תלכו ומשפטי תשמרו ועשיתם: ²⁸ וישבתם בארץ אשר נתתי לאבותיכם והייתם לי לעם ואנכי אהיה לכם לאלהים: ²⁹ והושעתי אתכם מכל טמאותיכם וקראתי אל הדגן והרבייתי אתו ולא אתן עליכם רעב: ³⁰ והרבייתי את פרי העץ ותנובת השדה למען אשר לא תקחו עוד חרפת רעב בגוים: ³¹ וזכרתם את דרכיכם הרעים ומעלליכם אשר לא טובים ונקטתם בפניכם על עונותיכם ועל תועבותיכם: ³² לא למענכם אני עשה נאם אדני יהוה יודע לכם בושו והכלמו מדרכיכם בית ישראל:

³³ כה אמר אדני יהוה ביום טהרי אתכם מכל עונותיכם והושבתי את הערים ונבנו החרבות: ³⁴ והארץ הנשמה תעבד תחת אשר היתה שממה לעיני כל עובר: ³⁵ ואמרו הארץ הלזו הנשמה היתה כגן עדן והערים החרבות והנשמות

their eyes. ²⁴ And I will take you from the nations and I will gather you from all the lands and I will bring you into your land. ²⁵ And I will sprinkle upon you clean waters and you will be clean from all your uncleanness, and from all your idols I will cleanse you. ²⁶ And I will give you a new heart and a new *ruach* I will set in your midst, and I will take away the heart of stone from your flesh and I will give you a heart of flesh. ²⁷ And I will set my *ruach* in your midst and I will make it so that you walk in my statutes, and my judgements you will keep and do. ²⁸ And you will dwell in the land which I gave to your fathers, and you will be for me as a people, and I will be for you as God. ²⁹ And I will save you from all your uncleanness and I will call to the grain, and I will increase it and I will not give you famine. ³⁰ And I will increase the fruit of the tree and the produce of the field so that you might not again receive the disgrace of famine among the nations. ³¹ And you will remember your wicked ways and your deeds which were not good, and you shall feel loathing for yourselves because of your iniquities and because of your abominations. ³² Let it be known to you that it is not for your sake that I am acting,' says the Lord Yahweh. 'Be ashamed and be humiliated by your ways, O house of Israel.'

³³ Thus says the Lord Yahweh, 'on the day that I purify you from all your iniquities I will also populate your cities and the waste places will be built. ³⁴ And the desolate land shall be cultivated; instead of being what was desolate in the eyes of every passer-by. ³⁵ And they shall say, "this land which was desolate has become like the garden of

והנהרסות בצורות ישובו: ³⁶ וידעו
הגוים אשר ישארו סביבותיכם כי
אני יהוה בניתי הנהרסות נטעתי
הנשמה אני יהוה דברתי ועשיתי:

³⁷ כה אמר אדני יהוה עוד זאת
אדרש לבית ישראל לעשות להם
ארבה אתם כצאן אדם: ³⁸ כצאן
קדשים כצאן ירושלם במועדיה כן
תהיינה הערים החרבות מלאות צאן
אדם וידעו כי אני יהוה:

^{37.1} היתה עלי יד יהוה ויוצאני
ברוח יהוה ויניחני בתוך הבקעה
והיא מלאה עצמות: ² והעבירני
עליהם סביב סביב והנה רבות מאד
על פני הבקעה והנה יבשות מאד: ³
ויאמר אלי בן אדם התחיינה
העצמות האלה ואמר אדני יהוה
אתה ידעת: ⁴ ויאמר אלי הנבא על
העצמות האלה ואמרת אליהם
העצמות היבשות שמעו דבר יהוה:
⁵ כה אמר אדני יהוה לעצמות
האלה הנה אני מביא בכם רוח
וחייתם: ⁶ ונתתי עליכם גדים
והעלתי עליכם בשר וקרמתי
עליכם עור ונתתי בכם רוח וחייתם
וידעתם כי אני יהוה: ⁷ ונבאתי
כאשר צויתי ויהי קול כהנבאי והנה
רעש ותקרבו עצמות עצם אל
עצמו: ⁸ וראיתי והנה עליהם גדים
ובשר עלה ויקרם עליהם עור

Eden and the wasted and desolate and destroyed
cities are fortified and inhabited.” ³⁶ And the nations
which remain around you will know that I, Yahweh,
have built the ruins, I have planted the desolate
place. I, Yahweh, have spoken and I have done it.’

³⁷ Thus says the Lord Yahweh, ‘again I shall be
sought by the house of Israel to do this for them. I
will multiply them like a human flock. ³⁸ Like a
flock of holy ones; like a flock of Jerusalem in her
appointed feasts; so shall the desolate cities be filled
with a human flock, and they will know that I am
Yahweh.’

^{37.1} The hand of Yahweh was upon me and he
brought me out by the *ruach* of Yahweh and he
settled me down in the midst of the valley and it was
full of bones. ² And he made me pass through them
around and around and behold there were very
many on the face of the valley and behold they were
very dry. ³ And he said to me, ‘Son of man, can
these bones live?’ and I said, ‘Lord Yahweh you
know.’ ⁴ And he said to me, ‘prophecy to these
bones, and you shall say to them, “dry bones, hear
the word of Yahweh.”’ ⁵ Thus says the Lord Yahweh
to these bones, “behold I am bringing into you
ruach and you shall live. ⁶ And I shall put upon you
sinews and I will bring flesh upon you and I will
cover you with skin and I will put *ruach* in you and
you will live, and you will know that I am
Yahweh.”’ ⁷ And I prophesied as I was commanded
and there was a sound as I prophesied and behold a
shaking and the bones came close together, a bone
to its bone. ⁸ And I saw and behold sinews were on

מלמעלה ורוח אין בהם: ⁹ ויאמר
אלי הנבא אל הרוח הנבא בן אדם
ואמרת אל הרוח כה אמר אדני
יהוה מארבע רוחות באי הרוח ופחי
בהרוגים האלה ויחיו: ¹⁰ והנבאתי
כאשר צוני ותבוא בהם הרוח ויחיו
ויעמדו על רגליהם חיל גדול מאד
מאד:

them and flesh came and skin covered them but
there was no *ruach* in them. ⁹ And he said to me,
'prophecy to the *ruach*, prophecy, Son of man, and
you shall say to the *ruach* thus says the Lord
Yahweh: "from the four *ruchot*, come, O *ruach*, and
breath into these slain ones and let them live"' ¹⁰
And I prophesied as he commanded me and the
ruach came into them and they lived and they stood
upon their feet, a very great army.

¹¹ ויאמר אלי בן אדם העצמות
האלה כל בית ישראל המה הנה
אמרים יבשו עצמותינו ואבדה
תקותנו נגזרנו לנו: ¹² לכן הנבא
ואמרת אליהם כה אמר אדני יהוה
הנה אני פתח את קברותיכם
והעליתי אתכם מקברותיכם עמי
והבאתי אתכם אל אדמת ישראל: ¹³
וידעתם כי אני יהוה בפתחי את
קברותיכם ובהעלותי אתכם
מקברותיכם עמי: ¹⁴ ונתתי רוחי
בכם וחייתם והנחתי אתכם על
אדמתכם וידעתם כי אני יהוה
דברתי ועשיתי נאם יהוה:

¹¹ And he said to me, 'Son of man these bones
are the whole house of Israel; behold they are
saying, "our bones have withered and our hope has
perished; we are cut off"' ¹² Therefore, prophecy and
you shall say to them, "thus says the Lord Yahweh:
behold I am opening your tombs and I will bring
you out from your tombs, my people, and I will
bring you into the land of Israel. ¹³ And you will
know that I am Yahweh when I open your tombs
and when I bring you out from your tombs, my
people. ¹⁴ And I will put my *ruach* in you and you
shall live, and I will settle you upon your land and
you will know that I, Yahweh, have spoken and
done it" says Yahweh.'

Bibliography

- Abegg, Martin G., ed. *Qumran non-Biblical Manuscripts*. Accordance Bible Software Module, 1999–2009.
- Abegg, Martin G., Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- Aernie, Jeffrey W. ‘Tablets of Fleshly Hearts: Paul and Ezekiel in Concert’. *JSPL* 6.1 (2016): 55–73.
- Agersnap, Søren. *Baptism and the New Life: A Study of Romans 6.1-14*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1999.
- Allen, David. ‘The Use of Criteria: The State of the Question’. Pages 129–41 in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*. Edited by David Allen and Steve Smith. LNTS. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Allen, Leslie C. *Ezekiel 20–48*. WBC 29. Waco, TX: Word, 1990.
- Allison, Dale C. ‘Acts 9:1–9, 22:6–11, 26:12–18: Paul and Ezekiel’. *JBL* 135.4 (2016): 807–26.
- Anderson, Tawa J., W. Michael Clark, and David K. Naugle. *An Introduction to Christian Worldview: Pursuing God’s Perspective in a Pluralistic World*. London: Inter-Varsity Press, 2017.
- Anrich, Gustav. *Das Antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1894.
- Assefa, Daniel. *L’apocalypse des animaux (1 Hen 85-90): Une propagande militaire?: Approches narrative, historico-critique, perspectives theologiques*. JSJSup 120. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Colossians and Philemon*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- . *Obedying the Truth: A Study of Paul’s Ethics in Galatians*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- . ‘Paul and Philo on Circumcision: Romans 2.25–9 in Social and Cultural Context’. *NTS* 44.4 (1998): 536–56.
- . *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

- . ‘Under Grace: The Christ-Gift and the Construction of a Christian Habitus’. Pages 59–76 in *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5–8*. Edited by Beverly Roberts Gaventa. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013.
- Barnett, Paul. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2nd ed. BNTC. London: A. & C. Black, 1971.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. BNTC. London: A. & C. Black, 1973.
- Bauckham, Richard. ‘A Quotation from “4QSecond Ezekiel” in the “Apocalypse of Peter”’. *RevQ* 15.3 (1992): 437–45.
- . ‘Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Writings’. *DLNT*, 68–73.
- . *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Baulès, Robert. *L’évangile puissance de Dieu: commentaire de l’épître aux Romains*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968.
- Beale, G. K. *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. *Baptism in the New Testament*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1962.
- . ‘Baptism, Wash’. *NIDNTT* 1:143–54.
- Beetham, Christopher A. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Best, E. ‘Who Used Whom? The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians’. *NTS* 43.1 (1997): 72–96.
- Best, Ernest. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Bird, Michael F. “‘Raised for Our Justification’: A Fresh Look at Romans 4:25”. *Colloq* 35.1 (2003): 31–46.
- Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel Chapters 25–48*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . ‘The Prophet of the Spirit: The Use of Rwh in the Book of Ezekiel’. *JETS* 32.1 (1989): 27–49.
- . ‘Transformation of Royal Ideology in Ezekiel’. Pages 208–46 in *Transforming Visions: Transformations of Text, Tradition, and Theology in Ezekiel*. Edited by

- William A. Tooman and Michael A. Lyons. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 127. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke 1:1–9:50*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994.
- de Boer, Martinus C. *Galatians: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011.
- Bossu, Nicolas. *Une prophétie au fil de la tradition: L’oracle des ossements desséchés (Ez 37, 1-14) et ses relectures chrétiennes, entre herméneutique et théologie*. EBib. Paris: Gabalda, 2015.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1970.
- Bowker, J. W. “‘Merkabah’ Visions and the Visions of Paul”. *JSS* 16.2 (1971): 157–73.
- Bradshaw, Jeffrey M. ‘The Ezekiel Mural at Dura Europos: A Witness of Ancient Jewish Mysteries?’ *BYUSQ* 49.1 (2010): 4–49.
- Brandon, S. G. F. *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1951.
- Brandon, S. G. F. ‘The Historical Element in Primitive Christianity’. *Numen* 2.1 (1955): 156–67.
- Brooke, George J. ‘Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts’. Pages 317–37 in vol. 1 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18–21 March, 1991*. Edited by J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Brown, Jeannine K. ‘Metalepsis’. Pages 29–41 in *Exploring Intertextuality: Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts*. Edited by B. J. Oropeza and Steve Moyise. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016.
- Brown, Schuyler. ‘Water-Baptism and Spirit-Baptism in Luke-Acts’. *AThR* 59.2 (1977): 135–51.
- Bruce, F. F. *1 & 2 Thessalonians*. WBC 45. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.
- . *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary*. London: Tyndale Press, 1963.
- . *The Epistle to the Ephesians: A Verse-by-Verse Exposition*. London: Pickering & Inglis, 1961.

- . *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Bujard, Walter. *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen zum Kolosserbrief als Beitrag zur Methodik von Sprachvergleichen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
- Bullock, C Hassell. ‘Ezekiel, Bridge Between the Testaments’. *JETS* 25.1 (1982): 23–31.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. London: SCM, 1965.
- Caird, George B. *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980.
- Campbell, Constantine R. *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- Campbell, Douglas A. *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Account*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Carson, D. A. *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12–14*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.
- . *The Gospel According to John*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1991.
- Cavallin, Hans Clemens Caesarius. *Life after Death: Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15: Part I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background*. ConBNT 7:1. Lund: Gleerup, 1974.
- Chang, Hae-Kyung. ‘The Christian Life in a Dialectical Tension?: Romans 7:7-25 Reconsidered’. *NovT* 49.3 (2007): 257–80.
- Chilton, Bruce D. *Resurrection Logic: How Jesus’ First Followers Believed God Raised Him from the Dead*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019.
- Ciampa, Roy E. ‘Scriptural Language and Ideas’. Pages 41–57 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Ciampa, Roy E., and Brian S. Rosner. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Cohen-Matlofsky, Claude. ‘Resurrection, from the Hebrew Bible to the Rock-Cut Tombs: An Inscribed Concept’. *QC* 23 (2015): 425–51.
- Collins, John J. *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

- . ‘Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls’. Pages 151–72 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Timothy H. Lim. Oxford University Press, 2010.
- . ‘Sibylline Oracles’. *DNTB*, 1107–12.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Cook, John Granger. ‘Resurrection in Paganism and the Question of an Empty Tomb in 1 Corinthians 15’. *NTS* 63.1 (2017): 56–75.
- Cothenet, E. ‘Influence d’Ézéchiél sur la spiritualité de Qumrân’. *RevQ* 13 (1988): 431–39.
- Crane, Ashley. *Israel’s Restoration: A Textual-Comparative Exploration of Ezekiel 36–39*. VTSup. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975, 1979.
- Cranfield, C.E.B. ‘Romans 6:1–14 Revisited’. *ExpTim* 106.2 (1994): 40–43.
- Das, A. Andrew. ‘Acts 8: Water, Baptism, and the Spirit’. *Concordia Journal* 19.2 (1993): 108–34.
- Deissmann, Adolf. *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*. Translated by William Edward Wilson. 2nd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1926.
- deSilva, David. *4 Maccabees*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- . *4 Maccabees*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Dimant, Devorah. *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960.
- . *The Parables of the Kingdom*. Rev. ed. New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1961.
- Duff, Paul B. *Moses in Corinth: The Apologetic Context of 2 Corinthians 3*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentacostalism Today*. London: SCM, 1970.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Commentary on Colossians and Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Romans 1–8*. WBC 38A. Waco, TX: Word, 1988.

- Ehrman, Bart D. *Forgery and Counter-Forgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Elliott, Mark A. *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Evans, C. F. *Resurrection and the New Testament*. SBT. London: SCM, 1970.
- Evans, Craig A., B. J. Oropeza, and Paul Sloan, eds. *New Studies in Textual Interplay*. LNTS 632. London: T&T Clark, 2020.
- , eds. 'New Studies in Textual Interplay: An Introduction'. Pages 3–8 in *New Studies in Textual Interplay*. LNTS 632. London: T&T Clark, 2020.
- Evans, Craig A., and H. Daniel Zacharias, eds. *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality: Volume 1: Thematic Studies*. London: Bloomsbury, 2009.
- , eds. *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality: Volume 2: Exegetical Studies*. London: Bloomsbury, 2009.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef. 'Ezechiel in Qumran und Masada – Bezeugung und Rezeption'. Pages 1–41 in *Das Buch Ezechiel: Komposition, Redaktion und Rezeption*. Edited by Jan Christian Gertz, Corinna Körting, and Markus Witte. BZAW 516. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2020.
- Fanning, Buist M. *Verbal Aspects in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
- Fee, Gordon D. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- . *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- . *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Rev. ed. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Ferguson, Everett. *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Fischer, James A. 'Synagogue Paintings of Dura-Europos'. *CBQ* 17.2 (1955): 189–95.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- . *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1993.
- Foster, Paul. 'Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament'. *JSNT* 38.1 (2015): 96–111.

- . ‘Who Wrote 2 Thessalonians? A Fresh Look at an Old Problem’. *JSNT* 35.2 (2012): 150–75.
- Foster, Raymond S. ‘The Text of Ezekiel in Papyrus 967’. *Colloq* 4.1 (1971): 46–53.
- Fowl, Stephen E. *Ephesians: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984.
- García Martínez, F. ‘L’interprétation de la Torah d’Ézéchiél dans les MSS. de Qumran’. *RevQ* 13 (1988): 441–52.
- Garraway, Joshua. ‘The Circumcision of Christ: Romans 15.7-13’. *JSNT* 34.4 (2012): 303–22.
- Garte, Edna. ‘Theme of Resurrection in the Dura-Europos Synagogue Paintings’. *JQR* 64.1 (1973): 1–15.
- Gäumann, Niklaus. *Taufe und Ethik: Studien zu Römer 6*. Munich: Kaiser, 1967.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. 12 vols. Bollingen Series 37. New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1953–1968.
- Goodrich, John K. ‘Sold under Sin: Echoes of Exile in Romans 7.14-25’. *NTS* 59.4 (2013): 476–95.
- Gorman, Michael J. *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul’s Narrative Soteriology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Gourgues, Michel. “‘Réveille-toi...” (Ep 5,14): de l’évocation de la Pâque baptismale à la motivation parénétique’. *ScEs* 63.3 (2011): 367–83.
- Greenspoon, Leonard. ‘The Use and Abuse of the Term “LXX” and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship’. *BIOSCS* 20 (1987): 21–29.
- Griffith-Jones, Robin. *The Gospel According to Paul: The Creative Genius Who Brought Jesus to the World*. New York: HarperCollins, 2004.
- Gundry, Robert Horton. *Soma in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.
- Guthrie, George H. *2 Corinthians*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.
- Hachlili, Rachel. ‘The Dura-Europas Synagogue Wall Paintings: A Question of Origin and Interpretation’. Pages 403–20 in *Follow the Wise: Studies in Jewish History*

- and Culture in Honor of Lee I. Levine*. Edited by Zeev Weiss, Oded Irshai, Jodi Magness, and Seth Schwartz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010.
- Hagen, Wayne H. 'Two Deutero-Pauline Glosses in Romans 6'. *ExpTim* 92.12 (1981): 364–67.
- Harris, Murray J. *Colossians and Philemon*. 2nd ed. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2010.
- . *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Hartman, Lars. 'Into the Name of the Lord Jesus': *Baptism in the Early Church*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Hartwig, Charlotte, and Gerd Theißen. 'Die korinthische Gemeinde als Nebenadressat des Römerbriefs. Eigentextreferenzen des Paulus und kommunikativer Kontext des längsten Paulusbriefes'. *NovT* 46.3 (2004): 229–52.
- Haykin, Michael A G. "'In the Cloud and in the Sea": Basil of Caesarea and the Exegesis of 1 Cor 10:2'. *VC* 40.2 (1986): 135–44.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- . *First Corinthians*. IBC. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- . 'The Conversion of the Imagination: Scripture and Eschatology in 1 Corinthians'. *NTS* 45.3 (1999): 391–412.
- . "'Who Has Believed Our Message?" Paul's Reading of Isaiah'. Pages 46–70 in *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament*. Edited by John M. Court. London: SPCK, 2002.
- Hayter, Daniel W. "'How Are the Dead Raised?": The Bodily Nature of Resurrection in Second Temple Jewish Texts'. Pages 123–43 in *The Body in Biblical, Christian and Jewish Texts*. Edited by Joan E Taylor. LSTS. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Heitmüller, W. 'Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus'. *ZNW* 13 (1912): 320–37.
- Heitmüller, Wilhelm. *Taufe und Abendmahl im Urchristentum*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1911.
- Héring, Jean. *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*. Translated by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. London: Epworth, 1962.
- Hoehner, Harold W. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Hoekema, Anthony A. *The Bible and the Future*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

- Hogeterp, Albert L. A. 'Resurrection and Biblical Tradition: Pseudo-Ezekiel Reconsidered'. *Bib* 89 (2008): 59–69.
- Hollander, John. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Holmes, Michael W., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius. *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1911.
- Hooker, Morna D. "The Sanctuary of His Body": Body and Sanctuary in Paul and John'. *JSNT* 39.4 (2017): 347–61.
- Hubbard, Moyer V. *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought*. SNTSMS 119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Humphrey, Edith M. 'Ambivalent Apocalypse: Apocalyptic Rhetoric and Intertextuality in 2 Corinthians'. Pages 113–35 in *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament*. Edited by Duane F. Watson. SBL Symposium Series 14. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- James, Montague Rhodes, ed. *The Testament of Abraham*. TS 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1892.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. 3rd ed. New Testament Library. SCM Press, 1966.
- Jewett, Robert. *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*. AGJU 10. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- . *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.
- Joyce, Paul M. *Ezekiel: A Commentary*. LHBOTS 482. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. London: SCM, 1980.
- Keefer, Arthur. 'The Meaning and Place of Old Testament Context in OT/NT Methodology'. Pages 73–85 in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*. Edited by David Allen and Steve Smith. LNTS. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Introduction and 1:1–2:47*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

- . *Galatians: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019.
- Keesmaat, Sylvia C. 'Exodus and the Intertextual Transformation of Tradition in Romans 8:14-30'. *JSNT* 16.54 (1994): 29–56.
- . *Paul and His Story: (Re)Interpreting the Exodus Tradition*. JSNTSup 181. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Kister, Menahem. 'Barnabas 12:1; 4:3 and 4Q Second Ezekiel'. *RB* 97.1 (1990): 63–67.
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Klink, Edward W. *John*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J., Benjamin L. Merkle, and Robert L. Plummer. *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek: An Intermediate Study of the Grammar and Syntax of the New Testament*. Rev. ed. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2020.
- Kowalski, Beate. 'Selective versus Contextual Allusions: Reconsidering Technical Terms of Intertextuality'. Pages 86–102 in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*. Edited by David Allen and Steve Smith. LNTS. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried. 'Papyrus 967: Bemerkungen zu seiner buchtechnischen, textgeschichtlichen und kanongeschichtlichen Bedeutung'. Pages 64–82 in *Die Septuaginta - Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Kruse, Colin G. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus*. UNT 17. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1929.
- Ladd, George Eldon. *The Presence of the Future: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Lane, William L. *Hebrews 1–8*. WBC 47A. Dallas, TX: Word, 1991.
- Leene, Henk. 'Ezekiel and Jeremiah: Promises of Inner Renewal in Diachronic Perspective'. *Past, Present, Future: The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets*. Edited by Johannes Cornelis de Moor and H. F. Van Rooy. OTS 44. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Lilly, Ingrid E. *Two Books of Ezekiel: Papyrus 967 and the Masoretic Text as Variant Literary Editions*. VTSup 150. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. WBC 42. Dallas, TX: Word, 1990.
- Lohse, Eduard. *A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*. Translated by William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- . *The New Testament Environment*. London: SCM, 1976.
- Loisy, Alfred Firmin. *Les Mystères Païens et Le Mystère Chrétien*. Paris: Émile Nourry, 1914.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. WBC 41. Dallas, TX: Word, 1990.
- . *The Epistle to the Romans*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Lowe, Bruce A. ‘Oh Διά!: How Is Romans 4:25 to Be Understood?’ *JTS* 57.1 (2006): 149–57.
- Lucas, Alec J. ‘Assessing Stanley E Porter’s Objections to Richard B Hays’s Notion of Metalepsis’. *CBQ* 76.1 (2014): 93–111.
- Lunde, Jonathan, and John Anthony Dunne. ‘Paul’s Creative and Contextual Use of Isaiah in Ephesians 5:14’. *JETS* 55.1 (2012): 87–110.
- Lust, Johan. ‘Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript’. *CBQ* 43.4 (1981): 517–33.
- . ‘Ezekiel Manuscripts in Qumran: Preliminary Edition of 4Q Ez a and b’. *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*. Edited by Johan Lust. BETL 74. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986.
- Lyonnet, Stanislas. ‘Rom 8,2–4 à la lumière de Jérémie 31 et d’Ézéchiel 35–39’. Pages 231–41 in *Etudes sur l’Épître aux Romains*. 2nd ed. AnBib 120. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003.
- MacGregor, Kirk R. ‘1 Corinthians 15:3b–6a,7 and the Bodily Resurrection of Jesus’. *JETS* 49.2 (2006): 225–34.
- Manning Jr., Gary T. *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Marshall, Howard I. ‘The Meaning of the Verb “Baptize”’. Pages 8–24 in *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross. JSNTSup 234. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Martin, Ralph Philip. *2 Corinthians*. WBC 40. Waco, TX: Word, 1986.
- . *2 Corinthians*. 2nd Ed. WBC. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2014.

- Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Maston, Jason. ‘Anthropological Crisis and Solution in the Hodayot and 1 Corinthians 15’. *NTS* 62.4 (2016): 533–48.
- . *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul*. WUNT 2/297. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Matera, Frank J. *II Corinthians: A Commentary*. Louisville: Presbyterian Publishing Corporation, 2013.
- Mayfield, Tyler D. ‘Literary Structure and Formulas in Ezekiel 34–37’. Pages 235–44 in *Ezekiel: Current Debates and Future Directions*. Edited by William A. Tooman and Penelope Barter. FAT. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- McCane, B. R. ‘Burial Practices, Jewish’. *DNTB*, 173–75.
- McHugh, John F. *John 1–4: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. ICC. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Mein, Andrew. *Ezekiel and the Ethics of Exile*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- . ‘Ezekiel: Structure, Themes and Contested Issues’. Pages 190–206 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Prophets*. Edited by Carolyn J. Sharp. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament*. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. *The Gospel of John*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Montefiore, Hugh W. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. BNTC. London: A. & C. Black, 1964.
- Moo, Douglas J. *Galatians*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- . ‘Israel and Paul in Romans 7.7–12’. *NTS* 32.1 (1986): 122–35.
- . *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- . *The Letters to the Colossians and to Philemon*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Morales, Isaac Augustine. ‘Baptism, Holiness and Resurrection Hope in Romans 6’. *CBQ* 83.3 (2021): 466–81.
- Moritz, Thorsten. *A Profound Mystery: The Use of the Old Testament in Ephesians*. NovTSup 85. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

- Morris, Leon. *1 Corinthians*. 2nd ed. TNTC. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985.
- Moule, C. F. D. *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*. CGTC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
- Muddiman, John. *The Epistle to the Ephesians*. BNTC. London: Bloomsbury, 2006.
- Nielsburg, George W. E. *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- Noack, Bent. ‘Das Zitat in Ephes 5:14’. *ST* 5.1 (1951): 52–64.
- Oepke, Albrecht. ‘Βάρτω Κτλ.’ *TDNT* 1:529–46.
- Olley, John W. *Ezekiel: A Commentary Based on Iezekiël in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Olson, Daniel. *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: ‘All Nations Shall Be Blessed’*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Oropeza, B. J., and Steve Moyise, eds. *Exploring Intertextuality: Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016.
- Orr, Peter. *Christ Absent and Present: A Study in Pauline Christology*. WUNT 2/354. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Orr, William F., and James Arthur Walther. *1 Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 32. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Pang, Francis G. H. ‘Aspect, Aktionsart, and Abduction: Future Tense in the New Testament’. *FN* 23 (2010): 129–59.
- Pao, David W. *Colossians and Philemon*. ZECNT 12. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.
- Patmore, Hector M. ‘The Shorter and Longer Texts of Ezekiel: The Implications of the Manuscript Finds from Masada and Qumran’. *JSOT* 32.2 (2007): 231–42.
- Philonenko, Marc. ‘De Qoumrân à Doura-Europos: La vision des ossements desséchés (Ézéchiël 37,1-4)’. *RHPR* 74.1 (1994): 1–12.
- Porter, Stanley E. ‘Allusions and Echoes’. Pages 29–40 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. SBL Symposium Series 50. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . ‘Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament’. Pages 98–110 in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*. Edited by Thomas L Brodie, Stanley E. Porter, and Dennis Ronald MacDonald. New Testament Monographs 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2006.

- . ‘Paul and His Bible: His Education and Access to the Scriptures of Israel’. Pages 97–124 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. SBL Symposium Series 50. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . ‘The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology’. Pages 79–96 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- . *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament: With Reference to Tense and Mood*. Studies in Biblical Greek 1. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Puech, Émile. *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d’une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien*. 2 vols. EBib. Paris: Gabalda, 1993.
- Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Riesenfeld, Harald. *The Resurrection in Ezekiel XXXVII and in the Dura-Europos Paintings*. UUA. Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistika Bokhandeln, 1948.
- Robinson, John A. T. *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology*. SBT 5. London: SCM, 1952.
- Robson, James. *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*. LHBOTS. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Rowland, Christopher, and Christopher R. A. Morray-Jones. *The Mystery of God: Early Jewish Mysticism and the New Testament*. CRINT 12. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Sabou, Sorin. ‘A Note on Romans 6:5: The Representation (ΟΜΟΙΩΜΑ) of His Death’. *TynBul* 55.2 (2004): 219–29.
- Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1895.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer: Kapitel 6–16*. HTANT. Witten: Brockhaus, 2015.
- . *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. HTANT. Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 2006.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *Baptism in the Thought of St Paul: A Study in Pauline Theology*. Translated by George R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Blackwell, 1964.
- . *Ephesians: A Commentary*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Schneider, Johannes. ‘Ομοίωμα’. *TDNT* 5:191–98.

- Schreiner, Thomas R. *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2018.
- . *Galatians*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.
- . *Romans*. 2nd ed. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018.
- . ‘The Abolition and Fulfillment of the Law in Paul’. *JSNT* 11.35 (1989): 47–74.
- Schuller, Eileen M., and Carol A. Newsom. *The Hodayot (Thanksgiving Psalms): A Study Edition of 1QH^a*. EJL 36. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Translated by William Montgomery. 2nd ed. London: A. & C. Black, 1953.
- . *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: Eine Geschichte der Leben Jesu Forschung*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1906.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *Der Brief an die Kolosser*. EKKNT. Zürich: Benziger, 1976.
- . ‘Dying and Rising with Christ’. *NTS* 14.1 (1967): 1–14.
- Segal, Alan F. *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Seifrid, Mark A. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- . ‘The Subject of Rom 7:14-25’. *NovT* 34.4 (1992): 313–33.
- Shauf, Scott. ‘Galatians 2.20 in Context’. *NTS* 52.1 (2006): 86–101.
- Sider, Ronald J. ‘St. Paul’s Understanding of the Nature and Significance of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians XV 1-19’. *NovT* 19.2 (1977): 124–41.
- Sigvartsen, Jan Age. *Afterlife and Resurrection Beliefs in the Pseudepigrapha*. JCT 31. London: Bloomsbury, 2019.
- Simpson, E. K., and F. F. Bruce. *Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.
- Spottorno, María Victoria. ‘La omisión de “Ez.” 36, 23b - 38 y la transposición de capítulos en el papiro 967’. *Emerita* 50 (1982): 93–98.
- Starling, David I. *Not My People: Gentiles as Exiles in Pauline Hermeneutics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- Stockhausen, Carol Kern. *Moses’ Veil and the Glory of the New Covenant: The Exegetical Substructure of II Cor. 3,1–4,6*. AnBib 116. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1989.

- Suh, Robert H. 'One New Humanity in Christ: The Use of Ezekiel 37 in Ephesians 2'. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2006.
- . 'The Use of Ezekiel 37 in Ephesians 2'. *JETS* 50.4 (2007): 715–33.
- Sumney, Jerry L. *Colossians: A Commentary*. NTL. London: Westminster John Knox, 2008.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. 'Fragments of an Ezekiel Scroll from Masada (Ezekiel 35:11–38:14): MasEzek, Masada 1043–2220'. Pages 53–69 in *Tehillah Le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg*. Edited by Mordechai Cogan, Barry L. Eichler, and Jeffrey H. Tigay. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *Dying and Rising with Christ: A Study in Pauline Theology*. BZNW 32. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967.
- Tappenden, Frederick S. *Resurrection in Paul: Cognition, Metaphor, and Transformation*. ECL 19. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2016.
- Taylor, Joan E. *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism*. Studying the Historical Jesus. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.
- . *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994, 2000.
- Tooman, William A. 'Scriptural Reuse in Ancient Jewish Literature: Comments and Reflections on the State of the Art'. Pages 23–39 in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*. Edited by David Allen and Steve Smith. LNTS. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Torrey, Charles Cutler. *The Lives of the Prophets: Greek Text and Translation*. SBLMS. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1946.
- Toynbee, Jocelyn M. C. *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1971.
- Tsui, Teresa Kuo-Yu. 'Some Observations on the Use of the Future in Rom 6,5.8'. *ZNW* 100.2 (2009): 287–94.
- Vanhoye, Albert. 'L'utilisation du livre d'Ézéchiél dans l'Apocalypse'. *Bib* 43.3 (1962): 436–76.
- Vos, Geerhardus. *The Pauline Eschatology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952.

- Wagner, Günter. *Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem von Römer 6, 1-11*. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1962.
- . *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1967.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wanamaker, Charles A. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Ware, James. ‘Paul’s Understanding of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15:36–54’. *JBL* 133.4 (2014): 809–35.
- . ‘The Resurrection of Jesus in the Pre-Pauline Formula of 1 Cor 15.3–5’. *NTS* 60.4 (2014): 475–98.
- Watts, Rikk. ‘Rethinking Context in the Relationship of Israel’s Scriptures to the NT: Character, Agency and the Possibility of Genuine Change’. Pages 157–77 in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*. Edited by David Allen and Steve Smith. LNTS. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Webb, William J. ‘Unequally Yoked Together with Unbelievers, Part 1: Who Are the Unbelievers (Ἄπιστοι) in 2 Corinthians 6:14?’ *BSac* 149.593 (1992): 27–44.
- . ‘Unequally Yoked Together with Unbelievers, Part 2: What Is the Unequal Yoke (Ἐτεροζυγοῦντες) in 2 Corinthians 6:14?’ *BSac* 149.594 (1992): 162–79.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology against Its Graeco-Roman Background*. WUNT 44. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.
- . ‘Hellenistic Christian Traditions in Romans 6’. *NTS* 29.3 (1983): 337–55.
- . ‘The Soteriology of the Mysteries and Pauline Baptismal Theology’. *NovT* 29.1 (1987): 53–72.
- Weima, Jeffrey A. D. *1–2 Thessalonians*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.
- Weiss, Johannes. *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900.
- Wengst, Klaus. ‘Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums.’ 1967.
- White, Joel. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Kolosser*. HTANT. Witten: Brockhaus, 2018.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 3 vols. EKKNT. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978–1982.
- Wilson, Andrew J. *The Warning-Assurance Relationship in 1 Corinthians*. WUNT 2/452. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

- Wilson, William E. 'The Development of Paul's Doctrine of Dying and Rising Again with Christ'. *ExpTim* 42.12 (1931): 562–65.
- Wolter, Michael. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 2 vols. EKKNT. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie, 2014, 2019.
- Wright, Martin. *The Dividing Wall: Ephesians and the Integrity of the Corpus Paulinum*. LNTS 646. London: T&T Clark, 2021.
- Wright, N. T. 'The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections'. Pages 393–770 in vol. 10 of *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.
- . *The New Testament and the People of God*. London: SPCK, 1992.
- . *The Resurrection of the Son of God: Christian Origins and the Question of God*. London: SPCK, 2003.
- Yates, John W. *The Spirit and Creation in Paul*. WUNT 2/251. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Ziesler, John A. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. TPINTC. London: SCM, 1989.