

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESIS

Writers consciously or unconsciously employ literary styles in their writing; their writing styles reflect what they want to deliver. Every writer, in a sense, has specific, characteristic writing skills. Therefore, a careful investigation of literary form helps to determine the intention of a writer. The relation of the form and content of a text seems to be indispensable. For instance, though no relationship seems to exist between the Book of Malachi and the New Testament, the significant role that the Book of Malachi plays in the New Testament is overlooked frequently. In fact, many key themes in Malachi occur in New Testament.¹ More specifically, Thomas L. Brodie, in his article, “A New Temple and A New Law,”² argues that a relationship exists between Luke in the New Testament and the Chronicler’s history in the Old Testament. According to him, Luke’s emphasis and focus on the Temple and the Law is evidence that Luke rewrote the Chronicler’s history, just as the Chronicler reworked the history of Israel in the Books of Chronicles. James A. Brooks points out the following quotations from and allusions to the Book of Malachi in the Gospel of Luke as well: Mal. 1:6 in Luke 6:46; Mal. 1:11 in Luke 13:29; Mal. 3:1 in Luke 1:17; Mal. 3:12 in Luke 1:48; Mal. 4:2 in Luke 1:78 and Mal. 4:5 in Luke 9:8.³ Malachi seems to influence Luke’s writing more than any other Gospel.

¹ Craig Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990) 99.

² Thomas L. Brodie, “A New Temple and a New Law,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 5 (1979) 21-45.

³ James A. Brooks, “The Influence of Malachi Upon the New Testament,” *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 30 (1987) 31.

Luke seems to write from the perspective that the messenger of the covenant in Mal. 3:1b points to the Messiah and His mission related to the covenant. Jesus says to His contemporary Jews in the Gospel of Luke that the prophecy regarding His mission has been fulfilled (Luke 4:17-21). After His resurrection, He explains to His disciples beginning with Moses and all the Prophets what was written in all the scriptures concerning Him (Luke 24: 27). He also says to His disciples, “Everything must be fulfilled that is written about me in the Law of Moses, the Prophets and the Psalms” (Luke 24:41).

Old Testament texts have their own “full meaning” in their own, but the New Testament writers sometimes reinterpret that meaning. How the quotations from, references and allusions to, imitations and motifs of the Old Testament texts explicitly or implicitly influence the New Testament texts can be determined by a study over Old Testament usage in the New Testament.⁴ Malachi’s greatest theological motifs or themes used by the New Testament writers are found in Mal. 3:1 and 4:5-6. Mal. 3:1 mentions eschatological figures. The issue regarding the identities of Yahweh’s *Mal’ak* and the *Mal’ak* of the covenant in Mal. 3:1 has been debated. The Synoptic Gospels explicitly cite Mal. 3:1a. In Matthew and Luke, Jesus uses the passage, but Mark quotes it to explain the relationship between John the Baptist’s activity and Jesus’ ministry. The Gospel of John implies that John the Baptist is Christ’s forerunner (John 3:28). Though Mal. 3:1 is a short sentence, it has abundant theological motifs. The identity and mission of YHWH’s messenger as His forerunner, the identity of *Ha Adon* (the Lord) and the

⁴ Gert J. Steyn, “Soteriological Perspectives in Luke’s Gospel,” in *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt, vol. 121, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, ed. M. M. Mitchell and D. P. Moessner (Leiden: Brill, 2005) 2. Steyn mentions that there are mainly three levels regarding the study of “the use of the OT in the NT.” The third level is the study of implicit influences.

identity of the messenger of the covenant are main problems to be solved. In addition, the nature of the covenant in Mal. 3:1, the significance of *Ha Adon's* advent to His temple, and the relationship between Mal. 3:1 and Mal. 3:2-5 are also important themes. Finally, Mal. 4:5-6 [English version] ought to be discussed with Mal. 3:1. This passage explains the identity and role of YHWH's messenger. It begins to divulge how the prophecy of Mal. 3:1a is fulfilled generically in John the Baptist. It seems that Luke uses and alludes to Malachi's eschatological *Mal'ak* motifs more than other Gospels. Luke 1:15-17 is an allusion to Mal. 4:5-6. Luke 1:76 is an allusion to Mal. 3:1. The phrase, "he sent messengers on ahead" in Luke 9:52, also seems to be an allusion to Malachi. Luke 1:78 seems to allude to Mal. 4:2. In addition, Luke emphasizes covenant themes by mentioning the Abrahamic Covenant, the Davidic Covenant, and perhaps the New Covenant. Luke underscores Jesus' visit to the Jerusalem temple. Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and ultimately to the Jerusalem temple, which is focused in the Gospel of Luke and that which is the main section of the book, draws the attention of the reader who is familiar with the *Mal'ak* of the covenant theme in Malachi. Luke stresses forgiveness of sins and spiritual restoration predicted in Mal. 3:2.

A current scholarship tendency for Lukan writings considers the Book of Acts as a sequel to the Gospel of Luke. In other words, the Book of Acts is the second volume of a two-volume work that has a continuity of literary style, structure and theological themes, but this thesis will investigate how Luke uses Malachi's eschatological figures and the related motifs only in the Gospel of Luke, because Luke seems to deal with the subjects in his Gospel. As Walter Kaiser, Jr., says, "the OT has a valid and strong contribution to

make to the ongoing theology found in the NT,”⁵ Malachi seems to make a significant contribution to the theology of Luke. This thesis will attempt to demonstrate that Malachi’s eschatological figures’ arrival motif⁶ is used in the Gospel of Luke and to show how the motif influences the Gospel.

1.2. OUTLINE

Chapter one and two of this investigation contain the statement of the problem and hypothesis, methodology and a survey of research history. Chapter three and four are main sections of the thesis. Chapter three will examine the passages that contain the themes of YHWH’s eschatological figures in the Book of Malachi. The historical setting will be included. The passages at issue will be exegetically and theologically examined. Chapter four will deal with Malachi’s eschatological figures in Luke. The chapter will present how the themes or motifs of Malachi’s eschatological figures contribute to the shaping of the Gospel of Luke. The study will show some theological parallels regarding the eschatological figures between the two books. Luke’s meaningful allusions to Malachi will be investigated. This chapter will corroborate that Malachi greatly influences Luke. Chapter five will examine the themes of eschatological figures in other Gospels. Chapter six will conclude the thesis.

⁵ Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985) 151.

⁶ Malachi’s eschatological figures refer to “my messenger,” “*Ha Adon*” and “the messenger of the covenant” in Mal. 3:1 and Elijah in Mal. 4:5.

CHAPTER II

A SURVEY OF RESEARCH HISTORY AND THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

The relationship between the Old Testament and the New Testament is inseparable. Even though fundamental differences exist between the two Testaments, “There is much continuity in recurring concepts and ideas.”⁷ The two Testaments tell one story of God’s work of salvation through Christ for all his people. Quotations of, references to and allusions to the Old Testament in the New Testament indicate this continuity. Therefore, the quotations of and references to the Old Testament in the New Testament should be studied hermeneutically, but it seems that the quotations and references cause hermeneutical debate. In his book, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, Kaiser asks, “Have the New Testament writers fairly cited the Old Testament quotations according to their real truth-intention and original writer’s meaning in their attempt to show that the Messiah and many of the events in the first century A.D. church had indeed been anticipated by the O.T. writers?”⁸ His question can be simply addressed: Did the New Testament writers give added meanings or different meanings to Old Testament texts? Or did they use the Old Testament texts properly? Speaking on this point, Richard N. Longenecker states, “It [the NT use of the OT] involves a number of important theological issues as to the relation of the two Testaments . . . the nature of prophecy, and the meaning of fulfillment. And it encompasses a number of significant

⁷ Henry M. Shires, *Finding the Old Testament in the New* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1974) 16.

⁸ Kaiser, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, xi.

critical questions.”⁹ In short, the study regarding the New Testament’s use of the Old Testament is significant and substantial.

This thesis belongs to the category of the study of the New Testament’s use of the Old Testament; therefore, it will examine how Luke uses Malachi. It will investigate how Luke uses Malachi’s eschatological messengers’ arrival motif in his Gospel. To reach the goal, a research history about the motif needs to be surveyed by identifying the authors who have written on this topic previously and scrutinizing the characteristics and weaknesses of their writings. A weakness of previous investigations is that no comprehensive research or study regarding Luke’s use of Malachi has been done, though Luke employs, borrows, refers to, or alludes to Malachi’s motifs, ideas, or terminology in his gospel.¹⁰ A few scholars argue that Malachi’s vocabularies and ideas are found in the Gospel of Luke.¹¹ Especially, Malachi’s messengers’ arrival motif in Luke has not been investigated fully, though Luke is full of Malachi’s echoes. Therefore, this study hopes to gain information from broad research categories. Eschatological messengers’ motif occurs in Malachi 3 and 4 [English Version]. The motif is composed of a cluster of several themes, which are mainly the identities and roles of the eschatological messengers, *Ha Adon*’s visit to his temple, and the Day of the Lord in Malachi. The themes are intermingled so that they can not be separated. Therefore, a survey of research

⁹ Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975) 11.

¹⁰ G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson’s recently edited book (*A Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007) is helpful in acquiring the information of the research history of the theme.

¹¹ John Paul Heil, *The Transfiguration of Jesus: Narrative Meaning and Function of Mark 9:2-8, Matt 17:1-8 and Luke 9:28-36*, vol. 144, *Analecta Biblica* (ROMA: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000).

history depends on how the themes are embraced by Luke for his composition purpose. The survey will cover the following: (1) who wrote about the subject before? (2) What aspects of the issue did they deal with? And (3) what are the weaknesses and omissions?

2.1. THE IDENTITY (or IDENTITIES)¹² OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL MESSENGERS

The Malachi's eschatological messengers' arrival motif can be dealt with in two ways: (1) who are the figures? And (2) what are their roles? This survey focuses on the identities of the eschatological messengers in Malachi 3 and 4. Mal. 3:1 and 4:5-6 introduce God's messengers including Elijah. This work will deal with how Luke regards Malachi's eschatological messengers in his Gospel. Then it will treat scholars' understanding regarding Luke's use of the motif. Mal. 3:1, which is the key verse for this study, invites different interpretations, and a premature conclusion about the meaning of Malachi 3 should be avoided.¹³

Mal. 3:1 refers to three figures other than the speaker (YHWH): "My messenger," "the Lord," and "the messenger of the covenant." This verse raises a question as to whether these figures indicate three different persons, two persons or the same person. Though most scholars agree on certain basic points about the identities of the figures, they have different views.¹⁴ Scholars generally agree that "my messenger" in Mal. 3:1 is

¹² It depends upon the number of the figures which the titles refer to.

¹³ David M. Miller, "The Messenger, the Lord, and the Coming Judgment in the Reception History of Malachi 3," *New Testament Studies* 53, no. 1 (2007) 3.

¹⁴ Bruce V. Malchow, "The Messenger of the Covenant in Mal 3:1," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984) 252.

Elijah in Mal. 4:5-6.¹⁵ These figures will be identified through a careful study in the later chapters of this dissertation; this section, however, briefly introduces the scholars' views regarding Luke's understanding of the identities of the eschatological messengers. A survey of research history concerning Luke's interpretation of Malachi's eschatological figures needs to begin with the views about the number and interrelation of the characters in Mal. 3:1 and Mal. 4:5-6.

2.1.1. Scholarship on the Number¹⁶ and Interrelation of the Figures in Mal. 3:1¹⁷

Mal. 3:1 causes interpretations about the identities of the figures mentioned in it, because Malachi makes the ambiguity of their identities intentionally or accidentally ambiguous.¹⁸ The verse mentions three titles. They are "my messenger," "the Lord," and "the messenger of the covenant." The ambiguity of the identity of these persons causes scholars to interpret this passage in different ways.

2.1.1.1. One Figure View

The one figure view maintains that the person mentioned in the three parts of the verse is the same messenger, but this view is divided into different approaches based on whether or not the character is divine or human. It has been claimed that the messenger of

¹⁵ Pieter A. Verhoef, *The Books of Haggai and Malachi*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament, ed. R. K. Harrison and R. L. Hubbard, Jr. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987) 340.

¹⁶ The number excludes the first-person speaker who is YHWH.

¹⁷ Cf. Gunther H. Juncker, "Jesus and the Angel of the Lord: An Old Testament Paradigm for New Testament Christology" (Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2001). His analysis is helpful.

¹⁸ Julia M. O'Brien, *Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries, ed. Patrick D. Miller (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2004) 305-6. Julia M. O'Brien's reasoning that the Book of Malachi "focuses more on the function of the messenger than on that messenger's identity" seems right.

the Lord as His forerunner is an angelic being or a human prophet/a noble person. The single-divine character view argues that the messenger is a divine being, that is, YHWH Himself.¹⁹ Among the adherents of this approach, some scholars deny that “my messenger” in Mal. 3:1a may be identified with Elijah in Mal. 4:5,²⁰ because Elijah may imply a human prophet. Even though the view identifies “my messenger” in Mal. 3:1 as Elijah in Mal. 4:5, it regards Elijah as a divine being. In short, this approach claims that the person in question is not a human being but an angel or a divine agent. Among the one-divine-being-approaches, the YHWH view is supported by the suggestion that the angel of the Lord and YHWH are interchangeable and thus, the phrase “the angel of the Lord” in Mal. 3:1 is “a euphemism for God to emphasize the transcendence of Yahweh.”²¹ The YHWH view seems to be impossible to those who argue for the “Two Figures Being View” or the “Three Figures Being View” because YHWH as the sender of his messenger can not be the one who will be sent. The sender can not be his envoy. On the other hand, Juncker attempts to prove that YHWH Himself as the sender of his forerunner can be His forerunner.²² YHWH as the speaker in Mal. 3:1 employs the word, “the Lord.” It can be argued that “the Lord” refers to a third person. Some scholars of the “One Divine Being View” consider the messenger as a heavenly angel similar to one of the angels mentioned in the Book of Zechariah.²³

¹⁹ In fact, there seems to be no one who maintains the single pre-incarnate Christ view.

²⁰ Juncker, “Jesus and the Angel of the Lord,” 169.

²¹ Stephen L. White, “Angel of the Lord: Messenger of Euphemism?” *Tyndale Bulletin* 50, no. 2 (1999) 299-305.

²² Juncker, “Jesus and the Angel of the Lord,” 186-89.

²³ *Ibid.*, 169.

The “Single-Human Being View” holds that the three appellations in Mal. 3:1 refer to the human messenger, Elijah, who prepares the way for the divine speaker.²⁴ The parallelism between “the Lord whom you seek” and “the messenger of the covenant whom you desire” can be evidence that the two figures indicate one and the same person. One person’s coming in Mal. 3:2 and the following verses may support the “One-Character Approach,” but the problem is that the task of the coming one in Mal. 3:1 and in the next verses can be accomplished by only a divine being. This view may be rejected as impossible, because *Ha Adon* in Mal. 3:1 must refer to a divine character. According to France, *Adon* does not always indicate YHWH in the Old Testament,²⁵ but how can the phrase, “His temple” (that is, *Ha Adon*’s temple) be understood? Who can be the owner of the temple except YHWH? The only owner of the temple is YHWH. The “One Figure Being View” may be diagrammatized as follows:

Table 1: One Figure View

1) One Divine Being View (YHWH View)

My messenger	<i>Ha Adon</i>	The messenger of the covenant
YHWH	YHWH	YHWH

2) One Heavenly Angelic Being View

My messenger	<i>Ha Adon</i>	The messenger of the covenant
--------------	----------------	-------------------------------

²⁴ David L. Petersen, *Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi*, Old Testament Library, ed. James L. Mays, Carol A. Newsom, and David L. Petersen (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995) 211. Petersen argues that *ha Adon* and the messenger of the covenant are not two different characters but one individual (211, no. 88). Though he does not deny the possibility that the messenger of the covenant is a divine being, he prefers the view of the covenant messenger’s being a human prophet endowed with powerful abilities like Elijah. R. T. France, *Jesus and Old Testament* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1971) 91-92.

²⁵ R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1971) 91, n. 31.

A heavenly angel	A heavenly angel	A heavenly angel
------------------	------------------	------------------

3) One Human Being View²⁶

My messenger	<i>Ha Adon</i>	The messenger of the covenant
Elijah	Elijah	Elijah

2. 1. 1. 2. Two Figures View

The Two Figures view argues that Mal. 3:1 mentions only two characters.²⁷ Among the Two Figures approaches, “my messenger” has been interpreted as follows: “My messenger” could be the prophet Malachi, Ezra the priest, Israel’s guardian angel, the angel of the Lord, a future prophet or a Levitical priest.²⁸ This view also has several interpretations based on the identity of *Ha Adon* and the messenger of the covenant. Some proponents of this view hold that YHWH’s forerunner is the messenger of the covenant. Others regard that *Ha Adon* is the messenger of the covenant. *Ha Adon* is viewed as an angel or YHWH or pre-Incarnate Christ.

The messenger of the covenant also has been interpreted from the single character view. As mentioned previously, this approach holds that only two figures are in Mal. 3:1. Among these interpretations, two approaches are more traditional: one approach argues

²⁶ Petersen, France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 91-92, n.31)-Dumbrell thinks that the human prophet may be Ezra, “Malachi and the Ezra-Nehemiah Reforms,” *RTR* 35 (1976) 48-49, 52, and O’Brien, *Priest and Levite*, 73-75, a human prophet.

²⁷ Andrew S. Malone, “Is the Messiah Announced in Malachi 3:1?” *Tyndale Bulletin* 57, no. 2 (2006) 215-228.

²⁸ Rex Mason, *The Books of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977) 152-53.

that the two figures in Mal. 3:1 are YHWH and the messenger of the covenant.²⁹ This approach usually claims that YHWH's forerunner in Mal. 3:1a is the same individual as the messenger of the covenant and also denies the messianic prophetic tone in Mal. 3:1.³⁰ In fact, it may be hasty to assert without the interpretative aid of the New Testament that the immediate literary context of Mal. 3:1 prophesies the coming of the Messiah, "Since an explicit reference to Messiah or to the angel of the Lord is missing elsewhere in the Book."³¹ Malachi does not directly refer to Messiah. The second approach argues that *Ha Adon* and the messenger of the covenant are one and the same as YHWH himself.³² According to Kaiser, Jr., whose view may be called Christological interpretation, *Ha Adon* as God is the same as the messenger of the covenant, and *Ha Adon* refers to the coming Messiah. In other words, the messenger of the covenant is "God's own self-revelation, the pre-incarnate Christ of the numerous OT Christophanies."³³ The Two Figures View may be summarized in the following form:

²⁹ Juncker attempts to prove how the angel of the Lord in the Old Testament is YHWH Himself, by especially examining 'the angel of the Lord' passages in Exodus. His conclusion results in the identification of the messenger of the covenant with YHWH Himself too (*Jesus and the Angel of the Lord*, 177-185). But Andrew S. Malone writes that the identification of the messenger of the covenant in Mal. 3:1 with the angel of YHWH in Exodus 23 is an arbitrary and dogmatic identification of careless and confused exegesis (*Is the Messiah Announced in Malachi 3:1?* 225-27).

³⁰ While Eugene Merrill tries to attest that YHWH's messenger in Mal. 3:1a is the messenger of the covenant, he admits that *Ha Adon* is none other than the coming Messiah (Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 429-435). Merrill belongs to class 6 in the table below.

³¹ Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, ed. Moisés Silva, vol. 3A (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1996) 674.

³² Beth Glazier-McDonald, "Mal'ak Habberit : The Messenger of the Covenant in Mal 3:1," *Hebrew Annual Review* 11 (1987) 98. She hints that there are some messianic echoes in Malachi (e.g., Mal 1:11) and that the figures in Mal. 3:1-5 are messianic characters. 102.

³³ Walter C. Kaiser, "The Promise of the Arrival of Elijah in Malachi and the Gospels," *Grace Theological Journal* 3, no. 2 (1982) 225.

Table 2: Two Figures View³⁴

Class	My messenger	Ha Adon (the Lord)	The messenger of the covenant	Proponents
1	The prophet Malachi	YHWH	The prophet Malachi	V. Orelli
2	Ezra the priest	YHWH	Ezra the priest	V. Blumerincq
3	Israel's guardian angel	YHWH	Israel's guardian angel	J. Lindblom
4	The angel of the Lord	YHWH	The angel of the Lord	A.E. Hill
5	A future prophet (Elijah)	Pre-Incarnate Christ	Pre-Incarnate Christ	W. Kaiser, Jr.
6	A future prophet (Elijah)	Pre-Incarnate Christ	A future prophet (Elijah)	E. Merrill
7	A future prophet (Elijah)	YHWH	A future prophet (Elijah)	C. A. Gieschen
8	A future prophet (Elijah)	YHWH	YHWH	B. Glazier-McDonald
9	A Levitical priest	YHWH	A Levitical priest	R. Mason

2.1.1.3. Three Figures View

The Three Figures View believes that three distinct characters exist in Mal. 3:1. According to this view, the three characters are as follows: (1) a prophet, YHWH and Ezra the priest;³⁵ (2) a prophet, YHWH and a priestly messiah.³⁶ B. V. Malchow seems to think that only two figures (YHWH and a priestly messiah) are in view in Mal. 3:1; Clark David George concludes that Elijah is “Phinehas, the great eschatological high

³⁴ Class 1: Von Orelli (Pieter A. Verhoef, *the Books of Haggai and Malachi*, 287); Class 2: Von Blumerincq (Juncker, 178); Class 3: J. Lindblom (Juncker, 178); Class 4: Andrew E. Hill, *Malachi* (Anchor Bible, 288-289). H. Juncker (Juncker, 178); Class 5: W. Kaiser, Jr. (*the Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, 79-81); Class 6: Eugene Merrill (*Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 429-35); Class 7: Gieschen; Class 8: Glazier-McDonald (*Malachi: The Divine Messenger*, 128-142); Class 9: R. Mason (*Malachi*, 152-53).

³⁵ Juncker, “Jesus and the Angel of the Lord,” 175.

³⁶ Malchow, “The Messenger of the Covenant in Mal 3:1,” 252-55.

priest who . . . was coming to pass in their time, will return to gather all Israel into geographical and social unity and so at last bring to fruition Yahweh’s promise of eternal salvation,”³⁷ but he identifies Elijah as the messenger of the covenant;³⁸ (3) Elijah, YHWH and the Messiah;³⁹ (4) a prophet, YHWH and the guardian angel; (5) a heavenly angel, YHWH and the guardian angel;⁴⁰ and (6) a heavenly angel (the angel of death), YHWH and another heavenly angel (the angel of the Lord).⁴¹ This view is a non-traditional and unsatisfactory interpretation.⁴² The Three Figures View may be illustrated by the following diagram:

Table 3: Three Figures View

My messenger	The Lord (<i>Ha Adon</i>)	The messenger of the covenant
A prophet	YHWH	Ezra the priest
A prophet	YHWH	A priestly messiah
Elijah	YHWH	The Messiah
A prophet	YHWH	The guardian angel of Israel
A heavenly angel	YHWH	The guardian angel of Israel
A heavenly angel	YHWH	Another heavenly angel

³⁷ Clark David George, “Elijah as Eschatological High Priest: An Examination of the Elijah Tradition in Mal. 3:23-24” (Ph. D, University of Notre Dame, 1975) 240.

³⁸ Ibid., 67, 238.

³⁹ Juncker, “Jesus and the Angel of the Lord,” 175.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 176.

⁴¹ Andrew Hill, *Malachi*, Anchor Bible, ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1998) 287.

⁴² Juncker, “Jesus and the Angel of the Lord,” 176-77.

2.1.2. Scholarship on the Identity (or Identities) of Malachi's Eschatological Figures in Luke

Scholars partially have dealt with the link of the Lord's messengers in Mal. 3:1 and/or Elijah in Mal. 4:5-6 with John the Baptist in Luke. Malachi 3 and 4 identify Jesus and John the Baptist. A question arises as to whether Malachi's Elijah is understood by Luke to be Jesus or John the Baptist. The identity and task of "my messenger" in Mal. 3:1 and of Elijah in Mal. 4:5-6 has been the major issue of both Malachi and Luke. There have been several approaches regarding Luke's understanding of Malachi's Elijah.⁴³

2.1.2.1. No Elijah-John View

This view argues that John the Baptist is not Elijah II.⁴⁴ This approach "denies that Luke in any way identifies Elijah with John the Baptist."⁴⁵

2.1.2.1.1. *Hans Conzelmann (The Theology of St. Luke. New York: Harper and Row, 1961):*

Conzelmann strongly emphasizes that Luke presents the role of John the Baptist within geographical motifs. He asserts that Luke deliberately associates John with the region of the Jordan. He understands that Luke divides the history of redemption into three stages:

- (1) The period of Israel (Luke 16:16).
- (2) The period of Jesus' ministry (not of his 'life').

⁴³ Robert J. Miller, "Elijah, John and Jesus in the Gospel of Luke," *New Testament Studies* 34, no. 4 (1988). The classification is indebted to his article.

⁴⁴ Elijah I and Elijah II will be used to avoid confusion. Elijah I represents Elijah in the Books of Kings, while Elijah II indicates Malachi's Elijah.

⁴⁵ Miller, "Elijah, John and Jesus in the Gospel of Luke," 611. P. Dabeck, "Siehe, es erschienen Moses und Elias," *Biblica*, no. 23 (1942) 175-89.

(3) The period since the Ascension and before the Parousia.

First of all, he regards Luke 16:16 as a key verse in the course of salvation history.⁴⁶ Conzelmann seems to contend that Luke excludes John the Baptist from the second period of the salvation history according to Luke 16:16. Wink, however, thinks that the literal sense of Luke 16:16 may contradict Conzelmann's interpretation because the phrase, "until John" may include John. The phrase, "until John" may indicate the expression, "until the time of John's manifestation to Israel" in Luke 1:80; 3:1-2. John's public manifestation to Israel implies his public ministry, which is his preaching of the good news of the kingdom of God.⁴⁷ According to Wink, "It would appear that, rather than excluding John, Luke 16:16 dates the beginning of the epoch of salvation from the time of his manifestation."⁴⁸

William C. Robinson, Jr., criticizes Conzelmann's analysis of Jesus' ministry.⁴⁹ Conzelmann argues that Luke rejects existing interpretations regarding the role of John the Baptist, but that he transforms the pre-Lukan tradition in a different way. Conzelmann states, "Nowhere in his (Luke) writing is a figure from the past brought into direct connection with the future eschatological events."⁵⁰ Luke, he thinks, removes associations of the Baptist with Elijah. In short, John is not Elijah II mentioned in Malachi. Conzelmann asserts that Mark's presentation of John the Baptist at the opening

⁴⁶ Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1960) 16.

⁴⁷ Walter Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*, vol. 7, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, ed. Matthew Black (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968) 51.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 51.

⁴⁹ William Childs Jr. Robinson, "The Way of the Lord: A Study of History and Eschatology in the Gospel of Luke" (Ph. D, University of Basel, 1960) 1-42.

⁵⁰ Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, 22.

of his Gospel (Mark 1:1-5) was made by the influence of the apocalyptic expectation of Elijah.⁵¹ Conzelmann affirms, “There is no ‘forerunner’ in the special sense either before the coming of Jesus or before the future Parousia.”⁵² His approach to the significance of John the Baptist in Luke is based on his own interpretation of Luke 16:16 in which he seems to ignore significant verses, which reveal John’s role in the narrative of his birth in Luke. He underestimates Luke’s quotation of Mal. 3:1 in Luke 7:27 by inferring that Luke 7:27 rejects the traditional view about John the Baptist.⁵³ It seems that Conzelmann is not interested in Malachi’s eschatological messengers’ motif.

2.1.2.1.2. *Walter Wink (John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition. SNTSMS 7, Cambridge: University, 1968)*

In his book, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*, Wink discloses his understanding of how Luke views John the Baptist. He evaluates Conzelmann’s treatment of John the Baptist as well by affirming that Luke contains nothing of John’s role as Elijah II. Wink believes that Luke does not use Elijah typology. He argues that “neither John nor Jesus *fulfills* anything as ‘new Elijahs,’” but that “Luke uses Elijah purely as a basis for comparison.”⁵⁴ Elijah I is the prophet *par excellence* of the Old Testament, and Jesus is compared to him.⁵⁵ In Luke 4:24-27, Jesus is presented as being similar to Elijah I. Furthermore, Wink accepts P. Dabek’s analysis parallels between Jesus and Elijah I, but he denies Elijah-Jesus typology, and he argues that Luke uses the Elijah I-Elisha

⁵¹ Ibid., 22.

⁵² Ibid., 167, no. 1.

⁵³ Ibid., 167, no. 1.

⁵⁴ Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*, 42.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 43.

narratives to illustrate Jesus' teaching.⁵⁶ Luke portrays Jesus as a greater prophet than Elijah. Whether or not Elijah-typology is used in Luke depends on the definition of "typology." Wink does not deny that Luke 1:17 refers to Mal. 4:5-6, but he claims that this verse does not identify John with Elijah II. According to him, Luke considers John to be a prophet *like* Elijah I.⁵⁷ Luke refuses to identify John with Malachi's Elijah who will restore all things, because John cannot restore all things, and at the end of history, Jesus will restore all things.⁵⁸ In conclusion, Wink somewhat agrees with Conzelmann on his understanding of Luke 7:27. Though he accepts the position that Luke willingly quotes the passage in Mal. 3:1, he asserts that even Luke 7:27 must be understood in the light of Luke 1:17.⁵⁹ According to him, Luke has developed "*an Elijah-midrash* based on the account of Elijah in the Books of Kings."⁶⁰ Wink believes that Luke rejects the eschatological Elijah motif, because in Luke, "when John the Baptist and Jesus came, all things were *not* 'restored', the Kingdom did *not* come, the fathers were *not* turned to the sons."⁶¹ On the contrary, Luke includes Malachi's eschatological Elijah motif. When Jesus and John the Baptist came, the Kingdom of God already began. Luke does not reject the "already-aspect" of God's Kingdom. Wink acknowledges that Luke describes John the Baptist as "the forerunner of the messiah, the preparer of the way, the messenger

⁵⁶ Ibid., 44.

⁵⁷ In fact, whether the forerunner is Elijah I or Elijah II, it does not matter to his argument.

⁵⁸ Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*, 43, 57.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 43.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid., 45.

before the Lord, the preacher of judgment and repentance.”⁶² Even though all things were not restored, Israel’s restoration already had begun with the ministries of John and Jesus; therefore, this view ignores the literal sense of Luke 7:27.

2.1.2.1.3. *Fredrick W. Danker (Luke. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987)*

The following words expose how Danker interprets Luke’s perspective about the role of John the Baptist: “The traditional association of John with Elijah is maintained (1:17) but in such a way that John is *not* made a forerunner of Jesus but of ‘the Lord their God.’ He is to go before ‘Him’—this demonstrative points to the preceding reference to God, and he is to do this in the ‘spirit and power of Elijah.’”⁶³ Similar to Conzelmann and Wink, Danker also holds the view that Luke deletes Mark’s association of John the Baptist with Malachi’s Elijah.⁶⁴ Danker argues that Luke dissociates John the Baptist from Malachi’s apocalyptic Elijah-typology, but he asserts that Luke associates Jesus with Elijah I.⁶⁵ Danker, unlike Wink, contends that Jesus-Elijah I typology is found frequently in Luke. He also seems to think that Luke links Elijah II with Jesus, because Jesus restores all things (Acts 3:21).⁶⁶ Unfortunately, this view fails to explain the sense of Luke 7:27 in which Luke associates John the Baptist with Malachi’s eschatological Elijah.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 57.

⁶³ Frederick W. Danker, *Luke*, 2nd ed., Proclamation Commentaries, ed. Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987; reprint, 1989) 69.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 70.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 70-71.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 71.

2.1.2.2. *Jesus as the new Elijah View*

This theory is a similar position to the “No-Elijah-John-View.” It “maintains that Luke intends to use the Elijah tradition to refer only Jesus, despite the indications that it also refers to John.”⁶⁷

2.1.2.2.1. *Adrian Hastings (Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem. Baltimore: Helicon, 1958)*

Hastings holds that Luke depicts Jesus as the new Elijah⁶⁸ and that he almost eliminates explicit references to John the Baptist as the new Elijah.⁶⁹ Hastings also believes that the Elijah narrative in Kings is a text of the Old Testament foundations of the Gospel of Luke⁷⁰ and that Luke employs Elijah’s miraculous departure from earth as a type of Jesus’ Ascension.⁷¹ According to Hastings, in the Gospel of Luke, some more parallels exist between Jesus and Elijah. Though Hastings’ presentation of the parallels between Jesus and Elijah in the Gospel of Luke seems to be plausible, no objective and valid evidence proves that Luke employs Elijah’s narrative or that Luke deliberately seeks to establish parallels between Jesus and Elijah except in Luke 4:24-26.

⁶⁷ Miller, “Elijah, John and Jesus in the Gospel of Luke,” 611.

⁶⁸ Adrian Hastings, *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem: A Study of the Teaching of Saint Luke* (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1958) 70.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 75.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 71.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 75.

2.1.2.2.2. *Jean-Daniel Dubois* [“*La figure d’Elie dans la perspective lucanienne.*” *RHPR*, no. 53 (1973): 155-76]

Unlike Wink, who argues for the Elijah-Jesus view, A. D. A. Moses uses the terminology, Jesus-Elijah typology.⁷² He contends that Luke particularly employs Jesus-Elijah typology and that Elijah-type functions are attributed to Jesus in Luke 3:16-17; 4:1-2, 25-27; 7:11-16. Similar to Daback and Wink, who present and emphasize Elijah-Jesus passages in Luke, however, he thinks that some other Jesus-Elijah motifs are found in Luke 9:8, 30, 51, 54-55, 61-62 and probably also in 10:1-12; 12:49-53.⁷³ J. D. Dubois asserts that from Luke’s perspective Jesus is the new Elijah. He concludes that even though Luke seems to associate Elijah both with John the Baptist and Jesus as follows: “*La conclusion qui s’impose au terme de cette enquête, c’est que le nouvel Elie, pour Luc, est Jésus, duquel Jean-Baptiste reçoit toute sa force*” (the conclusion at the end of this investigation, the new Elijah, for Luke, is Jesus, from whom John the Baptist receives all his power).⁷⁴ Elijah as a type of Jesus is more accurate than the assertion that Jesus is the new Elijah.

⁷² A. D. A. Moses, *Matthew's Transfiguration Story and Jewish-Christian Controversy*, vol. 122, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) 248.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 248.

⁷⁴ Jean-Daniel Dubois, “*La Figure D’elie Dans La Perspective Lucanienne (the Face of Elijah in the Perspective of Luke)*,” *Revue d’Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses (Review of History and of Religious Philosophies)*, no. 53 (1973) 155.

2.1.2.3. *Different Traditions (Elijah –Jesus/Elijah-John) View*

This “approach recognizes that both John and Jesus are compared to Elijah and judges this to be the result of Luke’s combination of traditions which remain in tension with one another.”⁷⁵

2.1.2.3.1. *Raymond E. Brown (The Birth of the Messiah. Garden City: Doubleday, 1977)*

Brown rejects Conzelmann’s analysis that Lukan John is not a precursor of Jesus. While Conzelmann disregards the infancy narrative in Luke 1-2, Brown emphasizes the relation of Luke 1-2 to the rest of Luke’s Gospel.⁷⁶ In his account of Jesus’ ministry, Luke dominantly identifies Jesus as the Elijah II-like “eschatological prophet of the last times (7:16), but in the infancy narrative, he associates John with Elijah II.”⁷⁷ Both Mal. 4:5 [English] and Sirach 48:10 expose that Elijah’s mission is a task of reconciliation before “the great and terrible day of the Lord.” Thus, it seems that Luke 1:17a, b (“go before Him in the spirit and power of Elijah”) is “simply following an established exegesis in introducing the Elijah motif as part of the association between Mal. 3:1 and John the Baptist.”⁷⁸ Luke mentions that John will be “a great man *before the Lord*” (Luke 1:16). In other words, John will be great by turning many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God. Luke 1:17c, d (c-“to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children,” d-“and the disobedient unto the wisdom of the just”) specifies how the turning will happen through John’s ministry: “make ready a people prepared for the Lord” (1:17). Furthermore, Luke

⁷⁵ Miller, “Elijah, John and Jesus in the Gospel of Luke,” 611.

⁷⁶ Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke* (New York: Doubleday, 1979) 242.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 276.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 277.

1:17c, d is reminiscent of Malachi's messenger motif, and Luke 1:17e is another example of following a settled exegesis. It associates Mal. 3:1 with Isaiah 40:3. According to Brown, Luke agrees with Mark on the composite quotation from Isaiah and Malachi.⁷⁹ Luke 1:76 is a reference to Mal. 3:1⁸⁰ and the "sun rising with healing" in Mal. 4:2 underlies "the rising sun" in Luke 1:78.⁸¹ In summary, Luke associates John the Baptist with Malachi's Elijah in John's birth narrative, but in Luke 4:25-26 and 9:54, Luke gives Jesus, not John the Baptist, the role of Elijah I. In 7:27, however, "Luke applies Mal. 3:1 to John the Baptist."⁸² According to Brown, Luke compares both Jesus and John to Elijah by combining different traditions.

2.1.2.3.2. *Joseph A. Fitzmyer (The Gospel according to Luke I-IX. Garden City: Doubleday, 1981)*

Fitzmyer accepts Luke's double Elijah theme (Luke, I-IX, 213). He presupposes that the appellation "ὁ ἐρχόμενος" (the Coming One) is what John the Baptist questions Jesus about while in prison (Matt. 11:3). John in prison asks Jesus through his envoys, "Are you the Coming One (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) or should we expect someone else?" (Matt. 11:3). The title for Elijah *redivivus* is derived from Mal. 3:1-4:6 (English),⁸³ though "the Coming One" has been interpreted differently. Fitzmyer rejects the messianic

⁷⁹ Ibid., 277-78. The writer holds that Mark 1:2-3 blends Exodus 23:20 (LXX), Malachi 3:1 (Heb), and Isaiah 40:3 (LXX). In Luke 1:76-78 Luke also refers to Malachi's Elijah motif.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 390.

⁸¹ Ibid., 391.

⁸² Ibid., 276.

⁸³ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-Ix: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible, ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman, vol. 28 (New York: Doubleday, 1970) 213.

interpretation of ὁ ἐρχόμενος.⁸⁴ According to Matthew 11:14, Jesus says to His disciples: “If you are prepared to accept it, he is himself Elijah, the one who is to come.” “The one who is to come” (ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι) in Matthew 11: 14 could be identified with ὁ ἐρχόμενος (the Coming One) in Matt. 11:3.⁸⁵ But two different figures seemed to be expected if the belief of the Messiah’s advent and of the coming of eschatological Elijah was widely accepted by the Jews in Jesus’ day. Thus, the expression, ὁ ἐρχόμενος (the Coming One), which John the Baptist mentions, may be a messianic title because of the following. First, John the Baptist would have expected the Messiah, not Elijah *redivivus*. John the Baptist was probably aware of his identity and mission even at his early life. Luke describes John the Baptist as the forerunner of the Lord in the birth narrative. Therefore, it is hardly likely that Luke portrays John the Baptist as a forerunner of the Lord’s forerunner Malachi’s Elijah.⁸⁶ Second, Jesus introduces Himself to John’s emissaries as the one who carries out messianic activity. In other words, Jesus implicitly identifies Himself as the Messiah whose messianic ministry is foretold in the Old Testament. Pay attention to Jesus’ answer to John’s messengers: “Go back and report to John what you have seen and heard: ‘The blind receive sight, the lame walk, those who have leprosy are cured, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the good news is preached to the poor.’” Even though it is generally argued that the list “alludes to Isa. 61:1 in Luke 4:18” and implies Messiah’s eschatological activity,⁸⁷ Fitzmyer denies that the list in

⁸⁴ Ibid., 667.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 667.

⁸⁶ J. A. Robinson, “Elijah, John and Jesus: An Essay in Detection,” *New Testament Studies* 4 (October 1917) 268.

⁸⁷ Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50*, 668.

Jesus' answer is messianic.⁸⁸ Nevertheless, unlike Conzelmann and Wink, Fitzmyer admits that in Luke 7:27, "Jesus explicitly identifies John as his precursor and implicitly as *Elias redivivus*."⁸⁹ Fitzmyer claims that John probably regards Jesus as *Elias redivivus* according to the gospel tradition but that Jesus identifies John as *Elias redivivus* by reversing John's perspective. Fitzmyer argues that the explicit identification of John as *Elias redivivus* comes from Matthean redaction.⁹⁰

2.1.2.4. Elijah-John View

2.1.2.4.1. Markus Öhler [“*The Expectation of Elijah and the presence of the kingdom of God.*” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118, no. 3 (1999): 461-76]

As the title of his article suggests, Öhler argues that John the Baptist plays the role of the eschatological Elijah as precursor of God's kingdom promised in Mal. 4:5-6. Elijah is an eschatological forerunner of God's final day as Malachi had predicted. John the Baptist is the eschatological Elijah. Jesus identifies John the Baptist as the eschatological Elijah. Öhler follows the traditional Christian view that John the Baptist is regarded as the Elijah promised in Malachi, but he mentions that Luke does not associate Jesus with Elijah and that John the Baptist has accomplished his role as the returned Elijah.⁹¹

⁸⁸ Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 667.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 672.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 320, 673.

⁹¹ Markus Öhler, “The Expectation of Elijah and the Presence of the Kingdom of God,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118, no. 3 (1999) 467.

According to him, “Luke creates analogies between Jesus and Elijah, but he denies that Jesus is the eschatological Elijah.”⁹² The following is Öhler’s argument:

Concerning the identification of John with the eschatological Elijah, there is one important point to note. In v. 16 the angel speaks only of God (“He [i.e., John] will bring back many of the people of Israel to the Lord their God”), and v. 17 continues with καὶ αὐτὸς προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἡλίου. Αὐτοῦ refers to God in v. 16, so John’s function is to prepare the way not of the messiah but of God himself. This is in agreement with the promise of Mal 3:23 and declares that John accomplishes the only eschatological function.⁹³

Dealing with Luke 3:7-9, 16-17, Öhler suggests some parallels between the Book of Malachi and John’s preaching. He points out the theme of “calling for repentance,” which is prominent in both Malachi and John’s preaching. Both Malachi and John announce a future judgment of God on the sons of Israel, through which the just will be separated from the unjust (Mal. 3:18). Öhler thinks that John could be influenced by Malachi’s prophetic announcement in Mal. 3:19: “Behold, the day is coming, burning like a furnace; and all the arrogant and every evildoer will be chaff; and the day that is coming will set them ablaze,’ says the Lord of hosts, ‘so that it will leave them neither root nor branch.” John announces God’s judgment in a similar way and uses corresponding terminology in Luke 3:17 (see Matt. 3:12): “His winnowing fork is in His hand, and He will thoroughly clear His threshing floor; and He will gather His wheat into the barn, but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.” Only Malachi in the Old Testament employs the phrase, “winnowing and burning the chaff,” to express God’s judgment on Israel. Thus, Malachi 3 and 4 can be read from the perspective of John the Baptist.⁹⁴

⁹² Ibid., 468.

⁹³ Ibid., 469.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 471-72.

Öhler links John's preaching against Herod's marriage with Malachi 2:15.⁹⁵ According to Öhler, Luke 16:16a ("the law and the prophets were until John") shows that "John plays the role of the immediate forerunner of the kingdom of God."⁹⁶ Elijah is expected to come as the forerunner before the great and dreadful Day of the Lord. John the Baptist regards himself as the eschatological Elijah. Jesus accepts the view that John is the eschatological forerunner of God's kingdom (Luke 7:26-27). The association of John the Baptist with Elijah is evidence that the early Christians gave profound significance to the Elijah traditions.⁹⁷

2.1.2.4.2. *David M. Miller* ["*The Messenger, the Lord, and the Coming Judgment in the Reception History of Malachi 3.*" *New Testament Studies* 53, no. 1 (2007): 1-16]

Some scholars argue that Luke inconsistently portrays both John the Baptist and Jesus as Elijah-like figures. David Miller attempts to prove Luke's consistency of describing Jesus and John. According to Miller, Luke associates Jesus with Elijah I and identifies John with Elijah II--Malachi's eschatological Elijah. He affirms that "the Lord" is the same person as "the messenger of the covenant" and that "the Lord" is the messianic Lord. His brief analysis of Mal. 3 is appealing and persuasive. Miller continues to explain how the Second Temple literature, such as *Ben Sira 48*, *4Q521* and *the Septuagint*, understands Mal. 3. His view regarding Luke's understanding of Malachi's eschatological figures is well founded in the following statement:

While Luke was willing to associate Jesus with Elijah of 1-2 Kings, he consistently links the task of Malachi's Elijah to John the Baptist and not to Jesus. On the other hand, Luke's identification of Jesus with the coming 'Lord' of Mal 3

⁹⁵ Ibid., 472.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 474.

⁹⁷ Craig A. Evans, "Luke's Use of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives and the Ethic of Election," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106, no. 1 (1987) 78, no. 16.

demonstrates that, for Luke, Jesus was both prophet and messianic Lord during his earthly existence.⁹⁸

2.1.2.5. *Two Prophetic Figures Comparison View*

2.1.2.5.1. *Eric Franklin (Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975)*

According to Franklin, Luke records that both John and Jesus are compared to the great prophets, Elijah, Elisha and Moses in the Old Testament. Franklin admits the view that “John is *linked* (italics mine) with the eschatological return of Elijah (1:17),”⁹⁹ but he does not argue that Luke identifies John with Elijah II. Franklin states, “Luke himself identifies John as the forerunner and Jesus as the Christ, but his work allows an Elijah Christology of Jesus to be recovered He is thinking primarily of the prophetic character of both rather than of a second, eschatological Elijah.”¹⁰⁰ Luke actually does not describe John the Baptist as Elijah II, because he “does not think primarily in terms of a new Elijah, the significance of whom is centered in an apocalyptic function.” Franklin thinks that Luke also describes Jesus in terms of Elijah.¹⁰¹ He discerns that John and Jesus are portrayed as prophets in the Gospel of Luke but ignores the close relationship between them, which was prophesied in the Old Testament already.

In short, this approach concludes that the reason Luke links both John and Jesus with Elijah is because he wants to portray Jesus and John as great prophets such as the

⁹⁸ Miller, “The Messenger, the Lord, and the Coming Judgment in the Reception History of Malachi 3,” 16.

⁹⁹ Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975) 83.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 200, n. 41.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 86.

great prophet Elijah in the Old Testament. This view focuses on the prophetic character of both figures rather than a second, eschatological Elijah.¹⁰² Furthermore, Franklin seems to argue that Luke employs both Elijah-Jesus typology and Elijah-John typology.

2.1.2.6. Various Usage of Elijah Imagery View

2.1.2.6.1. Robert Miller [“Elijah, John and Jesus in the Gospel of Luke.” *New Testament Studies* 34, no. 4 (1988): 611-22]

Luke’s allusions or references to Elijah seem to be enigmatic: “On the one hand, Luke refers and alludes to Elijah in ways that suggest similarities between him and Jesus. On the other, Luke sometimes compares this venerable prophet to John the Baptist.”¹⁰³ In this quotation, Miller raises a question: “How are we to understand this apparent ambivalence?”¹⁰⁴ Then, Miller introduces and summarizes several solutions to this problem. After Miller presents his approach briefly, he sets out Lukan passages, which connect Elijah with John the Baptist and then the ones, which connect him with Jesus. He rules out a part of Wink’s ‘Elijah-midrash’ parallels, however, because he thinks that neither of them “has even a slight verbal correspondence.”¹⁰⁵ The apparent discrepancy that Miller brings up may be solved by the suggestion of J. S. Croatto, who distinguishes between Elijah I and Elijah II in Luke.¹⁰⁶ In other words, Elijah, an Old Testament prophet in 1 Kings 17-2 Kings 2 is employed as a type of Jesus, the greatest prophet in

¹⁰² Miller, “Elijah, John and Jesus in the Gospel of Luke,” 611.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 614.

¹⁰⁶ J. Serverino Croatto, “Jesus, Prophet Like Elijah and Prophet-Teacher Like Moses in Luke-Acts,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124, no. 3 (2005) 454.

Luke. John the Baptist also represents Elijah II as the forerunner of the Lord's eschatological visit to His temple, who is promised to come in Mal. 3:1 and 4:5-6. Miller distinguishes Elijah from the eschatological Elijah. He argues that Luke uses Elijah allusions and believes that Luke deploys Elijah imagery either to compare Elijah to Jesus, to John the Baptist, or to contrast him with them¹⁰⁷:

There are three ways in which Luke uses Elijah for comparison. He can deploy a reference or allusion to Elijah: 1) to identify John or Jesus with him, 2) to attribute his role to one of them, or 3) not so much to compare Jesus specifically with Elijah, but more to embellish the general characterization of Jesus as a prophet by pointing to other figures along with Elijah (e.g., to Elijah and Elisha or Elijah and Moses). There are also two ways in which Luke uses Elijah for contrast. Luke can bring up an Elijah association, but then: 1) qualify it in some way, or 2) criticize it outright.¹⁰⁸

According to Robert Miller, Luke sees that Jesus is not Elijah, but he is *like* Elijah. Miller thinks that Luke regards John the Baptist as a forerunner of Jesus, not as Malachi's eschatological forerunner of God. According to Miller, John is "not Elijah the apocalyptic harbinger."¹⁰⁹ John is Elijah in the sense that he is "the forerunner of the time of salvation."¹¹⁰ In Miller's view, Luke regards John as the messenger foretold in Mal. 3:1, and yet, he denies that John plays Elijah's role in Mal. 4:5, which is the role of the one who "comes before the great and terrible day of the Lord."¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷ Miller, "Elijah, John and Jesus in the Gospel of Luke," 614.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 615.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 621.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 621, n. 2.

2.1.2.6.2. *A M Okorie* [“*Jesus and the eschatological Elijah.*” *Scriptura*, no. 73 (2000): 189-92]

Okorie argues that “Luke has a double Elijah theme.”¹¹² He thinks that Luke associates Jesus with Elijah by what John the Baptist says in 3:16 and 7:19, and in 7:27, and Jesus identifies John the Baptist as Elijah as well.¹¹³ Okorie admits that in 7:27 Luke identifies John as Jesus’ forerunner. However, he believes that since Luke does not refer to Elijah as a messianic forerunner, this verse cannot be understood as evidence to prove that John is identified as a messianic precursor. According to Okorie, Jesus implicitly identifies John as Elijah in the verse, although John is not a messianic precursor.¹¹⁴ Jesus compares Himself to Elijah in 4:25-27, but in Luke 9:54-55, Jesus does not parallel with Elijah, because He does not allow His disciples to call down fire from heaven (cf. 1Kgs, 18:36-38; 2Kgs 1:9-14).¹¹⁵ In short, Okorie concludes that Luke seems to present “both John and Jesus as types of Elijah.”¹¹⁶

2.1.2.7. *Elijah-John as Prophecy-Fulfillment View*

2.1.2.7.1. *Brigid Curtin Frein* [“*Narrative Prediction, Old Testament Prophecies and Luke’s Sense of Fulfillment.*” *New Testament Studies*, vol. 40 (1994): 22-37]

In fact, according to some, Malachi’s eschatological figures’ arrival motif can be examined in the perspective of prophecy-fulfillment. Some, who argue for the Elijah-John view, may agree that Malachi’s prophecy about Elijah is fulfilled partially or fully

¹¹² A. M. Okorie, “Jesus and the Eschatological Elijah,” *Scriptura* 73 (2000) 191.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 191.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 191-92.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 192.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

in John and his ministry. It has been widely accepted by biblical scholars that Luke's use of Malachi's eschatological figures' motif comes from the Jewish tradition or Jesus' mouth or/and the gospel traditions. Most of those who hold the "traditions" view seem to deny that Malachi's Elijah motif is used prophetically in Luke.¹¹⁷ Frein argues that Luke emphasizes the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy in his writings; he also views Malachi's eschatological Elijah motif in the same way. Frein insists that the predictions of John the Baptist in Luke 1:16-17, 76-79 were foretold already in the Old Testament and would soon be fulfilled in John's life. That is, the birth of John the Baptist is a fulfillment of Malachi's prophecies concerning Elijah's return; furthermore, the prophecy of Elijah's eschatological ministry is fulfilled in John's call for repentance, which causes Israel's spiritual restoration by family reconciliation. Frein understands Luke 1:68-79 in light of the fulfillment of Malachi's prophecies regarding Elijah's return and the idea that John's activities are the fulfillment of Malachi's predictions. In short, Frein stresses that Luke portrays John's ministry as fulfillment of Malachi's prophecies. However, Frein does not specify whether or not Luke's use of Malachi's Elijah theme is a partial fulfillment, a double fulfillment, a generic fulfillment or a complete fulfillment. Regardless, John the Baptist is Malachi's Elijah, and Jesus reflects Elijah and Elisha even though they are not one and the same.

¹¹⁷ Brigid Curtin Frein, "Narrative Predictions, Old Testament Prophecies and Luke's Sense of Fulfillment," *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994) 22-37.

2.1.2.8. *Elijah and Elisha as Models of John the Baptist and Jesus*

2.1.2.8.1. *Thomas L. Brodie (Proto-Luke the Oldest Gospel: A Christ-Centered Synthesis of Old Testament History Modelled Especially on the Elijah-Elisha Narrative. Introduction, Text, and Old Testament. Limerick, Ireland: Dominican Biblical Institute, 2006)*

Brodie's article, "Jesus as the New Elisha: Cracking the Code," hints that this view is similar to the New Elijah/the New Elisha view.¹¹⁸ The New Elijah view emphasizes a typological aspect, but Brodie focuses on Luke's rhetorical writing style. Brodie tries to demonstrate that the Elijah-Elisha narrative greatly influences the shaping of the Gospel of Luke.¹¹⁹ According to Brodie, Luke uses Elijah and Elisha as models when he describes both John and Jesus. In his article, "Luke 7:36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4:1-37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation (1983)," he argues that Luke 7:36-50 is a rhetorical imitation of 2 Kings 4:1-37, because Luke provides both a general theory of the imitation and a detailed analysis of the two texts in comparison. The imitation is concerned with content as well as with style.¹²⁰ He attempts to demonstrate that, "every element of the OT narrative is found in summarized or transformed shape in the NT passage."¹²¹ On the other hand, he acknowledges that Luke could have used other sources when writing Luke 7:36-50.¹²² As the title of the article suggests, Brodie argues

¹¹⁸ Thomas L. Brodie, "Luke the Literary Interpreter: Luke-Acts as a Systematic Rewriting and Updating of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative in 1 and 2 Kings" (S.T. D., Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas, 1981) 39-42.

¹¹⁹ Thomas L. Brodie, *Proto-Luke the Oldest Gospel: A Christ-Centered Synthesis of Old Testament History Modelled Especially on the Elijah-Elisha Narrative. Introduction, Text, and Old Testament* (Limerick, Ireland: Dominican Biblical Institute, 2006) 3-7.

¹²⁰ Thomas L. Brodie, "Luke 7:36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4:1-37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation," *Biblica* 64 (1983) 461.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 481.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 482.

that Luke 7:36-50 is not just a copy of the Old Testament text but a complicatedly internalized product.¹²³

This approach does not view Elijah or Elisha as a type of Jesus or John the Baptist. In other words, Brodie's approach is not typological. This approach does not claim that the links between Old Testament texts and New Testament texts are "due to oral tradition."¹²⁴ Brodie attempts to associate Luke 9:51-56 with 2 Kings 1:1-2:6. He argues that Luke imitated part of the narrative of Elijah's departure for the Jordan and that Luke adapted the basic literary techniques of the older text. According to him, the Elijah narrative provided Luke with its basic components but also a framework so that Luke could produce a better account of Jesus.¹²⁵ In his other article, "Luke 9:57-62: A Systematic Adaptation of the Divine Challenge to Elijah (1 Kings 19)," Brodie has the same view point as he does elsewhere. He seeks to prove that Luke transformed the Old Testament text and used it as a material for his composition.¹²⁶ His argument seems to be very persuasive and compelling. Luke might have used the Elijah-Elisha narrative as a model or a basic frame work in composing the Book of Luke. But it is not certain that Luke sought to describe Jesus as the New Elijah because Luke presents Jesus as the figure who surpasses the OT Elijah.¹²⁷ In his book, *The Crucial Bridge: The Elijah-Elisha narrative as an interpretive synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a literary model for*

¹²³ Ibid., 457.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 482.

¹²⁵ Thomas L. Brodie, "The Departure for Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-56) as a Rhetorical Imitation of Elijah's Departure for the Jordan (2 Kings 1:1-2:6)." *Biblica* 70 (1989) 108-109.

¹²⁶ Thomas L. Brodie, "Luke 9:57-62: A Systematic Adaptation of the Divine Challenge to Elijah (1 Kings 19)." In *Society of Biblical Literature: 1989 Seminar Papers*, ed. David J. Lull, vol. 28, 237-45 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 237.

¹²⁷ Thomas L. Brodie, "The Departure for Jerusalem," 108.

the Gospels, Thomas L. Brodie seeks to prove that the Gospel writers used the Elijah-Elisha narrative as a literary model for their Gospels. Even though he admits that the Elijah-Elisha narrative is not a full model for the Gospels, he holds that it is a central model and sees that it “provided an initial frame work for shaping the Gospels.”¹²⁸ On the contrary, David W. Pao emphasizes that the new Exodus theme as the unique Isaianic theme influences on the construction of the Lukan writings and contributes to the framework of the Lukan theology. As the title of his book indicates, though he basically argues that “the entire Isaianic New Exodus program provides the structural framework for the narrative of Acts,” he also shows the relationship between Isaiah and Luke by dealing with some passages in Luke.¹²⁹ Fitzmyer also thinks that Luke’s use of *avna, lhmyij* for Jesus in 9:51 at the beginning of the journey motif also reflects Elijah’s being taken up to heaven in a whirlwind (2 Kgs. 2:11). Craig A. Evans agrees with Brodie on the opinion that Luke uses the Elijah-Elisha narrative. The title of his article, “Luke’s use of the Elijah/Elisha narratives and the ethic of Election,” clearly shows it.¹³⁰

2.1.2.8.2. Darrell Reid James (“*The Elijah/Elisha motif in Luke.*” *Southern Baptist theological Seminary. Ph. D. 1984*)

Darrell Reid James holds that Luke employs the Elijah/Elisha narrative as a key motif in the shaping of his theology. Luke, he believes, uses the Elijah/Elisha motif to

¹²⁸ Thomas L. Brodie, *The Crucial Bridge: The Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels*. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000) 96.

¹²⁹ David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. Biblical Studies Library. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000) 250.

¹³⁰ Craig A. Evans, “Luke’s use of the Elijah/Elisha narratives and the ethic of Election,” *JBL* 106/1 (1987) 75-83.

reveal the purpose and direction of his Gospel.¹³¹ D. R. James argues that the Elisha/Elisha motif plays an important role in the development of Lukan Christology and affects Lukan eschatology,¹³² but some of the verses or pericopes, which he associates with the Elijah/Elisha motif, are arbitrary.

Up to this point, several interpretations concerning Luke's perspective of Malachi's eschatological figures have been presented.

2.1.3. Scholarship on Malachi's Eschatological Figures in the New Testament

J. A. T. Robinson insists that Luke applies the Elijah motif to Jesus and John by combining different gospel traditions in tension.¹³³ Morris M. Faierstein, in his article, "Why Do the Scribes say that Elijah must come first?" argues that the concept of Elijah as forerunner to the Messiah was not accepted in the First Century A. D. but that the concept was possibly a product influenced by the gospel tradition.¹³⁴ D. C. Allison, Jr. refuses Faierstein's position by suggesting several reasons.¹³⁵ In any case, both accept the idea that the New Testament presents John the Baptist as the eschatological Elijah.¹³⁶ Fitzmyer agrees with Faierstein that the concept of Elijah as forerunner to the Messiah

¹³¹ Darrell Reid James, "The Elijah/Elisha Motif in Luke" (Ph. D, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1984) 221.

¹³² Ibid., 222-23.

¹³³ Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus," 276-78.

¹³⁴ Morris M. Faierstein, "Why Do the Scribes Say That Elijah Must Come First?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100, no. 1 (1981) 86.

¹³⁵ D. C. Allison, Jr., "Elijah Must Come First," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984) 252-55.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

was not widely known in the First Century A. D.¹³⁷ R. Zehnle holds the view that Matthew 17:11 and Mark 9:12 echo the tradition of Elijah's restoration task but that Luke omits the reference. He thinks that Luke generally "avoids the Elijah-John Baptist parallel."¹³⁸ He believes that Luke employs the tradition of Elijah-Jesus.¹³⁹ He argues that in Acts, Luke portrays Jesus as the eschatological prophet.¹⁴⁰ According to Zehnle, Luke in Acts uses Elijah-Jesus typology as well as Moses-Jesus typology.¹⁴¹ J. A. Trumbower asserts that John the Baptist regarded himself as Elijah, just as Theudas saw himself as a new Joshua.¹⁴² According to Trumbower, John's dress, his baptismal ministry at the river of Jordan and his preaching for repentance show that Malachi and his understanding of Malachi's Elijah influenced John. Trumbower also contends that the Christians' identification of Jesus with "the Coming One" comes from Jesus himself. He insists that John and Jesus consciously enacted or embodied Malachi's eschatological figures.¹⁴³

¹³⁷Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "More About Elijah Coming First," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985) 295-96.

¹³⁸ Richard F. Zehnle, *Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3*, vol. 15, Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, ed. Robert A. Kraft (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1971) 58.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 59.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 91.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 91.

¹⁴² Jeffrey A. Trumbower, "The Role of Malachi in the Career of John the Baptist," in *Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 104. Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 3 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 30-41.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.* James B. DeYoung introduces several interpretations about Jesus' use of Mal. 3:1 in Matthew 11:10 and presents his own approach ["The Function of Malachi 3:1 in Matthew 11:10: Kingdom Reality as the Hermeneutic of Jesus." In *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series: Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 3, vol. 104, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 66-91. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994. The following works are related to this study: Sang-Ho Lee. "John the Baptist and Elijah in Lucan theology." Boston University. Ph.D. 1972; Robert A. Hausman. "The function of Elijah as a model in Luke-Acts." University of Chicago. Ph.D. 1975; R. A. Bascom. "Preparing the Way-Midrash in the Bible." In *Issues in Bible Translations*, ed. Philip C. Stine. United Bible Societies

Laurent Guyénot holds that the Markan Jesus is Elijah. He thinks that Luke stresses the “resemblance between Jesus and Elijah” not only by deleting Q’s saying identifying John with Elijah but also by adding Old Testament narratives.¹⁴⁴

2.1.3.1. *Joe Marcus (The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1992)*

Mark 1:2-3 is a conflation of the following three Old Testament passages: Ex. 23:20, Isa. 40:3 and Mal. 3:1. Mark 1:3 quotes Mal. 3:1 to identify John the Baptist as the preparer of the Way, which is God’s Way and the Way of Jesus. It seems that Mark understands the preparation in a double sense. Marcus argues that John the Baptist “prepares Jesus’ Way both by his preaching and by his martyrdom.”¹⁴⁵ He points out that Mark encapsulates Isaiah’s “Way of the Lord” theme (e.g., Isa. 40:3). Furthermore, Rikki E. Watts argues that the New Exodus theme in Isaiah with Malachi’s warning is the foundational rubric for the composition of the Book of Mark.¹⁴⁶ In chapter three, he contends that Mark’s introductory sentence, as the framework of the Gospel, is a combination of the New Exodus of Isaiah 40-55 and the pronouncement of divine judgment in Malachi 3 where he exegetically explains the passage.

Monograph Series, vol. 3, ed. Philip C. Stine, 221-46. New York: United Bible Societies, 1988; Gilbert M. Valentine. “The nature of the Elijah message: a study of Malachi 4:6 in the light of 1 Kings 18:37 and Luke 1:16, 17.” Andrew University. Ph. D. 1979.

¹⁴⁴ Laurent Guyénot, “Jesus as Elijah’s Apostle,” *Downside Review* 121 (2003) 282.

¹⁴⁵ Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1992) 41.

¹⁴⁶ Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah’s New Exodus in Mark* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1997, 2000; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic) 4, 37-374.

2.1.3.2. *John –Elijah Partial fulfillment View*

2.1.3.2.1. *Craig L. Blomberg [“Elijah, Election, and Use of Malachi in the New Testament.” *Criswell Theological Review* 2 (Fall 1987): 99-117]*

According to Blomberg, several key themes of Malachi reappear in the New Testament. He stresses that one of the prominent themes is “the promise of the Lord’s coming in righteousness to his temple both to save and to judge (Mal. 3:1-4; 4:1-3) with the repeated NT emphasis on the fulfillment of these prophecies in Christ’s first and second comings.”¹⁴⁷ Blomberg equates John the Baptist with Malachi’s Elijah, who prepares the Way for the Day of the Lord. Blomberg follows the view that John the Baptist as Malachi’s Elijah only prepares the Way for Christ’s first coming, that another Elijah II will come and prepare the Way for Christ’s second coming in the last days and that John the Baptist partially fulfills the role of Malachi’s Elijah. He seems to think that the prophecy has not been fulfilled fully.¹⁴⁸ According to Blomberg, even though he shows no direct or explicit reference to the Messiah in Mal. 3:1 and 4:5-6, Jesus appropriates “a text about the coming of God” and applies it to Himself.¹⁴⁹ Blomberg agrees with Kaiser, Jr., that one of two messengers in Rev. 11:1-13 will be another Elijah II.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁷ Craig L. Blomberg, “Elijah, Election, and Use of Malachi in the New Testament,” *Criswell Theological Review* 2 (Fall 1987) 99.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 99-108.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 104.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 108.

2.1.3.3. *John-Elijah Generic fulfillment View*

2.1.3.3.1. *Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. [“The Promise of the Arrival of Elijah in Malachi and the Gospels.” *Grace Theological Journal*, no. 3 (1982): 221-33]*

Kaiser, Jr., argues that “my messenger” in Mal. 3:1a is not a heavenly being but an earthly being.¹⁵¹ John the Baptist *generically fulfilled* (emphasis mine) the task of Malachi’s Elijah. Kaiser does not contend that John’s arrival fully fulfilled the eschatological Elijah in Malachi. The final Elijah will come in the future. He does not hold a partial fulfillment view or double fulfillment view, but a generic fulfillment view. Kaiser thinks that one of two witnesses in Revelation 11 will fulfill God’s promise climatically.¹⁵² Kaiser believes that many precursors have come for the Lord. He thinks that even Augustine, Calvin, Meno Simons, Luther, Zwingli, Moody and Graham are forerunners who have prepared the Way of the Lord¹⁵³:

John the Baptist did come as *a fulfillment of this prophecy* (italics mine), but he came in ‘the spirit and the power of Elijah’ and is thereby only one prophet in a series of forerunners who are appearing throughout history until that final and climatically terrible Day of Yahweh comes when it is announced by the last prophet in this series of forerunners.¹⁵⁴

Kaiser’s view assumes that Malachi 3 and 4 contain the Messiah’s first and second comings. His interpretation cannot be called eisegesis. In fact, in Mal. 3:2-5 and Mal. 4:1-3, the spiritual purification of divine cleansing is mixed with divine wrath and judgment. Here, Malachi appears to announce only divine judgment, but he prophesies both judgment and restoration. Malachi does not distinguish between the divine spiritual

¹⁵¹ Kaiser, “The Promise of the Arrival of Elijah in Malachi and the Gospels,” 224.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 232.

¹⁵³ Walter Kaiser, Jr., *Micah-Malachi*, Communicator's Commentary, ed. Lloyd J. Ogilvie, vol. 21 (Dallas: Word Books, 1992) 487.

¹⁵⁴ Kaiser, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, 86.

purification in Mal. 3:2-4 and the spiritual restoration in Mal. 4:5-6, which Malachi's Elijah must achieve, because Elijah's reforming ministry is followed by the Lord's restoration task.

2.1.3.4. *John-Elijah Typological Fulfillment View*

2.1.3.4.1. *Darrell Bock (Proclamation and from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, no. 12, Sheffield, 1987)*

Bock basically holds that Luke in John's birth narrative employs a parallelism between Elijah's eschatological ministry and John's reforming ministry. Bock does not claim that John's ministry is the direct fulfillment of Malachi's prophecy about the arrival of the eschatological Elijah. Rather, Luke portrays John as a prophet like Elijah.¹⁵⁵ Bock emphasizes "parallel" or "parallelism" between John and Malachi's Elijah, but Bock argues that the expression ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Luke 7:19 is a messianic title that refers back to John's announcement about Jesus in Luke 3:16.¹⁵⁶ In other words, in the Gospel of Luke, John the Baptist regards Jesus as Messiah. According to Bock, the combined citation of Exod. 23:20 and Malachi 3 in Luke 7:27 is possibly typological and prophetic.¹⁵⁷ The role of the Lord's angel in Exod. 23:20 is similar to John the Baptist's ministry. Just as the angel of the Lord prepares the way of the Lord's people to enter the Promised Land, John prepares the sons of Israel to enter the kingdom of God. Bock thinks that a typological link seems to exist between the role of the Lord's angel in Exod. 23:20 and that of John the Baptist in John's birth narrative in Luke. Bock also claims that a

¹⁵⁵ Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50*, 88.

¹⁵⁶ Darrel L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*, vol. 12, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* (1987) 112.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 114.

prophetic link exists in the identification of the messenger in Malachi 3, who precedes the Lord with John the Baptist in Luke 7:27, though the identification is made less directly by Luke 1:17. Thus, Luke’s use of Malachi 3 and Exodus—and Isaiah 40, may be called, “typological and prophetic.”¹⁵⁸

2.2. *THE ROLES OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL MESSENGERS*

The roles of Malachi’s eschatological figures are determined by their identities. The roles or missions of the eschatological messengers are related to the following grave themes: “Preparing the Way of the Lord” theme; “the Lord’s coming to his Temple’ theme”; Malachi 3:1’s “covenant messenger” theme; “covenant” theme; and “the coming of the Day of the Lord” theme (Mal. 3:2-5).

2.2.1. **‘Preparing the Way of the Lord’ Theme in Mal. 3:1**

As scholarly research history reveals, the theme “preparing way of the Lord” has been surveyed, because in Mal. 3:1 “preparing the way of the Lord” is the mission of YHWH’s forerunner. In other words, the identity of YHWH’s forerunner defines the content and nature of preparing the way of the Lord. For example, Fitzmyer believes that Luke identifies Jesus as YHWH’s forerunner whom Malachi predicts. He thinks that Luke describes Jesus as the preparer of the Lord, though he does not deny that Luke depicts John’s preparatory task, because Fitzmyer holds that Luke uses two different pre-Lukan traditions--the “John-Elijah tradition” and “Jesus-Elijah” tradition:

Luke depicts Jesus’ whole career as a course or a way. This view of his career seems to be rooted in the pre-Lukan tradition which used Isa. 40:3 to describe John the Baptist’s role in the desert, ‘making ready the way of the Lord’ (Mark

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 114.

1:3; cf. Luke 3:4; 7:27). Regardless of the specific meaning that *hodos*, ‘way,’ would have had in John’s career, it becomes for Luke a special designation for Jesus’ salvific mission. Within the travel account the word occurs in 9:57; 18:35; elsewhere it is found in 19:36; 20:21; 24:32.¹⁵⁹

W. C. Robinson, Jr., also argues that Luke describes Jesus’ journey to the Jerusalem narrative as the way of the Lord in terms of God’s purpose,¹⁶⁰ but he does not mention that the Lukan Jesus’ way is related to YHWH’s Way in Malachi.¹⁶¹

The scholarly research history of the theme will not be mentioned here, because it was already dealt with when scholars’ views of YHWH’s forerunner were presented.

2.2.2. “The Lord’s coming to His Temple” Theme in Mal. 3:1

Some scholars disagree about the identity of “the Lord” in “the Lord’s coming to His temple” theme. In the Books of Ezekiel and Zechariah, YHWH’s coming to His temple means salvation and restoration, but in the Book of Malachi, the Lord’s coming to His temple is not focused on salvation but on judgment. Since the Lord’s sudden coming to His temple is YHWH’s solemn promise, it will be fulfilled. The meaning and significance of the Lord’s sudden coming to His temple requires a careful investigation because to determine the meaning of *Ha Adon*’s coming to His temple is also important. A few Old Testament exegetes and scholars provide satisfying interpretations about the phrase.¹⁶² Furthermore, it is natural to study intensively as to who of the New Testament

¹⁵⁹ Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 169.

¹⁶⁰ William Childs Jr. Robinson, “The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke’s Travel Narrative (9:51ff.),” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960) 20-31.

¹⁶¹ Rikki E. Watts links the Way of the Lord in Malachi with the Markan Jesus’ Way (*Isaiah’s New Exodus in Mark*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1997, 2000. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic).

¹⁶² Beth Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi: The Divine Messenger*, vol. 98, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation, ed. J. J. M. Roberts (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987). Beth Glazier-McDonald in her

writers refer to the theme. This motif seems to recur in Luke. Francis D. Weinert observes that its “narrative both begins and ends in the Temple.”¹⁶³ He holds that Luke highlights the Jerusalem temple theme in a positive way, but he does not attempt to find out if there is a link between the temple theme or the Lord’s visit to His temple in Malachi and Luke. He attempts to present the meaning of the temple in Luke. Richard H. Hiers seems to assume that Jesus might regard Himself as the Lord who will suddenly come to His temple. According to Hiers, Jesus deliberately connects His purification of the temple with preparation for the Kingdom of God.¹⁶⁴ Ron C. Fay also points out that in Luke, the temple scene functions as the narrative center of Luke,¹⁶⁵ but he does not have interest in finding out any relationship between Malachi and Luke. René Laurentin sees that the temple-theme in Luke 1-2 is an allusion to the Lord’s sudden coming to His temple and His purification of the sons of Levi in Malachi 3.¹⁶⁶ Brown holds that Luke regards Jesus’ visit to the temple in Luke 2 as the Lord’s sudden coming in Mal. 3:1. He comments on it as follows:

comprehensive work on the Book of Malachi connects the Lord’s sudden coming to his temple with YHWH’s enthronement and ultimate triumph on the Day of the Lord. 137-147. Weyde, Karl W. *Prophecy and Teaching: Prophetic Authority, Form Problems, and the Use of Traditions in the Book of Malachi*. Vol. 288. Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Fur Die Alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, ed. Herausgegeben von Otto Kaiser (Walter de Gruyter: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co., 2000) 284-292.

¹⁶³ F. D. Weinert, “The Meaning of the Temple in Luke-Acts,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 11, no. 3 (1981) 85.

¹⁶⁴ Richard H. Hiers, “Purification of the Temple: Preparation for the Kingdom of God,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971) 88. There are disagreements about the meaning of Jesus’ temple activity. It depends on how Jesus’ harsh confrontational words and actions in the temple are interpreted. Jesus’ actions may be viewed as an activity of temple purification or as an act of judgment.

¹⁶⁵ Ron C. Fay, “The Narrative Function of the Temple in Luke-Acts,” *Trinity Journal* 27, no. 2 (2006) 255-270.

¹⁶⁶ René Laurentin, *Jésus Au Temple: Mystère De Paques Et Foi De Marie En Luc 2, 48-50* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1966). 90-91. C. Van der Waal, “The Temple in the Gospel According to Luke,” *Neot* 7 (1973) 53-54.

Now the Mal. 3:1-2 passage goes on to promise: ‘The Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to His Temple Who can endure the day of His coming?’ After the description of John the Baptist in Luke 1, is it accidental that in Luke 2 the child Jesus who has been hailed as Lord (2:11) comes to the Temple to be recognized by Simeon who was ‘waiting for the consolation of Israel’? And Simeon predicts in 2:34-35 that this coming of the Lord to the Temple is the beginning of his role as a sign of discrimination so that many will fall-or in the words of Malachi, many will not endure the day of his coming.¹⁶⁷

Pau Figueras also writes, “l’entrée de Jésus au Temple est mise en rapport avec la prophétie eschatologique de Malachie.”¹⁶⁸ James M. Dawsey thinks that Jesus’ confrontation scene in the temple (Luke 19:45-20:47) are reminiscent of Malachi’s stern, judgmental prophecy (Mal. 3:6-10; 16-18).¹⁶⁹

“The Lord” (*kyrios*) is Luke’s favorite Christological title in the Gospel of Luke.¹⁷⁰ Those who identify *Ha Adon* in Mal. 3:1 as the pre-incarnate Christ may argue that Luke’s frequent use of the appellation “the Lord” in the birth narrative and the infancy narrative is not accidental, because Luke employs the title “Lord” (*kyrios*) for both God and Jesus (Luke 1:43; 2:11, 23, 26). Though in Acts Luke confirms that Jesus is both Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36), even in the birth narrative and the infancy narrative of Jesus, he reveals that Jesus is Lord.

In short, among those who try to discover the meaning and significance of Jesus’ temple activity, a few scholars hold that Luke refers and or alludes to the Book of Malachi.

¹⁶⁷ Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 445.

¹⁶⁸ Pau Figueras, “Syméon Et Anne, Ou Le Témoignage De La Loi Et Des Prophètes,” *Novum Testamentum* 20 (1978) 84.

¹⁶⁹ James M. Dawsey, “Confrontation in the Temple: Luke 19:45-20:47,” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 11, no. 2 (1984) 157.

¹⁷⁰ Ralph P Martin, “Salvation and Discipleship in Luke’s Gospel,” *Interpretation* 30, no. 4 (1976) 371.

2.2.3. “The Messenger of the Covenant” Theme and “the Covenant” Theme in Mal. 3:1

Views regarding the identity and role of the messenger of the covenant have been previously presented, but the following viewpoints have not been explained. The term “covenant” may be defined differently based on the viewpoint of the covenant messenger’s identity. Several specific covenants are mentioned in Malachi. They are “the covenant of Levi” (Mal. 2:1-9), “the covenant of our fathers” (Mal. 2:10-12), “the covenant of marriage” (Mal. 2:13-16), and “the messenger of the covenant” (Mal. 3:1). In addition, the Book of Malachi is full of covenant terminology.¹⁷¹ Julia M. O’Brien attempts to demonstrate that the entire Book of Malachi employs the form of the covenant lawsuit.¹⁷² Though covenant themes are spelled out in the Book of Malachi, they have been given little consideration.¹⁷³ The kind of covenant Malachi refers to in Mal. 3:1 is not clear. A. S. van der Woude identifies the messenger of the covenant as the guardian angel of the congregation; thus, he argues that “the covenant” refers to the congregation.¹⁷⁴ Those who identify the messenger of the covenant as a priest figure contend that the covenant may be the covenant of perpetual Levitical priesthood, because

¹⁷¹ Ralph L. Smith, “The Shape of Theology in the Book of Malachi,” *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 30 (1987) 24; Tillman, William M. Jr. “Key Ethical Issues in Malachi,” *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 30 (1987) 44-45.

¹⁷² Julia M. O’Brien, *Priest and Levite in Malachi*, vol. 121, Society of Biblical Literature, ed. David L. Petersen (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 49-84.

¹⁷³ Steven L. McKenzie and Howard N. Wallace, “Covenant Themes in Malachi,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983) 549.

¹⁷⁴ Karl W. Weyde, *Prophecy and Teaching: Prophetic Authority, Form Problems, and the Use of Traditions in the Book of Malachi*, vol. 288, Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Fur Die Alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, ed. Herausgegeben von Otto Kaiser (Walter de Gruyter: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co., 2000) 286.

the covenant with Levi is mentioned primarily in Malachi.¹⁷⁵ Glazier-McDonald assumes that since the messenger of the covenant theme in Malachi is derived from the messenger motif in the context of the covenant text in Exodus, the covenant in Mal. 3:1 represents the Sinai Covenant.¹⁷⁶ Though Walter Kaiser, Jr., does not deny that “the covenant” mainly represents the Levitical priesthood,¹⁷⁷ he argues that “the covenant “ is “the same one anciently made with Israel (Exod. 25:8; Lev. 26:11-12; Deut. 4:23; Isa. 33:14) and later renewed in Jer. 31:31-34 as repeated in Heb. 8:7-13 and 9:15,”¹⁷⁸ because he believes that the covenant is God’s single plan for all generations.¹⁷⁹

Luke 1-2 contains the Abrahamic Covenant and the Davidic Covenant.¹⁸⁰ This dissertation will attempt to prove that a significant relationship exists between the covenants in Mal. 3:1 and in Luke. A few scholars point out that the covenant theme has some close link between the two books. James M. Dawsey, for example, argues that Luke seems to portray Jesus as Malachi’s covenant messenger (Mal. 3) in Luke 19:45-21:38.¹⁸¹ According to him, Luke describes Jesus’ teaching and confrontation in the temple as the activity of Malachi’s covenant messenger who will purify the temple of the Lord.

¹⁷⁵ Malchow, “The Messenger of the Covenant in Mal 3:1,” 253; Karl William Weyde, *Prophecy and Teaching*, 289.

¹⁷⁶ Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi: The Divine Messenger*, 130.

¹⁷⁷ Actually he holds that the covenant also indicates the one made between God and the nation Israel.

¹⁷⁸ Kaiser, “The Promise of the Arrival of Elijah in Malachi and the Gospels,” 225.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 225.

¹⁸⁰ Robert L. Brawley, “For Blessing All Families of the Earth : Covenant Traditions in Luke-Acts,” *Currents in Theology and Mission* 22 (1995) 18-26.

¹⁸¹ Dawsey, “Confrontation in the Temple,” 158.

2.2.4. “The Day of the Lord” (יהוה יום / ἡμέραν κυρίου) Theme

It is widely accepted that the coming Day in Mal. 3:2 indicate the Day of the Lord frequently mentioned in the prophetic Books of the Old Testament.¹⁸² Though Brent Kinman argues that Luke explicitly makes connection between Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem “as the day of visitation and his pronouncement of judgment on the city,”¹⁸³ he neglects the idea that Luke refers or alludes to Malachi. Kinman contends that “The day of the Son of man” in Luke is regarded as the Day of the Lord.¹⁸⁴ Luke does not explain that he refers to the Day of the Lord in Malachi, but the pronouncement of divine judgment in Luke is similar to that in the Book of Malachi.

2.3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This chapter has examined the studies on Malachi’s eschatological figures. The identity of the figures in Mal. 3:1 has caused disagreements and discussion among scholars. The “One single divine being view” (van de Woude) argues that the messenger in Mal. 3:1 is a heavenly angel. The “One single human being view” (Petersen and France) argues that Mal. 3:1 mentions only Elijah. The “One single character approach” is not widely accepted. On the other hand, the “Two figures view” has several different approaches: (1) the prophet Malachi, YHWH and the prophet Malachi (Von Orelli); (2) Ezra the priest, YHWH and Ezra the priest (von Blumerincq); (3) Israel’s guardian angel, YHWH and Israel’s guardian angel (J. Lindblom); (4) the angel of the Lord, YHWH and

¹⁸² Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi: The Divine Messenger*, 138.

¹⁸³ Brent Kinman, “Parusia, Jesus' "A-Triumphal" Entry, and the Fate of Jerusalem (Luke 19:28-44),” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118, no. 2 (1999) 293.

¹⁸⁴ Martin, “Salvation and Discipleship in Luke's Gospel,” 379.

the angel of the Lord (A. E. Hill); (5) Elijah and the pre-Incarnate Christ and the pre-incarnate Christ (Water Kaiser, Jr.); (6) Elijah, pre-Incarnate Christ and Elijah (Eugene Merrill); (7) Elijah, YHWH and Elijah (Gieschen); and (8) Elijah, YHWH and YHWH; and (9) a Levitical priest, YHWH and a Levitical priest (Mason). Among the “Two figures approaches” a couple of approaches have been accepted as the traditional view of the passage. There could be three characters in Malachi as follows: (1) a prophet, YHWH and Ezra the priest (Chary); (2) a prophet, YHWH and a priestly Messiah (Malchow); (3) Elijah, YHWH and the Messiah (Juncker); (4) a prophet, YHWH and the guardian angel; (5) a heavenly angel, YHWH and the guardian angel (Rudolf); and (6) a heavenly angel (the angel of death); YHWH and the angel of the Lord (Rashi).¹⁸⁵ To identify the characters is significant because their identity determines their mission or task.

Among Malachi’s eschatological figures, Elijah’s identity is problematic in the light of the New Testament. Some opinions on the Lukan perspective of Malachi’s eschatological figures and different viewpoints about Elijah’s identity in Luke were presented. H. Conzelmann, W. Wink and Danker hold that Luke does not identify John the Baptist as Malachi’s Elijah. A. Hastings and J. D. Dubois view Jesus as the new Elijah. In fact, this view is similar to Wink’s opinion. R. Brown holds that in the Gospel of Luke, Jesus and John are compared to Elijah by Luke’s combination of pre-Lukan traditions. J. Fitzmyer emphasizes that Luke associates Jesus with *Elias redivivus*. Markus Öhler and David Miller support the ‘Elijah-John’ view. They argue that John the Baptist plays the role of the eschatological Elijah promised in the Book of Malachi. David Miller contends that Luke associates Jesus with Elijah I and identifies John with

¹⁸⁵ All the bibliographical information in each instance where the writer mentions a scholar’s name in the section above has already been supplied before so that it is omitted here to avoid redundancy.

Elijah II—Malachi’s eschatological Elijah. The distinction between Elijah I and Elijah II removes some latent confusion in understanding the Lukan identification of Malachi’s Elijah. It seems that Luke uses Elijah/Elisha as a type or shadow of Jesus while he identifies John as Malachi’s eschatological Elijah. David Miller also affirms that the Lord in Mal. 3:1 is the messianic Lord and that He is the same character as “the messenger of the covenant.”¹⁸⁶ E. Franklin’s idea on Lukan identification of Elijah cannot be disregarded easily. He seems to argue that Luke compares both John and Jesus to Elijah, Elisha and Moses. He seems to assert that Luke uses both Elijah-Jesus typology and Elijah-John typology. Robert Miller’s view is similar to the previous idea. According to Robert Miller and A M Okorie, Luke uses Elijah imagery or motif. Some of the previously mentioned views agree that Luke deals with Malachi’s eschatological figures in the perspective of prophecy-fulfillment in the Gospel of Luke. Thomas L. Brodie has written the most noteworthy works about the Lukan usage of Elijah/Elisha narrative. He seeks to demonstrate that Luke employs the Elijah/Elisha narrative as models of John the Baptist and Jesus. Though his argument is not convincing, it cannot be refuted completely either. His view is not a typological approach. Darrell Reid James and some other scholars agree with him, but he has attempted to establish, enhance and expand his view. As a matter of fact, he is not concerned about Malachi’s eschatological Elijah. In addition, New Testament scholars try to reveal the perspective of the four Gospel writers about Malachi’s Elijah. Three views are remarkable: “John-Elijah partial fulfillment view,” “John-Elijah generic fulfillment view” and “John-Elijah typological fulfillment view.”

¹⁸⁶ Miller, “The Messenger, the Lord, and the Coming Judgment in the Reception History of Malachi 3,” 11-16.

Compared to the scholarly works on the identity of YHWH's forerunner/Malachi's Elijah, other themes consisting of Malachi's eschatological messengers' arrival motif have been neglected. So to speak, the survey of research history helps prove that the motif at issue deserves a careful academic investigation. This study could be the discovery of new knowledge, and it will help establish a new connection and development of previously unrelated truths including the revision of old views, which will offer a significant contribution to the understanding of the relationship between Malachi and Luke. This dissertation examines exegetically the text of Malachi and Lukan pericopae or passages in the next chapters.