



Copyright © 2010 Russell Dale Quinn

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

EXPECTATION AND FULFILLMENT OF THE GIFT  
OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

---

A Dissertation  
Presented to  
the Faculty of  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

---

by  
Russell Dale Quinn  
December 2010

**APPROVAL SHEET**

EXPECTATION AND FULFILLMENT OF THE GIFT  
OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

Russell Dale Quinn

Read and Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
William C. Cook (Chair)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark A. Seifrid

\_\_\_\_\_  
James M. Hamilton, Jr.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

To Laura,  
my precious wife,  
and to our sweet daughters,  
Hannah Grace, Sarah Katherine, Ellen Elizabeth,  
Abigail Rose, and Mary Allison

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	vii
PREFACE .....	xiv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Thesis .....	2
History of Research .....	2
Method .....	43
Overview .....	45
2. PNEUMATOLOGICAL EXPECTATION IN THE ΠΙΝΕΥΜΑ PASSAGES .....	48
Introduction .....	48
The Witness of John the Baptist (John 1:29-34) .....	49
Born of the Spirit (John 3:5-8) .....	59
The Spirit without Measure (John 3:34) .....	70
Spirit and Truth (John 4:4-30) .....	75
The Life-giving Spirit (John 6:63) .....	83
Rivers of Living Water (John 7:37-39) .....	87
Conclusion .....	93
3. PNEUMATOLOGICAL EXPECTATION IN THE ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ PASSAGES .....	94
Introduction .....	94

Chapter	Page
The Literary Context of the Farewell Discourse . . . . .	96
Another Paraclete (John 14:16-17) . . . . .	102
The Paraclete and the Holy Spirit (John 14:25-26) . . . . .	108
The Spirit of Truth (John 15:26-27) . . . . .	111
The Sending of the Paraclete (John 16:7-11) . . . . .	113
The Spirit and Apostolic Revelation (John 16:12-15) . . . . .	116
Conclusion . . . . .	119
<b>4. THE FULFILLMENT OF JOHANNINE PNEUMATOLOGICAL EXPECTATION . . . . .</b>	<b>121</b>
Introduction . . . . .	121
The Hour of Glorification (John 12:20-50) . . . . .	121
The Hour of Departure (John 13:1-4, 31-35) . . . . .	125
The Prayer for Glorification (John 17:1-5) . . . . .	128
Thirst, Spirit and Water at the Cross (John 19:28-37) . . . . .	129
Resurrection and Ascension (John 20:1-18) . . . . .	139
The Giving of the Spirit (John 20:19-23) . . . . .	144
The Problem of Thomas (John 20:24-29) . . . . .	151
An Anti-climatic Ending? (John 21) . . . . .	155
Conclusion . . . . .	163
<b>5. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOHANNINE AND LUKAN PNEUMATOLOGICAL FULFILLMENT . . . . .</b>	<b>165</b>
Introduction . . . . .	165
Historical Relationship . . . . .	167
Literary Relationship . . . . .	174
Theological Relationship . . . . .	182
Conclusion . . . . .	199

Chapter	Page
6. CONCLUSION .....	201
Johannine Expectation of the Giving of the Spirit .....	202
Johannine Fulfillment of the Giving of the Spirit .....	205
The Relationship of Easter to Pentecost .....	206
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	207



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ABD</i>	<i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
ABG	Arbeiten zur Bible und ihrer Geschichte
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AGSU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
AnBib	Analecta biblica
<i>AsTJ</i>	<i>Asbury Theological Journal</i>
<i>AusBR</i>	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BDAG	Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed.
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
BGBE	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BK	Biblische Konfrontationen
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentary

BSC	Bible Study Commentary
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BU	Biblische Untersuchungen
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
<i>CBR</i>	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
CJAS	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series
<i>CJT</i>	<i>Canadian Journal of Theology</i>
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
<i>ConcJourn</i>	<i>Concordia Journal</i>
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
<i>CTM</i>	<i>Concordia Theological Monthly</i>
<i>CTR</i>	<i>Criswell Theological Review</i>
<i>CR</i>	<i>Currents in Research</i>
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
<i>CTJ</i>	<i>Calvin Theological Journal</i>
DJG	Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
ECS	Epworth Commentary Series
EKKNT	Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament

<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>EvRTh</i>	<i>Evangelical Review of Theology</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GNC	Good News Commentary
<i>GOTR</i>	<i>Greek Orthodox Theological Review</i>
<i>GTJ</i>	<i>Grace Theological Journal</i>
HB	Hebrew Bible
HBS	Herders Biblische Studien
<i>HBT</i>	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
<i>HeyJ</i>	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>
HKAT	Hanndkommentar zum Alten Testament
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>IBS</i>	<i>Irish Biblical Studies</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBLMS	Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JPT</i>	<i>Journal of Pentecostal Theology</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>

JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
KNT	Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LEC	Library of Early Christianity
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement
LXX	Septuagint
<i>MelT</i>	<i>Melita theologica</i>
MT	Masoretic Text
NA27	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , Nestle-Aland, 27th ed.
NAC	New American Commentary
NCS	Newport Commentary Series
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NIDNTT</i>	<i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i>
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIVAC	NIV Application Commentary
NKZ	Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplement Series

NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
NT	New Testament
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OT	Old Testament
<i>OTP</i>	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i>
PatS	Patristica Sorbonensia
PBTM	Paternoster Biblical and Theological Monographs
<i>PRSt</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
<i>QR</i>	<i>Quarterly Review</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RefR</i>	<i>Reformed Review</i>
<i>RelSRev</i>	<i>Religious Studies Review</i>
<i>ResQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
<i>RevScRel</i>	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
<i>RSPT</i>	<i>Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
<i>RTR</i>	<i>Reformed Theological Review</i>
<i>SBJT</i>	<i>The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology</i>
SBL	Studies in Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology

<i>ScandJTh</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of Theology</i>
<i>ScEccl</i>	<i>Sciences ecclésiastiques</i>
<i>ScEs</i>	<i>Science et esprit</i>
SCJ	Studies in Christianity and Judaism
<i>SE</i>	<i>Studia evangelica</i>
<i>SEÅ</i>	<i>Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok</i>
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses</i>
SubBi	Subsidia biblica
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
<i>SVTQ</i>	<i>St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly</i>
<i>SwJT</i>	<i>Southwest Journal of Theology</i>
TBBB	Theologie Bonner Biblische Beiträge
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
THNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>TJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
<i>TLGNT</i>	B. M. Metzger, <i>A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament</i>
<i>TP</i>	<i>Theologie und Philosophie</i>
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
UBS4	<i>The Greek New Testament</i> , United Bible Societies, 4th ed.
<i>VE</i>	<i>Vox evangelica</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>

WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZBKNT	Zürcher Bibelkommentare New Testament
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

## PREFACE

I want to express my appreciation for the wonderful teachers with whom I have been privileged to study the Greek New Testament. Dr. George Guthrie helped me develop a love for the Greek language and a desire to seek to understand what the New Testament really says. Dr. Frank Thielman helped me learn to think exegetically and to value the hard work of interpreting the text contextually. Dr. Bill Cook has been a supportive supervisor and a great role model as a scholarly pastor.

I have had the unique opportunity while pursuing my formal education to serve at three wonderful churches, First Baptist Church in Gardendale, Alabama, Highview Baptist Church in Louisville, Kentucky, and Bellevue Baptist Church in Cordova, Tennessee. Each of these precious families of believers has nurtured and shaped my ministry. I know that my work in this dissertation will be more profitable to the body of Christ because of their influence on me as a minister of the Gospel.

I have also greatly benefited from the investment in my life by three pastors with whom I have served. When I was a young believer with a lot of questions, David Jett listened to my struggles and guided me in my striving to understand the truth. Dr. Steve Gaines invested in me as a young minister and encouraged me to love preaching the Bible. Dr. Kevin Ezell helped me to grow in my leadership skills, and I am forever grateful to him for the opportunity to be a part of planting the Spencer County Campus of Highview Baptist Church in Louisville. I am thankful for the role that these men have played in modeling what it means to be a pastor.

I would also like to thank my parents, Dale and Brenda Quinn, for their love



and support. I am blessed to have parents that love learning and God's Word. I am also indebted to the childhood pastors who encouraged that love in both me and my parents. Rev. Jerry Haughton was instrumental in discipling my parents as a young couple and helping them grow in their knowledge of the full counsel of God. Dr. Buck Morton was instrumental in encouraging my love for Scripture when I was a young boy.

Words cannot express my gratitude for my wife. Laura has been a model of support in my ministry. Her joyful willingness to obey the Lord has been a source of inspiration for me during the process of writing this dissertation. I am deeply aware of the grace of God that she represents in my life. I also want to express my gratitude to our five daughters, Hannah, Sarah, Ellen, Abigail, and Mary Allison, for their patience and willingness to sacrifice so their daddy could work on his dissertation. Abigail and Mary Allison were both born during the course of this study.

Finally I would like to offer my deepest gratitude to the Lord Jesus who offered living water to me in the thirst of my sin. My sincere prayer is that He might choose to use this work to help others find eternal life by knowing the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent (John 17:3).

Rushing wind, blow through this temple,  
blowing out the dust within,  
come and breathe your breath upon me,  
for I've been born again. (Keith Green)

Russell Dale Quinn

Louisville, Kentucky

September 2010

CHAPTER 1  
INTRODUCTION

**Introduction**

One hermeneutical difficulty of interpreting the Fourth Gospel is the apparent simplicity of its language. The use of such common metaphors as water, thirst, wind, breath, bread, and hunger to communicate profound spiritual realities often causes the reader to underestimate the complexity of what the author is attempting to communicate.<sup>1</sup> Although the author uses such plain language to speak of the person and work of the Holy Spirit, a simple description of its full meaning is complicated. Perhaps this difficulty is most clearly felt in the debate surrounding the fulfillment of Johannine expectations regarding the gift of the Holy Spirit. While most scholars agree that John 20:19-23 is the pneumatological climax of the Gospel, consensus erodes regarding the precise nature of the gift in relation not only to the narrative of the Fourth Gospel itself but also to the Lukan gift at Pentecost.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>While I find compelling the arguments of Andreas J. Köstenberger that the author of John can be more precisely identified as John the Son of Zebedee, the argument of this study rests on the more broad assertion that the Fourth Gospel is better understood as an earlier product of an eyewitness rather than a later product of a Johannine community (“‘The Disciple Jesus Loved’: Witness, Author, Apostle — A Response to Richard Bauckham’s *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*,” *BBR* 18 [2008]: 209-31). For brevity and clarity, I will refer to the author of the Fourth Gospel simply as “the author.”

<sup>2</sup>F. F. Bruce remarks, “The relation of the insufflation (as the act of Christ in John 20:22 is called) to the outpouring of the Spirit recorded in Acts 2:1-4 is an interesting critical and theological question. It is a relevant point that Luke appears generally to think of the Spirit as coming with external manifestations of power, whereas the incident recorded by John is marked by none of the visible and audible phenomena experienced on the day of Pentecost” (*The Book of the Acts*, rev. ed., NICNT [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988], 31).

## **Thesis**

This dissertation will argue that the author of the Fourth Gospel understood John 20:19-23 as the fulfillment of the pneumatological themes of revelation, life, dwelling, and mission. I will also argue that the author develops expectations for the themes of empowerment and the external witness by the Spirit but does not provide a context for their fulfillment. The author's careful development of these themes suggests an awareness of the later outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost in Acts 2.

## **History of Research**

A survey of the scholarly literature reveals a need for a dissertation dedicated to providing a more nuanced explanation of expectation and fulfillment in Johannine pneumatology. While many scholars have considered different aspects of the evidence as an ancillary topic in broader works, no one has considered all the evidence in a work dedicated to the question itself.

Scholarly contributions to the debate can be divided into three major positions. The first group proposes that the Johannine account should be understood as the author's equivalent of the Lukan account of Pentecost in Acts 2. According to this school of thought the Johannine promise of the Spirit is completely fulfilled when Jesus breathes the Spirit on the disciples. On the other end of the spectrum are those who view this pericope as merely symbolic. In their view the significance of this passage is its foreshadowing of the real gift of the Spirit at Pentecost. The third position is held by those who propose two distinct gifts in the life of the early Church: one on Easter in John 20:19-23 and one on Pentecost in Acts 2. While differing on the exact nature of the two gifts, these scholars understand John 20:19-23 as a very real impartation of the Spirit in some sense.

## **The Johannine Pentecost View**

The proponents of the Johannine Pentecost view can be further distinguished

according to their attitude towards the possibility of historical harmonization of John's account with Luke. Some see the historical discrepancies between the two accounts as precluding any hope of harmonization, while others merely view the exercise as unnecessary in light of the literary or theological climax that John 20:19-23 provides for the Fourth Gospel.<sup>3</sup> Because source criticism of the Fourth Gospel is no longer widely upheld and those who were influenced by it typically asserted the impossibility of harmonization as a presupposition, our survey of this stream of scholarship will highlight those scholars who have advanced their position by arguments from the text.<sup>4</sup>

**Cassien Bésobrasoff.** Referring his readers to the Bishop Cassien's discussion of the relationship of John 20:22 to Acts 2:1-4, C. H. Dodd credits him for coining the

---

<sup>3</sup>Scholars who discourage harmonization for historical reasons include W. Bartlett, "The Coming of the Holy Ghost according to the Fourth Gospel," *ExpTim* 37 (1925): 72-74; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1953), 430; F. W. Beare, "The Risen Jesus Bestows the Spirit: A Study of John 20:19-23," *CJT* 4 (1958): 98-100; Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1958), 116-18; C. S. Mann, "Pentecost, the Spirit, and John," *Theology* 62 (1959): 188-90; S. MacLean Gilmour, "Easter and Pentecost," *JBL* 81 (1962): 62-66; John Amedee Bailey, *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*, NovTSup 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 94; C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 144 n.1; C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1966), 159-60; John Marsh, *Saint John*, Westminster Pelican Commentaries (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968), 640; J. N. Sanders, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, Harper's New Testament Commentaries (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 433; Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 692; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 570; Gerard S. Sloyan, *John*, Interpretation (Atlanta: John Knox, 1988), 255. Scholars who discourage harmonization more for theological reasons than historical reasons include John Henry Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, 2 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929), 677-78; James I. Cook, "John 20:19-23, an Exegesis," *RefR* 21 (1967): 8-9; Ernst Haenchen, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, ed. Robert W. Funk and Ulrich Busse, trans. Robert W. Funk, 2 vols., Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 2:211, 217; Robert W. Lyon, "John 20:22, Once More," *Asbury Theological Journal* 43 (1988): 75-76; John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 424-25; Charles H. Talbert, *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1992), 255; Gerald L. Borchert, *John 12-21*, NAC, vol. 25B (Nashville: Broadman Press, 2002), 307-08.

<sup>4</sup>On the diminishing influence of source criticism on Johannine studies, see Klaus Scholtissek, "The Johannine Gospel in Recent Research," in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, ed. Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 455-58. For a critique of the modern tendency to posit a single event behind John 20:22 and Acts 2 as "a hypothesis or axiom" rather "than a conclusion built on irrefutable arguments," see Joost van Rossum, "The 'Johannine Pentecost': John 20:22 in Modern Exegesis and in Orthodox Theology," *SVTQ* 35 (1991): 149-50.

phrase ‘Johannine Pentecost’.<sup>5</sup> Cassien frames his argument by recognizing the reasonableness of traditional interpretations that see two events behind John 20:19-23 and Acts 2, he notes Heitmüller and Bauer as alternative liberal interpretations.<sup>6</sup> Cassien states,

Il nous semble inévitable de revenir à la thèse qui est défendue par l’exégèse libérale et d’interpréter la péricope Jo. XX, 19-23 comme le récit johannique de la Pentecôte. Nous essayerons de la prouver sans nier l’historicité du Quatrième Evangile, tout en tenant compte du symbolisme qui le caractérise. Cette thèse étant prouvée, nous serons en possession d’une clé qui nous permettra d’arriver à la solution du problème de Jo. XX dans son ensemble et dans ses rapports avec les Synoptiques.<sup>7</sup>

Disparaging previous attempts to distinguish between qualitative and quantitative aspects of the gift of the Spirit, he concludes that these solutions are “une échappatoire purement verbale.”<sup>8</sup>

**Raymond Brown.** In his influential commentary Brown considers the gift of the Spirit in John 20:22 to be “the high point of the post-resurrectional activity of Jesus.”<sup>9</sup> Brown dedicates two lengthy paragraphs to “the problem of reconciling John’s dating of

<sup>5</sup>Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 144 n.1.

<sup>6</sup>Cassien Bésobrasoff, *Pentecôte johannique (Jn 20, 19-23)* (Valence-sur-Rhône: Imprimeries Reunies, 1939), 9-10. See Walter Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium*, HNT 6 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Siebeck), 1933), 182; Wilhelm Heitmüller, *Das Johannes-Evangelium*, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1918), 151, 179.

<sup>7</sup>Bésobrasoff, *Pentecôte johannique*, 34.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., 18.

<sup>9</sup>Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John XIII-XXI: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB, vol. 29A (New York: Doubleday, 1966), 1037. In addition to his commentary, Brown has written several articles reviews on the Paraclete in John as well as reviews important monographs (Raymond E. Brown, “The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel,” *NTS* 13 [1967]: 113-32; idem, “The Paraclete in Light of Modern Research,” *SE* 4 [1968]: 158-65; idem, “review of *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, by George Johnston, *CBQ* 3 [1971]: 268-70; idem, “review of *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers: A Study in the History of Exegesis*, by Anthony Casarella, *CBQ* 48 [1986]: 738-39).

this event on Easter night with the picture in Acts ii of the outpouring of the Spirit on Pentecost fifty days later.”<sup>10</sup>

Having briefly criticized the symbolic and two gift approaches, Brown attributes his proposed alternative position to the “many critical scholars.”<sup>11</sup> Because there is nothing in the Gospel of John that would imply a partial gift of the Spirit in John 20:22, the emphasis of those who hold this position is on “the total fulfillment of earlier Gospel passages that promised the giving of the Spirit or the coming of the Paraclete.”<sup>12</sup> Based on the lack of evidence that neither the authors of John or Luke-Acts “was aware or making allowance for the other’s approach to the question,” any attempt to harmonize John and Luke-Acts is “bad methodology.”<sup>13</sup> Although both authors have modified historical details for theological emphasis, Brown allows for “the possibility that Luke preserves an authentic Christian memory of the first charismatic manifestation of the Spirit in the

---

<sup>10</sup>Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 1038-39.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., 1038. After mentioning the condemnation of “the view of Theodore of Mopsuestia that Jesus did not really give the Spirit on Easter but acted only figuratively and by way of promise,” Brown reports that besides Grotius and Tholuck few conservative scholars have attempted to “follow in Theodore’s steps by reducing John’s scene to the pure symbolism of a future giving of the Spirit” (ibid.). Turning to an evaluation of the two gift view, Brown distinguishes between those who make a qualitative distinction between the two accounts and those who make a quantitative distinction. Qualitative distinctions identified by Brown include (1) John 20:22 as forgiveness of sins, Acts 2 as the power to work miracles; (2) Easter gift as relationship of the individual to the Father, Pentecostal gift as ecclesiastical or missionary; (3) Easter gift as enablement of belief; and (4) Easter gift as impersonal, Pentecostal gift as personal. Quantitative distinctions include (1) Easter gift as transitional or anticipatory, Pentecostal gift as complete and definitive; and (2) Easter gift as potential, Pentecostal gift as actual (ibid.).

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid. Brown outlines his view of the relationship between the author’s accounts, “We may hold that functionally each is describing the same event; the one gift of the Spirit to his followers by the risen and ascended Lord. The descriptions are different, reflecting the diverse theological interests of the respective authors; but do we not have the same phenomenon of variance among the Gospel descriptions of the same event in Jesus’ ministry? In particular, there is no insurmountable obstacle in the fact that John and Acts assign a different date to the gift of the Spirit. As we have acknowledged, John’s dating of Jesus’ first appearance is artificial, for Galilee has a better claim than Jerusalem to be the original site of this appearance. But there is also much symbolic in Acts’ choice of Pentecost, for Luke is using the background of the Sinai covenant motif associated with that feast in his description of the coming of the Spirit” (ibid., 1038-39).

community on Pentecost.”<sup>14</sup> Brown’s conclusion is that he agrees with Cassian’s language describing John 20:22 as the Johannine Pentecost but disagrees with his attempt to date this one event to the feast of Pentecost.

**James D. G. Dunn.** The context of Dunn’s earliest work on this subject was his evaluation of the claim of Pentecostal pneumatology that the Christian life occurs in two stages: initial salvation and Spirit-baptism.<sup>15</sup> Dunn dedicates an entire chapter dealing with the significance of John 20:22.<sup>16</sup>

Dunn warns against assuming “that John and Luke-Acts are more or less narrative histories of the same sort, so uniform in their manner of presenting facts and events that they can immediately be dovetailed into each other in a straightforward chronological fashion.”<sup>17</sup> One of the biggest obstacles to harmonizing these two books is John’s use of *δοξάζειν* and *ὑψοῦν* “to demonstrate the unity of the decisive events in the climax of Jesus’ ministry.”<sup>18</sup> Dunn works through various aspects of Johannine pneumatology to demonstrate that “John is concerned more with the theological unity of these events than their chronological separateness.”<sup>19</sup> He finds this theological unity in the way John 3:3-14, 7:39, the discourse in chapter 6, and the Paraclete sayings look forward

---

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., 1039.

<sup>15</sup>James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970), 1-7. For a critique of Dunn’s work from Pentecostal perspective, see Howard M. Erwin, *Conversion-initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Critique of James D. G. Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984).

<sup>16</sup>Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 173-82.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., 173.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid. Dunn remarks, “John presents as a unitary conceptual whole the Son of Man’s redemptive acts in dying, rising, ascending and giving the Spirit. The decisive act of salvation is not complete until the Son of Man has ascended and bestowed the Spirit” (ibid., 174).

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., 174.

to the event of glorification.<sup>20</sup> Because there is only one recorded instance of the giving of the Spirit, it is natural “to say that John intended his readers to find the fulfillment of these earlier promises in the insufflation of 20.22, rather than in a later event which he does not record.”<sup>21</sup> Based on his observations so far, Dunn concludes, “We could therefore say that in 20.22 John records the disciples’ baptism in the Spirit.”<sup>22</sup>

Although Dunn could use his argument thus far to decisively reject the Pentecostal position, he exercises caution at this point saying, “Although we cannot deny John’s concern to impress a theological scheme on a chronological sequence of events, it would not be true to say that the former completely ignores and suppresses the latter.”<sup>23</sup> That John retains a chronological sequence is seen in the resurrection appearances where it seems that Jesus has not yet ascended (οὐπω in 20:17). Dunn remarks,

It may well be best, therefore, to interpret the Paraclete promises of 14.16, 26; 15.26 and 16.7 not of 20.22 (which is not naturally described as a ‘sending’ of the Spirit, especially by or from the Father), but of a later bestowal of the Spirit, following Jesus’ final return to the Father after his various appearances to the disciples. John’s account could then dovetail chronologically into the Acts narrative: John would know of two bestowals of the Spirit, though recording only one, and the promised baptism in the Spirit (1.33) could easily be referred to the unrecorded Pentecost.<sup>24</sup>

After an unambiguous rejection of the symbolic view as “an unsupported speculation which does too little justice to the text,” he confesses that he is “torn” between the Johannine Pentecost position with its emphasis on the theological unity of John and the possibility of John’s knowledge of two gifts even though it supports the Pentecostal position.<sup>25</sup> Ultimately, Dunn’s main contention against Pentecostal theology is not the

---

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., 175.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., 176.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., 177.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., 178.



possibility of two bestowals in salvation history but their insistence that it constitutes a pattern for the experience of all Christians.<sup>26</sup>

Dunn's struggle seems to lighten in his later work. In *Jesus and the Spirit*, he defends the Lukan chronology of the giving of the Spirit at Pentecost against the Johannine account at Easter.<sup>27</sup> Dunn argues that "John's presentation of the gift of the Spirit is almost wholly inspired by theological considerations."<sup>28</sup>

Dunn's movement towards the Johannine Pentecost position seems complete in his latest work. Dunn now asserts that John "compresses into this first appearance to the chief disciples his own equivalent both of the Pentecostal commissioning (20.21-22) and of ecclesiastical authorization (20.23)."<sup>29</sup> Dunn further comments, "John 20.22 is traditionally called 'the Johannine Pentecost,' and can indeed be regarded as John's theological compression of the Pentecost tradition (Acts 2) into the single complex of Jesus' death and resurrection/ascension."<sup>30</sup> Evaluations of Dunn's position should take his development over the years into account.

**Robert W. Lyon.** Lyon begins his article with a survey of the three typical positions concerning the relationship of the Johannine Easter to the Lukan Pentecost. Beginning with the two gift position, Lyon highlights the lack of agreement among its advocates concerning "the purpose, meaning and impact of the two events."<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., 182.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., 139-41; Also cited by Mark J. Olson, "Pentecost," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* [ABD], ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 5:223.

<sup>28</sup>James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975), 141.

<sup>29</sup>James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, vol. 1 of *Christianity in the Making* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 850.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., 850 n.105.

<sup>31</sup>Lyon, "John 20:22," 73-74.

Recognizing the attractiveness of this position's attempt to harmonize Luke and John, Lyon notes that the commonality between the noted proponents is "the recognition that only Acts 2 represents the actual fulfillment of the promise first declared by John the Baptist and repeated by Jesus that the followers of Jesus would be baptized in the Holy Spirit."<sup>32</sup> Turning to those who subscribe to the symbolic view of John 20:22, Lyon appreciates their emphasis "that there is only one bestowal of the Spirit" in the New Testament.<sup>33</sup> Finally, in his discussion of the Johannine Pentecost view, Lyon lists the historical discrepancies between John 20 and Acts 2 that support this position's claim that "John 20 is the writer's own highly theologized version of Acts 2."<sup>34</sup>

Having laid out the existing options, Lyon suggests "one fundamental principle of interpretation" that must guide one's own exegesis: "*We must read John according to John and not through Lukan lenses* [emphasis his]."<sup>35</sup> For Lyon this principle demands an immediate dismissal of the symbolic view "precisely because it is an attempt to understand John's text within the framework of Acts 2."<sup>36</sup> Due to its popularity, however, the two gift view is harder to dismiss. Lyon spends a good portion of the rest of his article critiquing Dunn's three milestones of the activity of the Spirit during the transition between the old and new dispensations.<sup>37</sup>

Based on his critique of Dunn's position, Lyon remarks,

The themes of John's Gospel, the terminology, (especially) the context, as well as the fact that at every theological point this pericope answers to Acts 2:4, all support the view that we do indeed have here a Johannine Pentecost. It is a highly

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., 74.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., 74-75.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., 75.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., 76.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., 76-80.

theologized version of that inceptive experience which gave birth to the Church and perfected the work of the incarnate Son.<sup>38</sup>

Recognizing the historical problems associated with identifying the gifting of the Spirit in John 20:22, Lyon concludes his article with a proposal that verses 19-23 “may well have served as a culminative word” in the earliest stages of this Gospel’s development.<sup>39</sup>

**George R. Beasley-Murray.** Although Beasley-Murray acknowledges that Jesus’ breathing is a symbolic action, he rejects the symbolic interpretation of the impartation of the Spirit in John 20:22.<sup>40</sup> In addition, he insists that the gift in this passage is intended for the whole church, not merely the disciples. Another view rejected by Beasley-Murray as inadequate is “the gift of Christ as a *partial* bestowal of the Spirit who is to be *fully* given at Pentecost.”<sup>41</sup> Considering the variations of this view by Calvin, Bengel, and Westcott, Beasley-Murray concludes that the “fundamental mistake” of these positions to be “the dividing of Easter from Pentecost, and the consequent placing of a wedge between the Fourth Gospel and Luke.”<sup>42</sup>

Challenging Barrett’s assertion that it is impossible to harmonize the “special” bestowal in John with Acts 2, Beasley-Murray emphasizes that the Johannine account is a different representation of the same event.<sup>43</sup> These two accounts are “two representations of the sending of the Holy Spirit to the Church, because of two ways of looking at

---

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., 81.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., 81-82. Concerning the reality of historical problems associated with his position Lyon remarks, “The historical problems are there, as in so many sections of this Gospel, but they cannot rule over what otherwise seems clearly to be the thrust of John’s message” (ibid., 81).

<sup>40</sup>George R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., WBC, vol. 36 (Dallas: Word, 1999), 381-82. Beasley-Murray includes all the variations of this view represented by Calvin, Bengel, Westcott, and Bruce.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., 381.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid.

<sup>43</sup>So C. F. D. Moule, “The Holy Spirit in Scriptures,” *CQ* 3 (1971): 279.

Christ's redemptive deeds."<sup>44</sup> While the Fourth Gospel views the giving of the Spirit as closely bound with the death, resurrection, and ascension, Luke allows for much more time between the events.

Beasley-Murray further questions the bifurcation of the Spirit and the Paraclete. He explains, "The gift of the Spirit is made to the disciples in the context of the handing to them of the commission; the Paraclete was promised to enable them to fulfill it; accordingly the Spirit who is given is the Paraclete."<sup>45</sup>

Turning to a discussion of the role of chronology in the composition of John, Beasley-Murray argues that "John is not recording in vv 19-23 something that took place in five minutes on the first Easter Sunday evening."<sup>46</sup> Because John is probably compressing events that occurred in the Easter period, he contends that the gift of the Spirit could have occurred at any time during that period. He also emphasizes the parallel with Luke's recognition of the outpouring of Pentecost as promised at Easter. Both evangelists, however, are equally apt to subvert chronology to theology according to Beasley-Murray. While John clearly does this in relation to his temple cleansing episode, Luke "has taken a leaf out of John's book, by concentrating his resurrection narratives in to his account of Easter Day without any hint of extension of time, even including the story of the Ascension in the Easter narrative."<sup>47</sup> Without Acts, he suggests it would be natural to assume that "Luke, like John, set the Ascension within Easter."<sup>48</sup> Although Beasley-Murray seems to favor the historicity of the Lukan account, he nevertheless

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., 381.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., 382.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid.

maintains that John's account "was theologically and historically sound."<sup>49</sup>

**Gary Burge.** The most thorough defense of the Johannine Pentecost position has been articulated by Gary Burge.<sup>50</sup> Because John 20:22 "incorporates all the difficulties connected with eschatology" in John, Burge devotes an entire chapter discussing its interpretation.<sup>51</sup> Two concerns which Burge seeks to address are (1) the historical relationship between John 20:22 and Acts 2; and (2) the theological relationship of John 20:22 to the rest of John's Gospel.<sup>52</sup>

In order to establish a context for his own analysis, Burge first lays out a thorough description of the three broad categories of typical interpretations of John 20:22: a symbol, a pre-Pentecost anointing, and a Johannine Pentecost.<sup>53</sup> Regarding the symbolic interpretation, Burge admits, "The most attractive feature of this approach to the text is the ready harmonization that results with Luke-Acts."<sup>54</sup> After mentioning the condemnation of Theodore for holding this view, Burge offers three reasons why conservatives are often attracted to this view: (1) the predominance of symbolism in John's Gospel; (2) the use of imperatives that do not expect immediate fulfillment in other places in John; and (3) the parallels between John 20 and Luke 24 suggest a parallel between John 20:22 and Luke 24:49.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup>Ibid.

<sup>50</sup>In lieu of his own attempt to resolve the issue, Francis Moloney refers his readers to the discussion of Burge (Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, Sacra Pagina Series 4 [Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1988], 535).

<sup>51</sup>Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 114-49. Burge also offers a simplified analysis in Gary M. Burge, *John*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 559-61.

<sup>52</sup>Burge, *Anointed Community*, 117.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., 117-31.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., 117.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., 117-18.

Burge then qualifies this position's historical attractiveness with three vulnerabilities that primarily deal with its theological deficiencies: (1) it does not give John 20:22 its proper weight as a determinative event given its use of the significant terms ἐμφυσᾶν and λαμβάνειν; (2) it does not appreciate the fulfillment of the Johannine expectation created by the Farewell Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit/Paraclete; and (3) the argument concerning the imperative does not apply to 20:22 because the other occurrences are "anticipatory" imperatives looking forward to the glorification of Jesus.<sup>56</sup> Burge concludes, "We must reject the symbolic interpretation as being unnatural to the text."<sup>57</sup>

Burge begins his explanation of the pre-Pentecost anointing view by listing three points of agreement among its advocates: (1) the determinative nature of 20:22 for John's theology of the cross; (2) 20:22 is not the fulfillment of the promises concerning the Paraclete; and (3) the ascension has not occurred before this event.<sup>58</sup> Burge then distinguishes between three interpretations of the significance of 20:22 from this perspective: the ordination of the apostles for their special office, the power of life, and an embryonic Paraclete.<sup>59</sup>

Taking Holwerda as the spokesperson for the ordination viewpoint, Burge objects to the idea that the gift is intended to be exclusive to the apostles because the author of John tends "to reduce the significance of the Twelve."<sup>60</sup> Furthermore, that forgiveness is considered a function of the ecclesiastical community is suggested by the parallel of John 20:23 with Matthew 18:18. In addition, the mission of the apostles

---

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., 118.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., 119.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., 119-123.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., 119-20.

corresponds to the mission of the Paraclete whom most scholars agree is given to the community as a whole.

Morris, Hoskyns, Westcott, and Menoud are the representatives noted by Burge for the view he labels “the power of life.”<sup>61</sup> Because this view “stresses that the Spirit came in a dynamic fashion giving different gifts at different times,” this view strongly supports a complementary interpretation of John and Acts.<sup>62</sup> Burge explains the distinction between the experience of the impersonal power of life in John 20:22 and the sending of the personal Paraclete in Acts 2. The problem with viewing John 20:22 as “a universal outpouring of the Spirit without Paraclete functions” is that there is no evidence of such a separation in the other Pneuma texts of John.<sup>63</sup>

Burge then focuses his attention on the argument of Turner that parallels the themes of Spirit and life in John. While agreeing that “to have the Spirit is to be born into a new life,” Burge disagrees with Turner’s contention that “the process of developing belief is a work of the Spirit in the Gospel—and within this process, John 20:22 is a ‘climacteric’ of experience.”<sup>64</sup> Burge then offers “three problems of eschatology” that result “when we bifurcate the Spirit and Paraclete”: (1) Turner’s argument that John 20:22 is climactic for the Spirit given to enable belief “obstructs the expectation of an ultimate giving of the Spirit”; (2) John’s realized eschatology does not stretch to allow the followers of Jesus to experience the eschatological Spirit before Jesus’ glorification; and (3) there are too many unanswered questions remaining concerning the nature of the gift in John 20:22.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., 120.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., 121.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid.

Burge next turns to Dunn's early arguments that were similar to this view as a helpful correction to the perceived problems with Turner's views.<sup>66</sup> Dunn, he says, correctly sees that John 20:22 "is not a climacteric within a process, but the inauguration of a new era in the work of Christ."<sup>67</sup>

Burge begins his discussion of the last variation of the pre-Pentecost anointing position by summarizing the exegetical problem associated with trying to harmonize the two accounts. His summary is worth quoting:

On the one hand, there is no room in John's thought for a second anointing of the Spirit (Acts 2). The Johannine horizon stops here. On the other hand, the Paraclete does not seem to be evident in 20:22. If John has fallen heir to two Spirit traditions, 20:22 must tie up with the Pneuma texts while the Paraclete passages are left to one side. Most scholars resolve this tension by denying one of these two problems.<sup>68</sup>

Burge then evaluates the attempt to resolve this tension by Porsch with his hypothesis that the Spirit given in 20:22 is an embryonic Paraclete.<sup>69</sup>

In contrast to the previous positions, Burge offers a defense of the Johannine Pentecost to which he ascribes two elements: (1) the Spirit Paraclete is fully given in John 20:22; and (2) this account is an alternative to Acts 2.<sup>70</sup> Concerning the historical reliability of John, he remarks, "John is either using a different chronological tradition in his sources or he has disregarded chronology altogether for the sake of theological emphasis."<sup>71</sup>

**Gerald L. Borchert.** In his commentary on John, Borchert mentions the positions of Westcott, Calvin, Bruce and Carson before expressing his preference for the

---

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., 121-22.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., 122.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., 122-23.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., 123.



arguments advanced by Beasley-Murray and Burge because “they fit more faithfully into the style and logic of the writings by the Johannine evangelist.”<sup>72</sup> Based on John’s placement of the Temple pericope, Borchert asserts that, for Johnmchronological sequences are not of primary concern.<sup>73</sup>

Even though Borchert emphasizes the unity of the resurrection, the gift of the Spirit, and the ascension, he rejects any suggestion that John is not historical or cannot be harmonized with Luke-Acts. A better viewpoint is to understand that John approaches events “holistically.” Borchert explains,

To view events holistically means that the story is told in such a way that the end is already part of the beginning. That also means that time sequences are not as important as meaning sequences, and it certainly does not imply that if someone writes in this manner he is polemicizing against someone who writes sequentially or that he creates the stories to provide the meanings.<sup>74</sup>

Based on this holistic understanding of John’s report, Borchert emphasizes that there is only one giving of the Spirit.<sup>75</sup>

**Craig S. Keener.** In his dissertation on Johannine pneumatology, Keener finds that two themes of the Paraclete passages are fulfilled in John 20:19-23: rebirth and empowerment.<sup>76</sup> Concerning rebirth, Keener finds the allusion to Genesis 2:7 in the context of midrashic treatments of Ezekiel 37:9 as evidence that “it is likely that the regenerating aspect of the Spirit of purification is here invoked.”<sup>77</sup> Concerning empowerment, he sees the commission in 20:21 as explicit evidence that Jesus’ command

---

<sup>72</sup>Borchert, *John 12-21*, 307-08.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., 308.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., 309.

<sup>76</sup>Craig S. Keener, “The Function of Johannine Pneumatology in the Context of Late First-century Judaism” (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1991), 316-22.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., 317-18.

to receive the Spirit signifies an empowerment. Although Keener clearly sees a complete fulfillment of the promises concerning the Spirit in John 20:22, he avoids any discussion of their relationship to Acts 2 insisting, “Our concern is not how John adapts pre-Johannine tradition (unless we can be sure the community would have recognized this adaptation and their recognition would have affected their interpretation), but how his language functions in the Gospel as a whole as read by his intended audience.”<sup>78</sup>

Although dedicating whole chapters to the role of the Spirit in Matthew, Mark, John, and Luke-Acts in *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts*, Keener does not discuss the relationship of John 20:22 to Luke-Acts at any length.<sup>79</sup> Emphasizing that Luke recognized the theological unity of the Spirit’s ministry in Acts 2:38-39 but also depicted experiences of empowerment subsequent to conversion (Acts 8:14-17; 19:5-6), Keener contrasts John’s approach stating, “The Fourth Gospel invests the experience of John 20:19-23 with the theological significance of Pentecost before closing his Gospel, but Luke, whose narrative extends into his second volume, feels free to include his Pentecost at a subsequent time.”<sup>80</sup>

Keener’s most extensive discussion is in his recent commentary on the Gospel of John. Still considering John 20:19-23 to be “the pneumatological climax to the Gospel, the fulfillment of the Paraclete sayings and much of the rest of the final discourse,”<sup>81</sup> Keener devotes an entire section to discuss whether or not John 20:19-23 should be described as a Johannine Pentecost.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., 317 n.445.

<sup>79</sup>Craig S. Keener, *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997). His chapter on the Fourth Gospel does not contain any references to 20:22.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., 191.

<sup>81</sup>Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 1196.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., 1196-200.

Against the symbolic view Keener complains that it “does not pull together an adequate narrative climax on the literary-theological level of John’s earlier promises of the Spirit.”<sup>83</sup> Against the two gift view, Keener similarly contends, “Suggesting that John intends to communicate a lesser impartation ignores the nature of his narrative.”<sup>84</sup>

Concerning the appropriateness of viewing John 20:19-23 as an alternative version of Pentecost, Keener points out that this view “presupposes the question whether he knows about Luke’s version of Pentecost.”<sup>85</sup> Based on his understanding of the connectedness of early Christian communities, Keener affirms, “I do think it likely that John knew of a story of Pentecost such as appears in Acts, whether through pre-Lukan tradition or tradition stemming from Acts.”<sup>86</sup> This affirmation does not, however, imply that “John is directly adapting or reacting against the Pentecost tradition.”<sup>87</sup> Interestingly, Keener allows that the historical tradition could have contained a two gift type of impartation but this would not prove the validity of that interpretation of John 20:22. Keener argues, “Even if the giving of the Spirit in the tradition behind 20:22 represents merely a symbolic or partial impartation, it must bear in John’s narrative the full theological weight equivalent to Luke’s Pentecost.”<sup>88</sup> Keener further argues that “one need not seek a chronological harmonization with Acts 2.”<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup>Ibid., 1197.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid.

<sup>85</sup>Ibid., 1199.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid.

<sup>87</sup>Ibid.

<sup>88</sup>Ibid.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid.

## The Symbolic View

**Theodore of Mopsuestia.** The first known proponent of the symbolic interpretation of John 20:22 was Theodore of Mopsuestia.<sup>90</sup> Originally written in Syriac, Theodore's commentary on John was rediscovered in 1868 but was not translated into Latin until 1940.<sup>91</sup> Theodore's position was condemned in 553 by the Council of Constantinople:

And in addition to his other countless blasphemies, he dared to assert that when the Lord breathed on the disciples after his Resurrection and said, "Receive the Holy Spirit" (John 20:22), he did not give them the Holy Spirit, but breathed on them merely as a symbol.<sup>92</sup>

Theodore's interpretation of John 20:22 has enjoyed a recent resurgence among conservative scholars.

**August Tholuck.** Tholuck frames his discussion with the question of "whether the breathing is to be regarded as the symbol of an endowment yet to be conferred, or of one imparted at the time."<sup>93</sup> Arguing against those who view "the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost as a quantitative climax of the Spirit," Tholuck asks why the Spirit could not have been given before John 20:22.<sup>94</sup> He also questions the significance of this event in

---

<sup>90</sup>On Theodore's life and theology, see Rowan A. Greer, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Exegete and Theologian* (London: Faith Press, 1961); Maurice F. Wiles, "Theodore of Mopsuestia as Representative of the Antiochene School," in *From the Beginnings to Jerome*, vol. 1 of *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. Peter R. Ackroyd et al. (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), 489-510; B. A. McDonald, "Theodore of Mopsuestia," in *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald K. McKim (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998), 65-69; Manlio Simonetti, "Theodore of Mopsuestia (ca. 350-428)," in *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, ed. Charles Kannengiesser, *The Bible in Ancient Christianity 2* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 799-828.

<sup>91</sup>Maurice Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: University Press, 1960), 2.

<sup>92</sup>John F. Clarkson, ed. and trans., *The Church Teaches: Documents of the Church in English Translation* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1961), 179.

<sup>93</sup>Augustus Tholuck, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*, trans. Charles P. Krauth (Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co, 1859), 415.

<sup>94</sup>Tholuck mentions Chrysostom, Gerhard, Calvin, Bengel, Lücke, and Olshausen as representatives (*ibid.*, 415).

light of the absence of Thomas and requires the glorification of 7:39 to include the enthronement of Jesus with the Father.<sup>95</sup> Noting that the parallel in Luke 24:49 only refers to a future bestowal, Tholuck concludes, “We must return, then, to the view of Grotius and Lampe, according to which the symbol typifies something future.”<sup>96</sup> Tholuck rejects Lücke’s appeal to Ezekiel 37:9 as a valid objection by observing that “most of the symbolical actions of the prophets are typifications of something future.”<sup>97</sup>

**George Eldon Ladd.** Assuming that holding the Johannine Pentecost position requires John to not have known about Pentecost, Ladd rejects it because “it is difficult to think that any Christian writing in Ephesus in the first century did not know about Pentecost.”<sup>98</sup> He rejects the two gift view because “the Spirit could not be given until Jesus’ ascension (7:39), and if Jesus actually gave his disciples the Spirit, we must assume two ascensions (see 20:17).”<sup>99</sup> In addition, he cites the lack of evidence that “the disciples entered into their Christian mission until after Pentecost.”<sup>100</sup> Ladd concludes, “There is no substantial objection to taking the Johannine incident as an acted parable that was actually fulfilled at Pentecost.”<sup>101</sup>

**Donald Guthrie.** Guthrie lists three proposals to the problem of relating Jesus’ breathing in John 20:22 to the outpouring of Pentecost.<sup>102</sup> The first position attributed to

---

<sup>95</sup>Ibid., 415-16.

<sup>96</sup>Ibid., 416.

<sup>97</sup>Ibid.

<sup>98</sup>George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 325.

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., 325.

<sup>100</sup>Ibid.

<sup>101</sup>Ibid.

<sup>102</sup>Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1981), 533-34.

Westcott is that the absence of the article with ‘Holy Spirit’ in John 20:22 indicates a gift while the presence of the article indicates in Acts 2 indicates a person. Guthrie denies that this is significant not least because both forms occur together in John 7. The second rejected position is the denial of the historicity of one account in favor of the other. The third view which is endorsed by Guthrie is the view of John 20:22 “as proleptic, a foreshadowing of Pentecost.”<sup>103</sup> Guthrie elaborates, “The action of Jesus was a reminder of the Spirit’s function in the disciples’ all important task of proclaiming and applying the gospel.”<sup>104</sup>

**James I. Packer.** In his popular book on the role of the Holy Spirit in the Christian life, Packer soundly rejects the idea that regeneration is in view in John 20:22 for three reasons.<sup>105</sup> First, John 13:10 and 15:3 imply that believers were regenerate before the cross. Second, Jesus’ breathing is better seen as linked with commissioning than with regeneration. Finally, because he takes the glorification of Jesus to include the enthronement of Jesus, Packer denies that the Spirit could have been given in 20:22.

Concerning the relationship of the ascension to John 20, he remarks,

I am not convinced by those scholars who would persuade me that John means us to think of Christ as already glorified on the evening of resurrection day, and I conclude instead that John expects us to remember 7:37-39 and to infer from it as we read 20:21-23 that the promised gift of the Spirit could not in the nature of the case actually have been given at that time.<sup>106</sup>

Packer also holds this interpretation of the ascension to be conclusive against the Johannine Pentecost position. Packer concludes, “So it seems every way more natural and sensible to understand Jesus’ breathing on the disciples as most commentators have

---

<sup>103</sup>Ibid., 534.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid.

<sup>105</sup>J. I. Packer, *Keep in Step with the Spirit* (Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1984), 87-88.

<sup>106</sup>Ibid., 88.

always understood it—that is, as an acted prophecy—and to take his words (“receive the Holy Spirit”) as a promise that very soon the disciples would begin to experience the Spirit’s new ministry, which would fit and equip them to meet all the demands of their new task.”<sup>107</sup>

**D. A. Carson.** The most thorough defense of the symbolic view of John 20:22 comes from D. A. Carson.<sup>108</sup> Carson evaluates four of the most important solutions to the problem of the relationship between John 20:22 and Acts 2. First, he dismisses the distinction between the gift as the impersonal breath of God in John 20:22 and the personal Holy Spirit in Acts 2.<sup>109</sup> Carson points out the fallacy of those who hold this view in placing too much weight on the absence of the article in John 20:22 when the anarthrous πνεῦμα in 7:39 clearly refers to the Spirit as a person.

The second position appraised by Carson is the two gift view that sees a real impartation in John 20:22 while still allowing for Pentecost.<sup>110</sup> After listing variations of the two gift view attributed to Calvin, Westcott, Bruce, Wojciechowski, and Turner, Carson suggests that they all suffer from three difficulties: (1) they “sound as if they are

---

<sup>107</sup>Ibid., 88-89. J. I. Packer also affirms the symbolic view in “Holy Spirit,” in *New Dictionary of Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1988), 319. In neither place, however, does Packer list the scholars who constitute “most commentators.” Based on my research, this seems to be the minority position.

<sup>108</sup>Because Carson’s earlier discussion of this issue, in D. A. Carson, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility: Biblical Perspectives in Tension*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 140-44, is a brief part of his larger argument for a two-age eschatological structure in John, this summary will mainly follow his fuller presentation in *The Gospel according to John*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 649-55. Carson’s influence on evangelical scholars is evident in recent works that note his work in support of this position including Frank Thielman, *Theology of the New Testament: A Canonical and Synthetic Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 700 n.31; Thomas R. Schreiner, *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 465-66. Another supporter of this view, William B. Simon, offers no exegetical reasons for its defense (“The Role of the Spirit-Paraclete in the Disciples’ Mission in the Fourth Gospel” [Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002], 77-82). His recommendation is based solely on the convenience of seeing a strong connection between the mission of the disciples and the Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel without having to deal with the complexities of the Lukan Pentecost.

<sup>109</sup>Carson, *John*, 649-50.

<sup>110</sup>Ibid., 650.

hostage to Acts 2”); (2) because the promise of the Spirit depends on Jesus’ return to the Father, a twofold gifting seems to imply a twofold return; and (3) separating the Spirit and the Paraclete or power for ministry and power for life seems forced.<sup>111</sup>

That John 20:22 is John’s version of Pentecost enjoys the majority support of modern scholars and is the third view presented by Carson.<sup>112</sup> This view usually involves four elements in its support: (1) John did not know about another Pentecost or at least does not have it in view; (2) the gift of the Spirit is bound to Jesus’ glorification which is bound to the ‘hour’ of the cross which has already occurred; (3) the allusion to Genesis 2:7 and Ezekiel 37:9 implied by Jesus’ breathing suggests “the beginning of the new creation”; and (4) Jesus has ascended by 20:17.<sup>113</sup> Carson further differentiates this view into two groups with different emphasis. One group represented by Barrett downplays the historical reliability of either Acts or John and emphasizes the unprofitability of attempts to harmonize them. The other group represented by Beasley-Murray and Burge admits John’s knowledge of the Lukan Pentecost as an historical event but argues that John intended 20:22 to be perceived as the full impartation of the Spirit for theological reasons.

Reserving his critique of the Johannine Pentecost position until he has presented the view which he endorses, Carson argues that John 20:22 is best understood as “a symbolic promise of the gift of the Spirit later to be given” as first espoused by Theodore of Mopsuestia.<sup>114</sup> He marshals seven arguments in support of the symbolic view over the Johannine Pentecost view: (1) the verb ἐμφυσάω should be translated simply as ‘breathed’ rather than as ‘breathing in’, ‘breathing into’, or ‘breathing upon’; (2) the

---

<sup>111</sup>Ibid.

<sup>112</sup>Ibid., 650-51.

<sup>113</sup>Ibid.

<sup>114</sup>Ibid., 650. Carson admits that Theodore’s position was condemned by the fifth ecumenical council at Constantinople in AD 533 but this does not seem to inhibit his enthusiasm for it.



imperative form of the verb λαμβάνω does not require an immediate response; (3) the lives of the disciples do not seem to have changed enough to warrant a real impartation of the Spirit; (4) even though all sides agree that John emphasizes the theological unity of the cross, resurrection, ascension, exaltation and giving of the Spirit, John is careful to mention chronological markers such as the first day of Easter in 20:19; (5) the exclusion of Thomas from this episode requires Beasley-Murray to posit a partition theory for the composition of chapter 20; (6) granted the historicity of Acts 2 as the beginning of the church, the symbolism of John 20:22 would gain additional significance for the original readers; and (7) John 20:22 as an acted parable finds a parallel in the foot washing of chapter 13 as an anticipatory event.<sup>115</sup>

**John Christopher Thomas.** Thomas is a confessing Pentecostal who argues for the symbolic position of John 20:19-23 based on a narrative analysis of the text.<sup>116</sup> Noting the preponderance of attention to the discussion of the meaning of παράκλητος, Thomas remarks,

For the most part, previous investigations devoted to the pneumatology of the Fourth Gospel have focused upon the topic from the methodological perspective of historical criticism. While such attempts have contributed a great deal to an understanding of the Spirit's role in the Fourth Gospel, these enquiries have usually not paid sufficient attention to the story of the Holy Spirit as it unfolds within the narrative of the Fourth Gospel itself. Unfortunately, this lack of attention to the narrative has resulted in a number of false turns in seeking clarity on the role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel. What has been missing is a reading of the Fourth Gospel which informs the reader of the Spirit's role as the narrative unfolds.<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>115</sup>Ibid., 651-55.

<sup>116</sup>John Christopher Thomas, "The Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Spirit and the Mind: Essays in Informed Pentecostalism*, ed. Terry L. Cross and Emerson B. Powery (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2000), 87-104, is republished as John Christopher Thomas, "The Spirit in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Explorations," in *The Spirit of the New Testament* (Leiden: Deo, 2005), 157-74.

<sup>117</sup>Ibid., 158.

In a critique of Max Turner's *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*,<sup>118</sup> Thomas disparages the reliability of Turner's use of a historical-critical approach because it reads too many of the presuppositions of late rabbinical literature into the narrative of Scripture.<sup>119</sup>

Because of this misguided methodology, Thomas contends that Turner fails to explain the work of the Spirit in the faith of the Samaritans and the disciples before the crucifixion and resurrection.<sup>120</sup>

**Ben Witherington III.** Noting the parallels between the promises in the farewell discourse and their fulfillment in the resurrection appearances, Witherington concludes, "The events recorded in John 20 are seen as providing the fulfillment of the promises made in the farewell discourses, at least in part."<sup>121</sup> Noting that this sense of fulfillment concerning the bestowal of the Spirit in John raises questions about its relationship to Acts 2, Witherington advances the view of John 20:22 as a prophetic sign or parable as "the approach that causes the least difficulties."<sup>122</sup> He suggests that this is similar to the symbolism of the foot washing in John 13.

Witherington offers four arguments to support this position. First, he quotes Carson at length concerning the disappointing behavior of the disciples in chapter 21.<sup>123</sup> Second, because John is full of symbolic signs, it is only natural to consider Jesus' breathing to be a symbol. For his third argument, Witherington reasons based on John 16:7, "The sending of the Spirit transpires when Jesus is away, not when the risen Jesus is

---

<sup>118</sup>See the following discussion on Turner on page 29.

<sup>119</sup>John Christopher Thomas, "Max Turner's *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1996): An Appreciation and Critique," *JPT* 12 (1998): 13-14. See the reply, Max Turner, "Readings and Paradigms: A Response to John Christopher Thomas," *JPT* 12 (1998): 23-38.

<sup>120</sup>Thomas, "Max Turner's *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*," 16.

<sup>121</sup>Ben Witherington III, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 339-40.

<sup>122</sup>*Ibid.*, 340.

<sup>123</sup>*Ibid.*

still with the disciples.”<sup>124</sup> Finally, Witherington sees this position as a solution to the problem that the absence of Thomas raises.<sup>125</sup> Witherington concludes,

Thus in John 20:19-29 we have commissioning scenes in preparation for mission, but the Spirit was only later bestowed, enabling that mission to take place. The evangelist wished to make clear that the actual mission work did not begin until after Jesus had finally departed from earth; hence the Gospel closes twice (in John 20 and 21) without the portrayal of mission work but with the portrayal of two highly figurative stories that foreshadow the equipping for ministry (20:22) and foreshadow the actual mission work (21:4ff.).<sup>126</sup>

Witherington suggests that this position “not only makes better sense of the Gospel of John but also creates fewer problems for those who take seriously the need to piece together the history of the early church using all the relevant data.”<sup>127</sup>

**Andreas J. Köstenberger.** Referencing the arguments of Carson and Witherington, Köstenberger argues for the necessity of the symbolic view stating, “Otherwise, it is hard to see how John would not be found to stand in actual conflict with Luke’s Pentecost narrative in Acts 2, not to mention his own disclaimers earlier in the narrative that the Spirit would be given only subsequent to Jesus’ glorification, which entailed his return to the Father.”<sup>128</sup> Köstenberger lists and dismisses the contributions of Hatina, Brown, Barrett, Bultmann, Calvin, Beasley-Murray, Borchert, M. Turner, Moloney, Schnackenburg, Burge, and Keener as unsatisfactory but does not offer any detailed argument against any of them.<sup>129</sup> He also appeals to the behavior of the disciples

---

<sup>124</sup>Ibid., 340-41.

<sup>125</sup>Ibid., 341.

<sup>126</sup>Ibid.

<sup>127</sup>Ibid., 346.

<sup>128</sup>Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 574. See also his earlier, briefer treatment in idem, *Encountering John: The Gospel in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 184-85.

<sup>129</sup>Köstenberger, *John*, 574 n.16.

after 20:22 as evidence against any real impartation.<sup>130</sup> Köstenberger concludes, “Here, at the occasion of the commissioning of his disciples, Jesus constitutes them as the new messianic community in anticipation of the outpouring of the Spirit subsequent to his ascension.”<sup>131</sup>

### The Two Gift View

While the two gift view has been proposed by many respectable theologians, this position has suffered from a notorious lack of clarity in explaining the precise nature of the two gifts. Calvin described it quantitatively as the difference between a sprinkling and a saturation of grace.<sup>132</sup> Westcott made a qualitative distinction between quickening and endowing.<sup>133</sup> Hoskyns emphasized the preparatory nature of the private gift in John 20 in contrast to the public gift in Acts 2.<sup>134</sup> Based on his argument that the phrase

---

<sup>130</sup>Ibid., 574-75.

<sup>131</sup>Ibid., 575.

<sup>132</sup>John Calvin, *The Gospel according to St John 11-21 and the First Epistle of John*, trans. T. H. L. Parker, Calvin’s Commentaries (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961), 205.

<sup>133</sup>B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John: The Authorized Version with Introduction and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), 191. Westcott clearly rejects the symbolic view when he states, “To regard the words and act as a promise only and a symbol of the future gift is wholly arbitrary and unnatural” (ibid., 295). Based on the usage of ἐμφυσάω in the LXX, Hoskyns also viewed 20:22 as an act of rebirth but argued that an empowerment of the disciples both to create through the forgiveness of sins and to destroy through the retention of sins was implied as well (Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, “Gen. 1-3 and St. John’s Gospel,” *JTS* 21 [1920]: 215-16).

<sup>134</sup>Edwyn Clement Hoskyns states, “The Resurrection scenes in the Fourth Gospel are preparatory scenes, preparatory for the mission. What the Lord will do invisibly from heaven He does visibly on earth. The mission is inaugurated, but not actually begun. The actual beginning of the mission lies outside the scope of the Fourth Gospel. There remains, therefore, room for the Pentecostal outpouring, after which the disciples take up the mission in public in the power of the Spirit descending from Father and Son in heaven” (*The Fourth Gospel*, ed. Francis Noel Davey, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. [London: Faber and Faber, 1947], 546-47). F. F. Bruce also emphasizes the public nature of the external gifts in Acts 2 versus the gift in John 20 which he identifies with Luke 24:36ff. He also insists the gift in John 20:22 is “no mere anticipation of Pentecost but a real impartation of the Spirit for the purpose specified,” but does not clarify what “the purpose specified” is (*The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983], 391, 396-97; *Book of Acts*, 31). Similarly, Herman N. Ridderbos distinguishes between the “more limited giving of the Spirit” in John 20:22 and “the outpouring of the Spirit on ‘all flesh’ without distinction that was to take place at Pentecost” (*The Gospel according to John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 643-44).

“Receive the Spirit” is a donation metaphor, Bennema attempts to define the Johannine gift in terms of a new relationship.<sup>135</sup>

**David Earl Holwerda.** In a four page excursus on the meaning of John 20:22 in his monograph dedicated to critiquing Bultmann’s view of Johannine eschatology, Holwerda finds the Johannine Pentecost view indefensible on two fronts: the role of the ascension and the nature of the gift.<sup>136</sup> Concerning the ascension, he recognizes its unity with the theme of glorification based on John’s use of *δοξάζω*, *ὕψω*, and *ὑπάγω* as parallel terms to death, resurrection, and ascension.<sup>137</sup>

Turning to a discussion of the events of John 20, Holwerda expresses his grievance with the Johannine Pentecost view not in terms of its relationship to Acts but in terms of how it relates to the ascension within the text of John itself. Because “the Holy Spirit is a post-ascension figure” and it is apparent from Jesus’ words to Mary that “He had not yet ascended to the Father,” Holwerda concludes, “The necessary condition for the coming of the Spirit was not completed in the resurrection.”<sup>138</sup> Against the argument by some that the bestowal of the Spirit in 20:22 seems to confirm that the ascension occurred on Easter, he replies that John “does not record the ascension, and it would hardly seem likely that he would have omitted such an important event.”<sup>139</sup> Against the view of those who “although not assuming an ascension on Easter, assert that the giving of the Spirit is the fulfillment of the promise of the Paraclete,” he responds that this

---

<sup>135</sup>Cornelis Bennema, “The Giving of the Spirit in John’s Gospel: A New Proposal?,” *EvQ* 74 (2002): 208-12.

<sup>136</sup>David Earl Holwerda, *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John: A Critique of Rudolf Bultmann’s Present Eschatology* (Kampen: Kok, 1959), 21-24.

<sup>137</sup>*Ibid.*, 21.

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

<sup>139</sup>*Ibid.*, 22-23.

“contradicts the saying of Jesus (16:7) and of the evangelist himself (7:39).”<sup>140</sup> Holwerda finds further reason to reject the Johannine Pentecost interpretation from his view of the nature of the gift in 20:22. Emphasizing the equivalence of ἀποστέλλω in reference to His mission and πέμπω in reference to the disciples, he suggests that “Jesus is here commissioning His disciples for their official task, as He had been commissioned by the Father.”<sup>141</sup> Based on this context for the gift, Holwerda surmises, “It is logical to conclude that the purpose of this gift is to qualify the disciples for their official task.”<sup>142</sup> Concerning the relationship of this gift on Easter to the one on Pentecost, Holwerda explains,

This does not mean that this is another Spirit than the one received on Pentecost, for in both cases it is the Holy Spirit. In speaking of “this Spirit” we are referring to a particular activity or task of the Spirit. The task of the Spirit in this instance is to qualify the apostles as representatives of Christ; and in virtue of this they receive the authority to forgive sins. This special gift of the Spirit was received by the apostles alone, and not by all the “brethren” as in Acts 2; and thus these verses report the renewal of the apostolic office and of the power of the keys.<sup>143</sup>

He concludes, “This is neither the Johannine version of Pentecost nor the fulfillment of the promise of the Paraclete.”<sup>144</sup>

**Max Turner.** Max Turner, the most prolific defender of the two gift perspective, has written several articles and monographs on both Lukan and Johannine pneumatology.<sup>145</sup> His first article is an investigation of the meaning of the concept of

---

<sup>140</sup>Ibid., 23.

<sup>141</sup>Ibid.

<sup>142</sup>Ibid., 24.

<sup>143</sup>Ibid.

<sup>144</sup>Ibid.

<sup>145</sup>Max Turner, “The Concept of Receiving the Spirit in John’s Gospel,” *VE* 10 (1977): 24-42; idem, “Luke and the Spirit: Studies in the Significance of Receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts” (Ph.D. diss., Cambridge, 1980); idem, “The Significance of Receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts: A Survey of Modern Scholarship,” *TJ* 2 (1981): 3-42; idem, “Jesus and the Spirit in Lukan Perspective,” *TynBul* 32 (1981): 45-63; idem, “Spirit Endowment in Luke-Acts: Some Linguistic Considerations,” *VE* 12 (1981): 131-58; idem, “Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now,” *VE* 15 (1985): 7-64; idem, “The Spirit and the Power of Jesus’ Miracles in the Lukan Conception,” *NovT* 33 (1991): 124-52; idem, “The Spirit of Prophecy and the Power of Authoritative Preaching in Luke-Acts: A Question of Origins,” *NTS* 38 (1992): 341-51; idem, “Holy

“Receiving the Spirit” in Johannine thought.<sup>146</sup> Turner argues against the scholarly tendency to regard this phrase “as a technical term in the earliest church” so as to only allow one bestowal of the Spirit when considering the relationship of John 20:22 to Luke-Acts.<sup>147</sup> Stating that the purpose of his article is “to show that within John’s writing the language of receiving the Spirit could be used at least at two levels,” Turner examines both the promises of the Paraclete and the meaning of John 20:22 in order to show that the author did not understand it as the giving of the Spirit-Paraclete.<sup>148</sup> Rather, John understood it “as a climax of receiving the Spirit within the ministry of Jesus.”<sup>149</sup>

Turner’s most recent exposition of John 20:22 is a chapter entitled “The Gift of the Spirit to and in the Johannine Church” which is divided into headings asking “four questions which take us to the centre of the debate between classic Pentecostals and more traditional evangelicalism.”<sup>150</sup> Turner’s first section, entitled “Was John 20:22 a Granting of the Spirit by Jesus?,” is a critique of Carson’s exposition of the symbolic view.<sup>151</sup> Focusing on only two of Carson’s arguments, Turner refutes his claim that ἐμψύσω can only mean ‘exhale’ and his assertion that the imperative behind ‘Receive the Holy Spirit’

---

Spirit,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. J. B. Green, S. McKnight, and I. H. Marshall (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 66-88; idem, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 9 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); idem, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts—Then and Now*, rev. ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998); idem, “The ‘Spirit of Prophecy’ as the Power of Israel’s Restoration and Witness,” in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 327-48; idem, “Holy Spirit,” in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000); idem, “The Spirit and Salvation in Luke-Acts,” in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 103-16.

<sup>146</sup>Turner, “Receiving the Spirit in John’s Gospel,” 24.

<sup>147</sup>Ibid., 25.

<sup>148</sup>Ibid., 26

<sup>149</sup>Ibid.

<sup>150</sup>Turner, *Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 90.

<sup>151</sup>Ibid., 90-92.

expects a future reference. Turner refers the reader to Hatina's article for a more thorough critique of Carson's position.<sup>152</sup>

In his second section concerning the nature of the gift in John 20:22, Turner evaluates the Johannine Pentecost and two gift views.<sup>153</sup> Turner begins his discussion of the Johannine Pentecost position with a summary of Brown's five supporting arguments: (1) the bond between the gift and the cross and exaltation of Jesus; (2) the connection emphasized by the water metaphor between John 7:39 and 19:34; (3) the completion of Jesus' ascension-glorification by 20:19; (4) the condition of Jesus' going away in 16:7 is fulfilled by His death; and (5) the contextual links between the Spirit and the mission of the disciples.<sup>154</sup> To these Turner mentions two more arguments that have been added by Burge, Hatina, and Swetnam: (6) John 20:22 is an appropriate conclusion to the narrative of John with his emphasis on the promise of the Spirit; and (7) in accordance with Jesus' promise not to leave the disciples as 'orphans' (14:16-18), John emphasizes the granting of the Spirit before the resurrection appearances are complete.<sup>155</sup>

Recognizing the wisdom of interpreting John in its own context instead of a Lukan framework, Turner concentrates his critique on the problems with this view that are found within the Fourth Gospel itself. His first critique is that "the very term 'Pentecost' gives too much priority to a Lucan agenda."<sup>156</sup> More significant, however, are Turner's observations that: (1) the conditions of John 14-16 have not been met when the Spirit is given in 20:22; and (2) the expected activities of the Paraclete are missing from

---

<sup>152</sup>Ibid., 91 n.3.

<sup>153</sup>Ibid., 92-100.

<sup>154</sup>Ibid., 92-93.

<sup>155</sup>Ibid., 94.

<sup>156</sup>Ibid., 94-95.



the closing narratives following 20:22.<sup>157</sup>

As an alternative interpretation to the symbolic and Johannine Pentecost views, Turner submits his version of the two gift view. Considering the allusions to Genesis 2:7 and Ezekiel 37:9 to conclusively imply an eschatological new creation, Turner discusses two issues concerning this gift that explain its relation to the Paraclete promises.<sup>158</sup> The first issue is that the tendency of those who see John 20:22 as the decisive gift fails to recognize “the strong element of inaugurated eschatology in the period of the ministry itself.”<sup>159</sup> Turner argues that “the event in 20:22 is better understood as the climax in a whole process of life-giving experiences of the Spirit-and-word (through Jesus), extending from the disciples’ earliest encounter with the one whose revelatory wisdom is Spirit and life (6:63).”<sup>160</sup> Turner’s second issue is the danger of separating the Spirit in 20:22 from the Paraclete to the point that there are two distinct gifts. Although recognizing Porsch’s suggestion that the embryonic gift of the Spirit in 20:22 becomes the Paraclete as “the most sensitive” interpretation, Turner does not see this as providing an adequate bond between 20:22 and the activities of the Paraclete.<sup>161</sup>

Turner clarifies his position in his third section which seeks to answer the question of whether John envisions two stages in the disciples’ experience of the Spirit.<sup>162</sup> Turner suggests, “John appears to see the Spirit active in and ‘given’ to the disciples as one theological ‘gift’, but realized in two chronological stages, separated by the completion of Jesus’ ‘ascension’.”<sup>163</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup>Ibid., 95.

<sup>158</sup>Ibid., 98-99.

<sup>159</sup>Ibid., 98.

<sup>160</sup>Ibid., 99.

<sup>161</sup>Ibid., 100.

<sup>162</sup>Ibid., 100-01.

<sup>163</sup>Ibid., 100.

His fourth section is an exploration of the question, “Does John Imply that the Disciples’ Two-stage Experience is Repeated in the Church?”<sup>164</sup> Turner follows Dunn in answering this question negatively. He states, “It should be clear that, after the ascension and the giving of the Paraclete, there would not again be the two-stage experience of the Spirit the disciples had.”<sup>165</sup>

**Felix Porsch.** Noted for its thorough attention to exegesis, Felix Porsch’s monograph on Johannine pneumatology has been well received by Johannine scholars.<sup>166</sup> Porsch explains the purpose of his study:

Diese Frage bestimmt die Hauptaufgabe vorliegender Untersuchung, nämlich das Verhältnis der Aussagen über den Geist-Parakleten in den Abschiedsreden zu den Pneumaaussagen des übrigen Ev zu klären. Sie will also auf die Frage antworten, ob im Johev zwei unterschiedliche Pneumaauffassungen vorliegen oder ob vielmehr eine im wesentlichen einheitliche Vorstellung zugrunde liegt, so daß die Pneumadarstellung der Abschiedsreden (also der Geist-Paraklet) eher als eine weitere Bestimmung und Explikation der sonstigen Pneumavorstellung in einem spezifischen Kontext angesehen werden muß.<sup>167</sup>

In contrast to many scholars who have sought to highlight the differences between the concept of the Paraclete in John 14-16 and the concept of the Pneuma in John 1-12, Porsch argues that a unifying concept underlies all the passages.

While he makes a very valuable contribution to this topic by demonstrating the continuity between the Pneuma, Paraclete, and fulfillment texts with exegetical precision, Porsch’s work leaves room for further clarification of two important issues related to

---

<sup>164</sup>Ibid., 101-102

<sup>165</sup>Ibid., 101.

<sup>166</sup>Felix Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Frankfurt: Knecht, 1974). Raymond E. Brown considers Porsch’s work to be “a model dissertation on Johannine theology” (review of *Pneuma und Wort: Ein Exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums*, *TS* 37 [1976]: 684). D. Moody Smith comments that Porsch “has scarcely left an exegetical stone unturned in the examination of relevant Johannine texts” (review of *Pneuma und Wort: Ein Exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums*, *JBL* 96 [1977]: 459).

<sup>167</sup>Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort*, 3.

Johannine pneumatology. First, Porsch's description of the gift of the Spirit in John 20:19-23 as a gift that becomes the Paraclete at Pentecost does not really describe the nature of the gift in Johannine categories. Porsch comments,

Jesus gibt hier wirklich – als der scheidende, zwar noch nicht definitiv verherrlichte, aber bereits im Glanz der Herrlichkeit stehende Herr, das Pneuma hagion. Weil Jesus aber noch selber inmitten der Jünger weilt, kann dieses Pneuma nicht eigentlich als Paraklet bezeichnet werden, da es ja noch nicht die Funktionen des Geist-Parakleten ausübt. Es ist aber das Pneuma, das in Zukunft ein Paraklet sein und als solcher wirken wird.<sup>168</sup>

Second, Porsch does not offer an adequate explanation of the relationship between the Johannine and Lukan gifts.<sup>169</sup>

**Max-Alain Chevallier.** Citing Cassien's coining of the phrase "the Johannine Pentecost," Chevallier argues that a more fruitful discussion of both Johannine and Lukan pneumatology should acknowledge multiple gifts of the Spirit in both accounts:

Reprenant cette désignation, nous voudrions suggérer *cum grano salis* [emphasis his] qu'en réalité on devrait parler au pluriel de deux « Pentecôtes » johanniques et les comparer non seulement à la Pentecôte d'Actes 2, mais bien à la série des « Pentecôtes » des Actes (« Pentecôte » des Juifs à Jérusalem, « Pentecôte » des Samaritains, « Pentecôte » des païens à Césarée, « Pentecôte » des Johannites à Ephèse), sans oublier la double annonce de l'évangile de Luc et au début des Actes.<sup>170</sup>

Chevallier contends that the Johannine gift can be distinguished "entre deux aspects de la communication de l'Esprit, avec appropriation du premier d'entre eux, l'impulsion missionnaire, au groupe des Douze, et du deuxième, le don eschatologique, au peuple des croyants en général."<sup>171</sup>

**Rudolf Schnackenburg.** Although Schnackenburg is sometimes listed as a

---

<sup>168</sup>Ibid., 376. Burge coined the phrase "Embryonic Paraclete" to describe Porsch's position (*Anointed Community*, 122-23).

<sup>169</sup>Burge, *Anointed Community*, 123; Bennema, "Giving of the Spirit," 204-05.

<sup>170</sup>Max-Alain Chevallier, "'Pentecôtes' lucaniennes et 'Pentecôtes' johanniques," *RSR* 69 (1981): 302.

<sup>171</sup>Ibid., 310.

supporter of the Johannine Pentecost view, a close reading of his comments on John 20:22 reveal that he is actually proposing a two gift position.<sup>172</sup> The confusion probably arises from his qualified allowance for the term ‘Johannine Pentecost’:

If by ‘Johannine Pentecost’ is meant the definitive bestowal of the Spirit on all believers as against only a preliminary or specific granting of the Spirit to the ‘apostles’, then, indeed, this expression may and must be chosen. For nothing points to the fact, that for John, after the Easter bestowal of the Spirit, there follows another one (on all believers), and that the disciples present are recipients of the Spirit in an exclusive sense (as against other believers). Jn 20:22 is the fulfillment of Jn 7:39 where the believers as such are mentioned as recipients of the Spirit.<sup>173</sup>

His position differs, however, from the Johannine Pentecost view because he does not see this episode as an alternative to Acts 2. Rather, he regards the Lukan outpouring to be “a special manifestation of the Spirit, which assisted the primitive Church in Jerusalem to make a break-through.”<sup>174</sup>

Schnackenburg calls for a distinction between the promises for the permanence of the gift of the Spirit in the Paraclete sayings which are fulfilled in 20:22 and the functions of the Paraclete which are not yet fulfilled. He concludes that in John 20:22 “only the fact of the receiving of the Spirit which is the foundation of the life of the Church, is mentioned, but the effect of the Spirit in the sense of the Paraclete is not yet focused upon.”<sup>175</sup>

**J. Ramsey Michaels.** Although J. Ramsey Michaels calls the breathing of Jesus a “sign of the impartation of the Holy Spirit,”<sup>176</sup> he contends that the “most natural

---

<sup>172</sup>Turner mistakenly accuses Schnackenburg of using this term to describe “a rival tradition to that in Luke-Acts” (Turner, “Receiving the Spirit in John’s Gospel,” 25, 37 n.15).

<sup>173</sup>Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, trans. David Smith and G. A. Kon, Herder’s Theological Commentary on the New Testament (New York: Crossroad, 1990), 3:325-26.

<sup>174</sup>Schnackenburg, *St. John*, 3:325.

<sup>175</sup>*Ibid.*, 3:326.

<sup>176</sup>J. Ramsey Michaels, *John: A Good News Commentary*, NIBC (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989), 334.

way of understanding” John 20:22 “is that the disciples were intended to receive (and did receive) the Holy Spirit at that very moment.”<sup>177</sup> Concerning the narrative role of John 20:22 in the context of the Gospel of John, Ramsey states,

This is the only recorded fulfillment of Jesus’ promises of the Spirit in his farewell discourses (cf. also 7:39), and it is clear that the Gospel writer intends it as the fulfillment. In that sense it is the Johannine equivalent of Pentecost, not a mere foretaste of Pentecost.<sup>178</sup>

Historically, however, Michaels cites Luke 24:45 and Acts 1:2 as evidence that the author of Luke-Acts emphasized the role of the Holy Spirit before Pentecost. These parallels suggest, therefore, that “something is given and something is still expected.”<sup>179</sup> Michaels suggests, “Luke’s emphasis is largely on what is still expected, whereas John’s emphasis is exclusively on what is already given.”<sup>180</sup>

**Leon Morris.** Morris sees the fulfillment of John 7:39 on the day of Pentecost but does not elaborate on the problems associated with the glorification of Jesus.<sup>181</sup> Morris suggests the principle in 1 Corinthians 12:4 of different gifts from the same Spirit as a possible hermeneutical key to the problem.<sup>182</sup> Citing the experiences of new believers with the Spirit subsequent to Pentecost in Acts, Morris argues for multiple gifts of the Spirit. He concludes, “John tells of one gift of the Spirit and Luke of another.”<sup>183</sup>

<sup>177</sup>Ibid., 349.

<sup>178</sup>Ibid.

<sup>179</sup>Ibid.

<sup>180</sup>Ibid.

<sup>181</sup>Leon Morris, *New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 259.

<sup>182</sup>Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 747-48. Morris quotes Hoskyns extensively as support for his position that John leaves room for a future gift outside of his narrative (ibid., 747 n.61).

<sup>183</sup>Ibid., 748.

**Craig Blomberg.** Craig Blomberg addresses the puzzle of the “so-called Johannine Pentecost” in the context of a discussion on alleged discrepancies between the synoptic Gospels and John.<sup>184</sup> Regarding symbolic interpretations of John 20:22, Blomberg complains that “attempts to reduce Jesus’ ‘breathing out’ the Spirit on the disciples to a symbolic gesture or enacted parable portending a still future event leave John’s narrative inexplicably incomplete” and asks why John “would bother to foreshadow an event which he never describes?”<sup>185</sup>

Blomberg criticizes the view that John has transformed Acts 2 for disregarding the significance of details in John’s account that not all of the disciples are present in 20:19-23 and that chapter 21 “does not at all depict the disciples as fully empowered for service.”<sup>186</sup> Noting the difference in how the Spirit functions in the two accounts, Blomberg states, “Luke’s Pentecost narrative focuses almost exclusively on the disciples’ preaching to others; here all attention centres on Jesus’ commissioning the disciples.”<sup>187</sup> Blomberg agrees with J. Ramsey Michaels that a stronger Lukan parallel is found in Luke 24:49.

Having rejected both the symbolic and Johannine Pentecost positions, Blomberg suggests that a more satisfying explanation “views John’s and Luke’s narratives as describing separate events, both equally real and significant.”<sup>188</sup> Blomberg explains the differences between the two accounts by comparing the relationship of the resurrection to the ascension with the relationship of the Easter gift to the Pentecost gift. Emphasizing the role of the ascension in the completion of Jesus’ full public work,

---

<sup>184</sup>Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1987), 167-68.

<sup>185</sup>*Ibid.*, 167.

<sup>186</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>187</sup>*Ibid.*, 167-68.

<sup>188</sup>*Ibid.*, 168.

Blomberg argues that “Jesus’ breathing out the Spirit gave the disciples the authority to lead the company of his followers, even though the full, public and permanent manifestation of this gift would arrive only at Pentecost.”<sup>189</sup>

Distinguishing between the reception of the Spirit in John and the filling of the Spirit in Luke-Acts, Blomberg further argues that neither Luke nor Acts requires Pentecost to be the first experience of the disciples with the Spirit. He attributes the chronological gap between the two events to the necessity of the ascension as a condition for the outpouring at Pentecost.<sup>190</sup>

**Thomas R. Hatina.** Having summarized Carson’s seven supporting arguments for his symbolic interpretation of John 20:22, Hatina offers alternative interpretations for each point.<sup>191</sup> Turning from his critique of Carson’s symbolic position, Hatina proposes his own position as a more satisfactory alternative which he says “rests partly” on the Johannine Pentecost view.<sup>192</sup> Appreciating its emphasis on “the complete fulfillment of prior Spirit and Paraclete texts in the Gospel,” he questions its “assumption of a single eschatological outpouring of the Spirit.”<sup>193</sup> Hatina asks, “Why can’t the Johannine endowment function on its own as a complete fulfillment divorced from further outpourings which begin at Pentecost and supposedly continue throughout the ‘last days’ as the giver of the Spirit sees fit?”<sup>194</sup> Although he agrees that there are misuses of some methods of harmonization, Hatina suggests that these accounts can be harmonized

---

<sup>189</sup>Ibid.

<sup>190</sup>Ibid. See also his briefer discussion in Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John’s Gospel: Issues and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001), 266-67.

<sup>191</sup>Thomas R. Hatina, “John 20,22 in Its Eschatological Context: Promise or Fulfillment?,” *Bib* 74 (1993): 196-204. Hatina’s arguments will be contrasted with Carson’s positions at the appropriate points in the exegetical discussions of the following chapters.

<sup>192</sup>Ibid., 204.

<sup>193</sup>Ibid., 204-05.

<sup>194</sup>Ibid., 205.

because “they may well enough be references to two separate theological, if not chronological, themes.”<sup>195</sup>

**Herman Ridderbos.** Although Ridderbos admits that those holding the Johannine Pentecost view correctly interpret John 20:22 in the sense that “there is nothing in this Gospel to suggest a later outpouring of the Spirit to be distinguished from the one spoken of here,” he nevertheless suggests that 7:39 is not fulfilled until Pentecost.<sup>196</sup> Concerning the relationship of 7:39 to 20:22 and Pentecost, Ridderbos contends,

But in view of the entire context it is hard to deny that the bestowal of the Spirit referred to here is related particularly to the equipping of Jesus’ disciples and must therefore be distinguished from the outpouring of the Spirit on “all flesh” without distinction that was to take place at Pentecost. Jn 7:39 speaks of Pentecost, and in much more general and exuberant manner than 20:22 speaks of this more limited giving of the Spirit.<sup>197</sup>

Ridderbos does not offer any explanation beyond the reference to “the entire context” to justify this assertion.

**Cornelis Bennema.** One of the most helpful introductions to the debate is provided in an article by Cornelis Bennema.<sup>198</sup> Bennema proposes his own solution in which he interprets 20:22 “in terms of the Spirit’s activities in relation to people.”<sup>199</sup> He summarizes his position, “In 20:22 the disciples ‘receive’ the Spirit in the sense that they

---

<sup>195</sup>Ibid.

<sup>196</sup>Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 643.

<sup>197</sup>Ibid., 643-44.

<sup>198</sup>Bennema identifies six major interpretations of John 20:22 including (1) the symbolic interpretation; (2) empowerment for ministry; (3) power of proclamation; (4) the Johannine Pentecost; (5) the embryonic Paraclete; and (6) the power of salvation (“Giving of the Spirit,” 201-08). Bennema’s dissertation on the relationship of the Spirit to wisdom in Johannine soteriology was published in the same year (Cornelis Bennema, *The Power of Saving Wisdom: An Investigation of Spirit and Wisdom in Relation to the Soteriology of the Fourth Gospel*, WUNT 2.148 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002]).

<sup>199</sup>Bennema, “Giving of the Spirit,” 208.



receive a new relationship with the Spirit that secures and sustains their salvation.”<sup>200</sup> The phrase ‘receive the Holy Spirit’ “is a donation metaphor, which depicts the gift of a new relationship with the Spirit rather than the Spirit having become a property of someone.”<sup>201</sup>

**James M. Hamilton.** In his dissertation Hamilton finds the two gift view compelling based on his understanding of the difference between the baptism, filling, and indwelling of the Spirit. He states, “It seems that baptisms in the Spirit, fillings with the Spirit, and indwelling by the Spirit are three distinct manifestations of the eschatological gift of the Spirit.”<sup>202</sup> Having explained these concepts, he contends, “It does not seem that John means to describe either a *baptism* or a *filling* in John 20:22, but a *reception*.”<sup>203</sup> Hamilton does not see this reception as conversion because 1:41, 45, 49 seem to indicate the disciples had already come to saving faith in the Messiah.<sup>204</sup> Hamilton concludes,

Read in the context of the Gospel of John, John 20:22 fits nicely as the fulfillment of the promises reception of the indwelling Spirit. From the different descriptions given by John and Luke, it does not seem difficult to affirm that the two authors are not describing the same thing.<sup>205</sup>

Rather than choosing between these two accounts, Hamilton advocates the benefits of comparing and contrasting them so they can clarify one another.

---

<sup>200</sup>Ibid., 211-12.

<sup>201</sup>Ibid., 212.

<sup>202</sup>James Merrill Hamilton Jr., “He Is with You and He Will Be in You: The Spirit, the Believer, and the Glorification of Jesus” (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003), 119. This dissertation has been edited and published as James Merrill Hamilton Jr., *God’s Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old & New Testaments*, NAC Studies in Bible & Theology (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2006).

<sup>203</sup>Hamilton, “He Is with You and He Will Be in You,” 118.

<sup>204</sup>Ibid., 118-19.

<sup>205</sup>Ibid., 119.

**Marianne Meye Thompson.** Thompson frames her discussion by limiting the scholarly options to Barrett’s denial of the possibility of harmonization, Beasley-Murray’s version of the Johannine Pentecost position, or Carson’s symbolic view.<sup>206</sup> She then commends Schnackenburg’s resistance to allow the Lukan Pentecost to control the interpretation of John 20. The problem with all of the previously mentioned positions is that they “assume that the New Testament speaks of one definitive gift of the Holy Spirit to the church.”<sup>207</sup> Thompson commends Calvin’s view that John 20:22-23 is primarily a commission to preach the Gospel for its potential for harmonization with Acts 2. Her questioning of this influence on Ridderbos’s interpretation of Jesus’ breathing as an empowerment rather than regeneration sets the stage for her contribution to the discussion in this article.

Recognizing her indebtedness to Schnackenburg as well as Dunn, Thompson highlights the need to reconsider strong connections with creation in Genesis that the act of breathing in John 20 evokes.<sup>208</sup> This creation language suggests that this passage “narrates the fulfillment of the promise that Jesus will baptize with the Holy Spirit (1:33), since Jesus has been glorified (7:37-39) and the Spirit has been sent; thus new birth by the Spirit (3:3,5) is now possible.”<sup>209</sup>

Having reviewed several Old Testament and non-canonical Jewish texts that use the breathing metaphor of Genesis in the context of spiritual re-creation, Thompson makes three observations concerning John 20:22-23.<sup>210</sup> First, the centrality of the

---

<sup>206</sup>Marianne Meye Thompson, “The Breath of Life: John 20:22-23 Once More,” in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 69-70.

<sup>207</sup>Ibid., 70.

<sup>208</sup>Ibid., 71.

<sup>209</sup>Ibid.

<sup>210</sup>Ibid., 71-78. Thompson deals with Ezek 36-37; Isa 32:15-17; 44:3-6; Jub. 1:13-14, 20-21, 23-25; 1QS 4:20-22; and Asenath’s prayer for conversion in *Joseph and Aseneth* (ibid., 71-75).

forgiveness of sins in verse 23 contrasted with the paucity of similar language in the rest of the book highlights the connection between the giving of the Spirit and salvation for John. Thompson remarks, “It may well be that John’s point is that it is precisely the giving of the Spirit which makes possible the forgiveness of sins, thus also engendering the transition from death to life as portrayed in Ezekiel and elsewhere.”<sup>211</sup>

Thompson’s second observation is that it is more appropriate to interpret this passage as a resurrection appearance than as an alternative to Pentecost. She aptly suggests, “While commentators often seek to reconcile it chronologically and theologically with Acts 2, in fact it is parallel to the resurrection scene as recounted in Luke 24:36-40.”<sup>212</sup> This correction in focus implies that “the scene in John 20:19-23 does as much to testify to the power and status which the risen Lord now has with God as it does to set out a ‘mission mandate’ for his disciples.”<sup>213</sup>

The final observation emphasized by Thompson is that the greater emphasis on the promise of the Spirit in John compared to the other Gospels creates the expectation that their fulfillment is realized in this passage. Thompson observes, “When set against the backdrop of the passages cited earlier from both the Old Testament and Jewish literature, the imagery of Jesus’ ‘breathing’ the Spirit suggests that this is the moment in which the eschatological re-creation and renewal of God’s people, as promised in Ezekiel and Isaiah and anticipated throughout John, has taken place.”<sup>214</sup> Thompson concludes, “The suggestion of this paper is that John presents the prophetic expectations of the work of God’s life-giving and renewing Spirit as brought to fruition in Jesus’ breathing on his

---

<sup>211</sup>Ibid., 75-76.

<sup>212</sup>Ibid., 76.

<sup>213</sup>Ibid., 77.

<sup>214</sup>Ibid., 78.

disciples the Spirit, the breath of life.<sup>2215</sup>

## Evaluation

Our survey of the history of scholarship on the relationship of the giving of the Spirit in John to the giving of the Spirit in Luke-Acts has yielded the following observations with implications for further study. First, most of the studies on this topic thus far have been undertaken in the context of a broader study. Because there have been no monographs that have pursued this question for its own sake, there is a need for a more thorough exploration of this topic. Second, the tendency to categorize the various positions of scholarship into these three broad positions has resulted in confusing dialog. There is a need to clarify the issues involved in an exegetical comparison of the fulfillment of the promises of the Holy Spirit in John and Luke-Acts.

## Method

The thesis of this dissertation will be developed along three lines of argument. First, pericopes that are relevant to pneumatological expectation and fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel will be carefully examined through historical-grammatical exegesis. This examination will include the disciplines of textual criticism, semantic analysis, grammatical analysis, background analysis and literary analysis<sup>216</sup> with an emphasis on

---

<sup>215</sup>Ibid.

<sup>216</sup>On the relationship of literary analysis to traditional exegesis, see Stanley E. Porter, "Can Traditional Exegesis Enlighten Literary Analysis of the Fourth Gospel? An Examination of the Old Testament Fulfillment Motif and the Passover Theme," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and William Richard Stegner, JSNTSup 3 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 396-428. This study will emphasize the influence of the Old Testament as a primary influence on Johannine metaphors and themes. On the role of the OT in the Gospel of John, see C. K. Barrett, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 48 (1947): 155-69; Franklin W. Young, "Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel," *ZNW* 46 (1955): 215-33; Jacob J. Enz, "The Book of Exodus as a Literary Type for the Gospel of John," *JBL* 76 (1957): 208-15; Richard Morgan, "Fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel: The Old Testament Foundations," *Int* 11 (1957): 155; T. F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*, SBT 40 (London: SCM, 1963); Bruce Vawter, "Ezekiel and John," *CBQ* 26 (1964): 450-58; E. D. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*, NovTSup 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1965); D. Moody Smith, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*, ed. James M. Efrid (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972), 53-58; G. Reim, *Studien zum Alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangelium*, SNTSMS 22

how the author uses language to develop the narrative.<sup>217</sup> Second, I will seek to identify

---

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974); Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 27-30; Craig A. Evans, "On the Quotation Formulas in the Fourth Gospel," *BZ* 26 (1982): 79-83; Peder Borgen, "The Prologue of John: An Exposition of the Old Testament," in *Philo, John and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity*, BJS 131 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 75-101; D. A. Carson, "John and the Johannine Epistles," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 245-64; Schnackenburg, *St. John*, 1:121-24; Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991); Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*, SBLDS 133 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, "John's Use of Scripture," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 358-79; Martin Hengel, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 380-95; Glenn Balfour, "The Jewishness of John's Use of the Scripture in John 6:31 and 7:37-38," *TynBul* 46 (1995): 357-80; William G. Fowler, "The Influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel: Intertextuality and Interpretation" (Ph.D. diss., Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, 1995); David Mark Ball, *'I Am' in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*, JSNTSup 124 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); Kirsten Nielsen, "Old Testament Imagery in John," in *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives. Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel in Århus 1997*, ed. Johannes Nissen and Sigfred Pedersen, JSNTSup 182 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 66-82; Margaret Daly-Denton, *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the Psalms*, AGJU 47 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000); G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, ed. D. A. Carson, NSBT 17 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004); Edward W. Klink III, "What Concern Is That to You and to Me? John 2:1-11 and the Elisha Narratives," *Neot* 39 (2005): 273-87; Dan Liroy, *The Search for Ultimate Reality: Intertextuality between the Genesis and Johannine Prologues*, SBL 93 (New York: Lang, 2005); Paul Miller, "'They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him': The Gospel of John and the Old Testament," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 127-51; Andreas J. Köstenberger, "John," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 415-512. Carson contends that scholarly consensus on this issue is sufficient to dismiss the need for a review of the documentation (Carson, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility*, 132).

<sup>217</sup>J. P. Louw noted the relationship between simplicity and complexity in the author's use of language in his discussion of John 3:16-21, "Though the syntax of the passage is quite simple, the semantic relations are indeed multiple and complex" ("On Johannine Style," *Neot* 20 [1986]: 12). On John's use of language, see Frank Thielman, "The Style of the Fourth Gospel and Ancient Literary Critical Concepts of Religious Discourse," in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Duane F. Watson, JSNT 50 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 169-83; Saeed Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: A Theological Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel*, WUNT 120 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000). On the artistic composition of the Fourth Gospel, see Mark W. G. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel*, SNTS 73 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 13-22. Scholarly attention to the function of symbolism in the Fourth Gospel has increased tremendously since Wayne A. Meeks lamented, "We have not yet learned to let the symbolic language of Johannine literature speak in its own way. It is symptomatic of the impasse in NT hermeneutics that we have as yet no adequate monograph on the Johannine symbolism as such" ("The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism," *JBL* 91 [1972]: 47). Recent important contributions to the study on Johannine symbolism and metaphors include David W. Wead, *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel*, Theologische Dissertationen 4 (Basel: Komm. Friedrich Reinhardt, 1970); Sandra M. Schneiders, "History and Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel," in *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, Rédaction, Théologie*, ed. M. de Jonge, BETL 44 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), 371-76; R. Wade Paschal Jr., "Sacramental Symbolism and Physical Imagery in the Gospel of John," *TynBul* 32 (1981): 151-76; Otto

pneumatological themes related to the expectation of the giving of the Holy Spirit that are inherent in the narrative itself to provide a context by which to interpret their fulfillment in John 20:19-23. Third, I will seek to define the relationship between Johannine and Lukan pneumatological fulfillment in terms of their thematic and theological relationships.

A distinguishing feature of this study is its attempt to discuss the development of pneumatological themes as they unfold in the narrative. A weakness of some studies is the tendency to arrange discussion of the Johannine material into schemas that do not emphasize the development of the themes within the narrative of John.<sup>218</sup>

### Overview

Chapters 2 and 3 are devoted to the exegesis of Johannine pericopes related to the development of pneumatological expectation. The πνεῦμα passages in John 1-7 is the

---

Schwankl, *Licht und Finsternis: Ein metaphorisches Paradigma in den johanneischen Schriften*, HBS 5 (Freiburg: Herder, 1995); Larry Paul Jones, *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 145 (1997); Jan G. van der Watt, *Family of the King: Dynamics of Metaphor in the Gospel according to John*, Biblical Interpretation Series 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2000); Wai-yee Ng, *Water Symbolism in John: An Eschatological Interpretation*, SBL 15 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001); Thomas Popp, *Grammatik des Geistes: Literarische Kunst und theologische Konzeption in Johannes 3 und 6*, ABG 3 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2001); Craig R. Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003); Jane S. Webster, *Ingesting Jesus: Eating and Drinking in the Gospel of John*, Academia Biblica 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003); Ruben Zimmermann, "Imagery in John: Opening Up Paths into the Tangled Thicket of John's Figurative World," in *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*, ed. Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann, WUNT 200 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 1-43. On the influence of the Septuagint on Johannine metaphors, see Margaret Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, JSNTSup 69 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992). See also Pierre Grelot, *The Language of Symbolism: Biblical Theology, Semantics, and Exegesis*, trans. Christopher R. Smith (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006).

<sup>218</sup>Porsch's order of discussion of the πνεῦμα passages is 1:29-34; 7:37-39; 3:3-8; 4:7-26; 6:63; 3:34 but he does discuss the παράκλητος passages in the order of their occurrence (*Pneuma und Wort*). Burge orders his discussion of the texts in a thematic arrangement discussing Christology with this arrangement of texts: 1:29-34; 3:34; 7:37-39; 19:34; 4:7-15; 6:63; 20:22 (*Anointed Community*). Turner's arrangement follows an order of 1:32-34; 3:34-36; 4:10, 13-14; 6:32-58, 60-66; 3:3, 10, 31 (*Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*). Trica Gates Brown's arrangement follows an order of 1:31-34; 19:30-34; 20:22-23; 3:3-8; 3:31-36; 4:21-24; 6:60-63; 7:37-39; and then a separate chapter dedicated to the παράκλητος passages (*Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-Scientific Perspective*, JSNTSup 253 [London: T. & T. Clark, 2003]).

subject of chapter 2 while chapter 3 examines the παράκλητος passages in John 14-16. Each text is carefully examined in its grammatical, historical, and theological context with special attention to the author's use of literary devices to develop pneumatological themes. These themes are summarized at the end of the chapter in an attempt to identify categories of pneumatological expectation that are inherent in the flow of the narrative itself.

In chapter 4 I exegete the passages that are directly related to the fulfillment of the expectations related to the Spirit. Special attention is given to the literary devices used by the author to relate these fulfillment passages to the Pneuma and Paraclete passages. After an examination of the author's understanding of glorification and its relationship to the death of Jesus, I attempt to provide an exegesis of John 20:19-23 within the context of the author's development of pneumatological themes. This chapter also includes an examination of the problems related to the role of Thomas in 20:24-29 and the behavior of the disciples in chapter 21.

Chapter 5 consists of an investigation of the relationship between Johannine and Lukan pneumatological fulfillment. First, there are several issues related to similarities in language between John and Luke that need to be explained. Specifically, the typically Lukan language associated with baptism in the Spirit, the gift of the Spirit, and the outward witness of the Spirit is present in the narrative of John but strangely missing from its conclusion. Second, the historical issues related to harmonizing the Easter account in John with the chronology of Luke-Acts are examined. I argue that the historical parallel of John 20:19-23 is not Pentecost in Acts 2 but the Lukan Easter narrative in Luke 24. Finally, I examine Luke-Acts in light of the pneumatological categories discovered by our exegesis of John to determine the extent to which we can say that Lukan pneumatology corresponds or differs with Johannine pneumatology.

In chapter 6 I summarize the main conclusions of this study. I hope that my exegesis of the relevant texts satisfactorily convinces the reader that the author of the

Fourth Gospel intended his audience to understand John 20:19-23 as the climax to his development of pneumatological themes. I also hope that the reader concludes that a careful harmonization of the Johannine presentation of the giving of the Spirit with the Lukan presentation is not only possible but provides a more satisfactory explanation of the evidence.



CHAPTER 2  
PNEUMATOLOGICAL EXPECTATION  
IN THE ΠΝΕΥΜΑ PASSAGES

**Introduction**

The Greek word πνεῦμα occurs twenty-four times in the Gospel of John.<sup>1</sup> Sixteen of these occurrences are found in six pericopes commonly designated as the πνεῦμα passages.<sup>2</sup> These passages containing explicit references to the Holy Spirit include the witness of John the Baptist in 1:29-34, the teaching on new birth to Nicodemus in 3:5-8, the commentary on the relationship of the Holy Spirit to Jesus Himself in 3:34, the offer of the living water of true worship to the Samaritan woman in 4:4-30, the correlation of the Spirit to the words of Jesus in 6:63, and the invitation for the thirsty at the Feast of Tabernacles in 7:37-39.

This chapter will seek to trace how the author generates a sense of expectation regarding the giving of the Holy Spirit in these passages. After establishing the context of each passage in the narrative as a whole, pertinent exegetical issues will be raised and significant motifs will be identified in an effort to understand its contribution to the

---

<sup>1</sup>John 1:32, 33 (2x); 3:5, 6 (2x), 8 (2x), 34; 4:23, 24 (2x); 6:63 (2x); 7:39 (2x); 11:33; 13:21; 14:17; 14:26; 15:26; 16:13; 19:30; 20:22. John 11:33 and 13:21 are not normally included as πνεῦμα passages in the discussion of Johannine pneumatology because these are clearly references to the human emotions of Jesus. Justification for treating the use of πνεῦμα in John 14:17; 14:26; 15:26 and 16:13 separately will be given in the introduction to chap. 3 of this study. While hardly anyone contests that 20:22 is a reference to the Holy Spirit, whether John 19:30 refers to the human spirit of Jesus or the Holy Spirit is debated and will be discussed in chap. 4 of this study.

<sup>2</sup>Scholars who discuss these passages in a similar division include Felix Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Frankfurt: Knecht, 1974), 14-210; Tricia Gates Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-Scientific Perspective*, JSNTSup 253 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2003), 75-169.

development of pneumatological themes.

### **The Witness of John the Baptist (John 1:29-34)**

The first πνεῦμα passage in John 1:29-34 serves as an introduction to many of the pneumatological themes that will be developed as the narrative of the Fourth Gospel unfolds. In addition to grounding these themes in the main themes introduced in the preceding prologue (1:1-18), the motifs and metaphors employed in this pericope are carefully woven throughout the fabric of the entire narrative.<sup>3</sup>

The immediate context of these first statements about the Spirit is the confession of John the Baptist regarding the identity of Jesus on the second day of his three day testimony (1:19-37).<sup>4</sup> The first part of this confession is a declaration of titles expressing who Jesus is (29-31). The second part is an explanation of how John came to know these things (32-34).<sup>5</sup>

### **The Theme of Revelation**

A major, if not primary, theme of the Fourth Gospel is the theme of revelation.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup>The careful composition of the Fourth Gospel has often been noted. George R. Beasley-Murray describes it as “a closely knit composition, constructed with consummate artistry” (*John*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., WBC, vol. 36 [Dallas: Word, 1999], 4). Herman N. Ridderbos says it is “splendidly constructed” (*The Gospel according to John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 17). Stan Harstine concludes that the Prologue is “an integral part of the narrative possessing a chiasmic structure with an Old Testament background” (*Moses as a Character in the Fourth Gospel: A Study of Ancient Reading Techniques*, JSNTSup 229 [London: Sheffield Academic, 2002], 44).

<sup>4</sup>Some have noted a chronological sequence progressing the narrative of John 1:19-2:11 (John Henry Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, 2 vols., ICC [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929], 33-34; Thomas Barrosse, “The Seven Days of the New Creation in St. John’s Gospel,” *CBQ* 21 [1959]: 507-16; D. A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, PNTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 167-68). This subtle focus on the number of days in the first week of the narrative strengthens the connections of the ministry of the incarnate Word to the activity of the Word in creation.

<sup>5</sup>Barclay M. Newman and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator’s Handbook on the Gospel of John*, UBS Handbook Series (New York: United Bible Societies, 1980), 36.

<sup>6</sup>The primacy of the concept of revelation as a theme in the Gospel of John is widely recognized. Gary M. Burge observes, “The observation is at least as old as Bultmann that the chief work of Christ in the Fourth Gospel is revelation and not the cross” (“Revelation and Discipleship in St. John’s Gospel,” in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, WUNT 222 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], 235-254). Note the recent challenges to Bultmann’s lack of emphasis on the significance of the cross in the

The theme of revelation is primarily developed in this πνεῦμα passage through the motif of the knowledge of John the Baptist. While verbs of knowing describe the content of John's knowledge about the identity of Jesus, verbs of seeing and hearing are employed to depict the means by which that knowledge is revealed. These motifs clearly establish the central role of the Spirit in the theme of revelation.

**The anthropological need for revelation.** The motif of knowing is developed through the use of the verb οἶδα (John 1:26, 31, 33).<sup>7</sup> A key aspect of the use of οἶδα in the context of this passage is that it is used to emphasize the lack of knowledge apart from revelation.<sup>8</sup> John tells his inquisitors that the reason he is baptizing even though he does not believe himself to be the fulfillment of messianic expectation is that there is one standing among them ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἶδατε (1:26).<sup>9</sup> John is careful to emphasize his dependence upon revelation for his own knowledge of Jesus by twice saying κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδην αὐτόν (1:31, 33).<sup>10</sup>

---

revelation of John by Bruce H. Grigsby, "The Cross as an Expiatory Sacrifice in the Fourth Gospel," *JSNT* 15 (1982): 51-53; Max Turner, "Atonement and the Death of Jesus in John: Some Questions to Bultmann and Forestell," *EvQ* 62 (1990): 99-122.

<sup>7</sup>The verb οἶδα occurs 84 times in 70 verses in John (1:26, 31, 33; 2:9; 3:2, 8, 11; 4:10, 22, 25, 32, 42; 5:13, 32; 6:6, 42, 61, 64; 7:15, 27-29; 8:14, 19, 37, 55; 9:12, 20-21, 24-25, 29-31; 10:4-5; 11:22, 24, 42, 49; 12:35, 50-13:1; 13:3, 7, 11, 17-18; 14:4-5; 15:15, 21; 16:18, 30; 18:2, 4, 21; 19:10, 28, 35; 20:2, 9, 13-14; 21:4, 12, 15-17, 24).

<sup>8</sup>Beasley-Murray, *John*, 24; Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 64-65.

<sup>9</sup>On the phrase ὡμολόγησεν καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο, καὶ ὡμολόγησεν (20), see John F. McHugh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1-4*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, ICC (London: T & T Clark, 2009), 115-16.

<sup>10</sup>John's knowledge is also contrasted with Jesus' knowledge in 1:47-49 where Jesus has supernatural knowledge about Nathanael's prior activity under a fig tree. So Köstenberger, *John*, 82-83. This contrast between the knowledge of Jesus and those with whom he dialogues will continue to be a significant theme throughout the πνεῦμα passages and will become explicit in the παράκλητος passages. The motif of the supernatural knowledge of Jesus is also developed throughout the narrative in several passages that are not explicitly connected with the πνεῦμα passages (1:42; 2:24-25; 4:17-18; 6:64, 70; 11:4, 11-14; 13:10-11, 38; 21:18-19). A prominent element of this motif is Jesus' knowledge about himself (2:4, 19-22; 13:1, 3; 18:4; 19:28). The self-understanding of Jesus and its relation to the early Christian community has been a matter of some debate in New Testament studies since the rise of the so-called Quest of the Historical Jesus. See Paul W. Meyer, "The Problem of the Messianic Self-consciousness of Jesus," *NovT* 4 (1960): 122-38; Christian P. Ceroke, "The Divinity of Christ in the Gospels," *CBQ* 24 (1962):

**The Christological content of revelation.** Another aspect of the motif of knowing is the actual content of John's knowledge about Jesus. Upon seeing Jesus, John declares ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου (1:29). Several potential conceptual backgrounds for John's use of this phrase have been offered.<sup>11</sup>

---

125-39; Raymond E. Brown, "How Much Did Jesus Know?—a Survey of Biblical Evidence," *CBO* 29 (1967): 315-45; Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*, trans. W. Montgomery (New York: Macmillan, 1968), 10-11; Gwilym Beckerlegge, "Jesus' Authority and the Problem of His Self-consciousness," *HeyJ* 19 (1978): 365-82; David Stanley, "Go and Tell John What You Hear and See: Jesus' Self-understanding in the Light of His Earthly Ministry," in *Who Do People Say I Am?*, ed. Francis A. Eigo (Villanova: Villanova University Press, 1980), 47-90; Royce Gordon Gruenler, "Implied Christological Claims in the Core Sayings of Jesus: An Application of Wittgenstein's Phenomenology," *SBLSP* 20 (1981): 66-77; Raymond E. Brown, "Did Jesus Know He Was God?," *BTB* 15 (1985): 74-79; Ragnar Leivestad, *Jesus in His Own Perspective: An Examination of His Sayings, Actions, and Eschatological Titles*, trans. David E. Aune (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1987); Petr Pokorný, *The Genesis of Christology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987), 38-51; James H. Charlesworth, *Jesus within Judaism: New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries* (London: SPCK, 1988), 131-64; I. Howard Marshall, *The Origins of New Testament Christology*, rev. ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990), 43-62; Ben Witherington III, *The Christology of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990); E. P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 1993), 238-48; Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to New Testament Christology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1994), 71-102; Ronald H. Fuller, "The Clue to Jesus' Self-Understanding," in *Christ and Christianity: Studies in the Formation of Christology*, ed. Robert Kahl (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994), 37-46; Ben F. Meyer, "Jesus' Ministry and Self-Understanding," in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 337-52; William R. Farmer, "Reflections Upon 'the Historical Perimeters for Understanding the Aims of Jesus'," in *Crisis in Christology: Essays in Quest of Resolution*, ed. William R. Farmer (Livonia, MI: Dove, 1995), 175-97; J. C. O'Neill, *Who Did Jesus Think He Was?*, Biblical Interpretation Series 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1995); N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God 2 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 475-654; Ben F. Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus*, Princeton Theological Monograph Series 48 (San Jose, CA: Pickwick Publications, 2002); James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, vol. 1 of *Christianity in the Making* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 615-762. The reliability of Johannine material is sometimes disparaged by those participating in this discussion. See especially Schweitzer, *Quest of the historical Jesus*, 6; Witherington, *Christology of Jesus*, 30; Wright, *Jesus and Victory of God*, 555-57; Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 165-67. For more positive views of the possibility of integrating Johannine material into this debate, see Richard Bauckham, "The Sonship of the Historical Jesus in Christology," *SJT* 31 (1978): 256; Marinus de Jonge, *Christology in Context: The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988), 140-151, 197-199; Marinus de Jonge, *God's Final Envoy: Early Christology and Jesus' Own View of His Mission*, *Studying the Historical Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 119-129, 139-42.

<sup>11</sup>These include (1) the Passover Lamb (Exod 12); (2) the Suffering Servant who was silent ὡς ἀμνὸς ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν (Isa 53:7); (3) the ἀρνίον ἄκακον to which the prophet Jeremiah likened himself (Jer 11:18); (4) the lamb that was sacrificed daily in the Temple; (5) the scapegoat for the day of Atonement (Lev 16); (6) the lamb provided by God on behalf of Isaac (Gen 22:1-14); (7) the lamb sometimes required for guilt or sin offerings (Lev 4:32-35; 14:12-20); and (8) the apocalyptic lamb who is triumphant (*1 En.* 90:38; *T. Jos.* 19:8; Rev 5:6; 7:17; 14:1-5; 17:14). See the discussions of C. K. Barrett, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 48 (1947): 155-56; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1953), 230-38; idem, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 269-71; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John I-XII: Introduction, Translation and Notes*, AB, vol. 29 (New York: Doubleday,

While arguments can be made for the relative strengths and weaknesses for each of these options, perhaps the most significant exegetical observation is to note the possibility that the lack of evidence required to determine the singular background might serve the purposes of an author who apparently uses ambiguity at key places in his narrative.<sup>12</sup> Even so, the author does seem to further develop imagery of Jesus as the Passover Lamb and the Suffering Servant suggesting that they should be given primacy in interpreting this title.<sup>13</sup>

Referring to his discussion with the representatives from the Jewish leaders on the previous day (1:24-27), John further identifies Jesus as ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν (1:30). While the adverb ὀπίσω, the preposition ἔμπροσθέν, and the adjective πρῶτός can all be taken in the sense that John is talking about the superiority of Jesus in terms of rank, the inclusion of this statement in the Prologue immediately following its climatic statement that the Word of creation

---

1966), 58-63; F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 52-53; Carson, *John*, 149-51; Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 126-30; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 24-25; Köstenberger, *John*, 66-68; McHugh, *John 1-4*, 126-34.

<sup>12</sup>So Grigsby, “The Cross as an Expiatory Sacrifice in the Fourth Gospel,” 54; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 52; Andreas J. Köstenberger, “John,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 428; McHugh, *John 1-4*, 131-33. Morris states, “The lamb figure may well be intended to be composite, evoking memories of several, perhaps all, of the suggestions we have canvassed. All that the ancient sacrifices foreshadowed was perfectly fulfilled in the sacrifice of Christ” (*John*, 130). See Carson’s discussion of the misunderstanding of these titles by those who confessed them (*John*, 148).

<sup>13</sup>Craig A. Evans concludes, “I am inclined to think that the evangelist has presented Jesus as the Suffering Servant, who as ‘lamb’ (Isa. 53:7) has been interpreted as the Passover lamb” (*Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John’s Prologue*, JSNTSup 89 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], 182 n.3). See also Martin Hengel, “The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” *HBT* 12 (1990): 29; Stanley E. Porter, “Can Traditional Exegesis Enlighten Literary Analysis of the Fourth Gospel? An Examination of the Old Testament Fulfillment Motif and the Passover Theme,” in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and William Richard Stegner, JSNTSup 3 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 407-11; Jesper Tang Nielsen, “The Lamb of God: The Cognitive Structure of a Johannine Metaphor,” in *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*, ed. Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann, WUNT 200 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 225-241, 256; James Merrill Hamilton Jr., “The Influence of Isaiah on the Gospel of John,” *Perichoresis* 5 (2007): 148-49.

became flesh clearly indicates that the preexistence of Jesus is in view.<sup>14</sup>

That John sees Jesus as superior in rank is developed in his previous statement regarding his lack of worthiness to untie Jesus' sandal (1:27). His superiority is further developed by the explanatory clause ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν (1:30). The superiority of Jesus is another Christological theme related to the theme of revelation that is woven throughout the narrative and into other πνεῦμα passages.<sup>15</sup>

**The pneumatological means of revelation.** The use of φανερώω serves to develop the positive side of the motif of knowing.<sup>16</sup> John says that he was sent to baptize with water ἵνα φανερωθῆ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ (31). The implied subject of the passive verb φανερώω is Ἰησοῦς from verse 29 who is also the antecedent of αὐτόν in verse 31. The water baptism serves to reveal Jesus in two ways. First, John's lesser authority to baptize with water is contrasted with Jesus' superior authority as ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (John 1:33).<sup>17</sup> The difficulty in determining the precise meaning of this phrase is compounded by two problems.<sup>18</sup> First, attempts to find the precise precedent for John's

---

<sup>14</sup>See Margaret Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, JSNTSup 69 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 170-71; Paul Miller, "They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him": The Gospel of John and the Old Testament," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 134-46.

<sup>15</sup>Jesus is greater than Moses in 1:17, Jacob in 4:12-14, and Abraham in 8:31-58.

<sup>16</sup>The verb φανερώω is used 9 times in 8 verses (John 1:31; 2:11; 3:21; 7:4; 9:3; 17:6; 21:1, 14). Other revelatory Johannine verbs in the same semantic domain include ἐξηγέομαι which occurs once in John 1:18 but 5 other times in NT (Luke 24:35; Acts 10:8; 15:12, 14; 21:19), ἀποκαλύπτω which occurs once in John 12:38 quoting Isa 53:1 (LXX) but 25 other times in NT (Matt 10:26; 11:25, 27; 16:17; Luke 2:35; 10:21-22; 12:2; 17:30; Rom 1:17-18; 8:18; 1 Cor 2:10; 3:13; 14:30; Gal 1:16; 3:23; Eph 3:5; Phil 3:15; 2 Thess 2:3, 6, 8; 1 Pet 1:5, 12; 5:1), and ἐμφανίζω which occurs 2 times in John 14:21, 22.

<sup>17</sup>The issue of authority is a recurring theme in John (John 5:27; 7:17-18; 8:28; 10:18; 12:49; 14:10; 16:13; 17:2; 19:10-11). The relationship of authority to John's baptism is also seen in the synoptic Gospels (Matt 21:23-27; Mark 11:28-33; Luke 20:1-8).

<sup>18</sup>Bennema notes Porsch as the only notable exception to the the lack of attention given to baptism in the Spirit in studies on Johannine pneumatology (Cornelis Bennema, "Spirit-Baptism in the Fourth Gospel: A Messianic Reading of John 1,33," *Bib* 84 [2003]: 35; Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort*, 42-51). For a defense of the historicity of the prophecy of Spirit baptism by John the Baptist, see Ernest Best, "Spirit Baptism," *NovT* 4 (1960): 236-43; James D. G. Dunn, "Spirit and Fire Baptism," *NovT* 14 (1972): 81-92; Archie W. D. Hui, "John the Baptist and Spirit-Baptism," *EvQ* 71 (1999): 99-115. Among the most important studies on baptism in the New Testament, note George R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New*

water baptism remain unconvincing to most scholars.<sup>19</sup> Second, the concept of Jesus baptizing in the Spirit does not occur again in the rest of the narrative.<sup>20</sup>

The second way that water baptism serves to reveal Jesus is that it provides the opportunity for the Spirit to identify Jesus to John. The foundational motifs that are used to develop the means by which revelation is received in Johannine thought are related to the physical senses of seeing, hearing, and touching.<sup>21</sup> While seeing and hearing are used in reference to revelation throughout the narrative, their relationship to Johannine pneumatology is especially prominent in this passage. The use of the verb θεάομαι and the use of the comparison of the Spirit's descent to the flight of a dove suggests that the Baptist is recounting a visible manifestation of the Spirit (1:32).<sup>22</sup>

---

*Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981).

<sup>19</sup>Morna D. Hooker, "John's Baptism: A Prophetic Sign," in *Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 22-23. Though I tend to agree with suggestions of Craig A. Evans that the ministries of Elijah, Joshua, Malachi, and Isaiah are typologically related ("The Baptism of John in a Typological Context," in *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, JSNTSup 234 [London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002], 45-71).

<sup>20</sup>Based on his reading of John 3:22 and 4:1, Dodd concludes that the water baptisms in these passages were administered by Jesus and should be considered baptisms in the Spirit (*Interpretation of Fourth Gospel*, 300). George Johnston's suggestion that the present tense of the participle βαπτίζων demands immediate baptism of the Spirit places too much weight on the tense (*The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, SNTSMS 12 [Cambridge: University Press, 1970], 10-11). Bennema acknowledges that the phrase is a hapax legomenon unique but then attempts to find meaning in John through exploring conceptual precedents in contemporary literature. Bennema concludes, "*Jesus' confronting of people with his Spirit-imbued revelatory life-giving teaching is essentially an actualization of Jesus' baptizing with Holy Spirit* [emphasis his]" ("Spirit-Baptism," 53). While the narrative does support this strong connection between the Spirit and the words of Jesus, it seems that the equation of Spirit baptism to the words of Jesus does not give adequate consideration to the author's typical method of integrating important motifs throughout the narrative. In my judgment the most significant aspect of Spirit baptism for the Fourth Gospel is that it is only mentioned here.

<sup>21</sup>J. P. Louw takes the use of ὁράω in 1:51 and βλέπω in 1:29 as evidence that John uses these terms synonymously. Louw regards the use of synonyms in the Fourth Gospel "as a Johannine device to give flavour to a discourse which is syntactically very simple in nature" ("On Johannine Style," *Neot* 20 [1986]: 6-7). The third sense of touch will be a central aspect for the two fulfillment passages discussed in chap. 4 of this study concerning Mary and Thomas (20:1-18, 24-29). The significance of these senses to Johannine thought are also emphasized in the introduction of 1 John 1:1: ὁ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὁ ἐωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐθεασάμεθα καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς.

<sup>22</sup>On the visibility of this event, see Carson, *John*, 153. Carson notes a possible allusion to the association of a dove with the Spirit's activity in Gen 1:2 by Rabbi Ben Zoma in *b. Hag* 15a (ibid.).

The second element of the Spirit's identification of Jesus to John the Baptist was that the descending Spirit ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν (1:32). The use of the verb μένω and the prepositional phrase ἐπ' αὐτόν to describe the interaction of the Spirit with Jesus alludes to a series of texts from Isaiah that also inform the relationship of the Spirit to the Suffering Servant (1:32, 33).<sup>23</sup> While the narrative seems to suggest that the initial descent of the Spirit was a visible event, John's witness that the Spirit remained on Jesus was probably based on this messianic pneumatological expectation and his observation of the effects of Jesus' ministry.<sup>24</sup>

While John's testimony that he was told about this sign by the One who sent him could be a reference to a divine verbal divine communication, it could also be the result of his reflection upon Scripture. The probability of John knowing these titles has raised debate concerning the historicity of this account.<sup>25</sup> For some, these titles evidence the later theological developments of a distinctively Christian author or community.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 97; Thomas R. Hatina, "John 20,22 in Its Eschatological Context: Promise or Fulfillment?," *Bib* 74 (1993): 206-07; Hamilton, "The Influence of Isaiah on the Gospel of John," 149. Cf. Isa 11:1-2; 42:1; 48:16; 61:1. See John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 107. This expectation is reflected in *Tg. Isa* 42,1-4; *1 Enoch* 49,3; 62,2; *T. Jud.* 24,2; *Pss. Sol.* 17,37; 18,7. See Hatina, "John 20,22," 206-07; Köstenberger, *John*, 69-70; Morris, *John*, 133.

<sup>24</sup>Cf. John 3:34.

<sup>25</sup>Scholars who deny that John the Baptist could have uttered this statement include Dodd, *Interpretation of Fourth Gospel*, 230-38; idem, *Historical Tradition*, 269-71; Maurice Casey, *Is John's Gospel True?* (London: Routledge, 1996), 63-79; McHugh, *John 1-4*, 133. Scholars who affirm the plausibility of its historicity as a statement made by the Baptist include Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel: Issues and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001), 78-79; Köstenberger, *John*, 66.

<sup>26</sup>Morris asserts that there is no pre-Christian evidence for taking Isa 53 to refer to the Messiah (*John*, 127-28). However, given the purposeful use of Isaiah throughout the Gospel, I think the connection with Isa 53 is particularly probable. See the discussion of John 12:20-36 in chap. 4 of this study. Peter Stuhlmacher represents a similar view when he says, "The Christological interpretation of Isaiah 53 that comes to the fore in 4:25; 1 Corinthians 15:3b-5; 1 Peter 2:22-25; Hebrews 9:28, and so forth was not first and foremost the fruit of post-Easter faith; its roots lie rather in Jesus' own understanding of his mission and death. He himself adopted the general messianic interpretation of Isaiah 53 current in early Judaism, but he understood his sufferings quite independently of the prevailing tradition in the light of the word of God given to him from Isaiah 43:3-4 and 53:11-12" ("Isaiah 53 in the Gospels and Acts," in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 149). For the evidence of pre-Christian messianic interpretations of Isa 53, see Martin Hengel and Daniel P. Bailey, "The



Others argue that there is evidence that these titles could have been in broader use in Palestine during the time of John the Baptist.

Bauckham suggests the possibility that John the Baptist could have arrived at this conclusion through gematria.<sup>27</sup> The numerical value of the Hebrew name for Jesus (יהשע) is the same as the numerical value for the Hebrew phrase for “the lamb of God” (שה אלהים).<sup>28</sup> Hofius points to the synonymous use of נשא and סכל as evidence that the author of John was reflecting specifically on Isaiah 52:13-53:12.<sup>29</sup> Given these arguments that John’s messianic expectations could have been developed through a careful study of Scripture, the historicity of these titles can be adequately defended. Certainty on whether the author used of verbs of speaking to literally depict a divine verbal communication to John or to metaphorically refer to John’s reflection on Scripture is not required to appreciate that John received this knowledge through revelation. It is certain, however, that the author’s use of verbs of seeing are intended to depict the supernatural role of the Spirit as the means by which John was able to apply these messianic expectations to the person of Jesus.

---

Effective History of Isaiah 53 in the pre-Christian Period,” in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 75-146. Contra John J. Collins, “A Messiah before Jesus?,” in *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. John J. Collins and Craig A. Evans, *Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 15-35. On the general influence of Isaiah on pre-Christian Jewish speculation, see Franklin W. Young, “Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel,” *ZNW* 46 (1955): 215-21.

<sup>27</sup>Richard Bauckham, “The 153 Fish and the Unity of the Fourth Gospel,” in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 276.

<sup>28</sup>McHugh suggests that use of the Hebrew text might explain the use of αἴρω in 1:29 instead of the LXX’s ἀναφέρω in Isa 53:11-12 (*John 1-4*, 129-30). Nielsen argues that both the Hebrew and Greek texts need to be taken into account based on the evidence that the author probably used both (“The Lamb of God,” 228). Also note his thorough survey of German scholarship on this point.

<sup>29</sup>Otfried Hofius, “The Fourth Servant Song in the New Testament Letters,” in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 163-88. For an argument for an Aramaic background, see David W. Wead, “The Johannine Double Meaning,” *ResQ* 13 (1970): 111-14. Also see George Leonard Carey, “The Lamb of God and Atonement Theories,” *TynBul* 32 (1981): 106.

## The Theme of Witness

The importance of the witness of the Baptist is evidenced by its placement at the beginning of the narrative immediately following the prologue.<sup>30</sup> The shift from prologue to narrative is marked by the statement αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου (1:19).<sup>31</sup> The lacuna of the actual baptism of Jesus requires the reader of the Fourth Gospel to depend upon the witness of the Baptist to the Spirit's role in revealing the identity of Jesus.<sup>32</sup> The role of the Baptist as a witness is first described in the prologue (1:6-8).<sup>33</sup> The humanity of John as ἄνθρωπος in verse 6 is contrasted with the divinity of the Logos as θεός in verse 1. This does not diminish, however, John's importance as one who is also ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ (1:6).<sup>34</sup> Although the author is clear regarding John that οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, he also emphasizes that John has a distinct purpose as a μαρτυρίαν ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός.<sup>35</sup> John's purpose as a witness is explicitly

---

<sup>30</sup>Blomberg notes, "In this Gospel, it is 'testimony', especially to Jesus, that characterizes the portrait of the Baptist" (*John's Gospel*, 75). On the prominence of witness as a theme in John, see Bernard, *Gospel according to St. John*, xc-xciii.

<sup>31</sup>Of its 37 occurrences in the NT, the noun μαρτυρία is used 14 times in the Gospel of John (John 1:7, 19; 3:11, 32-33; 5:31-32, 34, 36; 8:13-14, 17; 19:35; 21:24). The verb μαρτυρέω occurs 76 times in the NT and 33 times in the Fourth Gospel (John 1:7-8, 15, 32, 34; 2:25; 3:11, 26, 28, 32; 4:39, 44; 5:31-33, 36-37, 39; 7:7; 8:13-14, 18; 10:25; 12:17; 13:21; 15:26-27; 18:23, 37; 19:35; 21:24).

<sup>32</sup>Max-Alain Chevallier, *Souffle de Dieu: Le Saint-Esprit dans le Nouveau Testament*, 3 vols., L'apôtre Paul, Les écrits johanniques, L'héritage paulinien, Réflexions finales 2 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1990), 422. Some who have suggested that Jesus had already been baptized by this point in the narrative include Bernard, *Gospel according to St. John*, 43; Köstenberger, *John*, 69.

<sup>33</sup>The relationship of the prologue to the rest of the narrative of John has been debated. Rudolf Bultmann argued that there was no relationship (*The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971], 13). Scholars who argue for its originality as a part of the original narrative include C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 151; Judith A. Kowalski, "'Of Water and Spirit': Narrative Structure and Theological Development in the Gospel of John" (Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 1987), 62; Morris, *John*, 28; Stephen S. Smalley, *John, Evangelist and Interpreter*, New Testament Profiles (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 135-39. Ernst Haenchen does not find the evidence conclusive (*A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, ed. Robert W. Funk and Ulrich Busse, trans. Robert W. Funk, 2 vols., Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984], 1:101).

<sup>34</sup>So Köstenberger, *John*, 32.

<sup>35</sup>That this is emphatic on the part of the author is evidenced by the repetitive use of the noun

stated by the ἵνα clause in verse 7 that πάντες πιστεύσωσιν δι' αὐτοῦ. This first appearance of a key Johannine word πιστεύω demonstrates the interconnectedness of John's witness to the explicit purpose statement of the book in 20:30-31.<sup>36</sup>

Another aspect of the theme of witness that will be expanded upon in the subsequent πνεῦμα passages is its relationship with the theme of revelation. This relationship is first expressed in John's statement ἐώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα (34). John is witnessing to what he saw in the Spirit's witness confirming the word by the One who sent him to baptize regarding the identity of Jesus.

### **The Theme of Mission**

Closely related to the theme of witness is the supporting theme of mission. The theme of mission is highlighted in the use of the verbs of sending. John is first introduced as a man ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ (1:6). John refers to God as ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν (1:33). These synonymous words will be echoed throughout the remaining πνεῦμα passages.<sup>37</sup>

### **The Theme of Dwelling**

The theme of dwelling is introduced in the Prologue in the Christological

---

μαρτυρίαν and the verb μαρτυρέω in verses 6-7.

<sup>36</sup>On the use of πιστεύω as a motif in the theme of witness, see J. Daryl Charles, "Will the Court Please Call in the Prime Witness?: John 1:29-34 and the 'Witness'-motif," *TJ* 10 (1989): 71. On John 20:30-31 as the purpose statement of the Gospel, see D. A. Carson, "The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:30-31 Reconsidered," *JBL* 106 (1987): 639-51; D. A. Carson, "Syntactical and Text-critical Observations on John 20:30-31: One More Round on the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 124 (2005): 693-714.

<sup>37</sup>Louw, "On Johannine Style," 7; Andreas J. Köstenberger, "The Two Johannine Verbs for Sending: A Study of John's Use of Words with Reference to General Linguistic Theory," in *Studies on John and Gender: A Decade of Scholarship*, SBL 38 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 129-47. For fuller studies of the theme of mission, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples according to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel's Purpose and the Mission of the Contemporary Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); Andreas J. Köstenberger and Peter T. O'Brien, *Salvation to the Ends of the Earth: A Biblical Theology of Mission*, NSBT 11 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001).

statement ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν (1:14). The significance of this theme to pneumatological expectation is found in the statement that the Spirit descended on Jesus and ἔμεινεν ἐπ’ αὐτόν (1:32, 33). In contrast to the transient activity of the Spirit with God’s people in the Old Testament, Jesus could be recognized by the permanence of the Spirit’s dwelling with him.<sup>38</sup>

### **Born of the Spirit (John 3:5-8)**

The encounter between Jesus and Nicodemus in John 3:1-21 is the context of the second πνεῦμα passage.<sup>39</sup> Following the activity of Jesus at the Temple during the Passover in chapter 2, a ruler of the Jews named Nicodemus visits Jesus to acknowledge his divine authority as evidenced by signs which he had already performed. Jesus responds to this affirmation with an emphatic insistence on the necessity of a spiritual birth as a requirement to see or enter the kingdom of God. In the dialogue that ensues as a result of Nicodemus’s misunderstanding of this statement, several motifs from the previous passage are echoed and new metaphors are introduced to further develop the themes related to pneumatological expectation.

Several words and phrases in John 3:1-21 provide lexical cohesion with broader context of our first πνεῦμα passage. The description of Nicodemus as ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων invites a comparison of this encounter with the interrogation of John the Baptist by those ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων in 1:19-28. His second appellation as ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων and the fact that he ἦλθεν to Jesus instead of being

---

<sup>38</sup>Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 97; Marie E. Isaacs, “The Prophetic Spirit in the Fourth Gospel,” *HeyJ* 24 (1983): 401-02; McHugh, *John 1-4*, 140.

<sup>39</sup>As with most of the πνεῦμα passages in our study, many of the issues related to John 3:5-8 remain a matter of scholarly contention. Otfried Hofius remarks concerning this passage, “Das Gespräch Jesu mit Nikodemus Joh 3,1-21 gehört nicht nur zu den theologisch besonders gewichtigen, sondern zugleich auch zu den exegetisch recht umstrittenen Abschnitten des Johannesevangeliums” (“Das Wunder der Wiedergeburt: Jesu Gespräch mit Nikodemus Joh 3,1-21,” in *Johannesstudien: Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Vierten Evangeliums*, ed. Otfried Hofius and Hans-Christian Kammler, WUNT 88 [Tübingen: J C B Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996], 33).

sent suggest the greater stature of Nicodemus compared to John's inquisitors.<sup>40</sup>

### **The Theme of Revelation**

The theme of revelation is developed in this passage by the use of related motifs in the context of the pericope and by the πνεῦμα statements themselves. We will examine the motifs in the immediate context to establish the primacy of revelation before we examine the relationship of the use of πνεῦμα to the theme of revelation.

**The motif of knowing.** The motif of knowing is clearly present in the way that the narrative presents the knowledge of Nicodemus as insufficient. The first indication that Nicodemus is being presented as one who lacks the accurate knowledge of Jesus is seen by the description of him as a ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων (3:1). This designation serves to contrast Nicodemus with John the Baptist who is described as ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ (1:6).<sup>41</sup> Unlike John whose knowledge of Jesus is based upon a direct revelation from God, Nicodemus is dependent upon his observation of signs. This dependence upon signs is confessed by Nicodemus in his opening remark where he bases his perception of Jesus as ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος upon his observation of Jesus' ability to perform σημεῖα (3:2). Nicodemus is further contrasted with John by the use of the verb οἶδα (3:2). Whereas John uses the phrase κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν twice to emphasize his dependence upon revelation (1:31, 33), Nicodemus representing the many who believed based on seeing the signs is confident in his knowledge when he positively

---

<sup>40</sup>This title combined with the association of Nicodemus with the ἀρχιερεῖς and Φαρισαῖοι in 7:45-52 have led some to suggest that Nicodemus was a member of the Sanhedrin (Newman and Nida, *Translator's Handbook on John*, 76). For studies on Nicodemus as a person and a character, see Jouette M. Bassler, "Nicodemus in the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 108 (1989): 635-46; Richard Bauckham, "Nicodemus and the Gurion Family," in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 137-72; Gabi Renz, "Nicodemus: An Ambiguous Disciple? A Narrative Sensitive Investigation," in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, WUNT 222 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 255-83.

<sup>41</sup>Leon Morris has noted the uniqueness of this phrase (*John*, 186). Also see F. P. Cotterell, "The Nicodemus Conversation: A Fresh Appraisal," *ExpTim* 96 (1985): 238.

says οἶδαμεν (3:2).<sup>42</sup> This confident confession is then used by the author to create a sense of irony based on the skillful exposure of Nicodemus's lack of knowledge by Jesus.<sup>43</sup>

The knowledge of Nicodemus is also contrasted with the knowledge of Jesus. This observation is strengthened by the lexical coherence of 3:1-2 with the narrative aside in 2:23-25 provided by the terms σημεῖα (23) and ἄνθρωπος (25).<sup>44</sup> The belief of the πολλοὶ who believed upon seeing τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει (2:23) is contrasted with the saving belief of the disciples who later remember (μυμνήσκομαι) the sign of the resurrection and believe based on the Scripture and the Word spoken by Jesus (2:22). This belief based on signs is further disparaged in the explicit statement by the narrator that Jesus did not entrust himself to those who had believed this way. Jesus did not need any one to bear witness περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου because he knew τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ (25).<sup>45</sup>

A supporting motif to the theme of revelation is implied in the curious detail that Nicodemus ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς (3:2). While the syntactical function of νυκτὸς as an adverbial genitive of time is straightforward,<sup>46</sup> there has been some discussion as to

---

<sup>42</sup>While Bultmann's assertion that Nicodemus is asking this question on behalf of Judaism is somewhat anachronistic and simplistic given the complexities involved in defining such a multivalent term as Judaism, it does seem that Nicodemus represents the πολλοὶ of Israel who have yet to fully understand the significance of Jesus as the fulfillment of Scripture (*Gospel of John*, 133-34). Cotterell notes that the author "will demonstrate through his three references to Nicodemus in the fabric of the Gospel that his faith grew into a personal commitment to Jesus" ("The Nicodemus Conversation," 238). Finality on whether Joseph or Nicodemus should be considered as legitimate disciples in Johannine thought is beyond the scope of this inquiry. For further discussion of this issue, see Brown, *John I-XII*, 129; Bassler, "Nicodemus in the Fourth Gospel," 646; Carson, *John*, 186, 629; Morris, *John*, 186; Ben Witherington III, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 312; Blomberg, *John's Gospel*, 93; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 533; Köstenberger, "John," 119-120, 555.

<sup>43</sup>Saeed Hamid-Khani, "Johannine Expressions of Double Meaning: A Literary-exegetical Analysis" (Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1992), 55.

<sup>44</sup>So Cotterell, "The Nicodemus Conversation," 238; Köstenberger, *John*, 115.

<sup>45</sup>Carson, *John*, 185; Morris, *John*, 186.

<sup>46</sup>Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 122-24.

the significance of this detail.<sup>47</sup> Some have suggested that the night visit of Nicodemus merely reflects the prevailing rabbinic custom of the time in which Scripture was discussed after sunset.<sup>48</sup> Others have proposed that this is a surreptitious visit due to the negative political consequences that a Pharisee might face if found seeking the counsel of Jesus.<sup>49</sup> While both of these reasons might be valid explanations, this seemingly inconsequential detail regarding the time of Nicodemus's visit seems to take on a deeper meaning when considered in the broader context of the Johannine narrative and its development of the theme of revelation.<sup>50</sup> Based on our observations on the relationship between the verbs of seeing in the first πνεῦμα passage and the motif of light (φῶς) and darkness (σκοτία) in the Prologue, it is not surprising that the author uses double entendre to utilize the metaphorical possibilities of night and day.

The probability that νυκτὸς is used metaphorically and contributes to the theme of revelation is strengthened by the use of a verb of seeing in the initial response of Jesus to Nicodemus. Jesus instructs Nicodemus of the need to be born ἄνωθεν in order to be able ἰδεῖν the kingdom of God (3:3). While the kingdom of God in this context might have future eschatological overtones but the emphasis is on the true recognition of the kingdom that is present in the person of Jesus. The irony mentioned previously is now fully realized. While John confessed that he did not know, he was allowed to see the revelation of God in Jesus. While Nicodemus thinks he knows, he is unable to see.

---

<sup>47</sup>Wead, "The Johannine Double Meaning," 117-20.

<sup>48</sup>Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 133 n.5; Blomberg, *John's Gospel*, 92; McHugh, *John 1-4*, 220. Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. Francis Noel Davey, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), 211.

<sup>49</sup>B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John: The Authorized Version with Introduction and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), 48.

<sup>50</sup>Carson comments, "Doubtless Nicodemus approached Jesus at night, but his own 'night' was blacker than he knew" (*John*, 186).

**The motif of misunderstanding.** The irony of Nicodemus's lack of knowledge is developed further by a somewhat complicated use of double entendre to create a misunderstanding that enables Jesus to reveal his true identity to Jesus.<sup>51</sup> Jesus responds to Nicodemus by saying ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (3:3). The adverb ἄνωθεν can mean 'from above', 'from the beginning', 'for a long time', or 'again, anew'.<sup>52</sup> The ambiguity introduced by this word has been widely noted.<sup>53</sup>

Although most translations resolve this ambiguity by choosing the sense of 'again, anew', there are compelling reasons for preferring 'from above'.<sup>54</sup> First, ἄνωθεν is

---

<sup>51</sup>Burge notes that the first misunderstanding in the narrative was Jesus' comparison of the temple with his body in 2:19-21 ("Revelation and Discipleship," 243-44). So R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 155. On the Johannine use of double entendre, see Wead, "The Johannine Double Meaning," 106-120; Earl J. Richard, "Expressions of Double Meaning and Their Function in the Gospel of John," *NTS* 31 (1985): 96-112; Hamid-Khani, "Johannine Expressions of Double Meaning"; Saeed Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: A Theological Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel*, WUNT 120 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000). On the Johannine use of misunderstanding, see Marinus de Jonge, "Nicodemus and Jesus: Some Observations on Misunderstanding and Understanding in the Fourth Gospel," in *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God: Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 29-47; D. A. Carson, "Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel," *TynBul* 33 (1982): 59-91.

<sup>52</sup>Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, ed. and trans. William F. Arndt, F. Wilber Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker [BDAG], 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), s.v. "ἄνωθεν."

<sup>53</sup>Wead, "The Johannine Double Meaning," 116-17; Newman and Nida, *Translator's Handbook on John*, 79; Max Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1996), 292. This misunderstanding of a double entendre is based in the nature of the revelation of heavenly realities through earthly things. See de Jonge, "Nicodemus and Jesus," 40-41; Richard, "Expressions of Double Meaning and Their Function in the Gospel of John," 103.

<sup>54</sup>So ASV, ESV, HCSB, KJV, NASB, NIV, NKJV, NLT, RSV, and TNIV. The Vulgate agrees with its rendering *denuo*. Only The Message, The NET Bible, and NRSV prefer 'from above'. Scholars who prefer 'again, anew' include Westcott, *John* (1951), 136; Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 135. Scholars who prefer 'from above' include Bernard, *Gospel according to St. John*, 102; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, trans. David Smith and G. A. Kon, Herder's Theological Commentary on the New Testament (New York: Crossroad, 1990), 1:367-68; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 45. Scholars who emphasize ambiguity include Dodd, *Interpretation of Fourth Gospel*, 303; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 205-06; Wead, "The Johannine Double Meaning," 107-08; Jan G. van der Watt, "Double entendre in the Gospel according to John," in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. G. van Belle, Jan G. van der Watt, and



more commonly used in this sense in the NT and LXX.<sup>55</sup> Second, the author of John prefers the sense of ‘from above’.<sup>56</sup> Finally, translating ἄνωθεν in 3:3 as ‘from above’ makes more sense of the flow of the conversation. Although some argue that Nicodemus’ response indicates that he obviously understood ἄνωθεν to mean ‘again’,<sup>57</sup> others have noted that the intention of Jesus cannot be determined by the understanding or misunderstanding of Nicodemus.<sup>58</sup> That Nicodemus is questioning the possibility of a second birth in his response is indisputable (3:4). His use of imagery of an older person entering a mother’s womb and his use of the adverb δεύτερον are not ambiguous. An attentive reader, however, would recognize the birth language of Jesus in 3:3 from its first use of γεννάω in the Prologue (1:13) where the language of birth is clearly delimited by the prepositional phrase ἐκ θεοῦ.

Additionally the case that Jesus intended ἄνωθεν in the sense of ‘from above’ is strengthened by its usage by the narrator in 3:31 where he describes Jesus as ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος. The exegetical second title ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος removes all

---

P. Maritz, BETL 184 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 472-73.

<sup>55</sup>In the LXX, ἄνωθεν is used 23 times (Gen 6:16; 27:39; 49:25; Exod 25:21–22; 36:27, 38; 38:16, 19; 40:19; Num 4:6, 25; 7:89; Josh 3:16; 1 Kgs 7:40; Job 3:4; Wis 19:6; Isa 45:8; Jer 4:28; Bar 6:61; Ezek 1:11, 26; 41:7). It is used 8 times in the NT outside of John (Matt 27:51; Mark 15:38; Luke 1:3; John 3:3, 7, 31; 19:11, 23; Acts 26:5; Gal 4:9; Jas 1:17; 3:15, 17). The only time it is used in the sense of ‘anew, again’ is Gal 4:9. Cotterell asserts that references to the Greek use of ἄνωθεν are irrelevant “since the conversation took place in Aramaic, and since there is no one Aramaic word that could have produced that same ambiguity, it is clear that Jesus said ‘again’ and was understood by Nicodemus to have said ‘again’” (“The Nicodemus Conversation,” 240). However, this argument assumes that Jesus could not have clearly said the Aramaic equivalent of ‘from above’ and still caused enough confusion for Nicodemus to think he meant physical birth. So Barnabas Lindars, “John and the Synoptic Gospels: A Test Case,” *NTS* 27 (1981): 290; Blomberg, *John’s Gospel*, 92. While the potential for double entendre is inherent in the use of ἄνωθεν as a word, the most significant contributor to misunderstanding in the Fourth Gospel is the dualistic tension between heavenly or spiritual reality and earthly or physical reality.

<sup>56</sup>See John 3:31; 19:11, 23. Only the reference in 19:23 is strictly literal. See Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, 175.

<sup>57</sup>Newman and Nida argue, “Since the reply of Nicodemus would sound foolish if Jesus’ words were translated ‘from above’ in verse 3, it seems necessary to employ again in that verse” (*Translator’s Handbook on John*, 79).

<sup>58</sup>A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, 6 vols. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932), 5:44-45.

ambiguity concerning the intended sense of this occurrence as ‘from above’.

Furthermore, the language contrasting the one coming from heaven with ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς clearly connects this verse with the explanation of Jesus in 3:12-13. In my view, the Jesus means γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν in the sense of a new birth ‘from above’ but Nicodemus misunderstands him to mean a second physical birth.<sup>59</sup>

**The motif of fulfillment.** Another motif related to the theme of revelation is the fulfillment of Scripture. Jesus tells Nicodemus that a person is not able to enter the kingdom of God unless τις γεννηθῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος (3:5). The question of how to take this reference to water is even more controversial than the previous discussion of ἄνωθεν.<sup>60</sup> Attempts to find a conceptual background for understanding the meaning of water include taking it as a reference to (1) John’s baptism;<sup>61</sup> (2) Christian baptism;<sup>62</sup> (3)

---

<sup>59</sup>So John E. Morgan-Wynne, “References to Baptism in the Fourth Gospel,” in *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R. E. O. White*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, JSNTSup 171 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 121. Culpepper’s emphasis on the social effects of misunderstanding as enforcing distinctions between those who belong and those who do not belong to a group does not seem to appreciate that the episodes of misunderstanding are more based on the inherent tensions involved in describing heavenly realities in earthly terms (*Anatomy of Fourth Gospel*, 164).

<sup>60</sup>For fuller discussions, see Linda Belleville, “‘Born of Water and Spirit’: John 3:5,” *TJ* 1 (1980): 125-41; Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 158-71; Carson, *John*, 191-96. For studies on water as a Johannine metaphor, see Larry Paul Jones, *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 145 (1997); Morgan-Wynne, “References to Baptism in Fourth Gospel,” 121-26; Wai-ye Ng, *Water Symbolism in John: An Eschatological Interpretation*, SBL 15 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001).

<sup>61</sup>So Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 127-28. There are several attractive features of this view. The reception of Jesus is indelibly connected with the reception of the baptism of John the Baptist. While this is explicit in the synoptic account (Matt 21:23-27; Mark 11:27-33; Luke 20:1-8), it is also difficult to imagine a scenario in Johannine thought where one could reject the authenticity of John’s water baptism and accept Jesus’ Spirit baptism. This is not to say baptism by John is a requirement, but it is to say that it is plausible for this to be an endorsement of John’s authority to the leaders of Israel who Nicodemus represents. However, although baptism by water is encouraged by Jesus, it is also portrayed as inferior to the work of the Spirit. While water baptism under Jesus’ ministry enjoys even greater success than John’s ministry, the text is careful to distance Jesus himself from being the one who was performing the ritual (4:1-2). See George R. Beasley-Murray, “John 3:3, 5: Baptism, Spirit and the Kingdom,” *ExpTim* 97 (1986): 168; Burge, *Anointed Community*, 162-63; Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, 5:46; John Painter, “Johannine Symbols: A Case Study in Epistemology,” *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 27 (1979): 30; Westcott, *John* (1951), 108.

<sup>62</sup>So Dodd, *Interpretation of Fourth Gospel*, 309; Brown, *John I-XII*, 141; John Marsh, *Saint John*, Westminster Pelican Commentaries (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968), 185; Bultmann,

physical birth with water representing the embryonic membrane;<sup>63</sup> (4) physical birth with water as an euphemism for semen;<sup>64</sup> or (5) reflective of eschatological hope in Ezek 36:25-27.<sup>65</sup> While options 1, 3, and 4 might be helpful in understanding how Nicodemus misunderstood the reference to water, it seems that the most helpful suggestion for understanding what Jesus meant is found in the allusion to Ezekiel.<sup>66</sup> As our study of

---

*Gospel of John*, 138; Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, New Century Bible Commentary (London: Oliphants, 1972), 152; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 84-85; Haenchen, *Gospel of John*, 1:200. The primary weakness of this view is that it requires an anachronistic reading of the text that creates a difficulty of explaining how this view would make sense to Nicodemus. Ignace de la Potterie's conviction that water is a reference to baptism leads him to doubt that the word was part of the original conversation. He says, "Entre le dialogue de Jésus avec Nicodème et la rédaction du texte évangélique s'insèrent la prédication ultérieure de Jésus, la pratique sacramentaire de l'Eglise primitive et un long enseignement de l'Apôtre Jean; avec plusieurs modernes, il faut admettre que le verset de Jn 3, 5, qui rapporte les paroles de Jésus au Maître en Israël, reflète très probablement aussi cette longue tradition chrétienne; c'est vrai avant tout pour le mot ὕδατος, qu'il est difficile de considérer comme primitif" ("Naître de l'eau et naître de l'Esprit": Le texte baptismal de Jn 3:5," *ScEcc* 14 [1962]: 442). See also Bernard, *Gospel according to St. John*, clxv, 104-05.

<sup>63</sup>Russell Fowler, "Born of Water and Spirit (John 3:5)," *ExpTim* 82 (1970): 159; D. G. Spriggs, "Meaning of 'Water' in John 3:5," *ExpTim* 85 (1973): 150; Margaret Pamment, "John 3:5, 'Unless One Is Born of Water and the Spirit, He Cannot Enter the Kingdom of God'," *NovT* 25 (1983): 189-90. See especially the thorough discussion of Ben Witherington III, "The Waters of Birth: John 3:5 and 1 John 5:6-8," *NTS* 35 (1989): 155-60.

<sup>64</sup>Hugo Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel Interpreted in Its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-oriental World* (Chicago: Argonaut Publishers, 1968), 48-71; Leon Morris, *New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 257-58. The advantages and disadvantages of both variations of physical birth are really the same. Both views fit the context of Nicodemus understanding Jesus reference to birth as physical. Jesus' restatement that one must be born ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος in verse 5 could easily be understood as both a concession and a correction to Nicodemus who obviously has physical birth in mind in verse 4. See Morgan-Wynne, "References to Baptism in Fourth Gospel," 121. The concession is that anyone who is reborn spiritually would obviously be required to have already been born physically. The correction then is found in the statement τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σὰρξ ἐστίν, καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος πνεῦμά ἐστιν in verse 6. The obstacle to both of these views is the unlikelihood of either of these options being understood by Nicodemus. An additional weakness of this view is that it creates a somewhat unnatural transition to the comparison of wind and spirit in verse 8.

<sup>65</sup>James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970), 192; Belleville, "Born of Water and Spirit," 125-41; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 48-49; Robert V. McCabe, "The Meaning of 'Born of Water and the Spirit' in John 3:5," *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 4 (1999): 85-107; Blomberg, *John's Gospel*, 93; Köstenberger, *John*, 84-85.

<sup>66</sup>In agreement with Belleville, Fowler states, "Being born of 'water and Spirit' was something promised by Ezekiel and it is entirely possible that Jesus intended Nicodemus to recognize such a promise as the intelligible explanation to being 'born anew' ("The Influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel: Intertextuality and Interpretation" [Ph.D. diss., Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, 1995], 185-86). Fowler also argues for the possibility of reaching the same conclusion based on the OT use of water to refer to cleansing and spirit to refer to renewal (Lev 11:32; 14:8-9; Num 19:12-19; Isa 4:4; 44:3; Zech 13:1; Joel

other πνεῦμα passages will show, several motifs from Ezekiel are woven into the fabric of the narrative.<sup>67</sup>

If Ezekiel 36:25-27 is the primary background informing Jesus' use of ὕδωρ in 3:5, the contrast between σάρξ and πνεῦμά in 3:6 presents a difficulty. The crux of the exegetical problem is that πνεῦμά and σάρξ are compared positively in Ezekiel 36:26 but negatively in John 3:6. In Ezekiel the gift of a new spirit converts a heart of stone into a heart of flesh but in John the emphasis seems to be on the limitations of the flesh to be spiritual. While σάρξ is sometimes used in the narrative of John to emphasize the spiritual weakness of the human condition (1:13; 3:6; 6:63; 8:15), it is also used in a neutral or positive sense to describe mankind or the human body (1:14; 6:51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 17:2). A closer look at Ezekiel 36:26 reveals that the prophet used σάρξ in a similar way. In the gift of the new spirit, the heart of stone will be removed ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν so that the Lord can give καρδίαν σαρκίνην.

The nuances of this contrast become clearer as we understand that the allusions in John to Ezekiel are not limited to 36:25-27. After telling Nicodemus that he should not be surprised that it is necessary for him to be born from above (3:7), Jesus introduces a new metaphor to describe the work of the Spirit. In a play on the word πνεῦμα, Jesus compares the work of the Spirit with wind. As the effects of the wind blowing can be heard without being seen, so the effects of the Spirit can be discerned in πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος (3:8).<sup>68</sup> While this could be a kind of parable echoing

---

2:28-29).

<sup>67</sup>Studies on the use of Ezekiel in John include Cameron Mackay, "Ezekiel in the New Testament," *CQR* 162 (1961): 4-16; Bruce Vawter, "Ezekiel and John," *CBQ* 26 (1964): 450-58; C. Hassell Bullock, "Ezekiel, Bridge between the Testaments," *JETS* 25 (1982): 23-31; Fowler, "Influence of Ezekiel"; Mary Katharine Deeley, "Ezekiel's Shepherd and John's Jesus: A Case Study in the Appropriation of Biblical Texts," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 148 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 252-64; Gary T. Manning Jr., *The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*, JSNTSup 270 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2004).

<sup>68</sup>While τὸ πνεῦμα can be rendered lexically as either 'wind' or 'spirit', the phrase ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος more clearly refers to spiritual birth. See Wead, "The Johannine Double

texts like Isaiah 42:5 and Ecclesiastes 11:5 where spirit and breath are used in the context of physical life,<sup>69</sup> it seems that a stronger case can be made for the influence of Ezekiel 37:1-14 where πνεῦμα is used to refer to breath, wind, and spirit. The wind is heard as it brings life to the dead bones of Israel. This life is explicitly tied to the work of the Spirit in 37:14.

### **The Theme of Witness**

The theme of witness is explicitly referenced by the use of μαρτυρέω and μαρτυρία. The relationship between seeing and witnessing that was established in 1:34 is echoed in the phrase ὁ ἑώρακαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν and expanded to include verbs of speaking in the phrase ὁ οἶδαμεν λαλοῦμεν (11). This theme will become more prominent in subsequent πνεῦμα passages.

Another aspect of the theme of witness is the rejection motif represented by the negative use of λαμβάνω (11). This motif is prominent throughout the Gospel and will be specifically related to pneumatological expectations in the παράκλητος passage in 14:17.<sup>70</sup> The antithetical theme of receiving witness will be developed in the next πνεῦμα passage.

The contribution of this passage to the theme of witness is also seen in Jesus holding Nicodemus accountable as ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ for not understanding the necessity of a spiritual birth.<sup>71</sup> Apparently, Jesus expected Nicodemus to be familiar enough with the prophecy of Ezekiel to recognize the imagery water and wind in his explanation of the role of the Spirit in the new birth. Although misunderstanding is understandable in light of the complexity of simplicity, it also based in a failure to receive

---

Meaning,” 116.

<sup>69</sup>Blomberg, *John's Gospel*, 93.

<sup>70</sup>The rejection motif occurs in 3:11, 27, 32; 5:43; 12:48; 14:17.

<sup>71</sup>Perhaps this phrase is an allusion to Isa 1:2-3.

and believe the witness of Scripture.<sup>72</sup> Israel's responsibility to recognize Jesus as the fulfillment of the Old Testament is a Johannine theme.<sup>73</sup>

### **The Theme of Life**

The theme of life is developed in this passage through the motifs of birth, the kingdom of God, and eternal life. The motif of birth is based on the use of the verb γεννάω (3, 5). As we have already discussed, the modification of this verb with the adverb ἄνωθεν (3) and the prepositional phrase ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος (5) imply a rebirth. Although the concept of rebirth was common in the ancient world, its use in this context primarily reflects the eschatological hope of Ezekiel that God would cleanse sin and resurrect Israel as God's people.<sup>74</sup>

### **The Condition of Exaltation**

Another aspect of Johannine pneumatological themes is that the author creates expectations for certain conditions that need to be met before the Spirit is given. After Jesus exposes the limitations of Nicodemus's earthly nature to believe the heavenly things to which the Son of Man who has descended from heaven has witnessed, he says

---

<sup>72</sup>See Martin J. J. Menken, "Observations on the Significance of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. G. van Belle, Jan G. van der Watt, and P. Maritz, BETL 184 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 159-66. Martin Hengel notes that John the Baptist along with Abraham, Isaiah, and Moses function as "paradigms for the reception and witness of the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ in Israel" ("The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, JSNTSup 104 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994], 386).

<sup>73</sup>See John 5:39.

<sup>74</sup>For a survey of how the idea of regeneration was understood in contemporary Greek literature, see William D. Mounce, "The Origin of the New Testament Metaphor of Rebirth," (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Essex Fells, NJ, 17 December 1982, 4-5. Mounce concludes from his study about the use of the metaphor of rebirth in Greek literature up to the first century that (1) it was a common metaphor; (2) it had a wide variety of possible meanings; (3) the basic meaning was 'new beginning'; (4) the emphasis on the idea of birth could vary; (5) it was not dominated by one system of thought; (6) it was indigenous to cultures other than Hellenistic; (7) the imagery was becoming popular in the first century B.C. even though it was older; and (8) it was a common and flexible metaphor (ibid.).

that it is necessary for the Son of Man ὑψωθῆναι (14).<sup>75</sup> Like the adverb ἄνωθεν, the verb ὑψόω can have a double meaning.<sup>76</sup> All fifteen of its uses in the New Testament outside of John involve the concept of exaltation.<sup>77</sup> The explicit context for this statement is the story of the lifting up of the bronze serpent by Moses as a means of salvation for Israel from the effects of the snake bites they received as punishment for grumbling against the Lord in Numbers 21:4-9.

### **The Spirit without Measure (John 3:34)**

If the main themes related to the πνεῦμα passages were likened to threads woven into a tapestry, the immediate context of John 3:34 would be a knot. This passage is lexically dense with the key words and phrases that have so far been used to develop the motifs of various themes. The relationship of these themes to pneumatology is made more explicit by the centrality of the πνεῦμα passage itself where the highly significant Johannine verb δίδωμι is used.<sup>78</sup>

While the ambiguity of the subject and object of the verb presents an exegetical challenge for the third πνεῦμα passage in John 3:34, its immediate context is lexically dense with words and phrases that have been used in the narrative to develop the themes of revelation, witness, and life. These themes are explicitly grounded in the gift of the Spirit using language that resonates the echoes of the allusions to Ezekiel in the previous πνεῦμα passage in 3:5-8 and anticipates the future πνεῦμα passages in 6:63 and 20:19-23.

Whether one takes 3:31-36 as a continuation of the Baptist's dialogue with his

---

<sup>75</sup>The verb ὑψόω occurs 5 times in 4 verses (John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32, 34).

<sup>76</sup>Brown, *John I-XII*, 146; Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 178; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 54.

<sup>77</sup>Wead, "The Johannine Double Meaning," 109.

<sup>78</sup>Friedrich Büchsel, "δίδωμι κτλ," in *TDNT*, 2:166.

disciples in 3:25-30 or as a narrative aside, this section obviously serves as an explanation for the contrast between the role of the Spirit in the ministry of previous prophets including John the Baptist and the ministry of Jesus.<sup>79</sup>

### The Theme of Revelation

Before discussing the direct contributions of the πνεῦμα passage to the theme of revelation, it will be helpful to note the various motifs in the immediate context of this passage that echo the revelatory themes associated with the previous passages. The appellations ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος and ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος and the use of ἐπάνω in 3:31 echo the themes of John the Baptist in 1:29-34 and the 3:15.<sup>80</sup>

While we have established the motif of seeing as an aspect of the theme of revelation, this passage furthers the development of the theme of revelation by employing the motif of hearing. Just as the motif of seeing is metaphorically related to the motif of light, the motif of hearing is related to the motif of speaking which has been progressively developed since 3:11. The central theme of this passage is that the contrast between the superiority of τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ spoken by the Son who designated as ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος (31a), ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος (31c), and ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς (34a) and the ὃ ὦν ἐκ τῆς γῆς who can merely speak ἐκ τῆς γῆς (31b).

The use of γάρ in 3:34b connects this clause as the basis for the previous

---

<sup>79</sup>John the Baptist is referred to by Jesus again in 5:31-40 and by the narrator and the πολλοὶ in 10:40-42. Whether 3:31-36 should be taken as a narrative aside or as a continuation of the Baptist's answer to his disciples in 3:22-31 is debated. Scholars who follow the ESV, NRSV, RSV, TNIV in seeing 3:31 as beginning a narrative aside include Dodd, *Interpretation of Fourth Gospel*, 308-09; Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1981), 527; Burge, *Anointed Community*, 81-82; Schnackenburg, *St. John*, 1:381; Carson, *John*, 212; Morris, *John*, 214-15; Witherington, *John's Wisdom*, 110; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 53; Köstenberger, *John*, 133. Scholars who follow the NLT, NASB, NIV, NKJV in seeing a continuation of the Baptist's colloquy include Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 224; Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 148-49. Bultmann unconvincingly asserts that these verses were originally intended to immediately follow 3:21 (*Gospel of John*, 160). Brown suggests that these statements originated from Jesus himself (*John I-XII*, 160). Cf. Bernard, *Gospel according to St. John*, xxiii-xiv.

<sup>80</sup>See Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, 176.



statement that the One whom God sends speaks the words of God.<sup>81</sup> The absence of an explicit subject or indirect object of the verb δίδωσιν has caused scholarly disagreement concerning the identity of both the giver and the receiver of the Spirit.<sup>82</sup> There are three possible positions: (1) God (Father) is the subject giving the Spirit to the Son;<sup>83</sup> (2) the Son is the subject giving the Spirit;<sup>84</sup> or (3) the subject and indirect object is purposefully ambiguous.<sup>85</sup> Brown argues that Jesus is the giver because the present tense used here whereas the perfect and aorist tense is used elsewhere except for 6:37.<sup>86</sup> Porsch argues that Jesus is the giver because he is the subject of λαλέω in 3:34a.<sup>87</sup>

The flow of the of the verse seems to lean towards the view that because God has sent the Son to speak the words of God, he [God] gives the Spirit to the Son without measure. That the Father gives all things to the Son in verse 35 seems to determine the subject and the object in verse 34.<sup>88</sup> The Father giving to the Son is a theme that is further

---

<sup>81</sup>Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 226.

<sup>82</sup>George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 324.

<sup>83</sup>Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 226; Hatina, “John 20,22,” 208; Ladd, *Theology*, 324; Max Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts—Then and Now*, rev. ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998), 59; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 53-54; Köstenberger, “John,” 139. English translations that follow this option include KJV, NIV, NKJV, and NLT.

<sup>84</sup>Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort*, 104-05; Burge, *Anointed Community*, 83-84; Otfried Hofius, “Er gibt den Geist ohne Mass’ Joh 3,34b,” *ZNW* 90 (1999): 131. English translations that follow this option include ASV, ESV, NASB, NRSV, and RSV. Representing the minority view that Jesus is the subject, Hofius describes the scholarly consensus, “Daß *Gott* das Subjekt ist und der Satz demzufolge Jesus als den Geistträger prädiziert, der das πνεῦμα in unerschöpflicher Fülle vom Vater empfängt, ist der *magnus consensus* der Ausleger und gilt vielen von ihnen als so selbstverständlich, daß die sogleich zu nennende Alternative nicht einmal erwähnt, geschweige denn diskutiert wird [emphasis his]” (ibid.).

<sup>85</sup>Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 32. Although grammatically τὸ πνεῦμα could be the subject, very few have argued for this position. Ladd notes the possibility but dismisses it (*Theology*, 324).

<sup>86</sup>Brown, *John I-XII*, 158.

<sup>87</sup>Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort*, 104.

<sup>88</sup>Ladd, *Theology*, 324; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 54; Köstenberger, “John,” 139. While the scribal addition of ὁ θεὸς in A C D Θ Ψ 086 f 13 m lat syp.h co is not as strong as the witness for its absence in P66.75 κ B C\* L Ws 083 f 1 33. 565. 579. 1241, the fact that there is no evidence of a correction clarifying Jesus as the subject seems to strengthen this argument.

developed throughout the narrative.<sup>89</sup>

Another motif that is used to develop the theme of revelation is the motif of the fulfillment of Scripture. While the verb δίδωμι and the noun πνεῦμα by themselves are too common to be exegetically significant, other occurrences where δίδωμι is used to depict the giving of πνεῦμα do seem to suggest intertextual allusions.<sup>90</sup> Moses wishes that all of the Lord's people could be prophets ὅταν δῶ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτούς (Num 11:29). The elders of Israel thank the Lord for all of his faithfulness by praying τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἔδωκας (Neh 9:20). Another aspect of the fulfillment theme is the possibility that John's use of δίδωμι may also contain echoes of Daniel 7:13-14 where the υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου is given ἐξουσία and πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς.<sup>91</sup> While all of these motifs seem to support the conclusion that the Father is the subject of δίδωμι in 3:34, it should also be noted that a significant development in subsequent πνεῦμα passages is the idea that Jesus gives to believers what he receives from the Father.<sup>92</sup>

The second major difficulty of interpreting John 3:34 is finding an exact parallel to the phrase ἐκ μέτρου in extant Greek literature. This phrase makes the most sense in comparison to the Jewish conception of the Spirit of prophecy.<sup>93</sup> Jesus, however, differs from the prophets in that his authority to speak as God has no limit.<sup>94</sup> That

---

<sup>89</sup>The Father gives the Son πάντα (3:35), τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν (5:22), ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ (5:26), and ἐξουσίαν κρίσιν ποιεῖν (5:27). See the helpful survey of these occurrences by Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, 167-69. Interestingly Davies does not mention 3:34 in her discussion.

<sup>90</sup>The verb δίδωμι occurs 1991 times in 1811 verses in the LXX and 415 times in 378 verses in the NT while πνεῦμα occurs 350 times in 325 verses in the LXX and 379 times in 344 verses in the NT. However πνεῦμα as a reference to God's Spirit occurs as the direct object of δίδωμι in 12 verses in the LXX (Num 11:29; Neh 9:20; Wis 9:17; Isa 42:1, 5; 44:3; Ezek 11:19; 36:26, 27; 37:6, 14). Of the other 4 occurrences of this construction, πνεῦμα refers a lying spirit 3 times (1 Kgs 22:23; 2 Kgs 19:7; 2 Chr 18:22) and is used unambiguously to refer to a strong wind 1 time (Ezek 13:11).

<sup>91</sup>Manning, *Ezekiel in John*, 164.

<sup>92</sup>Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, 169.

<sup>93</sup>Beasley-Murray, *John*, 53.

<sup>94</sup>Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 150.

prophets were understood to have limits to their access to the Spirit is illustrated by the often quoted saying of Rabbi Aha in *Leviticus Rabbah* 15:2, “The Holy Spirit who rests on the prophets, rests on them only by measure.”<sup>95</sup> If taken this way, this is a variation of the motif of the revelation in Jesus being greater than other sources of revelation, in this case the Old Testament prophets.<sup>96</sup>

### **The Theme of Witness**

The theme of witness that has been associated with the previous πνεῦμα passages is also present in the immediate context of this passage. The relationship between the themes of revelation and witness that was established in 1:34 and repeated in 3:11 is again emphasized in 3:32. Besides the obvious connections already noted by the verbs ὁράω and μαρτυρέω that are used similarly in all three passages, 3:32 also repeats the indictment of 3:11 that the μαρτυρία is not received (λαμβάνω). The use of λαμβάνει in the rejection of the witness in 3:32,33 also echoes 1:11-12; 3:11; and 3:27.

### **The Theme of Life**

The theme of life is also explicitly tied to this πνεῦμα passage by the use of ζῶην αἰώνιον (36). Just as those who do not receive the Son’s witness in verse 32 are contrasted with the one who receives his witness in verse 33, the one who believes in the Son has ζῶην αἰώνιον but the one who disbelieves the Son will not see life (36). The statement ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μένει ἐπ’ αὐτόν connects the concept of eternal life with the need to be forgiven of sin.<sup>97</sup> Whereas the Spirit given to Jesus ἐκ μέτρου (3:34) remains

---

<sup>95</sup>As Turner points out, this saying is too late to be considered a source (Turner, *Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 59). It can only confirm that the phrase was understood in this way by interpreters other than the author of the Fourth Gospel.

<sup>96</sup>Ibid.; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 53-54.

<sup>97</sup>Contra J. Ramsey Michaels, “By Water and Blood: Sin and Purification in John and First John,” in *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, JSNTSup 234 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 149-62.

ἐπ’ αὐτόν (1:32, 33) as the one who speaks the words from God that must be believed in order to have ζωὴν αἰώνιον, for the one who does not obey these words God’s wrath μένει ἐπ’ αὐτόν (3:36).

### **Spirit and Truth (John 4:4-30)**

Following the direct statements by the narrator about the Spirit in our previous section, we return in the fourth πνεῦμα passage to a another dialogue between Jesus and a character that serves to provide a new opportunity for misunderstanding and revelation.<sup>98</sup> Although some scholars argue against the historicity of the encounter of Jesus with the Samaritan woman in John 4:4-30,<sup>99</sup> there is no need to deny the literalness of her situation to appreciate that metaphorical nuances are utilized to develop the pneumatological themes of revelation, life, dwelling, witness and the pneumatological condition of the coming hour.

### **The Theme of Revelation**

As with the previous πνεῦμα passage the theme of revelation is developed by the motifs of knowing, misunderstanding and the fulfillment of Scripture.<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup>On the contrast between Nicodemus as character and the Samaritan woman as a character, see Mary Margaret Pazdan, “Nicodemus and the Samaritan Woman: Contrasting Models of Discipleship,” *BTB* 17 (1987): 145-48; Carson, *John*, 216.

<sup>99</sup>Brown argues against historicity based on his claims of an absence of evidence in the New Testament that Jesus worked in Samaria (*John I-XII*, 175-76). More recently Mary L. Coloe has refuted its historicity based on her thesis that this story reflects early Christian missionary activity in Samaria (*God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* [Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2001], 85). Supporting a more positive view of its historical accuracy, Richard Bauckham notes, “This account of the issue between Jews and Samaritans was, it should be noted, still entirely accurate when John’s Gospel was written, even though no temple then stood on either mountain” (“The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why,” *ST* 47 [1993]: 135-51). For a comprehensive study on Samaritan history and culture, see Alan David Crown, *The Samaritans* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989).

<sup>100</sup>Urban C. von Wahlde argues convincingly that previous attempts to import criteria based on the form critical study of the Synoptic Gospels have sometimes distracted scholars from appreciating the role of this scene in the narrative of John (“The Samaritan Woman Episode, Synoptic Form-Criticism, and the Johannine Miracles: A Question of Criteria,” in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. G. van Belle, Jan G. van der Watt, and P. Maritz, BETL 184 [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005], 501-18). It is not necessary to fully embrace his exegesis of John 4:54 or his thesis that this scene should be counted as one of the signs to appreciate his

**The motif of knowing.** The verb οἶδα is again used to portray both a lack of knowledge and revealed knowledge. As with John the Baptist and Nicodemus, the Samaritan woman is portrayed as possessing insufficient knowledge of Jesus. That she does not know the truth about Jesus is explicitly stated by Jesus when he informs her that her response to him would have been different if she knew the gift of God and who he was (4:10).<sup>101</sup> Jesus also compares the errant knowledge of the Samaritans concerning worship with the accurate theology of the Jews (4:22).<sup>102</sup> Although the woman knows the Messiah is coming, she has not yet realized the true identity of Jesus (4:25). The insufficient knowledge of the disciples is exposed when Jesus tells them ἐγὼ βρῶσιν ἔχω φαγεῖν ἣν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἶδατε (4:32). In contrast to the limited knowledge of the woman, the disciples and Samaritan theology, the Samaritan villagers exhibit accurate knowledge of Jesus as the Savior of the world (42).<sup>103</sup> Another aspect of the motif of knowing is Jesus' supernatural knowledge of the woman's personal life which becomes a basis for her witness (4:16-19, 29).<sup>104</sup>

The author has used verbs of speaking in previous passages as a metaphor for revelation (1:33; 3:11). In this passage, one of the expected functions of the coming Messiah is that he ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα (4:25). It is possible that the use of this verb echoes several passages in Isaiah (41:26, 28; 42:9; 43:9, 12; 44:7; 45:19; 46:10; 47:13; 48:14). The likelihood of this echo is strengthened by the strong verbal similarity

---

emphasis on the role of belief as a major theme.

<sup>101</sup>The Samaritan woman's lack of knowledge should not be seen as a patronizing detail. She is portrayed in a more positive light than Nicodemus.

<sup>102</sup>Jesus is speaking as a prophet grounded in Old Testament categories. Although this pericope accurately reflects the social tensions of the day, it is rooted in the storyline of the Old Testament.

<sup>103</sup>That this knowledge is revealed knowledge is emphasized by the use of a verb of hearing (ἀκούω).

<sup>104</sup>P. J. Cahill, "Narrative Art in John 4," *Religious Studies Bulletin* 2 (1982): 44; Hendrikus Boers, *Neither on This Mountain nor in Jerusalem: A Study in John 4*, SBLMS 35 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 171.

between Isaiah 52:6 and Jesus' reply in John 4:26.<sup>105</sup>

**The motif of misunderstanding.** The initial misunderstanding of Jesus' offer by the Samaritan woman in 4:4-30 reflects a perfectly reasonable interpretation of his statement. Up to this point in the narrative, the metaphorical use of water has been informed by contextual indicators.<sup>106</sup> While Nicodemus's misunderstanding of the birth metaphor was similarly caused by the inherent tension of using earthly concepts to express heavenly realities, the woman's misunderstanding is compounded by the multivalent and common uses of water.<sup>107</sup> Thirst is much more common than birth. The universal need for water in various ways makes this metaphor incredibly flexible and powerful but also difficult to interpret.<sup>108</sup>

The initial response of surprise by the woman is not that the request for a drink does not make sense but that it was unusual for a Jew to socially interact with a

---

<sup>105</sup>ἐγὼ εἰμι ἀπὸς ὁ λαλῶν (Isa 52:6 LXX); ἐγὼ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι (John 4:26). So Philip B. Harner, *The 'I Am' of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Johannine Usage and Thought*, ed. John Reumann, Facet Books Biblical Series 26 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970), 46; David Mark Ball, *'I Am' in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*, JSNTSup 124 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 179; Hamilton, "The Influence of Isaiah on the Gospel of John," 153, 160. The ἐγὼ εἰμι formula occurs in Isa 41:4; 43:10, 25; 45:19; 46:4 (2X); 48:12; and 51:12. It also occurs in John 6:20; 8:58; 18:5-6. Also see Young, "Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel," 222-30.

<sup>106</sup>John's water baptism was compared to Jesus' superior authority to baptize in the Spirit. The options for interpreting the reference to water with Nicodemus are limited contextually. The use the language of the necessity of birth with a grown man creates more tension between the metaphor and its referent than asking a woman at a well for a drink.

<sup>107</sup>Painter, "Johannine Symbols," 30; Manning, *Ezekiel in John*, 172. On the climatic conditions that created the cultural appeal of water as a metaphor for the inhabitants of Palestine, see Gary M. Burge, "Water," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels [DJG]*, ed. Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1992), 869-70. For an illustration of the universal attractiveness of water as a metaphor, see L. Jayachitra, "A Postcolonial Exploration of Water in the Fourth Gospel," *Bangalore Theological Forum* 37 (2005): 114-29. Also see Leonhard Goppelt, "ὕδωρ," in *TDNT*, 8:314-33.

<sup>108</sup>Birger Olsson, *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel: A Text-linguistic Analysis of John 2:1-11 and 4:1-42*, trans. Jean Gray (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1974), 212. Olsson's call for a further study of the Johannine metaphor of water has been answered by Enrique Becerra, "Le symbolisme de l'eau dans le Quatrième Évangile" (Docteur ès Sciences Religieuses, Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, 1982); Jones, *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John*; Ng, *Water Symbolism in John*; Craig R. Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003).

Samaritan (4:9). Jesus' response begins the revelatory correction that is based in his identity that transcends normal Judeo-Samaritan relations (4:10).

The woman's question μή σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ is an ironic contribution to the revelatory theme of the superiority of Jesus to the most important characters in the Hebrew Bible (4:12).<sup>109</sup> Just as Jesus is greater than Moses because his revelation of grace and truth is superior to the Law and his identity as the one who baptizes with the Spirit makes him greater than John the Baptist, he is also greater than Jacob because his provision of spiritual water is greater than Jacob's provision of physical water (4:13-14).

**The motif of Scripture fulfillment.** The language of water and thirst draws on whole matrix of metaphorical uses in the Old Testament. The Psalmist expressed spiritual longing for God in terms of thirst (Psalm 42:1; 63:1). *Living* water was commonly contrasted with the still water contained in a well or cistern. The suitability of this metaphor as vehicle for communicating spiritual truth is demonstrated by its prevalence in the Old Testament and other Jewish literature.<sup>110</sup> In his indictment against Israel the prophet Jeremiah described their idolatry in terms of forsaking living water to drink water from broken cisterns (Jer 2:13; 17:13). The pouring out of water on thirsty land is explicitly equated to the pouring out of the Spirit in Isaiah 44:3. The use of the phrase τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ θεοῦ in John 3:34 is evocative of the verb δίδωμι which is also used in Isaiah 44:3.<sup>111</sup>

Jesus tells the woman that the water he offers will become a spring of water

---

<sup>109</sup>Reimund Bieringer, "Greater Than Our Ancestor Jacob?," *Bible Today* 44 (2005): 301-05.

<sup>110</sup>Beasley-Murray, *John*, 60.

<sup>111</sup>The noun δωρεά has a legal connotation in Greek literature often referring to endowments and is used exclusively in the NT for divine gifts. It refers to the Spirit in Acts 2:38; 8:20; 10:45; 11:17 but does not appear in any of the synoptic Gospels. While δῶρον refers to a divine gift in Eph 2:8, it has a wider semantic range including gifts from people to other people or to God (Büchsel, "δίδωμι," 2:166-67).

ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον (4:14). The verb ἄλλομαι occurs three times in the New Testament but only once in the Gospel of John.<sup>112</sup> Some see this as a clear reference to the Holy Spirit.<sup>113</sup> The verb ἄλλομαι is used in the LXX for the activity of the Spirit of the Lord with Samson and Saul (Judg 14:6, 19; 15:14; 1 Sam 10:10).<sup>114</sup>

Another aspect of this pericope as a fulfillment of Scripture is its setting at a well in Samaria with a woman suggesting a betrothal scene.<sup>115</sup> Several marriages in the Old Testament were arranged at wells including the meeting of Abraham's servant with Rebekah on behalf of Isaac in Genesis 24, Jacob's first sight of Rachel in Genesis 29, and the winning of Zipporah by Moses in Exodus 2.<sup>116</sup> While there is debate regarding whether to view the woman's situation as literal or metaphorical, there is no reason why her real situation could not also serve to metaphorically depict spiritual realities.<sup>117</sup>

The relationship with Samaria in the Hebrew Bible is also often depicted in terms of marriage and marital infidelity.<sup>118</sup> Some have argued that this betrothal scene is

---

<sup>112</sup>Morris, *John*, 233. The other two instances are in Acts 3:8 where ἐξάλλομαι is used to describe the leaping of lame man healed by Peter and John in Acts 14:10 where ἄλλομαι is used to describe the rising of another lame man healed by Paul.

<sup>113</sup>Carson, *John*, 220; Morris, *John*, 233.

<sup>114</sup>James D. G. Dunn, "Δωρεά as the Gift of the Holy Spirit," in *Pneumatology*, vol. 2 of *The Christ and the Spirit: Collected essays of James D. G. Dunn* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 207.

<sup>115</sup>So Lyle Eslinger, "The Wooing of the Woman at the Well: Jesus, the Reader and Reader-response Criticism," *Literature and Theology* 1.2 (1987): 168-69; Frances Taylor Gench, *Back to the Well: Women's Encounters with Jesus in the Gospels* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004), 112-13.

<sup>116</sup>Brown, *John I-XII*, 170; Tina Dykesteen Nilsen, "The True and the False: The Structure of John 4,16-26," *BN* 128 (2006): 61.

<sup>117</sup>Stephen Moore argues that it is backwards to take five husbands in 4:18 literally ("Are There Impurities in the Living Water That the Johannine Jesus Dispenses? Deconstruction, Feminism, and the Samaritan Woman," in *The Interpretation of John*, ed. John Ashton [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997], 282-83). But the majority view is to take this as a factual statement about her marital life (Brown, *John I-XII*, 171; Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 187; Lindars, *Gospel of John*, 185; Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 235; Haenchen, *Gospel of John*, 1:221; Schnackenburg, *St. John*, 1:433; Morris, *John*, 235; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 61).

<sup>118</sup>Ball, 'I Am' in *John's Gospel*, 61-62. Ball finds Eslinger's recommendation of an Old Testament betrothal scene as the interpretative background to be unconvincing (Eslinger, "The Wooing of the Woman at the Well," 167-83).



depicting Jesus as the true husband in contrast to false gods of the Samaritans.<sup>119</sup> That the idolatry of the northern kingdom of Samaria is in view is bolstered the language of drawing water from a well in John 4:10-15 which is reminiscent of Isaiah's vision of people joyfully "drawing of water from the wells of salvation" in the last days (12:3; cf. 44:3; 49:10; 55:1; see also John 6:53; 7:38; Sir. 24:21; 1 Enoch 48:1).<sup>120</sup> This connection is particularly evocative in the context of Jesus' outreach to the Samaritans in light of the context of Isaiah 12 where the emphasis is on the worship of the Lord in all the nations and in all the earth (12:4-5).<sup>121</sup> Furthermore, this passage follows the Spirit passage in Isaiah 11:1-5 which results in the restoration of the northern kingdom in 11:12-16. By using the language of satisfying thirst from drawing water from a well in Samaria, Jesus is inaugurating the fulfillment of Isaiah's promise of a restored Israel. The inclusion of the Samaritans is a fulfillment of "those remarkably universalistic prophecies from the post-exilic period which predicted the inclusion of all the nations in the covenant people of God."<sup>122</sup>

The most prominent theme related to the fulfillment of Scripture is the teaching of Jesus regarding the role of the temple in worship.<sup>123</sup> The theme of Jesus as the fulfillment of the promises surrounding the eschatological temple has already been introduced and developed in the previous narrative (John 1:14, 51; 2:18-22).<sup>124</sup> Whether

---

<sup>119</sup>Nilsen, "The True and the False," 62-63. Gench argues that the woman's marital difficulties are a metaphorical representation of the colonial history of Samaria (*Back to the Well*, 113-14). For "an attempt to rehabilitate the Samaritan woman from negative characterizations," see Janeth Norfleete Day, *The Woman at the Well: Interpretation of John 4:1-42 in Retrospect and Prospect*, Biblical Interpretation Series 61 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 179.

<sup>120</sup>Köstenberger, *John*, 149-52.

<sup>121</sup>Also note the use of ἀναγγέλλω in Isa 12:4 and John 4:25.

<sup>122</sup>Bauckham, "The Parting of the Ways," 146.

<sup>123</sup>Kowalski argues that John 4:4-42 is a chiasm centering on Jesus' instruction on worshipping in Spirit and truth ("Of Water and Spirit," 167).

<sup>124</sup>On the relationship between the tabernacle and the temple to Jesus' body, see John Painter, "'The Light Shines in the Darkness': Creation, Incarnation, and Resurrection in John," in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, WUNT 222 (Tübingen: Mohr

one takes ‘spirit’ in 4:23 as a reference to the Holy Spirit<sup>125</sup> or the inner reality of genuine worship,<sup>126</sup> it seems apparent that the inwardness of true worship is being contrasted with the external forms both of the Samaritan and Jewish temple worship. Certainly this theme resonates with echoes from both the inward working anticipated in Ezekiel 36:25-27 as well as the living water flowing from the temple in Ezekiel 47:1-12.<sup>127</sup>

### **The Theme of Life**

The physical reality of the dependance of human life on water points to the spiritual reality of the dependance of eternal life upon the Spirit.<sup>128</sup> This connection is made explicit by the phrase εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον which is used twice in this passage (4:14, 36). The concept of ζωὴ αἰώνιος is “the basic soteriological concept in the Gospel according to John.”<sup>129</sup>

### **The Theme of Dwelling**

The promise of Jesus that the one who drinks οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα alludes to the motif of permanence (4:14).<sup>130</sup> Occurring here for the first time in the Fourth Gospel, the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα is found 28 times in the New Testament.<sup>131</sup> The

---

Siebeck, 2008), 35.

<sup>125</sup>Ladd, *Theology*, 328; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 62. Cf. Stephen Um, *The Theme of Temple Christology in John’s Gospel*, LNTS 312 (London: T & T Clark, 2006).

<sup>126</sup>Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 110-11; Morris, *John*, 239-40.

<sup>127</sup>Alan Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus’ Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 220 (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 190-91.

<sup>128</sup>Thomas R. Schreiner, *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 464.

<sup>129</sup>Jan G. van der Watt, “The Use of Αἰώνιος in the Concept Ζωὴ Αἰώνιος in John’s Gospel,” *NovT* 31 (1989): 217.

<sup>130</sup>Morris states, “Jesus’ response contrasts the impermanent result of drinking water from the well with the permanent consequences of receiving water from him” (*John*, 232).

<sup>131</sup>Matt 21:19; Mark 3:29; 11:14; Luke 1:55; John 4:14; 6:51, 58; 8:35, 51–52; 10:28; 11:26; 12:34; 13:8; 14:16; 1 Cor 8:13; 2 Cor 9:9; Heb 1:8; 5:6; 6:20; 7:17, 21, 24, 28; 1 Pet 1:25; 1 John 2:17; 2

fact that the water that Jesus provides will become a spring of water welling up ἐν αὐτῷ denotes the motif of indwelling (4:14).

The theme of dwelling is also developed in the establishment of true worship as worship ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ (4:24). The emphasis on Spirit is based on the reality of God dwelling in Spirit beyond the physical constraints of a temple. The emphasis on truth echoes Psalm 145:18 (144:18) where the nearness of the Lord is promised πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις αὐτὸν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.

### **The Condition of the Coming Hour**

The second condition related to the giving of the Spirit is developed in this passage with the statement of Jesus that ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν when true worship will occur ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ (4:23). While not all occurrences of ὥρα in the narrative are thematically significant, it is predominantly used to create an expectation for the exaltation and glorification of Jesus.<sup>132</sup>

The emphasis on the coming hour already being present is a matter of emphasis for some scholars.<sup>133</sup> While Turner's explication of the significance of wisdom in Johannine thought is helpful, it seems that claiming that it provides the key to the puzzle of when salvation is available in the Johannine narrative presses the text too far.<sup>134</sup>

---

John 1:2.

<sup>132</sup>Ordinary uses of ὥρα include John 1:39; 4:6, 52-53; 5:35; 11:9; 16:21; and 19:14, 27. Thematically significant uses include John 2:4, 21, 23; 5:25, 28; 7:30; 8:20; 12:23, 27; 13:1; 16:2, 4, 25, 32; 17:1.

<sup>133</sup>Max Turner and Gary M. Burge, "The Anointed Community: A Review and Response," *EvQ* 62 (1990): 260.

<sup>134</sup>In my judgment the quest to determine when the characters were able to receive salvation puts the interpreter in the awkward position of asking misleading questions. Burge asserts, "Had they asked Jesus, Nicodemus presumably would have been born anew, the Samaritan woman would have discovered living water, and the worshippers at Tabernacles would have found the drink of life" (*Anointed Community*, 115). This hypothetical scenario results in pure speculation. Since the questions one brings to the text can shape one's exegesis of the text, it seems better to avoid hypothetical or anachronistic questions that the narrative does not seem to be interested in answering.

A more contextual approach might look for an answer to this question in the narrative itself. Since Jesus has been so clearly portrayed as the fulfillment of both the Tabernacle and the Temple of the Old Testament, the fact that the hour now is might be better explained in the sense that Jesus' own presence has already replaced the Temple.<sup>135</sup> The hour is now here in the sense that the presence of God is dwelling in Jesus as it did in the Tabernacle and the Temple. The hour is coming when the Spirit will given in such a way that true worship in the spirit will be possible for all those who believe in Jesus and receive the indwelling living water of the Spirit.

### **The Life-giving Spirit (John 6:63)**

The fifth πνεῦμα passage in John 6:63 immediately follows what is commonly known as the Bread of Life discourse in 6:22-59. While much of the discussion of John 6 has focused on the sacramental significance of this passage,<sup>136</sup> it seems that there are good reasons to view the response of Jesus to his disciples explaining the role of the Spirit as the focus of this pericope.<sup>137</sup>

As with the other passages, there are motifs in the broader context of this πνεῦμα passage that connect it with the previous passages. The reference to Jesus as ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in John 6:33, 41, 50, 51, 58 echoes the descent of the Spirit in 1:32-33 and the similar nominative participial phrase ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς in

---

<sup>135</sup>G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, ed. D. A. Carson, NSBT 17 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 193. Also see Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, PBTM (2006), 135-45; Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body*, 167-204.

<sup>136</sup>J. Albert Harrill observes, "An exclusive focus on 'sacramentalism' has framed the kinds of questions previous commentators have brought to John 6, a preoccupation that has often been concerned more about the theological controversies between Protestants and Catholics than about the text itself" ("Cannibalistic Language in the Fourth Gospel and Greco-Roman Polemics of Factionalism [John 6:52-66]," *JBL* 127 [2008]: 134).

<sup>137</sup>Dodd referred to 6:63 as "the clue that the reader must hold fast in attempting to understand this discourse" (*Interpretation of Fourth Gospel*, 341). Cited in agreement by Burge, *Anointed Community*, 105.

apposition to the Son of Man in 3:13.

Besides its contribution to the development of the themes of revelation, life and witness, this passage is also central to the debate surrounding the conceptual background of the Fourth Gospel. Is the Gospel best understood in terms of a later Johannine community? Or is it plausible that it reflects the concerns of the Palestinian milieu in which Jesus actually ministered? While the significance of this question has already been noted in the discussion of baptism and the meaning of water in John 3:5-8, it is even more critical to the relationship of the language in John 6 regarding eating the body and drinking the blood of Jesus to the later Christian sacraments.

Those who see sacramental language in John 6 view these metaphors as reflecting the concerns of a later community.<sup>138</sup> Does this not assume more than the text can bear exegetically by introducing theological developments within the Christian church into the text? Does the narrative demand an eucharistic setting to explain the language? Is there an explanation for the cannibalistic language used by Jesus that is more coherent with the narrative itself? James Dunn has argued that “eucharistic overtones” are secondary but could it be that they are not necessary at all to explain Jesus’ language?<sup>139</sup> While John 6 has ecclesiological applications, it is not necessary to posit an ecclesiological origin for its language.

An alternative view is that this language is best in the context of the sacrificial

---

<sup>138</sup>Bernard, *Gospel according to St. John*, 210; Brown, *John I-XII*, 287-94; Burge, *Anointed Community*, 105; Morgan-Wynne, “References to Baptism in Fourth Gospel,” 125-126, 128-131; Rudolf Karl Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 59. Wayne A. Meeks typifies this approach in his attempt to explain this language in terms of its social function in myths that arose from a later community. Meeks asserts, “It has become abundantly clear that the Johannine literature is the product not of a lone genius but of a community or group of communities that evidently persisted with some consistent identity over a considerable span of time” (“The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism,” *JBL* 91 [1972]: 49). Meeks admits, though, that all of our knowledge of this supposed community comes from allusions to it from the Johannine text itself. For surveys of the various positions, see Brown, *John I-XII*, cxi-cxiv; Morris, *John*, 351-55; Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 236-38.

<sup>139</sup>James D. G. Dunn, “John 6: A Eucharistic Discourse?,” *NTS* 17 (1971): 337.

language of Leviticus, the imagery of the Passover and Exodus, and Jewish sapiential literature.<sup>140</sup> Peder Borgen argues that John 6:31-58 is a midrashic exegesis of Exodus 16:4, 15 which is quoted in 6:31.<sup>141</sup> Diana Swancutt explicates the influence of Isaiah 55:2-3 and Psalm 78 (77) on John 6:27. She states, “Language and themes from Isaiah 55 intertwine with those of Psalm 78 (77) and Isaiah 54 to form a complex, playful weaving that supports and colors the thematic and rhetorical movements in Jn 6.22-71.”<sup>142</sup>

The identification of Jesus as the bread from heaven makes sense in light of the Exodus imagery and his invitation to eat his flesh is understandable in the context of the Passover celebration which required eating the flesh of the Passover lamb but what about his insistence that his followers drink his blood (John 6:51c-58)? Because consuming blood is an abomination in the Levitical Law (Lev 17:14) and cannibalism is the nadir of the curse of the Law (Deut 28:53-57), the negative reaction of the crowd is understandable. However, the reason that consuming blood is prohibited is that it is recognized as the source of life (Gen 9:4; Lev 17:11, 14; Deut 12:23).<sup>143</sup> This emphasis on blood in the Law could be a theological precedent for the association by Jesus of the

---

<sup>140</sup>So Herman C. Waetjen, *The Gospel of the Beloved Disciple: A Work in Two Editions* (New York: T & T Clark, 2005), 213; Petrus Maritz and Gilbert van Belle, “The Imagery of Eating and Drinking in John 6:35,” in *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*, ed. Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann, WUNT 200 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 345-49.

<sup>141</sup>Peder Borgen, *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John*, NovTSup 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 98. Meeks acknowledges that Borgen “has demonstrated the midrashic character of the discourse and has shown that a number of the motifs incorporated in it were already familiar in Alexandrian Judaism and attested somewhat later in haggadah from Palestinian sources” but states that he remains unconvincing on a number of details (“The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism,” 58 n. 48). But note the qualifications of Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, “John’s Use of Scripture,” in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 358-79. Those who agree on midrashic character of John 6 include Harstine, *Moses as a Character*, 63.

<sup>142</sup>Diana M. Swancutt, “Hungers Assuaged by the Bread from Heaven: ‘Eating Jesus’ as Isaian Call to Belief: The Confluence of Isaiah 55 and Psalm 78 (77) in John 6.22-71,” in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 148 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 219-20.

<sup>143</sup>Dunn, “John 6,” 330-31.

consumption of his blood with life.

### **The Theme of Revelation**

In anticipation of the desertion of many of his followers because of their unbelief in the teaching of Jesus that his body and blood was the true source of life, Jesus again underscores the role of the Spirit in regenerate life. In a statement reminiscent of another response of Jesus to a similar confession by Peter (cf. Matt 16:17), Jesus contrasts the effective work of the Spirit with the ineffective role of the flesh. Referring to the Spirit as τὸ ζῳοποιῶν Jesus is clearly stressing the centrality of the Spirit as the one responsible for regenerating those who exhibit truth belief. He also ties the regenerative ministry of the Spirit directly to the theme of revelation. The very words of Jesus are not just the sayings of a wise teacher or even an anointed prophet. Rather, his words are πνεῦμά and ζωή.

### **The Theme of Life**

The dominant pneumatological theme that is developed in this passage is the theme of life. The Spirit is designated τὸ ζῳοποιῶν (6:63). Three of the eleven occurrences of the lemma ζῳοποιέω in the New Testament are found in the Gospel of John.<sup>144</sup> The other two Johannine occurrences in 5:21 are verbs describing both the Father's and the Son's ability to resurrect the dead. Based on the verbal similarities between John 5:25, 28 and Ezekiel 37:4, 12, Manning persuasively argues that an

---

<sup>144</sup>In the Pauline corpus, God is τοῦ ζῳοποιῶντος τοὺς νεκροὺς (Rom 4:17). The Spirit who raised Christ from the dead ζῳοποιήσει to the mortal bodies of those in whom he dwells (Rom 8:11). In contrast to the death of all in Adam, all in Christ ζῳοποιηθήσονται (1 Cor 15:22). In an illustration from nature explaining the resurrection, that which is sown οὐ ζῳοποιεῖται unless it dies (1 Cor 15:36). Paul contrasts ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδάμ εἰς ψυχήν ζῶσαν with ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζῳοποιῶν (1 Cor 15:45). Perhaps the most direct Pauline parallel is 2 Cor 3:6 where the letter kills but τὸ πνεῦμα ζῳοποιεῖ. The inability of the law is highlighted in Gal 3:21 where Paul argues that it is unable ζῳοποιῆσαι. In 1 Pet 3:18, a passage which is described as being a matter of “intense controversy,” Jesus is said to have been made alive πνεύματι (Thomas R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, NAC, vol. 37 [Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2003], 183).

allusion to Ezekiel's vision of dry bones being resurrected can be discerned.<sup>145</sup> Having already observed the lexical coherence of John 5:22, 26, 27, 36 with the πνεῦμα passage in 3:34 based on πατήρ and δίδωμι, we should not be surprised to find that 5:21 is also lexically connected to another πνεῦμα passage. That the Son makes alive οὓς θέλει in 5:21 seems to allude to the πνεῦμα that blows ὅπου θέλει in 3:8. Given our previous discussion of the allusion to Ezekiel 37:1-14 in John 3:8, it seems that all three of these πνεῦμα passages are expecting the eschatological life of rebirth and resurrection envisioned by the prophet in exile.<sup>146</sup>

### **The Theme of Witness**

The theme of witness is developed in the surrounding context of this passage by the use of the language of rejection. Just as Israel rejected the leadership of Moses in the wilderness, they are now rejecting the leadership of Jesus. This is most clearly seen in the use of the verb γογγύζω to describe the grumbling of the people against Jesus (6:41, 43, 61).<sup>147</sup>

### **Rivers of Living Water (John 7:37-39)**

The sixth and last πνεῦμα passage, John 7:37-39, is one of the most crucial passages in understanding the pneumatological expectations of the Fourth Gospel.<sup>148</sup> It is

---

<sup>145</sup>Manning compares οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσουσιν τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ and οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσουσιν τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ in John 5:25 to ἀκούσατε λόγον κυρίου, τοὺς νεκρούς, and ζησάτωσαν in Ezek 37:4 and μνημείους in John 5:28 to μνήματα in Ezek 5:12 (*Ezekiel in John*, 160-65).

<sup>146</sup>Interestingly Manning notes John's use of θέλω in 5:21 and the allusions to Ezek 36:25-27 in John 3:5 but he does not mention the influence of Ezek 37:1-14 on John 3:8 at any point in his monograph (*ibid.*, 165). In my opinion his argument could be strengthened based on these observations.

<sup>147</sup>This verb is only used one other time in John 7:32. It also occurs in the LXX to describe Israel's grumbling against Moses (Exod 17:3; Num 11:1; 14:27, 29; 17:6, 20; Pss 59:15; 106:25).

<sup>148</sup>This is the last πνεῦμα passage until the first παράκλητος passage in 14:16. Tricia Brown suggests that the reason for the lack of occurrences of πνεῦμα in chaps. 8-13 is that the focus changes after this last invitation of Jesus to experience the benefits of believing in him to the increasing opposition that arises in rejection of his offer (*Spirit in Writings of John*, 166-67). As with many of the πνεῦμα passages, its exegetical difficulties are a matter of much debate. Brown comments that these verses "have occasioned voluminous analysis by biblical scholars" (*ibid.*, 155). Anthony Tyrrell Hanson refers to 7:37-39 as



also the only πνεῦμα passage that occurs in the context of a feast.<sup>149</sup> As one of the three annual feast celebrations that every Jew was required to attend in Jerusalem (Deut 16:16), the Feast of Tabernacles provided a highly visible, public forum for Jesus to announce that he was going to fulfill the Messianic promise of living water.<sup>150</sup>

### **The Theme of Revelation**

The theme of revelation is primarily developed in this pericope in its presentation of the fulfillment of Scripture in Jesus as the source of living water. The careful reader of the Gospel would have most likely appreciated the significance of celebrating the presence of God with Israel in Feast of Tabernacles while Jesus is present as the Word who became flesh and ἐσκήνωσεν among us (John 1:14).

Standing in the middle of the assembled Jewish families, Jesus declared that he could provide the water that would satisfy the thirst to which the symbolism of the Feast alluded. Whether ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς refers to the seventh day of the feast when the final libation was poured out by the priest or the eighth day which was a Sabbath celebration, it is certainly clear that his offer of living water was intended to evoke an interpretation of his role in the culmination of the salvation history of Israel as expressed through the symbolism of the festival.<sup>151</sup>

---

“probably the most thoroughly discussed three verses in the entire Gospel” (*The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991], 99).

<sup>149</sup>Richard Bauckham, “The Audience of the Gospel of John,” in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 122. Bauckham observes, “John’s account of Jesus at the feast of tabernacles (chapters 7-8) is considerably informed by the way this festival was celebrated in the first-century Jerusalem temple (which could not be known from the Old Testament)” (ibid.).

<sup>150</sup>Henry M. Knapp, “The Messianic Water Which Gives Life to the World,” *HBT* 19 (1997): 112. That the Fourth Gospel presents Jesus as the fulfillment of the Feasts of Dedication (10:22), Passover (2:13, 23; 6:4; 11:55; 12:1; 13:1; 18:28, 39; 19:14), and Tabernacles (5:1; 7:2, 8, 10, 11, 14, 37) is an often noted aspect of the Fourth Gospel’s use of Scripture. See Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 135-39; Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, 160-80.

<sup>151</sup>Scholars who argue for the seventh day include Bernard, *Gospel according to St. John*, 280-81; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, trans. David Smith and G. A. Kon,

Also known as the Feast of Booths, this celebration was instituted originally by Moses as a reminder to Israel of their wanderings in the desert (Lev 23:33-44).<sup>152</sup> Its further significance as a feast recognizing the blessing of the Lord for a bountiful harvest was introduced in Deuteronomy 16:13-15. This association with agricultural blessings was developed further in Zechariah 14:16-19 where the survivors of the Exile are warned along with the rest of the nations that “a day is coming” (14:1) when participation in the Feast will be necessary for the blessing of rain.<sup>153</sup> The eschatological context of this passage along with the eschatological promises concerning water in texts like Isaiah 12:3 and Ezekiel 47:1-12 provided the background for the highly symbolic cultic ceremonies of the Feast of Tabernacles.<sup>154</sup> Balabanski’s study on the aqueducts of Jerusalem demonstrates the importance of flowing water in life of Israel and how this contributes to the expectation surrounding this ceremony.<sup>155</sup>

Of course, the underlying background not only to John 7:37-39 but also all the other Old Testament passages previously mentioned is the provision of water to Israel in the wilderness recorded in Exodus 17:6 and Numbers 20:8-13. In light of this background, the crowd’s affirmation of Jesus in 7:40 as the “Prophet” demonstrates that

---

Herder’s Theological Commentary on the New Testament (New York: Crossroad, 1990), 2:152. Those who argue for the eighth day include Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 326; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 181; Knapp, “Messianic water,” 111. Fowler admits that he finds the evidence inconclusive (“Influence of Ezekiel,” 146).

<sup>152</sup>For a description of the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles and its significance as the background for Jesus’ statement, see George W. MacRae, “The Meaning and Evolution of the Feast of Tabernacles,” *CBQ* 22 (1960): 251-76; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 113-14.

<sup>153</sup>The liturgy preserved in *b. Meg.* 31a required the reading of Zechariah 14:16-17 on the first day of the Feast (Köstenberger, “John,” 453-54).

<sup>154</sup>Zane C. Hodges, “Rivers of Living Water: John 7:37-39,” *BSac* 136 (1979): 243-46; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 182; Köstenberger, *John*, 109, 239. On the role of Ezek 33-37 in John 8-11, see Deeley, “Ezekiel’s Shepherd and John’s Jesus,” 252-64.

<sup>155</sup>Victoria Balabanski, “‘Let Anyone Who Is Thirsty Come to Me’: John 7:37-38 in Dialogue with Josephus and the Archaeology of Aqueducts,” *Lutheran Theological Journal* 39 (2005): 132-39.

some realized the significance of the provision of bread and water from Jesus.<sup>156</sup>

Another Old Testament text informing the background of this passage is Nehemiah 7-9.<sup>157</sup> After Nehemiah completed fixing the walls of Jerusalem in chapter 7 and Ezra read the Law to the people in chapter 8, the survivors of the Exile celebrated the Feast of Booths in 8:14-18. It was in this context that the Levitical prayer confessing the sin of Israel and the faithfulness of Yahweh was offered in 9:5-38. Of particular importance for our study is Nehemiah 9:20 where the people recounted that during their wilderness wanderings the Lord was faithful to give them his “good Spirit to instruct them” as well as “manna” and “water for their thirst.”<sup>158</sup>

Besides the general Scriptural background of the Feast of Tabernacles, the theme of revelation is also developed by the phrase καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή in 7:38. While the specific source of this reference is unclear, options include Proverbs 4:23, 5:15, 18:4; Isaiah 44:3 55:1; 58:11; Ezekiel 47:1-12; Joel 3:18 (4:18); Zechariah 14:8; and Sirach 24:30-33.<sup>159</sup> Köstenberger aptly describes the author’s use of Scripture: “It is not any one of those passages by itself that is in view, but rather the entire matrix of scriptural

<sup>156</sup>Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 183.

<sup>157</sup>Carson, *John*, 326-28; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 727; Köstenberger, “John,” 455.

<sup>158</sup>The confession of Nehemiah ends with a recognition that their political situation was slavery (Neh 9:32-37). Since the Old Testament historical narrative ends with the elders of Israel recognizing their slavery, the fact that Jesus’ audience did not recognize their own slavery is even more ironic (especially since their situation had not improved greatly considering their present political situation was subjugation to Rome). See Carson, *John*, 349-50.

<sup>159</sup>Bernard, *Gospel according to St. John*, 280; Juan B. Cortés, “Yet Another Look at John 7:37-38,” *CBQ* 29 (1967): 85; Manning, *Ezekiel in John*, 178. J. Ramsey Michaels remains unconvinced that any one passage is the source (*John: A Good News Commentary*, NIBC [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989], 145). Beasley-Murray discerns a general allusion to the OT (*John*, 116). Barrett states, “The whole body of the Old Testament formed a background, or framework, upon which the new revelation rested” (“The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” 168). Paul Miller remarks, “John is such a skilled exegete that he can use a mere fragment of biblical texts as a kind of exegetical magnet, attracting whole clusters of other texts and themes to it” (“They Saw His Glory,” 132). On John’s exegetical method, see Glenn Balfour, “The Jewishness of John’s Use of the Scripture in John 6:31 and 7:37-38,” *TynBul* 46 (1995): 357-80. Keener points to other midrashic uses of Joel 2:28-29 in the early Christian community as the basis for a possible influence of Joel (Acts 2:17-18,33; 10:45; Rom 5:5; Tit 3:5-6) (*Gospel of John*, 724). Manning suggests a lexical connection between Joel 3:18 (4:18) and John 7:39 based on their common use of ῥέω and ἕδωρ (*Ezekiel in John*, 178).

expectations associated with the eschatological abundance presaged by the Feast of Tabernacles, as is reflected in the references to the feast in Neh. 9 and in this chapter's references to the provision of water from the rock during Israel's wilderness wanderings."<sup>160</sup>

### **The Theme of Dwelling**

Another heavily debated issue related to this passage is the referent of the source of living water.<sup>161</sup> Whether one takes the traditional view that the believer is the source of living water,<sup>162</sup> the majority view of contemporary exegetes that Jesus alone is the source,<sup>163</sup> or the position that both could be in view,<sup>164</sup> the language of the satisfaction of thirst strongly emphasizes an inward work of the Holy Spirit in the believer.<sup>165</sup>

---

<sup>160</sup>Köstenberger, "John," 454. Andrew T. Lincoln also suggests this is a composite reference to these texts (*The Gospel according to Saint John*, BNTC 4 [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005], 255-56). Keener agrees that this is a composite text but notes the primacy of Ezekiel when he states, "Although I believe that John makes most use of the new temple material in Ezekiel, I concur with the scholars who argue that John elsewhere midrashically blends various texts and that he is following that practice here" (*Gospel of John*, 728).

<sup>161</sup>Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel*, 99-109; Knapp, "Messianic water," 113-14; Brown, *Spirit in Writings of John*, 155-58. For discussions on the punctuation of 7:37, see Brown, *John I-XII*, 320-21; Cortés, "Yet Another Look at John 7:37-38," 75-86; Lindars, *Gospel of John*, 298; Bruce H. Grigsby, "'If Any Man Thirsts': Observations on the Rabbinic Background of John 7:37-39," *Bib* 67 (1986): 101-08; Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel*, 99-102; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 115.

<sup>162</sup>J. Blenkinsopp, "John 7:37-39: Another Note on a Notorious Crux," *NTS* 6 (1959): 97-98; Hodges, "Rivers of Living Water," 242; Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, 528-29; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 181-82; Carson, *John*, 322-29; Morris, *John*, 174-78; Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 272-73; Köstenberger, *John*, 109-10.

<sup>163</sup>C. H. Turner, "On the Punctuation of John 7:37-38," *JTS* 24 (1922): 67; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 115-16.

<sup>164</sup>Cortés, "Yet Another Look at John 7:37-38," 86; Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 197 n. 57; James Merrill Hamilton Jr., *God's Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old & New Testaments*, ed. E. Ray Clendenen, NAC Studies in Bible & Theology (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2006), 116. Balfour suggests that this could be an instance of double entendre ("Jewishness of John's Use of Scripture," 374).

<sup>165</sup>Beale argues that this is a reference to Jesus as the new Holy of Holies in the innermost part of the temple (*The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 197). Nigel M. Watson makes a helpful distinction between the believer as the immediate source of the water and Jesus as its ultimate source ("Risen Christ and Spirit/Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," *AusBR* 31 [1983]: 83).

### **The Theme of Life**

The theme of life is developed in this passage by the metaphor of thirst and the promise of living water (ὕδατος ζῶντος) in 7:38. This phrase echoes the private promise of living water made to the Samaritan woman in John 4.<sup>166</sup> That this promise definitely refers to the giving of the Spirit is explicitly stated in 7:39.

### **The Theme of Witness**

One aspect of the theme of witness in this passage is the very public nature of Jesus' invitation to Israel to believe in Him.<sup>167</sup> Another more subtle connection to the theme of witness in the broader context of John can be deduced from a reflection upon the lexical connections between Nehemiah 9 and John 6-8. The motif of rejection is seen in the ironic historical connection between the confession by the elders of Israel in Nehemiah 9:36-37 that they were slaves in their own land and the insistence by the elders that they have never been slaves in John 8:33.<sup>168</sup>

### **The Condition of Glorification**

The last issue for our discussion is the enigmatic phrase οὐπω γάρ ἦν πνεῦμα, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη in verse 39. The meaning of the first phrase cannot refer to the absolute existence of the Spirit because the author has clearly referred to his activity prior to this point in the narrative.<sup>169</sup> The Spirit has already served as an external witness to John the Baptist concerning the identity of Jesus by descending upon him at his baptism (John 1:32-34). Further, the truthfulness of the earthly testimony of the Son has been based on the role of the Spirit in his teaching ministry (3:34).<sup>170</sup>

---

<sup>166</sup>Knapp, "Messianic water," 112-13.

<sup>167</sup>Ibid., 112.

<sup>168</sup>Carson, *John*, 326-28; Köstenberger, *John*, 241.

<sup>169</sup>H. Woodhouse, "Hard Sayings—IX: 'The Holy Ghost Was Not Yet Given' (Jn 7:39)," *Theology* 67 (1964): 310-12; Lincoln, *The Gospel according to Saint John*, 257-58.

<sup>170</sup>John Christopher Thomas points to the dialogue with Nicodemus and the faith of the

This verse explicitly ties the giving of the Spirit with the glorification of Jesus. The question of whether the Johannine conception of glorification is centered on the crucifixion of Jesus,<sup>171</sup> his resurrection,<sup>172</sup> or his ascension and session,<sup>173</sup> will be more profitably discussed later in this study as the theme of glorification is more fully developed in the narrative. All that is clear at this point is that there is a condition of glorification.<sup>174</sup>

### Conclusion

In the six πνεῦμα passages we have found that the author of the Fourth Gospel develops five themes related to pneumatological expectation. These themes are revelation, witness, mission, dwelling, and life. While they are intrinsically related in many ways, the author employs motifs that are characteristic of each theme. These motifs are carefully woven throughout the narrative using associated words and metaphors. The author also has tied the giving of the Spirit to three conditions of exaltation, the coming hour, and glorification for its fulfillment.

---

Samaritans as evidence that the Spirit's work of regeneration has also been realized at this point in the narrative ("Max Turner's *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now* [Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1996]: An Appreciation and Critique," *JPT* 12 [1998]: 16). However, in my judgment, this line of evidence is not as clear.

<sup>171</sup>Smalley, *John*, 248-50.

<sup>172</sup>Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, 529.

<sup>173</sup>Augustus Tholuck, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*, trans. Charles P. Krauth (Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co, 1859), 415-16.

<sup>174</sup>This is the first occurrence of the verb δοξάζω which occurs 23 times in 16 verses in John (7:39; 8:54; 11:4; 12:16, 23, 28; 13:31-32; 14:13; 15:8; 16:14; 17:1, 4-5, 10; 21:19).

CHAPTER 3  
PNEUMATOLOGICAL EXPECTATION  
IN THE ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ PASSAGES

**Introduction**

In what is commonly referred to as the Farewell Discourse, the author records five passages unique to the Fourth Gospel describing the role of ὁ παράκλητος (14:16-17, 25-26; 15:26-27; 16:5-11, 12-15). The relationship between the Spirit in the narrative and the Paraclete in the upper room has been the subject of considerable debate.<sup>1</sup> Until the work of Felix Porsch and Gary Burge, many studies focused primarily on the uniqueness of these passages as the primary contribution of Johannine pneumatology.<sup>2</sup> Several of the recurrent themes that were developed in πνεῦμα passages are further developed and explicitly related to the promised Paraclete. In typical Johannine fashion, the themes related to the παράκλητος are developed in stages with each passage building on the last.<sup>3</sup> In addition to clarifying the pneumatological significance of these themes, the author also introduces two new conditions for the giving of the Spirit.

---

<sup>1</sup>John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 420; Tricia Gates Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-Scientific Perspective*, JSNTSup 253 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2003), 1-4.

<sup>2</sup>Felix Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Frankfurt: Knecht, 1974); Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987).

<sup>3</sup>G. Patrick Johnstone, "The Promise of the Paraclete," *BSac* 127 (1970): 334. Recent studies have used the French word 'réécriture' to describe this aspect of Johannine style (Klaus Scholtissek, "Relecture und Réécriture: Neue Paradigmen zu Methode und Inhalt der Johannesauslegung aufgewiesen am Prolog 1,1-18 und der ersten Abschiedsrede 13,31-14,31," *TP* 75 [2000]: 1-29; idem, "The Johannine Gospel in Recent Research," in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, ed. Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004], 459-60).

While the source critical arguments for treating the παράκλητος passages as foreign insertions has failed to win consensus, there are valid reasons for considering them together in their own group. First, the uniqueness of the passages in the Fourth Gospel marks a stark difference with the synoptic Gospels.<sup>4</sup> As D. Moody Smith has observed, the farewell discourses “represent the epitome of what is distinctive in the Fourth Gospel.”<sup>5</sup> Second, there is a change of audience that separate these passages from their counterparts in the previous narrative. The six πνεῦμα passages in chapters 1-7 were in the context of the public ministry of Jesus over several years. The five παράκλητος passages in chapters 14-16 are given to the private audience of Jesus’ disciples. Finally, this change of audience is accompanied by a distinct change in tone.

Several of the metaphors related to the theme of revelation that were identified in the previous chapter on the πνεῦμα passages are woven throughout the Farewell Discourse. Truly, what has been implied in the narrative of John concerning the Holy Spirit becomes explicitly stated in the five παράκλητος statements in the upper room discourse (14:16-17, 25-26; 15:26-27; 16:5-11, 12-15).<sup>6</sup> Also the theme of witness is still present, but it has changed from second person to third person.<sup>7</sup> Whereas the emphasis in the πνεῦμα passages is on the witness against the recipients of Jesus teaching, the emphasis in the παράκλητος passages is on the clearer revelation to the disciples.

---

<sup>4</sup>George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 322. Although the Farewell Discourse is unique to the Fourth Gospel among the Gospels, the precedent for a farewell discourse is established in the Old Testament. See Aelred Lacomara, “Deuteronomy and the Farewell Discourse (Jn 13:31-16:33),” *CBQ* 36 (1974): 65-84; John W. Pryor, *John, Evangelist of the Covenant People: The Narrative and Themes of the Fourth Gospel* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1992); Ernst Bammel, “The Farewell Discourse of the Evangelist John and Its Jewish Heritage,” *TynBul* 44 (1993): 103-16.

<sup>5</sup>D. Moody Smith, “John 16:1-15,” *Int* 33 (1979): 58.

<sup>6</sup>Hans Windisch, “The Five Johannine Paraclete Sayings,” in *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. John Reumann, Facet Books Biblical Series 20 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 2, 4-14.

<sup>7</sup>This can be seen by contrasting μέσος ὑμῶν ἔστηκεν ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε in 1:26 and ὁ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν, ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτὸ οὐδὲ γινώσκει in 13:17.



### The Literary Context of the Farewell Discourse

A difficult task facing the modern interpreter of the Farewell Discourse is to determine its historical and literary context. One's view of the most appropriate *Sitz im Leben* for these texts as well as the nature of their compositional unity colors exegesis at every level. Although the influence of literary criticism on recent Johannine studies has pushed scholars away from the more radical source-critical rearrangements of texts, many scholars uncritically accept its historical skepticism.<sup>8</sup> This hesitancy to embrace the full historicity of the text pushes many scholars to embrace a so-called third *Sitz im Leben* for the text in a proposed Johannine community at the end of the first century.<sup>9</sup> Placing more confidence in their reconstructions of the social setting of this community than in the historical integrity of the text itself, these scholars tend to minimize the plausibility that the Fourth Gospel is a reliable, historical account of the actual words of Jesus.<sup>10</sup>

One of the few aspects of the Fourth Gospel that receives nearly universal scholarly consent is that chapter 13 marks the beginning of a new section.<sup>11</sup> The two

---

<sup>8</sup>Studies that argue for the literary unity of the extant form of the text while allowing for a history of revision include John L. Boyle, "Last Discourse (Jn 13,13-16,33) and Prayer (Jn 17): Some Observations on Their Unity and Development," *Bib* 56 (1975): 210-22; Wayne Brouwer, *The Literary Development of John 13-17: A Chiastic Reading*, SBLDS 182 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000).

<sup>9</sup>For a lucid defense of a third *Sitz im Leben*, see Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*, ed. Francis J. Moloney (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 40-86; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 105-114, 171-232. For resistance to this view, see Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel according to John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 10-11.

<sup>10</sup>For a recount of the history of how these texts evolved from being considered as a single discourse to multiple discourses, see L. Scott Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13:31-16:33*, JSNTSup 256 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2004). For an interpretation of the Paraclete as a product of the later Johannine community in comparison with the book of Revelation, see M. E. Boring, "The Influence of Christian Prophecy on the Johannine Portrayal of the Paraclete and Jesus," *NTS* 25 (1978): 113-23.

<sup>11</sup>Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, trans. David Smith and G. A. Kon, Herder's Theological Commentary on the New Testament (New York: Crossroad, 1990), 3:1, 3; Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 451; D. Moody Smith, *John*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries (Nashville:

biggest arguments against the literary unity of the Farewell Discourse is based on the repetition of elements in 14:1-31 and 16:4-33 and the debate concerning the historicity of 14:31. The influence of literary criticism has softened the accusations of disunity based on repetition. As Keener notes, Gail R. O’Day has stated that the claim that there were two Farewell Discourses “tends to discount the role of repetition as a literary technique throughout the Fourth Gospel.”<sup>12</sup> In addition, scholars like Fernando Segovia, who have been most strongly influenced by source criticism, now argue for more unity and coherence in the existing text. This acknowledgement of repetition as a literary device allows Segovia to see the Farewell Discourse “as a self-contained artistic whole that is highly unified and carefully developed from beginning to end” but it does not rule out the theory of different stages of development.<sup>13</sup>

Since Bultmann divided the Discourse into various units, critics have pointed to the transition at 14:31 as the most substantial evidence against the unity and historicity of the discourse.<sup>14</sup> That the words of Jesus ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν in 14:31 present a challenge to those who hold to the unity of the Farewell Discourses is acknowledged by

---

Abingdon, 1999), 247-48; Gary M. Burge, *John*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 363. C. H. Dodd labeled chaps. 2-12 as “The Book of Signs” and chaps. 13-20 as “The Book of the Passion” (*The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1953], 289-91, 297, 390). Rudolf Bultmann titled chaps. 2-12 as “The Revelation of the ΔΟΞΑ to the World” and chaps. 13-20 as the “Revelation of the ΔΟΞΑ to the Community” (*The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971], 111, 457). Raymond E. Brown distinguished between “The Book of Signs” in 1:19-12:50 and “The Book of Glory” in 13:1-20:31 (*The Gospel according to John I-XII*, AB, vol. 29 [New York: Doubleday, 1966], cxxxviii-cxxxix).

<sup>12</sup>Keener, *Gospel of John*, 894.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Bultmann’s division was 13:1-30; 17:1-26; 13:31-35; 15:1-16:33; 13:36-14:41 (*Gospel of John*, 461). John Painter points out that Bultmann’s reconstruction “wrecks the (inclusio) structure whereby the Paraclete passages are held between chapters 13 and 17 which focus on Jesus’ cleansing act, the footwashing, and Jesus’ cleansing word, 17.14, 17” (“Glimpses of the Johannine Community in the Farewell Discourses,” *AusBR* 28 [1980]: 25).

everyone.<sup>15</sup> This phenomenon was coined an ‘aporia’ by Edward Schwartz in 1907.<sup>16</sup>

While many scholars claim this literary seam is evidence that the original discourse was not a literary unity, there are some who propose that a satisfactory explanation is possible.<sup>17</sup>

One of the more prolific modern interpreters to promote the necessity of multiple sources in the Farewell Discourse is Fernando Segovia.<sup>18</sup> Although he seeks to interpret the Farewell Discourse as a literary unit, in his interpretation Segovia categorizes four different approaches that attempt to explain the data.<sup>19</sup> The “*historicizing* approach,” initially proposed by B. F. Westcott, suggests that chapters 15-17 were delivered after Jesus and His disciples left the Upper Room in 14:31b but before they crossed the Kidron valley in 18:1.<sup>20</sup> The “*transpositional* approach” attempts to rearrange sections of the discourse to conform to a more logical flow of thought.<sup>21</sup> That logical flow

<sup>15</sup>D. A. Carson considers it the “major structural challenge of the entire discourse” (*The Gospel according to John*, PNTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 477). See Dodd, *Interpretation of Fourth Gospel*, 406; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 454; F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 306; Burge, *John*, 401-02; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 894.

<sup>16</sup>Gary M. Burge, “The Literary Seams in the Fourth Gospel,” *The Covenant Quarterly* 48 (1990): 17.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid. Burge credits the work of Eduard Schweizer and Eugene Ruckstuhl for convincing many that the entire Gospel is the result of a single author (Eugene Ruckstuhl, *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums: Der gegenwärtige Stand der einschlägigen Forschungen*, Novum testamentum et orbis antiquus 5 [Freiburg Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987]; Eduard Schweizer, *Ego Eimi: Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 56 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939]).

<sup>18</sup>Fernando F. Segovia, *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991). See Ben Witherington III, *John’s Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 244.

<sup>19</sup>Fernando F. Segovia, “The Theology and Provenance of John 15:1-17,” *JBL* 101 (1982): 115-18.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., 115-16.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., 116.

is primarily in the eye of the beholder is evidenced by the multiple solutions that proponents of this method have proposed.<sup>22</sup> The “*softening* approach” seeks either to reinterpret 14:31c or remove it altogether.<sup>23</sup> Segovia mentions P. Corsen as one who sees it as a later addition and thus removes it; and H. Zimmerman as one who reinterprets it as “an application of the Johannine technique of misunderstanding.”<sup>24</sup> Finally, the “*redactional* approach” proposes that a redactor has added material to the original discourse contained in 13:31-14:31.<sup>25</sup> Although there is no agreement among adherents of this approach whether there were single or multiple additions, Segovia claims it “has carried the day in recent and contemporary exegesis.”<sup>26</sup>

What is remarkable about the disposition of those who deny the literary unity of the Farewell Discourse is their absolute confidence that their solution is the only plausible explanation and their total dismissal of the claim of historicity.<sup>27</sup> Witherington, the mildest example, states that “to say the material in the Farewell discourses is difficult to analyze is to understate the case.”<sup>28</sup> Barrett is more bold in his rejection of the unity of the Discourse when he says,

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., 116. John Henry Bernard suggested the following order: 13:1-30; 15; 16; 13:31-38; 14; 17 (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, 2 vols., ICC [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929], xx-xxiii). Bultmann proposed 13:1-30; 17; 13:31-35; 15; 16; 13:36-14:31 (*Gospel of John*, 461).

<sup>23</sup>Segovia, “The Theology and Provenance of John 15:1-17,” 116.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., 116.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., 116-18.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., 116.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., 115. Other works based on the redactional approach include Benjamin Wisner Bacon, “The Displacement of John xiv,” *JBL* 13 (1894): 64-66; Painter, “Glimpses of the Johannine Community in the Farewell Discourses,” 21-38; D. Bruce Woll, “The Departure of ‘the Way’: The First Farewell Discourse in the Gospel of John,” *JBL* 99 (1980): 225-39; John Painter, “The Farewell Discourses and the History of Johannine Christianity,” *NTS* 27 (1981): 525-43. For a rejection of the recational approach, see John W. Pryor, “Covenant and Community in John’s Gospel,” *RTR* 47 (1988): 44-51.

<sup>28</sup>Witherington, *John’s Wisdom*, 244.

It has been suggested that the material contained in chs. 15-17 should be thought of as spoken in the streets of Jerusalem, or in the neighbourhood of the temple, as Jesus made his way to the garden mentioned in 18:1. This seems incredible, even when allowance is made for the fact that John's primary interest is in his discourses rather than in their settings.<sup>29</sup>

It is important to point out that Barrett's only argument against the historicity of 14:31 is that it seems "incredible."<sup>30</sup> He goes on to posit two distinct versions the Discourse: (1) 13:31-14:31 and (2) 15-17.<sup>31</sup> Painter, claiming that originally 14:31 was followed by 18:1, suggests three versions: (1) 13:1-14:31; (2) 15:1-16:4a; and (3) 16:4b-16:33.<sup>32</sup>

Schnackenburg exemplifies the type of circular reasoning that often accompanies this view by saying "If the gospel of John is only seen as a work with a fairly long genesis (see Vol. 1, pp. 44-74), then all earlier attempts to fit the lengthy discourses in Jn 15-16 into the situation of departure have to be rejected."<sup>33</sup>

Schnackenburg begs the question by basing his rejection of the unity of the Farewell Discourse on his theory of development not on the evidence itself.

While B. F. Westcott's work is often dismissed by modern interpreters because of its traditional views, no one has successfully disproved the core logic of his view that the entire Gospel is most likely the result of one author who was an eyewitness.<sup>34</sup> Indeed, Segovia's only argument against this view is that it is dated because it embraces the historicity of the events and accepts chapters 15-17 as a unified composition.<sup>35</sup> As a clear example of circular reasoning, his response begs the question. The only reason to reject a

---

<sup>29</sup>Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 454.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., 454-55.

<sup>32</sup>Painter, "The Farewell Discourses and the History of Johannine Christianity," 525-26.

<sup>33</sup>Schnackenburg, *St. John*, 3:89.

<sup>34</sup>Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel: Issues and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001), 27-31; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 89.

<sup>35</sup>Segovia, "The Theology and Provenance of John 15:1-17," 116.

view that the events are historical and the discourse is a collection of fragments is because it embraces historicity and compositional unity. This rejection, however, should be argued not assumed. Consistent with his view that the Fourth Gospel was the product of one author recounting historical occurrences, Westcott took ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν as the departure of Jesus and the disciples from the house in which they had eaten and proposed that Jesus spoke the words in chapters 15-17 on the way from the upper room but before he crossed the Kidron Valley (18:1).<sup>36</sup> In addition to acknowledging the Old Testament background behind the vine imagery in 15:1-6, Westcott proposes two plausible historical settings that could have evoked this metaphor.<sup>37</sup> Jesus and his disciples could have been surrounded by the many vineyards which covered the hill sides of the Kidron Valley or they could have been in the Temple courtyard in view of the sculpture of vines which Josephus describes (*Ant.* 25.11.3; *J.W.* 5.5.4).<sup>38</sup> It seems that this historical reconstruction is a simpler answer to the problem than the complex theories of community development and, therefore, to be preferred.

Besides the weakness of Segovia's dismissal of the historicizing approach in light of the evidence, there is another flaw in his endorsement of the necessity of a redactor. C. H. Dodd argued that the espousal of a redactor does not eliminate the problem.<sup>39</sup> Dodd rightly reasons "Unless the 'redactor' was strangely irresponsible, he must have given some thought to the arrangement of the material, and unless he was

---

<sup>36</sup>B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John: The Authorized Version with Introduction and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), 187.

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*, 197.

<sup>38</sup>On the luxuriant vine growth in the Kidron Valley, see Benjamin C. Chapman, "Kidron," in *New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology*, ed. E. M. Blaiklok and R. K. Harrison (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983); William Sanford Lasor, "Kidron, Brook; Kidron Valley," in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. 3, rev. ed., ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986).

<sup>39</sup>Dodd, *Interpretation of Fourth Gospel*, 406-09. Also see Thomas L. Brodie, who states, "The logic of the editorial hypothesis leads to the idea that in some strange way the editor was both careful and bungling, free and scrupulous. Thus, it is a hypothesis which lacks internal coherence" (*The Gospel according to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993], 437). See also the thorough discussion of Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse*, 205-33.

more obtuse than we can easily believe, he must have seen the difficulty about Ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν as clearly as we do. Presumably he thought the words had some intelligible meaning as they stand. And after all it is still not proof that the evangelist himself was not his own redactor.<sup>740</sup>

### **Another Paraclete (John 14:16-17)**

In this first παράκλητος passage, Jesus tells his disciples that he will request the Father to give them ἄλλον παράκλητον (14:16). Having already hinted at his impending departure (13:31-14:6), Jesus states the purpose of this gift is that the other Paraclete would be with them forever. Identifying the Paraclete as τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, Jesus warns them that the world οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν him because they do not see or know him (14:17a). In contrast, Jesus expresses his confidence that the disciples know him ὅτι παρ' ὑμῶν μένει καὶ ἐν ὑμῶν ἔσται (14:17b).

### **The Theme of Revelation**

The revelatory motifs of knowing and seeing are interwoven into the immediate context of this passage. The verbs of knowing, οἶδα and γινώσκω, and the verbs for seeing, δείκνυμι and ὁράω, are prominent in the dialogue between Jesus and Thomas (14:5-6) and Jesus and Philip (14:7-8).<sup>41</sup> Verbs of knowing and seeing are also emphasized in the passages itself. In contrast to the inability of the world to receive the

---

<sup>40</sup>Dodd, *Interpretation of Fourth Gospel*, 407. Based on his linguistic analysis, Kellum concludes, “The Farewell Discourse shows a discrete linguistic style in rather obscure criteria and a rather broad focus. It also demonstrates a meaningful semantic structure in terms of unity, prominence, and coherence. Finally, the procedure and assumptions that have led to the modern consensus of disunity have significant problems. Thus, not only does the text display a unity, but the reasons to posit disunity were insufficient to overturn the assumption of authorial integrity. Therefore, there are no objective reasons to propose the literary disunity of the Farewell Discourse. If Occam’s Razor still applies, the Johannine Farewell Discourse should be considered a literary unity in its entirety” (*The Unity of the Farewell Discourse*, 234).

<sup>41</sup>The word δείκνυμι occurs 6 times in the Gospel of John (John 5:20; 10:32; 14:8, 9; 20:20). While it is used in 20:20 in the context of Jesus showing his pierced hands and side to the disciples, the other 2 uses are in the context of the Father showing his works to the Son (5:20) and the Son showing those works to those who are rejecting him (10:32).

Paraclete because οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτὸ οὐδὲ γινώσκει, the disciples do know him (14:17).<sup>42</sup>

A consensus on the best English translation of παράκλητος has eluded modern scholarship.<sup>43</sup> While originally understood in the passive sense as “one called alongside,” it could also be understood in an active sense as someone who speaks for someone else.<sup>44</sup> The active sense seems to fit the Johannine context better since the Paraclete is sent by Jesus rather than called by the disciples. The term was primarily used in secular Greek in a forensic setting for a legal representative.<sup>45</sup>

Although lexical investigations have not yielded much exegetical fruit for understanding the Johannine concept of the Paraclete, studies that have compared its ascribed functions with other sources have produced more promising results. Attempts to provide a context for understanding the meaning of this term include Lutkemeyer’s suggestion that the use of the cognate noun παράκλησις in Luke 2:25 to describe Simeon’s hope in the context of the Holy Spirit supernaturally revealing the identity of the baby Jesus as the awaited Messiah.<sup>46</sup> Others have searched for possible connections to

---

<sup>42</sup>Both of the verbs in this clause have textual variants that change their tense. There are textual witnesses that substitute the future tense μένῃ for the present tense μένει and that substitute a present tense εστιν for the future tense ἔσται. George R. Beasley-Murray prefers the future tense for μένω and εἰμί and the present tense interpreted with a future meaning for γινώσκω (*John*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., WBC, vol. 36 [Dallas: Word, 1999], 243). See the fuller discussion of James Merrill Hamilton Jr., *God’s Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old & New Testaments*, ed. E. Ray Clendenen, NAC Studies in Bible & Theology (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2006), 175-82.

<sup>43</sup>English translations of the Bible often translate παράκλητος as ‘Advocate’ (NET, NLT, NRSV, TNIV), ‘Comforter’ (ASV, KJV), or ‘Counselor’ (HCSB, NIV, RSV), or ‘Helper’ (ESV, NASB, NCV, NKJV). Perhaps the scholarly dissatisfaction with any one of these options can best be seen in the tendency of revisers of a particular translation to change their rendering in their revision. Note for example the differences between the KJV and NKJV, the RSV and NRSV, and the NIV and TNIV. The difficulties surrounding the interpretation of παράκλητος are widely noted. See Burge, *Anointed Community*, 6-10; Margaret Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, JSNTSup 69 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 139-53; Max Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts—Then and Now*, rev. ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998), 77-79.

<sup>44</sup>Raymond E. Brown, “The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel,” *NTS* 13 (1967): 113-32; George Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, SNTSMS 12 (Cambridge: University Press, 1970); Kenneth Grayston, “The Meaning of Parakletos,” *JSNT* 13 (1981): 67-82; Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 587-91.

<sup>45</sup>Beasley-Murray, *John*, 256.



the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>47</sup> Burge explores the connections between the παράκλητος and the Qumranic concept of an intercessory angel, but concludes, “The personal metaphors surrounding the Johannine Spirit Paraclete stem from Christ, not from a model of an intercessory angel.”<sup>48</sup> Still others have looked for influences from the Old Testament in the ministry of the prophet Ezekiel.<sup>49</sup>

None of these backgrounds completely satisfy the full role of the Johannine Paraclete, however, as Ladd says, “The linguistic problem is primarily found in the fact that the Johannine Paraclete is primarily a teacher to instruct and lead the disciples rather than an advocate to defend them.”<sup>50</sup> Burge concludes, “The single most important feature of the Johannine Paraclete is its Christological concentration. Christ is the template within the Fourth Evangelist’s thinking that has given shape and meaning to the Spirit in the Farewell Discourses.”<sup>51</sup>

Upon the request of Jesus, the Father will give ἄλλον παράκλητον to the disciples (14:16).<sup>52</sup> The use of the demonstrative adjective ἄλλος both distinguishes the

<sup>46</sup>Lawrence J. Lutkemeyer, “The Role of the Paraclete: Jn 16:7-15,” *CBQ* 8 (1946): 220-21. Cf. Max Turner, “The Concept of Receiving the Spirit in John’s Gospel,” *VE* 10 (1977): 27; Nigel M. Watson, “Risen Christ and Spirit/Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel,” *AusBR* 31 (1983): 83-84.

<sup>47</sup>A. R. C. Leaney, “The Johannine Paraclete and the Qumran Scrolls,” in *John and Qumran*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972), 38-61.

<sup>48</sup>Burge, *Anointed Community*, 30. Also see Max Turner and Gary M. Burge, “*The Anointed Community*: A Review and Response,” *EvQ* 62 (1990): 254.

<sup>49</sup>Bruce Vawter, “Ezekiel and John,” *CBQ* 26 (1964): 455-58; C. Hassell Bullock, “Ezekiel, Bridge between the Testaments,” *JETS* 25 (1982): 30-31. Cf. William G. Fowler, who regards Vawter’s evidence as inadequate (“The Influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel: Intertextuality and Interpretation” [Ph.D. diss., Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, 1995], 192-95). Although Gary T. Manning Jr. dedicates a whole section in his monograph explicating the relationship of the metaphor of the vine in John 15 to Ezekiel, he does not mention the Paraclete or engage the studies by Bullock or Vawter (*The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*, JSNTSup 270 [London: T. & T. Clark, 2004], 135-48).

<sup>50</sup>Ladd, *Theology*, 329.

<sup>51</sup>Burge, *Anointed Community*, 93.

<sup>52</sup>Arthur Lee Mansure, “The Relation of the Paraclete to the Spiritual Presence of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel” (Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1950), 72, 87; Carson, *John*, 499-500.

Paraclete as a separate person and emphasizes his identification with Jesus.<sup>53</sup> As Köstenberger says, “Jesus’ identification with the Spirit, the “other παράκλητος,” is so strong that he can say that he himself will return to his followers in the person of the Spirit (14:18).”<sup>54</sup>

The theme of revelation is also developed by the apposition of τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας with ἄλλον παράκλητον. Like the word παράκλητος, the phrase τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας only occurs in the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles.<sup>55</sup> While some have noted the influence of 1QS 3.19; 4.21, 23 on this title, it is better understood as a contemporary idea drawing from a common tradition represented in the Hebrew Bible and the Jewish literature of the Second Temple.<sup>56</sup> Bauckham points out that the only similarity is the term itself which also occurs in *Jubilees* 25.14 and *Joseph and Aseneth* 19.11.<sup>57</sup> Although some have argued this title presents a new development, it actually strengthens the connection of the παράκλητος passages to the πνεῦμα passages. The relationship of the Spirit to truth has already been well established in the previous πνεῦμα passages (4:23-24). Another thematic connection with the πνεῦμα passages might be found in their allusions to Nehemiah 9:20 in John 3:34; 6:63; and 7:37-39.

---

<sup>53</sup>Watson, “Risen Christ,” 84.

<sup>54</sup>Andreas J. Köstenberger, “John,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 434. Also see Eskil Franck, *Revelation Taught: The Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, ConBNT 14 ([Lund]: CWK Gleerup, 1985), 125-26.

<sup>55</sup>Cf. 1 John 4:6.

<sup>56</sup>Richard Bauckham, “The Qumran Community and the Gospel of John,” in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 125-36. See the discussion of the positions of Otto Betz, *Der Paraklet: Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannes-Evangelium und in neu gefundenen*, AGSU 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), and Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, by Burge, *Anointed Community*, 16-23. Also see John Breck, *The Origins of Johannine Pneumatology*, vol. 1 of *Spirit of Truth: The Holy Spirit in Johannine Tradition* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1991), 162-63.

<sup>57</sup>Bauckham, “The Qumran Community and the Gospel of John,” 135. Bauckham also notes the absence of courtroom language in 1QS (*ibid.*).

Additionally, the connection to John 4 is strengthened by the echo of Isaiah 11:12 describing πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως, πνεῦμα βουλήs καὶ ἰσχύος, πνεῦμα γνώσεως καὶ εὐσεβείας.

### **The Theme of Witness**

The theme of witness is developed in typical Johannine terms by the contrast between the inability of the world to receive the Spirit of truth and the disciples' knowledge of the Spirit's presence (17). The use of the verb λαμβάνω strongly echoes the theme of witness in the previous narrative.<sup>58</sup>

### **The Theme of Dwelling**

Two pneumatological expectations related to the theme of dwelling are developed in this passage by its use of prepositional phrases. The permanence of the Spirit's dwelling is implied because the Spirit-Paraclete will be μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (16). As Guthrie aptly states, "Once the Spirit has taken possession, he remains in residence."<sup>59</sup>

The supporting theme of indwelling is developed by the statement to the disciples that the Spirit παρ' ὑμῶν μένει καὶ ἐν ὑμῶν ἔσται.<sup>60</sup> Just as the ability to see glory of the Father and Son was based on the Word dwelling in the flesh among the disciples (1:14,18), their ability to know the Spirit is based on his dwelling with and in them.

While it is more common for the Old Testament to describe the Spirit's activity of outward empowerment, the concept of an inward reality is not completely foreign. Part

---

<sup>58</sup>The verb λαμβάνω occurs 46 times in the Gospel of John (1:12, 16; 3:11, 27, 32–33; 4:36; 5:34, 41, 43–44; 6:7, 11, 21; 7:23, 39; 10:17–18; 12:3, 13, 48; 13:4, 12, 20, 26, 30; 14:17; 16:14–15, 24; 17:8; 18:3, 31; 19:1, 6, 23, 27, 30, 40; 20:22; 21:13).

<sup>59</sup>Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1981), 531.

<sup>60</sup>Frederick R. Harm, "Distinctive Titles of the Holy Spirit in the Writings of John," *ConcJourn* 13 (1987): 122; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 257.

of David's request of the Lord to not remove the Holy Spirit from him in Psalm 51:10-11 was that God would create a clean spirit within him. The Old Testament also looks forward to a coming work of the Spirit associated with the messianic salvation (Joel 2:28; Ezek 36:26-27). But these earlier hints at the inward work of the Spirit will become fully realized in the work of the Spirit-Paraclete. Concerning the inwardness of the work of the Holy Spirit, Ladd comments, "The eschatological promise is to be fulfilled, and a new dimension of the inwardness of the Spirit experienced."<sup>61</sup>

Three prepositional phrases have now been used to describe the ways in which the Spirit dwells with people: ἐπί, μετά, παρά, and ἐν. The identity of Jesus was revealed to John by the Spirit descending and remaining ἐπ' αὐτόν (1:32-33). There is no significant difference in the meaning of μετά and παρά when used with μένω.<sup>62</sup> The preposition ἐν can be used in the sense of 'among' with collective singular nouns (John 7:43).<sup>63</sup> It can also, however, be used in the sense of 'in' (4:14; 6:56).

### **The Condition of Asking**

A new condition for the giving of the Spirit is introduced by Jesus' statement ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα (16). Although the previous conditions have been based on the more abstract concepts of exaltation, the coming hour, and glorification, this condition is connected to a direct action of Jesus. The exact timing or circumstances of Jesus' request are not clearly specified.

---

<sup>61</sup>Ladd, *Theology*, 326.

<sup>62</sup>In John μένω is used with παρά 4 times (John 1:39; 4:40; 14:17, 25). This construction only occurs 4 times in the rest of the New Testament (Acts 18:3; 21:7, 8; 1 Cor 7:24) and 2 times in the LXX (Jdt 11:17; Tob 10:9). The preposition μετά is used with μένω in Gen 24:55 with imperative. In NT (Luke 24:29; John 11:54; 1 Tim 2:15; 1 John 2:19; 2 John 2). After Jesus ceased his public ministry in response to the plots to kill him, he remained μετά τῶν μαθητῶν in Ephraim (11:54).

<sup>63</sup>Cf. John 2:25; 5:38.

### **The Paraclete and the Holy Spirit (John 14:25-26)**

This second παράκλητος passage introduces the direct role of the Spirit in the theme of revelation and strengthens the connection between the Paraclete and the Spirit by the apposition of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον with ὁ παράκλητος.<sup>64</sup> Additionally, the didactic functions of the Spirit-Paraclete are explicated for the first time. Finally, the second condition for the giving of the Spirit is introduced.

#### **The Theme of Revelation**

This passage strengthens the connection between the Paraclete and the Spirit by the apposition of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον with ὁ παράκλητος.<sup>65</sup> More importantly the context of the function of teaching and remembering makes this title interchangeable with τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (14:16; 15:26; 16:13). The theme of revelation is further clarified in the description of the twofold didactic function of the Spirit-Paraclete. First, the Spirit διδάξει πάντα (14:26). This function of the Spirit-Paraclete is reminiscent of the role of teaching in the ministry of Jesus (6:59; 7:14, 28; 8:2; 8:20; 18:20).

Second, the Spirit ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν (14:26). Just as Jesus' teaching ministry was limited to what the Father taught him (8:28), the Spirit's teaching ministry is primarily a ministry of reminding believers of the teaching of Jesus (14:26). The verb ὑπομνήσκω is echoed in two narrative asides that emphasize the role of remembrance in the writing of the Fourth Gospel. In response to the request for a sign to validate his authority for cleansing the temple, Jesus refers to his ability to raise up the destroyed temple in three days (2:13-22). Although Jesus meant this as a reference to the resurrection of his body after his death, his inquisitors misunderstood it as a reference to

---

<sup>64</sup>Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John XIII-XXI: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB, vol. 29A (New York: Doubleday, 1966), 1036-37. Hamilton notes that this is the only occurrence of the full form in John (*God's Indwelling Presence*, 80 n. 107), and cites Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 650, and B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes* (London: John Murray, 1908), 2:183.

<sup>65</sup>Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 1036-37.

the temple itself (2:19-20). The narrator's explanation that the real meaning of Jesus' statement was his physical body is based on the disciples remembrance of this statement after his resurrection (2:21-22). Less clear is whether the disciples remembrance of Psalm 69:9 as an explanation for Jesus' cleansing of the temple occurred before or after the resurrection (2:17).

The other instance of remembrance in the narrative occurs at Jesus' entrance to Jerusalem in John 12:12-19. The disciples did not understand the significance of Jesus riding a young donkey until they remembered ὅτι ταῦτα ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ (12:16). This instance is especially instructive for understanding the Spirit-Paraclete's role for two reasons. First, the connection of the remembrance of the disciples is to the glorification of Jesus in 12:16 echoes the necessity of the glorification of Jesus for the giving of the Spirit in 7:39.<sup>66</sup> Second, this example shows the relationship of remembering to Scripture in the didactic ministry of the Spirit-Paraclete.<sup>67</sup> This is most likely an example of the Spirit applying a Scripture to the ministry of Jesus that may not have been explicitly taught by Jesus himself.

Several scholars have based their arguments for or against the personality of the Spirit on the gender of the neuter noun πνεῦμα and the masculine pronoun ἐκεῖνος in 14:26 evidences that the author envisioned the Spirit as an impersonal force instead of a personal actor.<sup>68</sup> However, Wallace convincingly demonstrates that this use of the

---

<sup>66</sup>The significance of this connection is amplified by the fact that the narrator only uses the verb δοξάζω in reference to anticipating the glorification of Jesus in 7:39 and 12:16.

<sup>67</sup>Martin Hengel, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 389-91. Also see Peter Stuhlmacher, "Spiritual Remembering: John 14:26," in *Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 55-68.

<sup>68</sup>Daniel B. Wallace is writing against those who use the grammatical argument a basis for the personality of the Spirit ("Greek Grammar and the Personality of the Holy Spirit," *BBR* 13 [2003]: 103). Also see James Merrill Hamilton Jr., "He Is with You and He Will Be in You: The Spirit, the Believer, and the Glorification of Jesus" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003), 97 n. 118.

masculine demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος is better explained grammatically as being in simple agreement with the masculine noun παράκλητος than being a theological statement regarding the personality of the gender neutral πνεῦμα.<sup>69</sup> While the full weight of this grammatical argument should be recognized, the ascription of personality to πνεῦμα in this passage is clearly in view in because the functions of the Paraclete imply personality. Indeed as Wallace admits, “Although one might argue that the Spirit’s personality is in view in the Upper Room Discourse, the view must be based on the nature of a παράκλητος and the things said about the Counselor, not on any alleged grammatical subtleties.”<sup>70</sup> Indeed, as argued earlier, the nature of the παράκλητος is better defined by the connections with Jesus and the Spirit in the rest of the narrative.

### **The Theme of Witness**

The pneumatological theme of witness is reinforced in this context by the statement that the Father πέμπει the Spirit ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι of Jesus. We have already noted the significance of πέμπω to the theme of witness. That the Holy Spirit is sent by the Father in the name of Jesus shows that the Spirit is the representative of them both. Just as Jesus was sent in the name of the Father (1:25; 5:43), the Spirit is sent in the name of the Son.<sup>71</sup>

### **The Condition of Departure**

The condition of departure is implied in the use of the perfect verb λελάληκα and present participle μένων in verse 25 contrasted with the use of the future verb πέμψει

---

<sup>69</sup>Wallace, “Greek Grammar and Personality of Holy Spirit,” 102-113, 117. Wallace concludes, “In sum, none of the gender shift passages clearly helps establish the personality of the Holy Spirit. In light of this, I would recommend that an argument that appears to be a modern invention be excised from our theological textbooks” (ibid., 120).

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., 111. Wallace further submits, “There is no text in the NT that clearly or even probably affirms the personality of the Holy Spirit through the route of Greek grammar. The basis for this doctrine must be on other grounds” (ibid., 122).

<sup>71</sup>Beasley-Murray, *John*, 261.

in verse 26. The things that Jesus has already spoken while with the disciples will be taught by the Spirit when he is sent. While theme of departure has already been developed in the previous narrative, it is first connected in this passage with the sending of the Spirit.

### **The Spirit of Truth (John 15:26-27)**

The future role of the Spirit and the disciples as witnesses to Jesus in a hostile world are the main theme of the third παράκλητος passage. Having illustrated the necessity of the disciples to abide in his love so that they could bear the fruit of loving one another with the imagery of the vine and its branches (15:1-17), Jesus then describes the hatred that the world would have for them (15:18-25). Quoting Psalm 69:4, Jesus explains that world's hatred of the disciples is based in its irrational hatred of him and his Father.<sup>72</sup> The unjustness of this irrational hatred will be challenged by the witness of the Paraclete as the Spirit of truth and the disciples (15:26-27). The intimately connected themes of mission, witness, and revelation are all explicitly tied to the future ministry of the Paraclete.

### **The Theme of Witness**

The theme of witness is the primary theme developed in 15:26-27. Once again, the Holy Spirit is referred to as the "Spirit of truth" as a reference to his role as a witness to the true identity of Jesus is emphasized. Whereas the theme of witness has been implicit in the previous παράκλητος passages, the phrase ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ is the first mention of direct witness of the Spirit himself (15:26). The verb μαρτυρέω is also used in the first explicit instruction for the disciples to be witnesses (15:27).

The continuity between Jesus as Paraclete and the Spirit as Paraclete is seen in the similarity between the bases for their legitimacy as witnesses to the truth. The

---

<sup>72</sup>Ps 35:19 could also be a source for this quotation but the widely recognized messianic nature of Ps 69 makes it the more likely candidate (Köstenberger, "John," 467).



qualification of the Spirit as a witness is based on his being sent by Jesus and his coming from the Father (15:26). This standard of truthfulness is also claimed by Jesus about his own witness in the previous narrative (5:37; 8:18).

The qualification for the disciples to be witnesses is found in the causal clause ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστε (15:27). The prepositional phrase ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is most likely a reference to the beginning of Jesus' ministry when he called the disciples (1:35-51).<sup>73</sup> Those who had been with Jesus since the beginning were eyewitness to all that Jesus had done (1:14).<sup>74</sup> The role of the eyewitness is a recurring motif throughout the entire Gospel.

### **The Theme of Revelation**

The theme of revelation is also picked back up in the role of the Spirit as a witness concerning Jesus. The truth to which the Spirit witnesses is the truth of Jesus.<sup>75</sup> That the Spirit is given in the name of Jesus is a witness to his identity. As the descent of the Spirit in 1:29-34 was the witness that revealed Jesus' identity to John the Baptist, the giving of the Spirit in the name of Jesus is the witness that proves his identity to his disciples as well as to the world.

The fulfillment of Scripture plays a role in this passage by its connection to Isaiah 43:10-12 and 44:8 where God's people are said to be witnesses.<sup>76</sup> This connection

---

<sup>73</sup>Ridderbos remarks concerning these verses, "The Spirit will not push aside the word of Jesus or open a new source of revelation. The Spirit has nothing new to offer, nothing that Jesus has not brought. The Spirit will only enable the disciples to witness to Jesus as he really was, the one with whom they have been from the beginning" (*Gospel of John*, 15).

<sup>74</sup>Cf. 1 John 1:1-4.

<sup>75</sup>Anthony Casarella, *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers: A Study in the History of Exegesis* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 144; Morris, *John*, 261; Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 15.

<sup>76</sup>Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 468; Köstenberger, "John," 495.

to the present text is strengthened by the use of πνεῦμα in the broader context of these passages (Isa 42:1,5,7; 44:3).

### **The Theme of Empowerment**

The theme of empowerment is implied in the relationship between the Spirit's role as a witness and the role of the disciples as witnesses. The Spirit-Paraclete is the primary witness enabling the disciples to also be a witness to the truth that they have observed in Jesus.

### **The Sending of the Paraclete (John 16:7-11)**

This παράκλητος passage is intended to be a source of comfort after a series of difficult statements for the disciples since the previous passage. Sadness has filled the hearts of the disciples in 16:6 because of three things that Jesus has communicated to them. First, they will be called to witness to the truth of Jesus in a hostile world (15:18-27). Second, they will be persecuted even by their fellow Jews (16:1-3). Third, Jesus himself is leaving them (16:4).

The relationship between the work of Jesus and the work of the Holy Spirit is emphasized by Jesus' teaching in 16:7 concerning the advantage of the spiritual presence of the Paraclete over the physical presence of Jesus.<sup>77</sup> The theme of mission echoes in the promises of Jesus "to send" the Spirit to the disciples (16:7). Whether one takes ἐλέγξει as 'convince', 'convict', or 'expose', this is clearly an expression of the theme of witness.

### **The Theme of Witness**

Considered "one the most baffling passages" in the Johannine corpus, the exegetical difficulties associated with these verses are regularly debated.<sup>78</sup> While all the

---

<sup>77</sup>Beasley-Murray comments, "When 16:7 is set alongside 7:39; 12:23, 27-28, 31-32; 13:31-32 and 20:22, it is evident that the 'lifting up' of Jesus via his cross to the throne of God brings about the turn of the ages that ushers in the saving sovereignty of God in fullness" (*John*, 280).

<sup>78</sup>D. A. Carson, "The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7-11," *JBL* 98 (1979): 547. Also see W. H. P. Hatch, "The Meaning of John XVI, 8-11," *HTR* 14 (1921): 103-05; Barnabas Lindars,

details surrounding these debates are not directly relevant to the current investigation, a few observations will prove helpful. The theme of witness is related to other motifs that are judicial in nature.<sup>79</sup>

The Paraclete ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον (16:8). The word ἐλέγω occurs three times in John. There are four possible meanings for the verb ἐλέγω: (1) “to scrutinize or examine carefully, bring to light, expose, set forth”; (2) “to bring a person to the point of recognizing wrongdoing, convict, convince someone of something, point something out to someone”; (3) “to express strong disapproval of someone’s action, reprove, correct”; or (4) “to penalize for wrongdoing, punish, discipline.”<sup>80</sup>

The structure of this clause with the verb modified by an accusative of person and a *περὶ* with a genitive also occurs in John 8:46 and Jude 15. Borrowing the language of 1 Enoch 1:9,<sup>81</sup> Jude says it is the Lord and his holy ones who came ἐλέγξαι πᾶσαν ψυχὴν περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ’ αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς. In John 8:46, Jesus responds to his opponents by asking which of them could convict him of sin.

### The Theme of Empowerment

Another theme that becomes explicit in this passage is the theme of empowerment. This theme is not absent in earlier passages of the Farewell Address. The disciples will be empowered not only to do the works of Jesus but will even do greater

---

“Δικαιοσύνη in Jn. 16:8 and 10,” in *Mélanges Bibliques En Hommage Au R. P. Béda Rigaux*, ed. Albert Decamps and R. P. André de Halleux (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970), 275-86; John Aloisi, “The Paraclete’s Ministry of Conviction: Another Look at John 16:8-11,” *JETS* 47 (2004): 55-69.

<sup>79</sup>On role of the trial of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, see Anthony E. Harvey, *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1976); Andrew T. Lincoln, *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000).

<sup>80</sup>Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, ed. and trans. William F. Arndt, F. Wilber Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker [BDAG], 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), s.v. “ἐλέγω.”

<sup>81</sup>BDAG, s.v. “ἐλέγω.”

works (14:12).<sup>82</sup> This empowerment is starkly contrasted with the natural inability of the disciples to bear fruit outside of their relationship as branches in the vine (15:1-8). The theme of empowerment is also seen in ability of the disciples to make requests of the Father and the Son (14:13-14; 15:7, 16; 16:23-24, 26-27).

While the grammar of 16:7-11 requires that the world is recipient of the conviction of the Spirit, this ministry of the Spirit's conviction holds advantages for the disciples. Both direct and indirect witness to the world is empowering for the disciples. In their sorrow over the loss of Jesus and their fear of persecution the Paraclete will join them in their witness.<sup>83</sup> The presence of the Spirit as witness among the disciples echoes the presence of God with Moses in the Old Testament. Lacomara observes, "It is evident that both Moses in Dt, and Jesus in the FD, appeal to signs and wonders for the same reason: for Moses they served to prove to the Israelites the presence of God in their midst; for Jesus they prove the presence of God in him and, consequently, in the midst of those to whom he had been sent."<sup>84</sup>

### **The Condition of Departure**

Another development related to an expected condition of the giving of the Spirit is the statement *συμφέρει ὑμῶν ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω* (14:7). The distinct contribution of this passage is that both the necessity and the advantage of Jesus' departure is explicitly connected to the sending of the Spirit. The benefits of Jesus' departure have already been established in the discourse. Jesus' departure to the Father is the basis for the ability of

---

<sup>82</sup>Andreas J. Köstenberger remarks, "Significantly, the primary distinction in 14:12 is not between Jesus and his followers, but between the mission of the earthly and of the exalted Jesus" ("The 'Greater Works' of the Believer according to John 14:12," *Didaskalia* 6 [1995]: 41).

<sup>83</sup>Köstenberger states, "John's acknowledgment of the disciples' misunderstanding before the giving of the Spirit underscores the fact that it is the Spirit who accounts for the disciples' later understanding and ability. It is he who continues the revelation and work of Jesus who is now exalted" (ibid.).

<sup>84</sup>Lacomara, "Deuteronomy and the Farewell Discourse (Jn 13:31-16:33)," 71.

believers to do greater works than Jesus (14:12), the disciple's joy (14:28), and the sending of the Spirit (16:7).

The departure of Jesus has been developed in both the narrative and the Farewell Discourse using five Johannine verbs of departure: *ὑπάγω* (7:33; 8:14, 21, 22; 13:3, 33, 36; 14:4, 5, 28; 16:5, 10, 17),<sup>85</sup> *πορεύομαι* (7:35; 14:2-3, 12, 28; 16:7, 28), *μεταβαίνω* (13:1),<sup>86</sup> *ἀπέρχομαι* (16:7), and *ἀφίημι* (16:28). As with other themes in the *παράκλητος* passages, the theme of Jesus' departure is anticipated in previous passages connected with *πνεῦμα* statements (7:23-26). The destination and purpose of Jesus' departure has been expressed in various ways: going to the one who sent me (7:33; 16:5),<sup>87</sup> going in a clear sense of return to the Father (13:1; 14:12, 28; 16:10, 17, 28),<sup>88</sup> going to God (13:3),<sup>89</sup> and going to prepare a place (14:1).<sup>90</sup>

### **The Spirit and Apostolic Revelation (John 16:12-15)**

In this last of the five *παράκλητος* passages, the theme of revelation is developed using language that is evocative of several Old Testament themes. The theme of revelation is also connected to the theme of empowerment and the condition of departure.

---

<sup>85</sup>The verb *ὑπάγω* occurs 32 times in 28 verses in the Fourth Gospel (John 3:8; 4:16; 6:21, 67; 7:3, 33; 8:14, 21, 22; 9:7, 11; 11:8, 31, 44; 12:11, 35; 13:3, 33, 36; 14:4-5, 28; 15:16; 16:5, 10, 17; 18:8; 21:3).

<sup>86</sup>The verb *μεταβαίνω* occurs 3 times in the Fourth Gospel (John 5:24; 7:3; 13:1). The other two occurrences do not contribute to the development of this condition as a pneumatological theme.

<sup>87</sup>*ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντά με* (7:33; 16:5).

<sup>88</sup>*μεταβῆ ἔκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα* (13:1); *ὅτι ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πορεύομαι* (14:12); *πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα* (14:28; 16:28); *πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγω* (16:10); and *ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα* (16:17).

<sup>89</sup>*πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὑπάγει* (13:3).

<sup>90</sup>*πορεύομαι ἐτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν* (14:1).

## The Theme of Revelation

The theme of revelation is continued in these verses using language that echoes the work of the Spirit in the Old Testament to guide Israel.<sup>91</sup> Referred to as τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας for the third time, the Spirit ὀδηγήσει the disciples into all truth.<sup>92</sup> The imagery of the Lord guiding evokes several passages in Psalms where the Lord guides his people.<sup>93</sup> The allusion to Psalm 142 is particularly interesting because it is τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἀγαθὸν that leads. Also there is a reference to the thirst of the Psalmist's soul in 142:6 (143:6). The connection to Psalm 31:3 (30:4) might be strengthened considering the likelihood that the author reflected on Psalm 31:5 (30:6) in relation to the crucifixion.

While all these are true, possibly the most significant echo in the context of the Fourth Gospel is Nehemiah 9:12, 19 (2 Esd 19:12, 19).<sup>94</sup> Nehemiah 9 probably echoes Deuteronomy 1:32-33 where the rejection of the Lord's word is placed in the context of Israel behind led by the pillar of fire. The connection of this παράκλητος passage to Nehemiah 9 echoes its use in the immediate context of the πνεῦμα passage of John 7:37-39.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup>See R. Glenn Wooden, "Guided by God: Divine Aid in Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. John J. Collins and Craig A. Evans, Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 101-20.

<sup>92</sup>The verb ὀδηγέω is used 5 times in the NT (Matt 15:14; Luke 6:39; John 16:13; Acts 8:31; Rev 7:17). While 2 of the other NT occurrences are references to the inadequacy of human guides (Matt 15:14; Luke 6:39), there are several suggestive connections with Rev 7:17 where it is the Lamb as shepherd who ὀδηγήσει αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ ζωῆς πηγᾶς ὕδατων. More suggestive for this study is the scene where Philip has been led by the Spirit to minister to the Ethiopian eunuch, the eunuch admits his need for someone to guide him regarding the interpretation of Isa 53:7b-8. See Hamilton, *God's Indwelling Presence*, 82.

<sup>93</sup>The verb ὀδηγέω occurs 27 times in Psalms (Pss 5:8 [5:9]; 23:3 [22:3]; 25:5, 9 [24:5, 9]; 27:11 [26:11]; 31:3 [30:4]; 43:3 [42:3]; 45:4 [44:5]; 60:9 [59:11]; 61:3 [60:4]; 67:4 [66:5]; 73:24 [72:24]; 77:20 [76:21]; 78:14, 53, 72 [77:14, 53, 72]; 80:1 [79:2]; 86:11 [85:11]; 90:16 [89:16]; 106:9 [105:9]; 107:7, 30 [106:7, 30]; 108:10 [107:11]; 119:35 [118:35]; 139:10, 24 [138:10, 24]; 143:10 [142:10]). In 3 of these, ὀδηγέω and διδάσκω are used in parallel (Ps 24:5, 9 [25:5, 9]; 142:10 [143:10]).

<sup>94</sup>The LXX uses ὀδηγέω 2 times with πνεῦμα in Ps 143:10 (142:10) and Isa 63:10. Ps 143:10 (142:10) is particularly suggestive in that it uses the same language of Neh 9 (τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἀγαθὸν ὀδηγήσει []).

<sup>95</sup>See the previous discussion on page 90 in chapter 2 of this study.

Another Old Testament echo is the influence of Isaiah on the use of ἀναγγέλλω in 16:13. As with its use in John 4:25, this word is most likely informed by its use in Isaiah (41:23, 26, 28; 42:9; 43:9, 12; 44:7; 45:19; 46:10; 47:13; 48:14).<sup>96</sup>

The truthfulness of the Spirit is based in the fact that he does not speak ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅσα ἀκούσει λαλήσει (16:13). The Spirit will be a trustworthy guide ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ because he will speak what he hears instead of from himself. As with the other functions of the Spirit-Paraclete, this same measure of truthfulness that is applied to the Spirit of truth was applied to Jesus in the preceding narrative (7:17-18; 8:26-28, 38, 44; 12:49; 14:10).<sup>97</sup>

In addition to the remembrance of all that Jesus had already said (14:26), verse 12 implies further revelation of the will of Jesus because there are things that he would tell them when they are better able to bear them.<sup>98</sup> The dual function of the revelatory work of the Spirit, therefore, includes the significance of the meaning of what Jesus has accomplished through his life, death and resurrection as well as the revelation of the eschatological events of the future.<sup>99</sup>

One aspect of the future teaching of the Spirit-Paraclete is that the disciples will no longer be taught ἐν παροιμίαις (16:25). In 10:6 a narrative aside describes the previous verses as a παροιμία that was not understood by the those listening to Jesus.

---

<sup>96</sup>Franklin W. Young, "Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel," *ZNW* 46 (1955): 224-26; James Merrill Hamilton Jr., "The Influence of Isaiah on the Gospel of John," *Perichoresis* 5 (2007): 160.

<sup>97</sup>Especially note 8:44 where the devil is said to speak ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων.

<sup>98</sup>So Reimund Bieringer, "The Spirit's Guidance into All the Truth: The Text-critical Problems of John 16,13," in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 183-207. However, the question of whether the Spirit will teach the disciples the things already revealed by Jesus or things yet to be revealed does not rest solely on the text critical question of whether to follow the witness of κ and D' to the preposition ἐν or the witness of A and B to the preposition εἰς. The immediate context of verse 12 should be given more exegetical weight than the nuance of the preposition.

<sup>99</sup>Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, 532-33.

### **The Theme of Empowerment**

The theme of empowerment is developed through Jesus' admonishment that the disciples οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν the things that he needs to tell them (12). The ability of the disciples to receive all of the truth of what Jesus has taught is an empowerment to greater works. In the discussion immediately following, Jesus clarifies the relationship between revelation and empowerment. The ability of the disciples to make their own requests of the Father is based in their ability to understand the revelation of the Father in Jesus (16:23-28).<sup>100</sup> The echoing of the language of the coming hour when Jesus will be able to communicate to the disciples plainly instead of using figures of speech suggests that this clarity will be dependent upon the ministry of the Spirit-Paraclete.

### **The Condition of Departure**

Although there are no verbs of departure in this passage, the condition of departure is implicit in the use of adverbs and verb tense. At this point in the discourse, it is clearly understood that the anticipation of the future ministry of the Spirit-Paraclete involves Jesus' departure. This anticipation is emphasized in the use of ἔτι and ἄρτι to describe the need for the Spirit-Paraclete's enabling of the disciples to receive the rest of Jesus' teaching (16:12). It is also seen in the future tense of the verbs describing the ministry of the Spirit-Paraclete in 16:13-15.

### **Conclusion**

Our study of the παράκλητος passages of the Farewell Discourse has shown that the themes that were introduced in the πνεῦμα passages of the narrative are further developed and explicitly related to the sending of the Spirit-Paraclete. The ministry of the

---

<sup>100</sup>Köstenberger observes, "The Fourth Gospel may therefore be taken to represent the product of a disciple who knew from his own experience the difference between the pre- and the post-glorification eras, and who for this reason is able to emphasize, for later believers, the importance of understanding the true significance of Jesus' person, words, and works (cf. esp. 20:17, 29; cf. also 2:22; 12:16; 14:26)" ("The 'Greater Works' of the Believer," 42).



Spirit-Paraclete will include functions related to revelation, witness, dwelling, and empowerment.

The problem of the relationship of the Spirit and the Paraclete is helped with the recognition that the Spirit will continue the ministry of Jesus as Paraclete. Rather than speaking of the ministry of the Paraclete as a replacement for the ministry of Jesus, it is preferable to speak of the ministry of the Spirit as a replacement for the ministry of Jesus as Paraclete.

While the three conditions for the giving of the Spirit developed in the previously discussed πνεῦμα passages are connected to the concepts of exaltation, the coming hour, and glorification, the conditions developed in the παράκλητος passages are related to the more concrete actions of asking and departure. The language of going away seems to be purposefully ambiguous at times and should not be forced to support the death of Jesus versus the ascension of Jesus. This is not due to the usual theological versus historical dichotomy. Rather it is a reflection of the nature of the subject itself.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE FULFILLMENT OF JOHANNINE PNEUMATOLOGICAL EXPECTATION

#### **Introduction**

In previous chapters we investigated the development of pneumatological themes and their role in creating expectation for the giving of the Spirit in the six πνεῦμα passages of the narrative and the five παράκλητος passages of the Farewell Discourse. While some scholars have rightly noted the differences between the first eleven chapters and the last ten chapters of the Fourth Gospel, there are also many similarities between these two halves.<sup>1</sup> The emphasis of this chapter will be on how the themes introduced in the previous passages are brought to closure by depicting their fulfillment.

#### **The Hour of Glorification (John 12:20-50)**

Although it does not contain a reference to πνεῦμα, our first fulfillment passage is lexically dense with words used in the πνεῦμα passages to create an expectation of the conditions that would have to be met for the Spirit to be given.<sup>2</sup> In the

---

<sup>1</sup>The relationship of eleven chapters in the first half of the book to the ten chapters in the second half of the book has been expressed in various ways. Raymond E. Brown designates the first eleven chapters as the Book of Signs and the last ten chapters as the Book of Glory (*The Gospel according to John I-XII*, 2 vols., AB 29 [New York: Doubleday, 1966], cxxxviii). David E. Aune emphasizes the public nature of chaps. 1-11 and the more private scenes in 12-21 (“John, Gospel of,” in *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003], 245). One of the main differences between chaps. 1-11 and chaps. 12-21 is the pace of the narrative. While the events in chaps. 1-11 are depicted over the course of at least two Passover Feasts, the rest of the book occurs within the span of one Passover. The key turning point seems to be John 11:53-55 where it is reported that Jesus retreated from public life in reaction to the increased resolve of the Jewish leaders to kill him.

<sup>2</sup>See Gilbert van Belle, “The Death of Jesus and the Literary Unity of the Fourth Gospel,” in *The Death of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. G. van Belle, BETL 200 (Leuven: University Press, 2007),

conversation with Nicodemus, the connection was established between the work of the Spirit in a new birth and the necessity of the Son of Man ὑψωθῆναι (3:14).<sup>3</sup> In the conversation with the Samaritan woman, Jesus looked forward to the coming ὥρα when worship would no longer be limited to the physical location of the temple (4:21-23). In his explanation of Jesus' invitation to believe in him in order to receive living water, the narrator explains that the living water is a reference to the Holy Spirit who was not yet given because Jesus οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη (7:39). These three concepts based on the words ὑψόω, ὥρα, and δοξάζω are connected together for the first time by Jesus in John 12:20-36.<sup>4</sup>

### **The Condition of the Coming Hour**

In response to the request of some Greeks to see Jesus relayed through Andrew and Philip, Jesus responds that ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα (23b). Besides its literal use as a chronological marker, ὥρα is used in the narrative to create anticipation of two slightly different but related expectations.<sup>5</sup> First, in the previous narrative, Jesus has referred to a coming hour when worship will be spiritualized (4:21, 23) and the dead will be resurrected (5:25, 28).<sup>6</sup> In the subsequent Farewell Discourse, Jesus will speak of a coming hour when his disciples will be persecuted (16:2, 4), his speech about the Father

---

15-17, 19-23.

<sup>3</sup>Besides this passage and the conversation with Nicodemus, John 8:28 is the only other occurrence of the verb ὑψόω in the Johannine narrative.

<sup>4</sup>These three words also occur in close proximity in John 8. A narrative aside informs the reader that Jesus could not be arrested in the temple because his ὥρα had not yet come (8:20). Jesus tells his interlocutors that they would know that his authority comes from the Father when they had lifted him up (8:28). Jesus also points out that he does not glorify himself but is glorified by the Father (8:54).

<sup>5</sup>The noun ὥρα is used in a literal sense in John 1:39; 4:6, 52, 53; 11:9. The attempt by J. Edgar Bruns to find a symbolic significance in these references pushes the text too far in my judgment (J. Edgar Bruns, "Use of Time in the Fourth Gospel," *NTS* 13 [1967]: 285-90). Andreas J. Köstenberger comments that this statement is startling because all references to Jesus' hour up to this point have been future (*John*, BECNT [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004], 378).

<sup>6</sup>See the previous discussion in chap. 2 on page 82 of this study.

will no longer be in figures of speech (16:25), and his disciples will abandon him (16:32). A second use of ὥρα refers to the time of Jesus' full revelation (John 2:4; 7:30; 8:20; 13:1).<sup>7</sup>

### The Condition of Glorification

The relationship of the anticipated hour to the glorification of Jesus is strengthened by the clause ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in 12:23b.<sup>8</sup> If the use of δοξάζω up to this point in the narrative has left room for the reader to interpret it in a positive sense, its use in this passage clearly emphasizes the relationship of glorification to Jesus' death.<sup>9</sup> That Jesus has his death in mind as he speaks of his glorification is seen in the four aphorisms introduced by the formulaic ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν (12:24-26),<sup>10</sup> the rhetorical request for the Father to save him ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης (27), Jesus' resolve to face his destiny διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην (27), Jesus' prayer πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα (28), and the Father's response ἐδόξασα καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω (28).<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>The author uses καιρός synonymously when Jesus' brothers attempt to pressure him into going to the Feast of Tabernacles (7:6, 8).

<sup>8</sup>Maximilian Zerwick suggests that ἵνα has replaced τοῦ which is often found with infinitives that are modifying a substantive (*Biblical Greek Illustrated By Examples*, trans. Joseph Smith, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. [Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963], § 411).

<sup>9</sup>The verb δοξάζω has only been used in three other passages since its enigmatic introduction in 7:39. It is used twice in John 8:54 where Jesus maintains that his glory is based on the Father glorifying him rather than any attempt to glorify himself. It is used again in 11:4 where Jesus explains that the purpose of the death of Lazarus is that the Son might be glorified. The last occurrence before our current passage is in the narrative aside of 12:16 where the reader is told that the disciples did not understand the significance of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem on a donkey as the fulfillment of Zech 9:9 until after Jesus was glorified. In contrast to the scant usage of δοξάζω until this point in the narrative, it is used 4 times in this passage (John 12:23, 28) and 14 times in 10 verses in the remainder of the book (13:31, 32; 14:13; 15:8; 16:14; 17:1, 4, 5, 10; 21:19).

<sup>10</sup>Verse 24 is probably based in a rabbinic teaching on the resurrection. Köstenberger notes, "In rabbinic literature, the kernel of wheat is repeatedly used as a symbol of the eschatological resurrection of the dead. By argument 'from the lesser to the greater,' 'If the grain of wheat, which is buried naked, sprouts forth in many robes, how much more so the righteous, who are buried in their raiment' (*b. Sanh.* 90b)" (*John*, 378).

<sup>11</sup>The use of the aorist imperative and aorist indicative forms of δοξάζω reflect the tension between past acts where the Son has been glorified and the future glorification of Jesus through his death and resurrection. Contra Margaret Pamment, who argues that the aorist reflects the punctiliar nature of the event of glorification rather than pointing to the past ("The Meaning of Doxa in the Fourth Gospel," *ZNW*

## The Condition of Exaltation

Jesus statement *καὶ γὰρ ἔὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, πάντας ἑλκύσω πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν* (32) clearly echoes his similar statement to Nicodemus in 3:14-15. While the lifting up of the Son of Man was directly linked to the lifting up of the serpent by Moses in Numbers 21:5-9, the relationship between lifting up and glorification also echoes Isaiah 52:13 where the Servant of the Lord *ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται*.<sup>12</sup> This echo is strengthened by the immediate context of Isaiah which describes the rejection and suffering of the Servant in very graphic terms (Isa 52:14-53:12). The direct quotation of Isaiah 53:1 in John 12:38 also appropriately fits the context of the narrative of John given the response of confusion by the crowd to Jesus in John 12:33-34. Just as Isaiah's audience struggled to believe the report of the suffering of the Lord's Servant, the crowd is confused by the necessity of Jesus' death even as he strengthens the connection of *ὑψῶ*, *ᾶρα*, and *δοξάζω* with his impending death (John 12:32-33, 37-40).<sup>13</sup> The strong allusions to the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 52:13-53:12 also serve to connect this passage thematically to the first *πνεῦμα* passage in John 1:29-34.<sup>14</sup>

## The Theme of Witness

Several motifs related to the theme of witness are developed in this fulfillment

---

74 [1983]: 13). The clearest example of a past act of glorification is when Jesus says that the purpose of the death of Lazarus was to glorify the Son (11:4).

<sup>12</sup>Köstenberger, *John*, 378.

<sup>13</sup>See John Painter, "The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b-43," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 429-58.

<sup>14</sup>Craig A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue*, JSNTSup 89 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 182. See also Jesper Tang Nielsen, "The Lamb of God: The Cognitive Structure of a Johannine Metaphor," in *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*, ed. Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann, WUNT 200 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 244-52. George B. Caird surveys the LXX usage of *δοξάζω* in Exod 15:1; Isa 5:16; 10:15; 33:10; 44:23; Ezek 20:41; 28:22; 38:23; 39:13; and Sir 1:5; 48:4 but curiously overlooks Isa 52:13 ("Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics," *NTS* 15 [1969]: 273-75).

passage. The voice from heaven validating Jesus' request for the Father to glorify him parallels the external witness of the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at the beginning of his ministry (1:29-34). Just as the witness of the Spirit was given for the benefit of John, the voice from heaven is given for the benefit of those witnessing this event (12:30). The voice of the Father as a witness also connects this passage to several other points in the narrative where the witness of the Father is described (5:36-37; 8:18; 10:25).

Another aspect of the voice from heaven that connects this scene to the broader theme of witness is the ambiguous reception that leads to the rejection of it as a witness by some of the crowd (12:29, 37).<sup>15</sup> In addition, the previously noted allusion to Isaiah 52:13 in John 12:23-32 and the explicit quotation of Isaiah 53:1 and 6:10 in John 12:37-40 are the climax of the motif of rejection.<sup>16</sup> Just as unbelief and rejection was the response in the original context of Isaiah's prophecy about the Servant who would be lifted up and glorified through his suffering, the unbelief of those who heard Jesus relate his exaltation and glorification to his death serve to point to him as the fulfillment of that prophecy.<sup>17</sup>

### **The Hour of Departure (John 13:1-4, 31-35)**

Just as the concept of ὥρα was connected with the condition of glorification and δοξάζω and ὑψόω in John 12:23-33, it is further associated with the theme of departure in the narrative aside of 13:1-4.<sup>18</sup> The supernatural knowledge of Jesus is shown

---

<sup>15</sup>Craig A. Evans argues that John 12:37 echoes John 2:23-25 ("Obduracy and the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987], 227).

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., 228.

<sup>17</sup>Painter, "The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b-43," 430.

<sup>18</sup>While many agree that chap. 13 signals a transition in the book, few agree on the exact relationship of 13:1-4 to the rest of the narrative. B. F. Westcott argues that verse 1 should be taken as a complete sentence with verse 2 beginning a new sentence (*The Gospel according to St. John: The Authorized Version with Introduction and Notes* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951], 144). Viewing verse 1 as the introduction to chaps. 13-17 and verses 2 and 3 as an introduction to the foot washing narrative, he

in the two participial clauses employing the word εἰδῶς (1, 3). In verse 1, the emphasis is on Jesus's knowledge of his coming departure while verse 3 highlights his knowledge both of his divine origin and his destiny. This passage also echoes the previous πνεῦμα passage in 3:34 by its use of the verb δίδωμι. The phrase πάντα ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατήρ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας (13:3) is a clear echo of the phrase τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ (3:35).

### **The Theme of Revelation**

While the importance of the foot washing should not be minimized in this pericope, it should be noted that the more dominant motif of chapter 13 is the divine knowledge of Jesus. As we have already noted, rather than seeing the repetition of the participial phrases based on εἰδῶς in verses 1 and 3 as redundant or awkward, one should interpret them as emphatically bracketing the two main themes of the narrative: the demonstration of Jesus' love and the betrayal of Judas. One of the most striking aspects of this pericope is that Jesus not only anticipates his own death and its implications for his disciples but that he is fully aware of the intent of his betrayer.

---

suggests that the prepositional phrase πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα modifies the verb ἠγάπησεν. Rudolf Bultmann, however, considers the grammar of 13:1-4 to be problematic to the point of denying its authenticity (*The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971], 463-64). He holds that the only original phrase was πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα, which did not make sense as a modifier to the main verbal clause ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς. Although he does not go as far, Rudolf Schnackenburg also describes these verses as "overladen" (*The Gospel according to St. John*, trans. David Smith and G. A. Kon, Herder's Theological Commentary on the New Testament [New York: Crossroad, 1990], 3:6). Rather than accepting Bultmann's accusation that this is problematic Greek, one might see these verses as carefully composed Greek at its best. A. T. Robertson argued that the phrase ἀγαπήσας τοὺς ἰδίους τοὺς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς should be understood as a parenthetical remark instead of as the main verbal clause (*A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. [Nashville: Broadman, 1934], 433-35). D. A. Carson argues that a very similar phenomenon occurs in 4:1-3 with the phrase καίτοιγε Ἰησοῦς αὐτὸς οὐκ ἐβάπτισεν ἀλλ' οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ in verse 2. In his reading, 13:1-4 should be taken as one complete sentence (*The Gospel according to John*, PNTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 460-61). The two εἰδῶς clauses bracket the parenthetical clause about the love of Jesus and the genitive absolute clause that foretells the role of Judas. The repetition of these two clauses could then be seen as emphasis in their modification of the three main verbs ἐγείρεται, τίθησιν, and διέζωσεν (4). One could then take the prepositional phrase πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα as modifying either the first εἰδῶς clause or the action verbs depicting Jesus' acts of service.

One of the first hints of the divine knowledge of Jesus in the gospel is found in his calling of Nathanael in 1:45-51. He is said to know what is in man in 2:24. Jesus displays his supernatural knowledge of the history of failed relationships of the woman at the well (4:16-19). The narrator explains that Jesus knew who would betray him “from the beginning” in 6:64. Jesus supernaturally knew that Lazarus had died (11:11-15). It comes, therefore, as no surprise to the reader when Jesus knows who would betray him in 13:11. He shares his knowledge of the betrayal as a prophecy of Scripture as a sign to point the disciples to his divinity (13:19).

### **The Condition of the Coming Hour**

The object of first participle εἰδὼς is the clause ὅτι ἦλθεν αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα (1). Jesus knew that his hour had come. As he had already stated as much in the previous narrative, this comes as no surprise to the reader. This occurrence is slightly different than 12:23 in that it is described as αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα (1). Whereas Jesus referred to himself in the third person designation of the Son of Man in public, now the reader knows that Jesus is fully aware that he is indeed the Son of Man who will die.

### **The Condition of Departure**

The thematic development of the condition of departure in this pericope is found in the clause ἵνα μεταβῆ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα modifying the substantive ὥρα (1). Whereas the other conditions related to ὥρα, ὑψώω, and δοξάζω are introduced in the narrative before their fulfillment is described, the condition of departure is presented to the reader as being fulfilled before it is explicitly connected to the coming of the Spirit-Paraclete in 16:7. The departure of Jesus is a major theme of chapters 13-17 expressed by several different verbs.

### **The Condition of Glorification**

The condition of glorification is connected to the condition of the coming hour through the use of the verb δοξάζω in 13:31-32. Although the word ὥρα does not occur in



these verses, the use of the temporal marker  $\nu\tilde{\nu}\nu$  provides a semantic connection.

### **The Prayer for Glorification (John 17:1-5)**

Another passage that does not mention  $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$  but is lexically dense with words related to pneumatological themes is the High Priestly prayer of Jesus in John 17:1-5. Immediately following his teaching in the Farewell Discourse, Jesus turns his attention from preparing his disciples for his impending departure to praying.<sup>19</sup>

### **The Relationship between Revelation and Life**

We have already noted that authority to grant eternal life is one aspect of the glory that Jesus receives from the Father (4:14; 6:27, 51; 10:28). In addition to making the connection between the glorification of the Son and the authority to give eternal life explicit in 17:1-3, the relationship between the revelation of God in the person of Jesus and eternal life which also was developed throughout the narrative is explicitly stated in the sentence  $\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\eta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\tilde{\nu}\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \zeta\omega\eta$  (3).

### **The Condition of the Coming Hour**

Jesus prays  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho,\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\lambda\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\ \eta\ \acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$  (1). For a third time in the narrative, the hour is said to have arrived.

### **The Condition of Glorification**

The condition of glorification is highlighted with the verb  $\delta\omicron\zeta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  used as an aorist imperative of request in the main clause  $\delta\acute{\omicron}\zeta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \upsilon\iota\acute{\omicron}\nu$  and the subjunctive for used in the purpose clause  $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha\ \acute{\omicron}\ \upsilon\iota\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \delta\omicron\zeta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\ \sigma\acute{\epsilon}$  (1). Additionally there are several sub-themes to glory that expand the theme beyond what has been developed previously in the narrative.

---

<sup>19</sup>Carson notes, “This prayer is not free-standing: it is intimately connected by themes and link-words with the discourse that precedes it (chs. 14-16), as even the first words of 17:1 (‘After Jesus said this ...’) intimate” (ibid., 550).

The way in which Jesus has glorified the Father on earth is described in the participial clause τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας ὃ δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα ποιήσω (4). The lexical coherence of the verbs τελειόω and ποιέω and the noun ἔργον suggest that this passage is echoing John 4:34 and 5:36. This echo is strengthened with 5:36 by its use of δίδωμι indicating the influence of Isaiah 55:10-11.<sup>20</sup> As we will see in our discussion on 19:28-36, this passage is also anticipating the final consummation of these motifs in the death of Jesus.

### **The Condition of Asking**

In our earlier chapter on the παράκλητος passages, we noted that an expectation was created that the giving of the Spirit was dependent upon Jesus asking the Father (14:16). There are several requests in the prayer using imperative verbs: δόξασον (1, 5), τήρησον (11), and ἀγίασον (17). While all of these could be related to the giving of the Spirit, there is not enough evidence to warrant identifying this prayer as the request that fulfills this condition.

### **Thirst, Spirit and Water at the Cross (John 19:28-37)**

After the explanation of the relationship between the gift of the Spirit and the glorification of Jesus in 7:39 and the relationship between his hour, glorification and death in 12:20-36; 13:1-4, 31-35 and 17:1-5, it should not be surprising that this twelfth πνεῦμα passage is lexically dense with fulfillment language. Scholars differ, however, on how to interpret several details of Jesus' death as presented in the Johannine account. Are they merely historical details provided as evidence for the veracity of the claims of an eyewitness? Or do they have meaning as metaphors in the symbolic world of the Fourth Gospel?<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>See James Merrill Hamilton Jr., "The Influence of Isaiah on the Gospel of John," *Perichoresis* 5 (2007): 160. Also see John V. Dahms, "Isaiah 55:11 and the Gospel of John," *EvQ* 53 (1981): 88.

<sup>21</sup>See the discussion of Paul N. Anderson, "Gradations of Symbolization in the Johannine

## The Theme of Revelation

As with many of the πνεῦμα passages, the theme of revelation is a dominant theme in this pericope. The motif of knowing is given a place of prominence at the beginning of this pericope in the use of the participle εἰδὼς highlighting the knowledge of Jesus that all was finished (28).<sup>22</sup>

Another motif related to revelation in this passage is developed by the use of verbs of fulfillment. The use of the verb πληρόω in the fulfillment formula in 19:36 reflects a common Johannine idiom.<sup>23</sup> The use of τελειόω in the fulfillment formula in 19:28 is more unique suggesting thematic significance. In three of the other four occurrences, τελειόω is used in reference to Jesus accomplishing the works of the One who sent him (4:34; 5:36; 17:4).<sup>24</sup> While the verbal similarities between these three verses indicate they they echo each other, the thematic connection with 17:4 with its use of δοξάζω is particularly significant for this passage.<sup>25</sup> Additionally, the author probably uses τελειόω instead of πληρόω because of its lexical connection with τελέω (19:28, 30).<sup>26</sup> The

---

Passion Narrative: Control Measures for Theologizing Speculation Gone Awry,” in *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*, ed. Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann, WUNT 200 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 179-91.

<sup>22</sup>This first reference to the knowledge of Jesus since 16:30 echoes 13:1-3. In addition to the significance of this word, the use of μετὰ τοῦτο serves to mark the beginning of this pericope as a unit (Köstenberger, *John*, 549).

<sup>23</sup>The author uses the verb πληρόω to describe the fulfillment of Scripture 4 other times (12:38; 15:25; 17:12; 19:24) and the words of Jesus 2 times (18:9, 32). Evans notes its regularity after chap. 18 (“Obduracy and the Lord’s Servant,” 225).

<sup>24</sup>The other occurrence is in 17:24 where Jesus is praying that those who believe in him ὧσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν.

<sup>25</sup>Richard L. Brawley, “An Absent Complement and Intertextuality in John 19:28-29,” *JBL* 112 (1993): 427; Andreas J. Köstenberger, “The Two Johannine Verbs for Sending: A Study of John’s Use of Words with Reference to General Linguistic Theory,” in *Studies on John and Gender: A Decade of Scholarship*, SBL 38 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 145. Note the lexical cohesion in the following verses: ποιήσω . . . τοῦ πέμψαντός με . . . τελειώσω . . . αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον (4:34); τὰ ἔργα ἃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατήρ . . . τελειώσω . . . τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιῶ . . . ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν (5:36); τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας ὁ δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα ποιήσω (17:4).

<sup>26</sup>Köstenberger, *John*, 550 cites Carson, *John*, 620 and C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster,

use of verbs based on the stem τελ- in 19:28-30 is both linguistically and theologically significant to the development of pneumatological themes.<sup>27</sup> John's choice of τελειώω in the Scripture fulfillment formula in verse 28 is a deviation from his usual choice of πληρώω (12:38; 13:18; 15:25; 17:12; 18:9, 32; 19:24, 36). The fact that Jesus knows ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται is the basis for his saying διψῶ so that Scripture τελειωθῆ (28). These verbal and thematic connections suggest that this scene represents the apex of the Johannine motif of fulfillment.<sup>28</sup>

While the fulfillment of Scripture gets the most attention from commentators in this passage, one should not overlook how the author subtly interweaves the themes of thirst and water into his account of the death of Jesus.<sup>29</sup> In a dramatic example of Johannine irony, the one who had previously promised living water to satisfy those who thirst is now thirsty.<sup>30</sup> In response to his thirst, however, the one who had turned water into wine receives sour wine. Proposing a parallel to the statement to Jesus' cry of

---

1978), 553.

<sup>27</sup>The verb τελειώω (τελειωθῆ in 28) occurs 23 times in the NT (Luke 2:43; 13:32; John 4:34; 5:36; 17:4, 23; 19:28; Acts 20:24; Phil 3:12; Heb 2:10; 5:9; 7:19, 28; 9:9; 10:1, 14; 11:40; 12:23; Jas 2:22; 1 John 2:5; 4:12, 17–18) and τελέω (τετέλεσται in 28, 30) occurs 28 times in the NT (Matt 7:28; 10:23; 11:1; 13:53; 17:24; 19:1; 26:1; Luke 2:39; 12:50; 18:31; 22:37; John 19:28, 30; Acts 13:29; Rom 2:27; 13:6; 2 Cor 12:9; Gal 5:16; 2 Tim 4:7; Jas 2:8; Rev 10:7; 11:7; 15:1, 8; 17:17; 20:3, 5, 7) but only in this passage in John.

<sup>28</sup>Martin Hengel, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 392-94; Stanley E. Porter, "Can Traditional Exegesis Enlighten Literary Analysis of the Fourth Gospel? An Examination of the Old Testament Fulfillment Motif and the Passover Theme," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and William Richard Stegner, JSNTSup 3 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 418. Köstenberger considers Jesus' cry τετέλεσται in 19:30 to be the "second and major climax of John's Gospel" (*John*, 551). He regards Jesus' claim that "I and the Father are one" in 10:30 to be the first climax (ibid., 312). Paul Miller suggests that the author quotes Scripture in 19:28-29 "to show that Christ's Passion was not the failure of God's Word, as it seemed, but its fulfillment" ("They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him": The Gospel of John and the Old Testament," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006], 130).

<sup>29</sup>The passages most likely in view here are Pss 22:15 (21:16); 69:21 (68:22). There could also be echoes of the same texts discussed in relation to John 7:37 like Zech 14:8 and Ezek 47:1-11.

<sup>30</sup>So Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 135. Also see Leonard Theodor Witkamp, "Jesus' Thirst in John 19:28-30: Literal or Figurative?," *JBL* 115 (1996): 489-510.

forsakenness in Matt 27:46 and Mark 15:34, J. M. Spurrell remarks, “Now thirst is being suffered on the cross by the giver of the living water himself, which in terms of the previous use of the word must mean that he feels himself cut off from the knowledge and the Spirit of God.”<sup>31</sup>

Although the majority opinion is that the clause ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή modifies Jesus’ statement “I thirst” in verse 28, there is no consensus on what Scripture is being fulfilled.<sup>32</sup> Some have suggested that this is a reference to Jesus’ own rhetorical question in response to Peter’s attempted defense at his arrest that he should drink the cup given to him by the Father (18:11).<sup>33</sup> While the author does put the words of Jesus on the same level as Scripture by using πληρῶω to refer to the fulfillment of both (18:9, 32), it is improbable that the words of Jesus are in view here because the author is clear that it is ἡ γραφή that is being fulfilled.<sup>34</sup> While some have suggested Psalm 22:15 or 69:21,<sup>35</sup> others have viewed it as deliberately ambiguous.<sup>36</sup>

### **The Theme of Witness**

The use of the verbs of seeing, believing and witnessing in 19:35 serve to emphasize the intrinsic connection between the themes of witness and revelation. The role of John the Baptist as a witness in the first πνεῦμα passage in 1:29-34 is echoed in

---

<sup>31</sup>John Mark Spurrell, “Interpretation of ‘I Thirst’,” *CQR* 167 (1966): 16-17.

<sup>32</sup>Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 553; Schnackenburg, *St. John*, 3:283; Carson, *John*, 619.

<sup>33</sup>Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John XIII-XXI: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB, vol. 29A (New York: Doubleday, 1966), 930; Schnackenburg, *St. John*, 3:283.

<sup>34</sup>Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel according to John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 617; Köstenberger, *John*, 550.

<sup>35</sup>Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 553; Schnackenburg, *St. John*, 3:283. Carson, Köstenberger, and Ridderbos see a possible allusion to the entire Psalm (Carson, *John*, 619; Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 616; Köstenberger, *John*, 550).

<sup>36</sup>Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 719.

the role of the Beloved Disciple as a witness. This echo is strengthened by the presence of the anonymous disciple in 1:35-40, 19:35 and 21:24.<sup>37</sup> Concerning the role of this disciple in the narrative, Bauckham notes that he “witnesses the key salvific event of the whole Gospel story, the hour of Jesus’ exaltation, toward which the whole story from John the Baptist’s testimony onward has pointed.”<sup>38</sup> While this connection based on the presence of the eyewitness serves as evidence for the human death of Jesus,<sup>39</sup> it also serves to connect the death of Christ to the Lamb of God confession in 1:35.<sup>40</sup>

### **Is the Spirit Given at the Cross?**

While most interpreters agree that the death of Jesus plays a central role in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel, some further argue that the Spirit is actually bestowed at the cross.<sup>41</sup> This view is typically defended by appealing to two details unique to the Johannine crucifixion account—the meaning of the phrase παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα in 19:30 and the significance of the αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ that flowed from Jesus’ side in 19:34.

---

<sup>37</sup>Richard Bauckham, “The Beloved Disciple as Ideal Author,” in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 85.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., 85-86.

<sup>39</sup>Carson, *John*, 623-24.

<sup>40</sup>Bauckham comments, “When the beloved disciple’s own witness is especially highlighted at 19:35, it is his eyewitness testimony to the fulfillment of precisely these words of John the Baptist: he sees the flow of blood and water, along with the fact that no bone is broken, that show Jesus to be the true Passover lamb (19:31-37)” (“The Beloved Disciple as Ideal Author,” 85).

<sup>41</sup>Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. Francis Noel Davey, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), 532; Gillian Bampfyld, “John 19:28: A Case for a Different Translation,” *NovT* 11 (1969): 254-55; Max-Alain Chevallier, “‘Pentecôtes’ lucaniennes et ‘Pentecôtes’ johanniques,” *RSR* 69 (1981): 304-05; idem, *Souffle de Dieu: Le Saint-Esprit dans le Nouveau Testament*, 3 vols., L’apôtre Paul, Les écrits johanniques, L’héritage paulinien, Réflexions finales 2 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1990), 427-30; James Swetnam, “Bestowal of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel,” *Bib* 74 (1993): 571; J. P. Heil, *Blood and Water: The Death and Resurrection of Jesus in John 18-21*, CBQMS 27 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1995), 105-09; Hans-Ulrich Weidemann, “Der Gekreuzigte als Quelle des Geistes,” in *The Death of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. G. van Belle, BETL 200 (Leuven: University Press, 2007), 577.

**The meaning of παραδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα.** Based on his understanding of John's emphasis on unity of the death and resurrection as the glorification of Jesus, Ashton sees both John 19:30 and 20:22 as the Johannine alternative to the Lukan Pentecost.

Regarding John 19:30, Ashton states,

In the first half of the Gospel John had used the word ὑψοῦν to suggest that Jesus' exaltation is conditional upon and contained in his death, so that passion and resurrection must be viewed as a single happening. Now the simple expression παραδίδοναι τὸ πνεῦμα allows him to fuse Easter and Pentecost as well, hinting that there is no need to think of the latter as a distinct and separate event.<sup>42</sup>

Going as far as to suggest that the logic of John's theology of the cross "makes any resurrection narrative superfluous," Ashton surmises that John includes John 20 because "the idea of this mission is important to him" and "he is working with traditional material."<sup>43</sup> Carson offers little help in countering these arguments when he scantily remarks, "The suggestion that this means he handed over the Holy Spirit to his followers is contradicted by the flow of the argument in ch. 20."<sup>44</sup>

Scholars differ on whether to take τὸ πνεῦμα symbolically as a pneumatological reference to the Holy Spirit or literally as an anthropological reference to the human spirit of Jesus.<sup>45</sup> While the absence of the possessive pronoun found in Luke 21:16 might tempt one to view this as an explicit reference to the Spirit, the parallel in Matthew 27:50 weakens that argument. However, it is not entirely possible to rule out the possibility that this is an example of Johannine double entendre.<sup>46</sup>

The verb παραδίδωμι is used in the synoptic Gospels to denote handing

---

<sup>42</sup>John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 424-25.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., 425.

<sup>44</sup>Carson, *John*, 621.

<sup>45</sup>Brown argues for a pneumatological sense (*John XIII-XXI*, 913). Margaret Davies argues for a strictly anthropological sense (*Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, JSNTSup 69 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992], 140).

<sup>46</sup>Burge, *Anointed Community*, 134-35; Anderson, "Imagery in John," 184-85.

someone over to a party who means them harm with death potentially in view (Luke 21:16). In the Gospel of John, it is used frequently to describe the betray of Jesus by Judas (John 6:64, 71; 12:4; 13:2, 11, 21; 18:2, 5) and the handing over of Jesus from the Jews to Pilate for trial (John 18:30, 35). Jesus himself uses it in this latter sense in 18:36. There are also instances where it is used in conjunction with δίδωμι in a more positive sense emphasizing a transfer of authority that allows one party to give something to another party. This seems to be the intention in Luke 4:6 where the devil offers to give Jesus the kingdoms that have been handed over to him and in John 19:11 where the more ambiguous participial phrase ὁ παραδούς μέ is used in close vicinity to phrase εἰ μὴ ἦν δεδομένον σοι ἄνωθεν.

Some have seen an allusion to the phrase εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου in Psalm 31:5 (30:6) which is almost certainly quoted in Luke 23:46.<sup>47</sup> However, the problem with this allusion is discerning the reason for change of verb in John. Agreeing with Porsch's discussion of this "ungewöhnlichen Ausdruck,"<sup>48</sup> Burge has pointed out the uniqueness of this phrase in Greek literature claiming, "Nowhere in Greek literature is παραδίδωμι τὸ πνεῦμα used as a description of death."<sup>49</sup> Whether or not this statement is unique in Greek literature is not as important as determining how it functions in the narrative of John.

Perhaps the best explanation for this somewhat peculiar Johannine construction is the possibility that it echoes the use of παραδίδωμι to describe the death of the suffering Servant in Isaiah 53:12.<sup>50</sup> As we have already seen, several words and concepts

---

<sup>47</sup>John Henry Bernard suggests, "It is just possible that the words of Jn. 19:30, παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα, contain a reminiscence of Lk.'s παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, 2 vols., ICC [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929], 636).

<sup>48</sup>Felix Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Frankfurt: Knecht, 1974), 327.

<sup>49</sup>Burge, *Anointed Community*, 134.

<sup>50</sup>Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 910; Morris, *John*, 721 n. 81; Köstenberger, *John*, 551. The specific



from Isaiah 52:13-53:12 have played a prominent role as an influence on the Fourth Gospel. While this allusion has the same problem as Psalm 31:5 (30:6) of a word change, there is a plausible explanation of why John might have used πνεῦμα instead of ψυχή that fits the broader context of both the Gospel of John and the book of Isaiah. In Isaiah 53:12, the Septuagint uses ψυχή to translate נפש and the passive form of παραδίδωμι to translate ערה.<sup>51</sup> This could reflect the author's familiarity with both the Greek and Hebrew texts because ערה is also used in Isaiah 32:15 where it is translated by ἐπέρχομαι describing the pouring out of the Spirit ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ. Strengthening this connection is the fact that ὑψηλός translating מרום is a derivative of ὑψόω translating רם in Isaiah 52:13.<sup>52</sup> In addition to the previously discussed echoes of ὑψόω and δοξάζω from this passage, the connection to Isaiah 53:12 is also strengthened by the fact his crucifixion with the other two criminals in John 19:18 echoes that he would be counted among the lawless (Isa 53:12).<sup>53</sup>

**The significance of blood and water.** The metaphors of thirst and water are highlighted in verse 34 when blood and water flow from the spear wound in the side of Jesus. While many have explained the physical element of the blood and water flowing from Jesus side, it is the theological significance in the context of the Johannine narrative

---

phrase from Isa 53:12 is παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἢ ψυχή αὐτοῦ.

<sup>51</sup>While πνεῦμα typically translates רוּחַ, נֶפֶשׁ and ψυχή are parallel terms in Isa 26:9.

<sup>52</sup>Friedrich Büchsel, “δίδωμι κτλ,” in *TDNT*, 2:166-73.

<sup>53</sup>Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 900; Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 699 n. 1; George R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., WBC, vol. 36 (Dallas: Word, 1999), 346; Köstenberger, *John*, 544 n. 16; Andreas J. Köstenberger, “John,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 500. Carson comments, “It is hard to imagine that the Evangelist who uses Isaiah 53 so effectively in John 12 is not now thinking of Isaiah 53:12: Jesus ‘was numbered with the transgressors’” (*John*, 610). Bernard suggests that the author was making an effort “to describe the death of Jesus in the same words as those used by the prophet of the death of the Servant of Yahweh” (*Gospel according to St. John*, 641). He also sees “a covert allusion” between the phrase παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα in John 19:30 and the phrase παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἢ ψυχή αὐτοῦ from the LXX in Isa 53:12. Although the LXX used the passive form of παραδίδωμι, Bernard argues that the active form would be a more literal translation. Morris seems to agree (*John*, 721 n. 81).

that is most pertinent to the present investigation.<sup>54</sup> Blood could refer to 6:53-56 and water could refer to theme of water beginning in 3:5 continuing with 4:10-14 and culminating in 7:38-39.<sup>55</sup> Ridderbos opposes this view when he says,

There is no reason for thinking of a miracle here. What we are told need not mean any more than that a bloody and watery substance came out of a spear wound, which to those present confirmed that Jesus was dead. It is doubtful that the occurrence conceals any deeper meaning. A connection with 7:38 does not establish this deeper meaning because the words used there (“out of his belly will flow”) refer not to Jesus but to the operation of the Spirit in believers.<sup>56</sup>

This observation, however, is flawed at two points. First, as already noted, the combination of the language of thirst, spirit, and water seem to suggest that this could be another case of Johannine double entendre. Second, as Bruce Grigsby has argued, connection between the water from the pierced side of the Messiah and the statement of Jesus in 7:38 as a reference to remembering the Mosaic water from the rock in the wilderness and anticipating the living water from the eschatological temple is stronger than Ridderbos maintains.<sup>57</sup>

Bauckham offers a philological argument to strengthen the relationship of the

<sup>54</sup>Although we are interested in the different interpretations throughout the history of the Church, we are focusing here on the relationship of this pericope within the development of strictly Johannine themes. For more thorough discussions of the history of interpretation, see Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 946-49; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 355-56; Kevin J. Vanhoozer, “Body-piercing, the Natural Sense, and the Task of Theological Interpretation: A Hermeneutical Homily on John 19:34,” *ExAud* 16 (2000): 16-18.

<sup>55</sup>Morris, *John*, 724-25. So Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, PBTM (2006), 180. J. Ramsey Michaels suggests a similar variation, “Perhaps the simplest explanation is that John intends 19.34 as a sequel to 7.37-38, identifying the thirst-quenching ‘living water’ from Jesus’ stomach (ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ, 7.38) with the blood and water from his side at the crucifixion. Such an identification is in keeping with 6.53-56, where Jesus insists repeatedly on the necessity of drinking his blood in order to gain eternal life . . .” (“By Water and Blood: Sin and Purification in John and First John,” in *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, JSNTSup 234 [London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002], 154). Pace Judith A. Kolwaski, who does not see a clear connection between this and the other uses of water in the Gospel of John (“‘Of Water and Spirit’: Narrative Structure and Theological Development in the Gospel of John” [Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 1987], 9).

<sup>56</sup>Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 619. See also John Wilkinson, “Incident of the ‘Blood and Water’ in John 19:34,” *SJT* 28 (1975): 149-72.

<sup>57</sup>Bruce H. Grigsby, “‘If Any Man Thirsts’: Observations on the Rabbinic Background of John 7:37-39,” *Bib* 67 (1986): 105-08.

water flowing from the side of Jesus with the Scripture quotation given at the Feast of Tabernacles (7:38).<sup>58</sup> Suggesting that the rabbinical exegetical technique of *gezera shewa* was used to combine words from various texts that have words in common, Bauckham argues that the enigmatic text has been derived from Ezekiel 47:1, Zechariah 14:8, and Psalm 78:16. Basing the choice of these texts on the author's reading of the Hebrew text, he suggests they were connected by the phrases מֵי יַצְאִים (Ezek 47:1), מֵי-חַיִּים (Zech 14:8), and וַיִּזְרַד כְּנֶהְרֹת מַיִם (Ps 78:16). The conflation of these phrases explain the phrase ποταμοὶ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος in 7:28. Bauckham suggests that the source of the water described in 7:28 by the phrase ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ could have been derived by the author's reflection on the double meaning of the Hebrew word כְּתֵף. While this term can be used as an architectural term depicting the side of a structure, it can also be used anatomically to refer to the shoulder of a human or animal.<sup>59</sup> According to Bauckham, the author of John could have reflected on the anatomical sense of this word and construed the phrase describing the water coming from below the shoulder as ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ. Bauckham further argues that this emphasis on the side of Jesus below his shoulder is also reflected in 19:34 where the soldiers are said to have pierced the πλευρὰν of Jesus. Bauckham concludes, "This combines the image of Jesus as the new Passover lamb, from which the blood flows, with that of Jesus as the new temple, from which water flows."<sup>60</sup> The connection between blood and even blood mixed with water can be seen as an allusion to Jesus as the Passover Lamb.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup>Richard Bauckham, "The 153 Fish and the Unity of the Fourth Gospel," in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 279-80.

<sup>59</sup>The author of Ezekiel uses כְּתֵף in an architectural or geographical sense 10 times (25:9; 40:18, 40, 41, 44; 41:2, 26; 46:19; 47:1, 2) and in an anatomical sense 7 times (12:6, 7, 12; 24:4; 29:7, 18; 34:21).

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., 280.

<sup>61</sup>Evans suggests that the lifting up of Jesus on the cross along with the combination of flowing blood and intact bones clearly identifies Jesus as "the glorified Suffering Servant, whose glory Isaiah

The significance of blood and water can be best understood in context of the Scriptural quotations that are said to have been fulfilled by these events. The phrase ὄστουν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ in 19:36 is taken from the command to preserve the integrity of the bones of the Passover lamb in Exodus 12:46 and Numbers 9:12 both of which are echoed in Psalm 33:20 (21).<sup>62</sup> That the Passover is in view here is strengthened by the reported details of the hyssop (19:29).

**Conclusion.** While the Johannine description of Jesus' death serves to allude to the themes that have been developed related to the giving of the Spirit, it is important to distinguish between allusions to an event that is necessary to fulfillment and the fulfillment itself. While there can be no fulfillment of the conditions of the giving of the Spirit apart from the crucifixion of Jesus, it does not necessitate that the Spirit is given in that moment. The crucifixion is part of the glorification process but it is not the end of it.<sup>63</sup>

### **Resurrection and Ascension (John 20:1-18)**

One of the most striking features of this pericope is the absence of the verbs ὥρα, ὑψόω, and δοξάζω which have been so lexically dense in the previous fulfillment passages. Although the resurrection of Jesus is not as explicitly identified in the narrative of John as a condition of the giving of the Spirit in the same way as the death of Jesus, the relationship of the resurrection to the glorification of the Messiah is anticipated in the Servant Song of Isaiah 52:13-53:12.<sup>64</sup> As we noted earlier in our discussion of John 12:20-50, the Johannine relationship between ὑψόω, δοξάζω, and the death of the

---

beheld" and "the Passover lamb 'who takes away the sin of the world'" (*Word and Glory*, 184). Nielsen notes, "The blood alludes to the blood of the Passover lamb that was applied to the doorposts to obtain the apotropaic effect of the Passover ritual" ("The Lamb of God," 253).

<sup>62</sup>Köstenberger, "John," 503.

<sup>63</sup>So G. C. Nicholson, *Death as Departure: The Johannine Descent-Ascent Schema*, SBLDS (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1979), 141-44.

<sup>64</sup>G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, ed. D. A. Carson, NSBT 17 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 194-95.

Messiah seems to find its origin in 52:13. The resurrection of the Suffering Servant is anticipated in 53:10-12 where the Servant sees his offspring, has his days prolonged, and receives his portion after he has been crushed and poured out unto death.<sup>65</sup>

Another way the resurrection is connected to the giving of the Spirit in the Gospel of John is through the temple motif. The first mention of resurrection in the Fourth Gospel is in the context of the misunderstanding by the Jewish leaders of Jesus' promise to raise the temple in three days after its destruction (2:18-21).

### **The Condition of Ascension**

Most of the debate concerning the relationship of the ascension to the giving of the Spirit focuses on when the ascension happens in the narrative of John. Does the ascension occur between verse 18 and 19? When the disciples saw Jesus in 20:19-23, would they have understood Jesus to have ascended based on Mary's report of his own words? While much of the discussion of the significance of John 20:17 has focused on the first half of the verse (μή μου ἅπτου, οὐπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα), the second half is perhaps more salient to the purpose of the present study.<sup>66</sup>

There is some debate regarding the meaning of the puzzling command given by Jesus to Mary upon her recognition of him. In contrast to the permission granted by Jesus to Thomas to place his finger in his side (20:27-29),<sup>67</sup> Mary is told μή μου ἅπτου (20:17). Does the present imperative ἅπτω mean "touch" or "hold" or "cling"?<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup>John D. Barry, *The Resurrected Servant in Isaiah* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2010).

<sup>66</sup>Reimund Bieringer, "I Am Ascending to My Father and Your Father, to My God and Your God' (John 20:17): Resurrection and Ascension in the Gospel of John," in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, WUNT 222 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 209.

<sup>67</sup>Barrett points to this as evidence that the ascension must have occurred between Jesus' appearance to Mary and his appearance to the rest of the disciples (*The Gospel according to John*, 565).

<sup>68</sup>While the verb ἅπτω occurs 39 times in 37 verses in the NT (Matt 8:3, 15; 9:20-21, 29; 14:36; 17:7; 20:34; Mark 1:41; 3:10; 5:27-28, 30-31; 6:56; 7:33; 8:22; 10:13; Luke 5:13; 6:19; 7:14, 39; 8:16, 44-47; 11:33; 15:8; 18:15; 22:51; John 20:17; Acts 28:2; 1 Cor 7:1; 2 Cor 6:17; Col 2:21; 1 John 5:18), this is its only occurrence in the Gospel of John. The imperatival inflection of ἅπτω only occurs 2

Although ἀναβαίνω is used often in John to describe geographical movement, it is also used to describe earthly to heavenly movement.<sup>69</sup> The other three uses do not seem to create an expectation of an ascension as described in Luke-Acts. Given our discussion of the author's careful development of hour, exaltation, glorification, and departure, it would seem the expectation of the ascension as a pneumatological condition would have played a bigger role in the narrative before now if it is as critical as it is sometimes portrayed.

Hoskyns rejects both the symbolic and the Johannine Pentecost positions on the grounds that Jesus has not yet ascended in John 20:22.<sup>70</sup> Cook suggests that "John may have utilized an independent tradition which remembered the entire process of Jesus' glorification, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, and the Ascension, as a single dynamic event."<sup>71</sup> But the collapse of chronology does not hold either.<sup>72</sup> That John retains a chronological sequence is seen in the resurrection appearances where it seems that Jesus has not yet ascended (οὐπω in 20:17).<sup>73</sup>

The logic of requiring the final ascension before the giving of the Spirit is not

---

times in the NT (John 20:17; 2 Cor 6:17).

<sup>69</sup>The verb ἀναβαίνω occurs 16 times in 13 verses in the Fourth Gospel (John 1:51; 2:13; 3:13; 5:1; 6:62; 7:8, 10, 14; 10:1; 11:55; 12:20; 20:17; 21:11). Twelve of those occurrences are references to physical earthly movement (2:13; 5:1; 7:8, 10, 14; 10:1; 11:55; 12:20; 21:11). Four of the occurrences are related to movement between heaven and earth (1:51; 3:13; 6:62; 20:17).

<sup>70</sup>Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, 546-47.

<sup>71</sup>James I. Cook, "John 20:19-23, an Exegesis," *RefR* 21 (1967): 8.

<sup>72</sup>See the discussion of Max Turner, "The Concept of Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel," *VE* 10 (1977): 28-29.

<sup>73</sup>James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970), 177. So Turner, who points out, "The use of δοξάζειν, ὑψοῦν and ἀναβαίνειν certainly welds the life, death, resurrection and ascension into a theological unity, but this has not swamped John's chronology. Jesus neither ascends from the cross (his last word being τετέλεσται not ἀναβαίνω) nor does he bestow the Spirit therefrom ("Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel," 28). See also D. A. Carson, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility: Biblical Perspectives in Tension*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 142; Hoskyns, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, 147.

supported by the text. Carson asks,

Since in John the promise of the Spirit turns on Jesus' return to his Father, a twofold coming of the Spirit somehow suggests that Jesus returned twice; or, less provocatively put, if Jesus finally returned to the Father only once (upon which the gift of the Spirit depends), what warrant is there for thinking the Spirit was bestowed twice?<sup>74</sup>

While admitting that Carson is correct to note the development of expectancy by John in scenes such as the foot washing, Hatina argues that the internal evidence for events anticipating the glorification of Jesus is obvious but for those afterward it is less clear.<sup>75</sup> Hatina points out that by insisting on only one bestowal of the Spirit and requiring two ascensions for two bestowals, Carson is guilty of holding John 20:22 hostage to Acts 2.<sup>76</sup>

Those who hold the symbolic view place an undue burden on the text to require the final ascension before the Spirit can come.<sup>77</sup> Those who hold the Johannine Pentecost view put an undue burden on this text by arguing that the Spirit can be given because the ascension has already occurred.<sup>78</sup> Some who hold the two gift view make

<sup>74</sup>Carson, *John*, 650. Carson rephrases his second objection with a slightly different emphasis: "If Jesus finally returned to the Father only once (upon which the gift of the Spirit depends), what warrant is there for thinking the Spirit was bestowed twice?" (ibid.). Bruce Malina and Richard Rohrbaugh argue for two descents of Jesus based on their contention that Jesus has already ascended without commenting on the bestowal of the Spirit (*Social-science Commentary on the Gospel of John* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998], 278-81).

<sup>75</sup>Thomas R. Hatina, "John 20,22 in Its Eschatological Context: Promise or Fulfillment?," *Bib* 74 (1993): 204.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., 201.

<sup>77</sup>George Eldon Ladd rejects the two gift view because "The Spirit could not be given until Jesus' ascension (7:39), and if Jesus actually gave his disciples the Spirit, we must assume two ascensions" (*A Theology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993], 325). Both Tholuck and Packer require the glorification of 7:39 to include the enthronement of Jesus with the Father (Augustus Tholuck, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*, trans. Charles P. Krauth [Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co, 1859], 415-16; J. I. Packer, *Keep in Step with the Spirit* [Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1984], 87-88).

<sup>78</sup>John Marsh affirms both the reality of the ascension and the gift in John 20:22: "John has prepared his reader well for this. He had said that the Spirit was not given previously because Jesus had not been glorified (7:39). But now the Spirit is given; therefore Jesus is glorified. He is no longer, as in the morning, 'not yet ascended'; he has now 'gone to the Father', he has finally received from the Father the glory which was his with the Father from the foundation of the world. He can now bestow the Spirit, and does" (*Saint John*, Westminster Pelican Commentaries [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968], 639). R. H. Lightfoot argues that one can assume that the ascension has already occurred because the Spirit is

their distinction between the Johannine gift at Easter and the Lukan gift at Pentecost based on their interpretation of the ascension.<sup>79</sup>

### **The Theme of Revelation**

The theme of revelation is once again conveyed through the use of verbs of seeing. Mary and the disciples see the results of the resurrection but not the resurrection itself. Mary sees the stone moved away from the tomb (20:1). Peter and the Beloved Disciple see the grave clothes and face cloth (4-7). This series of events culminates in a moment of faith for the Beloved Disciple who sees and believes (8).

Another motif of the theme of revelation is intimated through verbs of knowing. It is interesting that the emphasis is still on what they do not know. Mary obviously has not yet understood that Jesus would rise from the dead given her confession that she did not know where his body had been taken (2). Even more significant is the narrative aside that explicitly states that they did not yet understand (οἶδα) that Jesus would rise again from Scripture (9). This seems to be the conclusive argument against a bestowal of the Spirit at the cross. This motif is continued in the scene with Mary who sees (θεωπέω) the resurrected Jesus without knowing (οἶδα) that it was

---

given in John 20:22 (*St. John's Gospel: A Commentary*, ed. C. F. Evans [London: Oxford University Press, 1960], 331).

<sup>79</sup>Craig L. Blomberg argues, “The resurrection of Jesus was the climactic vindication of his sinless life and unjust death, yet his ascension to the right hand of the Father was needed to complete the process and to make public to the universe his triumph and sovereignty. So also Jesus’ breathing out the Spirit gave the disciples the authority to lead the company of his followers, even though the full, public and permanent manifestation of this gift would arrive only at Pentecost. To put it almost simplistically, in John 20 the disciples receive the Spirit; in Acts 2 they are filled with the Spirit, who empowers them to preach the gospel boldly. Luke consistently associates the filling or fulness of the Holy Spirit with special occasions in which the disciples fearlessly witness for Christ (e.g. Acts 4:8; 7:55; 13:9), even though the Spirit remains more generally with believers at all times. Nothing in Luke or Acts demands that Pentecost be seen as the first occasion in which the disciples had any experience of the Spirit; the reference to their coming ‘baptism’ in the Spirit in Acts 1:5 is best taken as referring to the immersion or filling which occurred at Pentecost, and not just to an initiatory experience. The reason for the gap between the reception and the filling of the Spirit, then, is that at the time of John 20:22 Christ was not yet ascended (cf. Jn. 7:39)” (*The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* [Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 1987], 168).



him (20:14).<sup>80</sup>

### **The Theme of Witness**

The theme of witness is developed by the role that Mary plays in relaying the news of the resurrection of Jesus to the disciples. Just as the Samaritan villagers were dependent upon the Samaritan woman's witness in John 4, the disciples are dependent upon the witness of Mary (20:2, 18). The relationship between revelation and witness is once again demonstrated in the statement that Mary ἀγγέλλουσα τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὅτι ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον (18).<sup>81</sup>

### **The Giving of the Spirit (John 20:19-23)**

The critical role of John 20:19-23 in Johannine pneumatology is recognized by all sides of the debate.<sup>82</sup> Upon reviewing the relevant literature, however, one quickly realizes that agreement on the issues related to this passage does not go much further.<sup>83</sup> The two overarching issues that are heavily disputed can be summarized in two

---

<sup>80</sup>Craig R. Koester, "Hearing, Seeing and Believing in the Gospel of John," *Bib* 70 (1989): 344-45.

<sup>81</sup>For studies on Mary's role as a character, see Dorothy Lee, "Partnership in Easter Faith: The Role of Mary Magdalene and Thomas in John 20," *JSNT* 58 (1995): 37-49; John M. Howard, "The Significance of Minor Characters in the Gospel of John," *BSac* 163 (2006): 63-78.

<sup>82</sup>Brown calls it "the high point of the post-resurrectional activity of Jesus" (*John XIII-XXI*, 1037). Gary M. Burge describes John 20:22 as "the climax to the entire Gospel" (*John*, NIVAC [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000], 559). So Arthur Lee Mansure, "The Relation of the Paraclete to the Spiritual Presence of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel" (Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1950), 75. Burge, Dunn, and Turner all devote a whole chapter of their books to this passage (Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 173-82; Burge, *Anointed Community*, 114-49; Max Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts—Then and Now*, rev. ed. [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998], 90-102). Craig L. Blomberg states, "This passage forms the climax of John's recurring motif of the Holy Spirit; no other passage within his Gospel so qualifies as the fulfillment of all of Jesus' prior predictions about the Paraclete's coming ministry (chs. 14-16)" (*The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel: Issues and Commentary* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001], 266).

<sup>83</sup>Turner notes, "Few passages in John offer quite the range of problems that John 20:19-23 presents" ("Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel," 28). Marianne Meye Thompson is somewhat understated when she says, "Much ink has been spilled in an effort to settle the interpretation of this passage in the Gospel of John" ("The Breath of Life: John 20:22-23 Once More," in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 69).

questions. What is the relationship of John 20:19-22 to the pneumatological expectations in πνεῦμα passages in the rest of the narrative and the παράκλητος passages in the Farewell Discourse?<sup>84</sup> And what is the relationship of John 20:19-22 to the Lukan account of the outpouring of the Spirit on Pentecost in Acts 2? We will attempt to answer the first question in this section and the second in the next chapter.

### The Condition of Glorification

After blessing the disciples with peace and commissioning them, Jesus ἐνεφύσησεν and said to them, λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον (22). While some argue whether Jesus breathed on the disciples or merely exhaled, one's position on this issue does not seem terribly significant to the over all thrust of the passage.<sup>85</sup> Reminiscent of Genesis 2:7 where the Lord ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, Wisdom of Solomon

---

<sup>84</sup>Those who see John 20:22 as the fulfillment of the Paraclete promises include George Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, SNTSMS 12 (Cambridge: University Press, 1970), 81; Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 692; Robert Kysar, *John*, Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986), 304; Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 425. Echoing Bultmann, Gail O'Day states, "In the Farewell Discourse, Jesus promised his followers a life shaped by joy, a life grounded in the gift of his peace, a life guided by the work of the Paraclete/Spirit, and when each of these promises is fulfilled in 20:19-23, the distance between Easter and Pentecost is collapsed" (*The Gospel of John: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections*, in vol. 9 of *The New Interpreter's Bible*, ed. Leander E. Keck [Nashville: Abingdon, 1995], 848). Kysar sees Jesus' act in John 20:22 "as the fulfillment of the promise of the Spirit scattered throughout the Gospel (1:33; 7:39; and 16:7)" (*John*, 304). James Merrill Hamilton Jr. suggests, "Read in the context of the Gospel of John, John 20:22 fits nicely as the fulfillment of the promised reception of the indwelling Spirit" ("He Is with You and He Will Be in You: The Spirit, the Believer, and the Glorification of Jesus" [Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003], 119). However, Turner maintains that "very little in this scene (20:19-23), if anything, corresponds to the promises of the Paraclete" ("Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel," 29). And Ridderbos denies any connection with 7:39: "Jn. 7:39 speaks of Pentecost, and in a much more general and more exuberant manner than 20:22 speaks of this more limited giving of the Spirit" (*Gospel of John*, 643-44).

<sup>85</sup>That the verb ἐμφυσάω is a hapax legomenon in the New Testament contributes to the difficulty of interpreting the significance of this detail. Are the disciples the object of this verb with the sense that Jesus breathed on them before he spoke? Or is it used in an absolute sense with the meaning that Jesus merely exhaled? Carson has been the strongest proponent of an absolute sense arguing that it merely means that Jesus exhaled before he spoke (*John*, 651-53). In Carson's view this weakens the argument that John had a bestowal of the Spirit in mind. Hatina concedes that Carson is correct to note that ἐμφυσάω is absolute and the term 'insufflation' assumes too much for the word itself but argues that the context nevertheless suggests a connection to Genesis 2:7 (Hatina, "John 20,22," 198). Hatina notes the parallels with the creation account in the Prologue and the later scribal addition of αὐτοῖς which suggests that they did not understand the verb as absolute. Ridderbos wonders if αὐτοῖς might modify ἐμφυσάω as well as λέγει (*Gospel of John*, 643).

15:11 where the idolater has failed to know τὸν πλάσαντα αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν ἐμπνεύσαντα αὐτῷ ψυχὴν ἐνεργοῦσαν καὶ ἐμφυσήσαντα πνεῦμα ζωτικόν, and Ezek 37:3-14, these strong connections emphasize the revelation of the identity of Jesus as creator.<sup>86</sup>

The thematic significance of the phrase λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον for the author of John is clear from its use in key pneumatological passages. The verb λαμβάνω only has the noun πνεῦμα as an object three times in the Fourth Gospel. The first occurrence is where the narrator explains Jesus' invitation in 7:37-38 was said περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ὁ ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν (7:39). The second occurrence is in the first παράκλητος passage where Jesus describes τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας as ὁ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν (14:17). The third and last passage is in this last πνεῦμα passage of the narrative (20:22).<sup>87</sup>

The public invitation from Jesus to all of the people of Israel assembled in expectation of the fulfillment of the eschatological promises for living water to flow from the temple could be considered the apex of the development of pneumatological expectation in the πνεῦμα passages (John 7:37-39). The significance of the narrative

---

<sup>86</sup>Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 1022-23; F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 392; Kysar, *John*, 304; Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 643; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 380; Köstenberger, *John*, 184-85; Gary T. Manning Jr., *The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*, JSNTSup 270 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2004), 166; Thompson, "Breath of life," 71; John Pretlove, "John 20:22—Help from Dry Bones?," *CTR* 3 (2005): 93. The verb ἐμφυσάω occurs 7 times in the LXX (Gen 2:7; 1 Kgs 17:21; Job 4:21; Wis 15:11; Nah 2:2; Ezek 21:36; 37:9). Based on the usage of ἐμφυσάω in the LXX, Edwyn Clement Hoskyns views 20:22 as an act of rebirth as well as an empowerment of the disciples to both create through forgiveness of sins and destroy through the retaining of sins ("Gen. 1-3 and St. John's Gospel," *JTS* 21 [1920]: 215-16).

<sup>87</sup>Pretlove's suggestion that this phrase is deliberately ambiguous does not appreciate its use in the broader context of the narrative ("John 20:22," 101). Nor does Turner when he says, "For this writer at least τὸ πνεῦμα λαμβάνειν is not a well defined formula" ("Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel," 25). While Turner's point that language about the Spirit can be used in different ways depending upon the context is appropriate, the Johannine use of λαμβάνω in relation to πνεῦμα nevertheless seems to be semantically and thematically significant in the narrative of John. Hamilton is more helpful in that he also distinguishes between the different manifestations of the Spirit but is more precise with his language than Turner ("He Is with You and He Will Be in You," 118-19). He argues that the terms related to baptism, filling, and indwelling are distinct terms referring to different manifestations of the Spirit. Based on this distinction, he argues, "It does not seem that John means to describe either a *baptism* or a *filling* in John 20:22, but a *reception* (cf. 7:39; 14:17) [emphasis his]" (ibid., 118).

aside that explains the relationship between Jesus' invitation and the Spirit is the most explicit pneumatological statement given by the narrator to create an expectation of a condition related to the giving of the Spirit.

Another possible echo of λαμβάνω is from the feet washing scene in John 13. Jesus tells the disciples ὁ λαμβάνων ἄν τινα πέμψω ἐμὲ λαμβάνει, ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ λαμβάνων λαμβάνει τὸν πέμψαντά με (13:20). This echo is strengthened by the statement of Jesus to his disciples in 20:21 where he says καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέν με ὁ πατήρ, κἀγὼ πέμψω ὑμᾶς.

The absence of an article in the command λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον in 20:22 has been a source of debate on whether the direct object πνεῦμα ἅγιον should be understood in personal or impersonal terms. Westcott recommended rendering πνεῦμα ἅγιον as “a gift of the Holy Spirit” because the absence of the article emphasized “the power of the new life proceeding from the Person of the Risen Christ.”<sup>88</sup> Johnston is perhaps best known for his view that the absence of the article with πνεῦμα in John 20:22 implies that the Spirit given is an impersonal force.<sup>89</sup> These views, however, fail to appreciate that the absence of an article does not necessarily imply indefiniteness.<sup>90</sup> Brown helpfully points out that the clear reference to the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:4 is also anarthrous.<sup>91</sup> The conclusive grammatical argument from Johannine usage is that both anarthrous and

---

<sup>88</sup>Westcott, *John* (1951), 295. Donald Guthrie seems to imply that Westcott's arguments are based on a comparison between the anarthrous use in John 20:22 and the arthrous use in Acts 2 (*New Testament Theology* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1981], 533-34). Westcott does argue that there are qualitative differences between the two gifts but does not mention the use of the article in Acts 2 (*John* [1951], 295).

<sup>89</sup>George Johnston, “The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John,” *Perspective* 9 (1968): 30; Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, 49.

<sup>90</sup>As Daniel B. Wallace points out, “It is not necessary for a noun to have the article in order for it to be definite. But conversely, a noun *cannot* be indefinite when it has the article. Thus it *may* be definite without the article, and it *must* be definite with the article [emphasis his]” (*Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996], 243). Also see note 70 on page 110 of this study for Wallace's comments regarding the unprofitability of using grammar to address the question of the personality of the Spirit.

<sup>91</sup>Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 1023. Also Kysar, *John*, 304.

arthrous forms clearly refer to the Holy Spirit in John 7:39.<sup>92</sup> Turner's suggestion that the Paraclete is not in view here because πνεῦμα ἅγιον is used instead of παράκλητον ignores the grammatical structure of the παράκλητος passages these terms are carefully set out appositionally.<sup>93</sup>

Based on his observation that other imperatives in John do not require immediate fulfillment, Carson argues that the imperative λάβετε is used in a similar way. However these imperatives are typically looking forward to the glorification or exaltation of Jesus.<sup>94</sup> Hatina admits that Carson is correct to argue that not all imperative verbs necessitate an immediate action.<sup>95</sup> Pointing to examples of imperatives in John that clearly suggest immediacy, Hatina argues that the context of λαμβάνω suggests a scene that is "characterized by eschatological fulfillment and not further prediction or sign."<sup>96</sup> Ramsey refutes the legitimacy of appealing to the aorist imperative in 2:19 (where Jesus refers to the destruction of the temple which did not happen until later) because it is conditional while the verb in 20:22 is an actual command.<sup>97</sup> However, it should be pointed out that the Johannine use of imperatives is more complex than this. Some imperatives do not require immediate fulfillment (even νῦν δόξασόν in 17:5 is not immediate in one sense, or but imperatives of ἔρχομαι in 1:39, 46; 4:16; 11:34; and all obviously expect immediate ἀκολουθέω in 1:43; 12:26; 21:19; 21:22 ὁράω (John 1:46; 4:29; 7:52; 11:34; 20:27) are mixed perhaps the imperatives of ἔρχομαι and πίνω in

---

<sup>92</sup>Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, 533-34; Carson, *John*, 649-50; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 380. Kysar points out that the only other occurrences of the title are John 1:33 and 14:26 (*John*, 304).

<sup>93</sup>Turner, "Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel," 40 n. 40.

<sup>94</sup>Ibid., 29.

<sup>95</sup>Hatina, "John 20,22," 198.

<sup>96</sup>Hatina's examples of imperatives in John that imply immediacy are ἴδε in 19:26-27 and φέρε in 20:27 (ibid., 198-99).

<sup>97</sup>J. Ramsey Michaels, *John: A Good News Commentary*, NIBC (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989), 349.

7:37-39 but these are obviously looking forward to the glorification of Jesus.

There are also other connections with the παράκλητος passages including the greeting of peace in 20:19 echoing the language of peace immediately following the second παράκλητος passage (14:25-27)<sup>98</sup> and the joy of the disciples that echoes promise of joy in 16:20, 22.<sup>99</sup> However, it seems that the anticipation created around the use of λαμβάνω in 7:39 and 14:17 is clearly fulfilled in 20:22.<sup>100</sup> From this point forward, those who believe in Jesus are able to receive the Spirit-Paraclete.

### **The Theme of Revelation**

Two motifs related to the theme of revelation are used by the author. The first is a motif related to verbs of knowing. Jesus ἔδειξεν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν to the disciples (20). The verb δείκνυμι is in the same semantic domain as ἐξηγέομαι and φανερώω which have already been noted as significant for the theme of revelation.<sup>101</sup> The second motif is represented in the participial phrase ἰδόντες τὸν κύριον (20). The pairing of a verb of seeing and a verb related to revealing is common in the Fourth Gospel.

The disciples receive the Spirit-Paraclete who enables them to “truly understand the words and works of Jesus, as well as the Word of Scripture.”<sup>102</sup> Those that reject the evidence of the Spirit-Paraclete after this do not give proper weight to the

---

<sup>98</sup>Christina Hoegen-Rohls remarks concerning this connection, “Damit ist deutlich, daß die Geistaussage in 20,22 der Intention der Abschiedsreden entspricht” (*Der nachösterliche Johannes: Die Abschiedsreden als hermeneutischer Schlüssel zum vierten Evangelium*, WUNT 2.84 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996], 293).

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., 292-95. Also see Jean Zumstein, “Jesus’ Resurrection in the Farewell Discourses,” in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, WUNT 222 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 124.

<sup>100</sup>So Colin G. Kruse, *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction and Commentary*, The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 2004), 382.

<sup>101</sup>The verb δείκνυμι occurs 6 times in 5 verses in John (5:20; 10:32; 14:8-9; 20:20), the verb ἐξηγέομαι only occurs once in 1:18, and the verb φανερώω occurs 9 times in 8 verses (John 1:31; 2:11; 3:21; 7:4; 9:3; 17:6; 21:1, 14).

<sup>102</sup>Martin Hengel, “The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” *HBT* 12 (1990): 30.

literary role of this scene as the basis for the role of the Spirit-Paraclete as the basis for the veracity of the text itself. The veracity of the witness of the Fourth Gospel is based on the eyewitness account of the ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus (John 1:14; 19:35; 20:8; 21:24) and the remembrance and understanding provided by the Spirit-Paraclete (2:17, 22; 16:4; 12:16; 20:9). As careful as the author is to show the role of the eyewitness, would it not be surprising if he did not depict the reality of receiving the Spirit as the basis for his claim to remember all that Jesus said?

### **The Theme of Life**

The Old Testament allusions of ἐνεφύσησεν to Genesis 2:7 and Ezekiel 37:3-5 suggest the theme of regeneration. In addition to the Old Testament background, one could argue that breathing could also allude to the metaphor of the Spirit as the wind in John 3:8. This connection strengthens the association of this event with the theme of life. Although the use of ἐμφυσάω is not sufficient for building a strong case for equating regeneration with indwelling, it certainly seems warranted to argue that it does apply to the broader theme of life.<sup>103</sup> Similarities with 3:5-8 and 7:37-39 and echoes of Old Testament texts that undergird them seem to serve as a strong connection with life in this context.<sup>104</sup> Is this the point in time of their regeneration? The moment of salvation seems to be purposefully complex in John because language is used that seems to indicate that they have already received forgiveness.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup>James Merrill Hamilton Jr., *God's Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old & New Testaments*, ed. E. Ray Clendenen, NAC Studies in Bible & Theology (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2006), 171-73.

<sup>104</sup>There may also be an echo from John 1:1-3 of Jesus the Creator as the source of life. So Peter F. Ellis, *The Genius of John: A Composition-critical Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1984), 293.

<sup>105</sup>Although Michaels is correct to point out that the forgiveness of sins is not as prominent in the Gospel of John as it is in the Synoptic Gospels, he presses his case too far in his suggestion that the forgiveness of sin is not an issue for believers ("By Water and Blood," 149-54). The language used to contrast the life possessed by those who believe in Jesus and the wrath that remains on those who do not believe implies that the believer has escaped that wrath rather than suggests that he does not deserve it (3:36). For a defense of the traditional Pentecostal argument for regeneration here and empowerment in

### **The Theme of Mission**

The theme of mission is developed in this pericope with the verbs of sending in Jesus' statement: καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέν με ὁ πατήρ, κἀγὼ πέμπω ὑμᾶς (21).<sup>106</sup> These verbs have been used synonymously throughout the narrative at key points in the development of pneumatological expectation.<sup>107</sup>

After the disciples receive the Spirit in verse 22, Jesus, once again, emphasizes the nature of their relationship both with God and the world in verse 23. Their relationship to the forgiveness of sins is a clear reference both to their role and authority as Christ's representatives.

### **The Theme of Witness**

The theme of witness is present in this passage because of its inherent relationship to its parent theme of revelation and its supporting theme of mission. This theme is emphasized by the relationship of λαμβάνω to its supporting motif of acceptance and rejection (John 3:11, 32, 33; 14:17).

### **The Problem of Thomas (John 20:24-29)**

One line of evidence often referenced by those who argue against the Spirit being given in the previous passage is the uniquely Johannine emphasis on the role of

---

Acts 2, see Ben C. Aker, "'Breathed': A Study on the Biblical Distinction between Regeneration and Spirit-Baptism," *Paraclete* 17 (1983): 13-16; Howard M. Erwin, *Spirit-Baptism: A Biblical Investigation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987), 14-21. However, my view is that any attempt to discern any sort of *ordo salutis* pushes the text beyond its natural reading because the time of regeneration for any character in the Fourth Gospel is a complex issue. Hamilton does not see this reception as conversion because 1:41, 45, 49 seem to indicate the disciples had already come to saving faith in the Messiah ("He Is with You and He Will Be in You," 118-19). So Packer who similarly rejects regeneration in 20:22 because John 13:10 and 15:3 imply that believers were regenerate before the cross (*Keep in Step with the Spirit*, 87-88).

<sup>106</sup>Köstenberger suggests that these verbs may echo John 5:33, 36 ("Two Johannine Verbs for Sending," 145).

<sup>107</sup>On the synonymous usage of ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω, see J. Seynaeve, "Les verbes ἀποστέλλω et πέμπω dans le vocabulaire théologique de Saint Jean," in *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, Rédaction, Théologie*, ed. Marinus de Jonge, BETL 44 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), 385-89; Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 569-70; Kysar, *John*, 304; Köstenberger, "Two Johannine Verbs for Sending," 137-38. Cf. Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, 163-67.



Thomas in John 20:24-29.<sup>108</sup> A detail particular to the Fourth Gospel is that Thomas was not present when Jesus appeared to the disciples the first time (24). Upon hearing the witness of the other disciples, he insisted that he would never believe without seeing and touching the wounds from Jesus' crucifixion (25). Eight days later, Jesus appeared again to the disciples along with Thomas, invited him to touch his wounds, and encouraged him to believe (29).

Some have pointed to the absence of Thomas from the gathering of disciples in John 20:19-23 as evidence that the Spirit was not given in verse 22.<sup>109</sup> However, this argument goes beyond the text in its requirement for the presence of the disciples as a condition for the giving of the Spirit. As our study of the πνεῦμα and παράκλητος passages have shown, this requirement has not been developed as a pneumatological condition. Hatina asks whether the absence of Thomas from this scene would also imply that he was not commissioned like the other disciples. Because the context of the resurrection appearances suggest that each “adds a unique aspect and teaching,” it seems that “John’s intent is to show that the Spirit was given, and not to whom it was given.”<sup>110</sup> The necessity of Thomas’s presence for the giving of the Spirit is also weakened by his inclusion as one of the seven present in chapter 21 (21:2).

In response to Thomas’s confession, Jesus seemingly offers a mild rebuke by asking ὅτι ἑώρακάς με πεπίστευκας and blessing οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες (29). Is the response of Jesus an indication that Thomas’s confession is less than saving faith? Some interpreters have sought to disparage the character of Thomas based on this scene

---

<sup>108</sup>Outside of the Fourth Gospel, Θωμᾶς is listed as one of the Twelve in Matt 10:3 and Acts 1:13. Playing the role of a more prominent character in the Johannine narrative, Thomas appears in John 11:16; 14:5; 20:24, 26, 28; 21:2.

<sup>109</sup>Tholuck, *St. John*, 415-16; Ben Witherington III, *John’s Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 341; Kruse, *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction and Commentary*, 382.

<sup>110</sup>Hatina, “John 20,22,” 202.

characterizing him as pessimistic or dull.<sup>111</sup> Some have attempted to exonerate him by placing his doubt in the broader context of ancient literature.<sup>112</sup> Others have sought to interpret Thomas's reaction in terms of stages of faith.<sup>113</sup>

While some have used this to characterize Thomas as doubting or dull, others have simply argued that his dependence of his faith upon seeing and touching serves as evidence that the Spirit has not been given at this point. Porsch contends that Jesus' answer shows that Thomas is still dependent upon the old way of believing based upon seeing and hearing which is "charakteristisch für das Wirken des Irdischen."<sup>114</sup> Turner argues,

There is a decisive argument against the hypothesis which has not yet received sufficient attention: from 20: 20 to the end of John's gospel there is no trace of Paraclete activity. Firstly, Thomas does not believe the witness of the disciples, and secondly, it is *a resurrection appearance* that convinces him. Thirdly, even if John 21 does not belong to the earliest edition of the gospel it nevertheless witnesses to johannine tradition of further resurrection appearances. Each appearance of Jesus can only hammer home the point that Jesus must still appear because the Spirit has *not* yet come as the Paraclete. 4' John does not record the coming of the Paraclete.<sup>115</sup>

Too much focus on the character of Thomas obfuscates the role of this pericope in the broader context of the narrative of John.<sup>116</sup> A more fruitful context for our purposes is to

<sup>111</sup>Bernard speculates that Thomas's lack of faith was the cause for his absence from the previous gathering when Jesus appeared (*Gospel according to St. John*, 681). Contra Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 1024. Joseph A. Fitzmyer points to the fear of the rest of the apostles in this scene as evidence that the giving of the Spirit in 20:21 had "no recorded effect" ("The Ascension of Christ and Pentecost," *TS* 45 [1984]: 428).

<sup>112</sup>For an attempt to understand the ἀπίστος/πίστος of Thomas in the context of recognition scenes in Homer, see Stan Harstine, "Un-doubting Thomas: Recognition Scenes in the Ancient World," *PRSt* 33 (2006): 435-47.

<sup>113</sup>Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 1004-1005, 1045-1046; Brendan Byrne, "The Faith of the Beloved Disciple and the Community in John 20," *JSNT* 23 (1985): 83-97.

<sup>114</sup>Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort*, 351.

<sup>115</sup>Turner, "Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel," 29.

<sup>116</sup>For a full study on Thomas as a character, see William Bonney, *Caused to Believe: The Doubting Thomas Story at the Climax of John's Christological Narrative*, Biblical Interpretation Series 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

understand Thomas's faith in the context of the relationship between seeing and believing in the narrative of John.<sup>117</sup>

The reaction of unbelief in the presence of the resurrected Jesus is not unique to Thomas or the Gospel of John. At the end of Matthew just before Jesus gives the Great Commission in 28:18-20, the eleven disciples are said to have seen Jesus in Galilee (Matt 28:16). Upon seeing Jesus there, the disciples worshipped him but there were also οἱ ἐδίστασαν (Matt 28:17). The use of the plural verb indicates that Thomas could not have been alone in his doubt. Also Mark records that the response of the disciples to the resurrection of Jesus was trembling and fear (Mark 16:8). In Luke Jesus eats fish to prove that he is not a ghost (Luke 24:36-42). Luke also records that during time Jesus spent with the disciples between his resurrection and ascension "He presented himself alive to them after his suffering by many proofs (Acts 1:3)."

Furthermore we have already noted the function of the motif of seeing in the Johannine theme of revelation. The veracity of the Gospel is based upon the eyewitness account of seeing the piercing and death of Jesus at his crucifixion (19:34-35).<sup>118</sup> The relationship of seeing to witness and true faith is clearly expressed in the phrase ὁ ἑώρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκεν . . . ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς πιστεύ[σ]ητε (19:35). The intrinsic role of seeing the physical reality of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus are also clearly emphasized in the introductions of both the Fourth Gospel (1:14) and the First Epistle of John (1 John 1:1-3). As Judge has noted, "What the disciples saw, what was done "in their sight" has become precisely the basis for promoting the faith of those future believers who will not be able to see, i.e. John's generation of disciples who do in fact believe in Jesus."<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup>Koester, "Hearing, Seeing and Believing in the Gospel of John," 345-46.

<sup>118</sup>Michaels, "By Water and Blood," 154.

<sup>119</sup>Peter J. Judge, "John 20,24-29: More Than Doubt, Beyond Rebuke," in *The Death of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. G. van Belle, BETL 200 (Leuven: University Press, 2007), 929.

Based on the lack of evidence in the narrative for the full attendance of the disciples as a condition for the giving of the Spirit and the abundance of evidence for the relationship of this pericope as a fulfillment of other themes, I conclude that in no way should Thomas's absence in 20:19-23 or his desire to see Jesus in 20:24-29 be taken to preclude that the author of John has presented a giving of the Spirit-Paraclete by this point in the narrative. Rather than viewing the absence and faith of Thomas as evidence that the Spirit has not been given, this episode should be counted as evidence that a superior way of believing through the Spirit is now available.

### **An Anti-climatic Ending? (John 21)**

The relationship of John 21 to the rest of the book has been a matter of contention among Johannine scholars. The authenticity of chapter 21 was rejected by Dodd on grounds of textual criticism, but as Cassian notes, the textual witnesses to its received form are as strong as the rest of the book.<sup>120</sup> Regardless of this lack of textual evidence, some scholars have argued that the author originally intended the narrative to end at 20:31 and chapter 21 has been added as a sort of appendix.<sup>121</sup> Increasingly more

---

<sup>120</sup>C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1953), 431; Bishop Cassian, "John xxi," *NTS* 3 (1956): 133. Also see Stephen S. Smalley, "The Sign in John xxi," *NTS* 20 (1974): 276.

<sup>121</sup>Bernard, *Gospel according to St. John*, 687; Dodd, *Interpretation of Fourth Gospel*, 431; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 576-77; Cook, "John 20:19-23," 3; Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 17; Savas Agourides, "Structure and Theology in the Gospel of John," *GOTR* 47 (2002): 133-34; Aune, "John, Gospel of," 245; Herman C. Waetjen, *The Gospel of the Beloved Disciple: A Work in Two Editions* (New York: T & T Clark, 2005), 8. M. E. Boismard suggests that Luke was the author of chap. 21 ("Le Chapitre xxi de S. Jean: Essai de critique littéraire," *RB* 54 [1947]: 36 cited by John Breck, "John 21: Appendix, Epilogue or Conclusion?," *SVTQ* 36 [1992]: 36). Some who see John 20:19-23 as the Johannine Pentecost do not see chap. 21 as a continuation of the previous narrative (Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 1070). Barrett points out the differences in language between chap. 21 and the rest of the narrative (*The Gospel according to John*, 576-77). However, few have followed this line of argument since these differences can be explained by the uniqueness of language required to describe a fishing scene (Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, 263; D. Moody Smith, "What Have I Learned about the Gospel of John?," in *What Is John? Readers and Reading of the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Fernando F. Segovia, SBLSymS 3 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996], 227; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003], 1219-20).

scholars are arguing for its literary integrity as the original ending by giving more weight to the internal evidence of the literary connections that exist between chapter 21 and the rest of the book.<sup>122</sup>

Interestingly, even those who argue for its legitimacy as the original ending to the book have sometimes failed to see its relationship to the pneumatological themes that have been developed thus far. One of the major arguments by those who hold the symbolic or two-gift views of the fulfillment of the pneumatological promises in the Fourth Gospel is that the lives of the disciples are not dramatically changed enough in chapter 21 to evidence a real gifting of the Spirit in 20:22.<sup>123</sup> Along with Thomas, Peter has often been cast in a negative light by interpreters of John.<sup>124</sup> Blomberg states that chapter 21 “shows that the final editor of the Gospel did not see the disciples as yet ready for the mission they would soon undertake.”<sup>125</sup> Carson is the most insistent on this point when he says,

---

<sup>122</sup>Köstenberger aptly expresses this viewpoint, “Both prologue and epilogue frame the Gospel in such a way that they form an integral part of the theological and literary fabric of the entire narrative” (*John*, 584). Smalley argues on the basis of stylistic elements such as the use of synonyms in chap. 21 that “a redactor too far from the Johannine swim would not have caught such a trick” (“The Sign in John xxi,” 277). More recently many have argued that chap. 21 should be considered a conclusion instead of an appendix because it brings closure to several themes in the narrative. See Paul Sevier Minear, “The Original Function of John 21,” *JBL* 102 (1983): 85-98; Sandra M. Schneiders, “John 21:1-14,” *Int* 43 (1989): 70-75; Breck, “John 21,” 27-28; Peter F. Ellis, “The Authenticity of John 21,” *SVTQ* 36 (1992): 17-25; Charles H. Talbert, *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1992), 248; Beverly Roberts Gaventa, “The Archive of Excess: John 21 and the Problem of Narrative Closure,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 240-52; Stephen S. Smalley, *John, Evangelist and Interpreter*, New Testament Profiles (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 139-40. Keener points to examples of anti-climactic endings in Greek literature as evidence that the author of John is probably following a contemporary literary convention (*Gospel of John*, 1221). For a defense of the unity of John 21:1-23 as a single pericope, see Timothy Wiarda, “John 21:1-23: Narrative Unity and Its Implications,” *JSNT* 46 (1992): 53-71.

<sup>123</sup>Hoskyns considers this scene to be a demonstration of apostasy in fulfillment of John 16:32 (*The Fourth Gospel*, 552). Brown and Barrett also see it in a negative light (Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 1096; Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 579).

<sup>124</sup>Savas Agourides argues that the purpose of John 21 was to demonstrate the superiority of the Beloved Disciple over Peter (“The Purpose of John 21,” in *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament in Honor of Kenneth Willis Clark* [Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967], 127-32).

<sup>125</sup>Blomberg, *John's Gospel*, 266.

Those who accept John 21 as part of the Gospel, even if it is cast as an epilogue, cannot fail to observe that the disciples are sidling back to their old employment (21:1–3), sorting out elementary reconciliation with the Master (21:15–19), and still playing ‘let’s-compare-service-record’ games (21:20–22). All this is not only a far cry from the power, joy, exuberant witness, courageous preaching and delight in suffering displayed by the early Christians after Pentecost in Acts, it is no less distant from the same virtues *foretold in John’s farewell discourse, where the promise of the Spirit receives such emphasis*. If John 20:22 is understood to be the Johannine Pentecost, it must be frankly admitted that the results are desperately disappointing, and the promises of John 14–16 vastly inflated. The alternative is surely preferable. The episode in 20:22, which most will agree is in some sense symbolic, is best understood as symbolic of the enduement *that is still to come* [emphasis his].<sup>126</sup>

However, these objections do not seem to appreciate the full dynamic of how these scenes in chapter 21 serve as a climax to many of the major pneumatological themes that have been developed in the earlier narrative.

Before discussing the contribution of chapter 21 to the development of these themes, it might first be helpful to offer an answer to these reasons for dismissing the work of the Spirit-Paraclete in the lives of the disciples. First, the return of the disciples to their fishing in 20:1-3 should not be viewed as a return to a former sinful lifestyle.<sup>127</sup> There is no evidence from the text that Jesus considered their fishing as a form of backsliding. In light of the vagueness of time indicators in John 21:1-3 and the synoptic tradition of Jesus and the disciples spending time in Galilee after his resurrection and before his ascension (Matt 28:16; Mark 16:7), it could be argued that they were in Galilee in obedience to Jesus. In addition, Jesus blesses their fishing and prepares their breakfast (21:5-13). There is more evidence of divine approval than disapproval.

---

<sup>126</sup>Carson, *John*, 653. As an alternative to Carson’s interpretation of the fishing incident, Hatina suggests that this scene might have used by the author to highlight other themes in John such as the abiding presence of Christ or Peter’s commission (Hatina, “John 20,22,” 200).

<sup>127</sup>So *ibid.* As our discussion will show, Hatina is correct that the author is using this scene to develop themes from his narrative but his suggestion that this is an “atypical circumstance” should be balanced by Beasley-Murray’s emphasis on this activity as a necessary part of their lives (Beasley-Murray, *John*, 399). Scholars who view the fishing scene in a negative light include Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, 552; Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 1096.

Second, as has already been noted, the physical presence of Jesus restoring Peter has been a cause for rejecting the reality of the giving of the Spirit in John 20:22.<sup>128</sup> The assertion that Peter's reconciliation in 21:15-19 is evidence of the absence of the Spirit denies the role of other people in the Spirit-filled Christian life. There is no reason to fault Peter as unspiritual because Jesus physically helps him work through his restoration. There is plenty of evidence in the broader New Testament witness that true Christians who are walking by the Spirit need one another (Gal 6:1; Jas 5:16; Heb 10:25). In no way does the need of a Christian for the encouragement of real people imply that they have not received the Holy Spirit. One particularly striking example is Paul's reminder to Timothy that he needs ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ when by he has already received the Spirit at some point in the past (2 Tim 1:6).

Finally, it is to one of the most dramatic examples of this truth that we evaluate the so-called "let's-compare-service-record' games" between Peter and the Beloved Disciple in 21:20-22.<sup>129</sup> That Peter's question is motivated by a sinful preoccupation with his own greatness does not seem self-evident in this text. There is a stark contrast between the disciple's desire for greatness in the synoptic tradition (Matt 20:20-24; Mark 9:34; 10:35-41; Luke 22:24) and Peter's question about the future of the Beloved disciple. In light of the news that Peter would one day be martyred (21:18-19), it is not surprising that he should wonder about the fate of the other disciples. This may reflect an inquisitive spirit but not necessarily a competitive spirit. More importantly, however, even if one is convinced that Peter is guilty of a wrong attitude here, it should not negate a real work of the Spirit in 20:22. There is, after all, a clear example of a wrong attitude by Peter even after Pentecost in Galatians 2:11-14. Rather than seeing these scenes as evidence against the giving of the Spirit, therefore, I concur with Hatina who regards

---

<sup>128</sup>See George W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 370-72.

<sup>129</sup>Carson, *John*, 653.

them as evidence for the beginning work of the Spirit in the life of the disciples.<sup>130</sup> Several aspects of this story serve as a fitting conclusion to many motifs related to pneumatological themes.<sup>131</sup>

### **The Theme of Revelation**

The theme of revelation is emphasized immediately by the use of verb φανερώω twice in 21:1 and once in 21:14. While this verb occurs several times in the narrative, it is most prominently tied to our study by its use in the context of our first πνεῦμα passage (1:31). Additionally the theme of revelation is developed through the use of οἶδα (21:4, 12). Perhaps Peter recognized the Lord based on a similar experience recorded in Luke 5:1-11. The theme of revelation is also seen in the motif of fulfillment through allusions to two main themes of Ezekiel that are echoed in 21:1-14.

**The significance of catching fish.** One of the more enigmatic details in the Fourth Gospel is the exact number of fish caught by the disciples upon obeying Jesus' instructions. Does the report of 153 fish reflect an incidental detail confirming the presence of an eyewitness?<sup>132</sup> Is there a deeper meaning underlying this exact number of fish? There have been many suggestions offered to explain the significance of the

---

<sup>130</sup>Hatina expresses this well when he states, "If there is to be found some immoral circumstance on the part of the disciples in the post-resurrection narrative, this would only be consistent with Christian discipleship throughout the entire church age. The bestowal of the Spirit does not automatically imply moral perfection, rather it is the beginning of the journey to perfection. More central, however, to the Johannine understanding of the endowment of the Spirit is the continued presence of Christ in the new community, and not so much the moral outworking of that community" ("John 20,22," 200).

<sup>131</sup>Although Smalley is helpful in elucidating the structural and thematic connections of this scene with the rest of the narrative, his contention that this miraculous catch is the seventh sign in John does not withstand close scrutiny ("The Sign in John xxi," 277-78, 280-81). Bauckham correctly points out that the resurrection should be considered to be the seventh sign given its designation as such in 2:18-22. He also helpfully distinguishes between the purpose of the signs in the narrative to reveal the identity of Jesus and the purpose of the miraculous catch that "symbolizes programmatically the mission in which the disciples are now to engage" ("153 Fish," 274). Bruce calls it "a parable of their missionary activity in the time that lies ahead" (*Gospel of John*, 402).

<sup>132</sup>So Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 1076; Craig R. Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 120. Contra Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 581.



author's precision in reporting the exact number fish caught by the apostles in the presence of Jesus. One of the problems of discerning the exegetical significance of this report is that abundance of fish seems to be rivaled by the number of suggested interpretations.<sup>133</sup>

Most interpretations have focused on the use of gematria, which has been shown to be a common hermeneutical practice in the ancient world.<sup>134</sup> Modern interpreters, though, are wise to appreciate the exegetical dangers involved in determining the exact meaning where this technique has been employed. Without appropriate textual constraints, attempts to decipher these puzzles can result in fanciful conjectures.<sup>135</sup> Finding the symbolism obscure, Fowler suggests withholding a verdict for more evidence.<sup>136</sup> One of the more plausible recent explanations is the suggestion of Richard Bauckham that this number is used to portray this scene as a fulfillment of

---

<sup>133</sup>Contributions include F. H. Colson, "Triangular Numbers in the New Testament," *JTS* 16 (1914): 72; John A. Emerton, "The Hundred and Fifty-three Fishes in John 21:11," *JTS* 9 (1958): 86-89; Peter R. Ackroyd, "The 153 Fishes in John xxi.11—A Further Note," *JTS* 10 (1959): 94; Joseph A. Romeo, "Gematria and John 21:11, the Children of God," *JBL* 97 (1978): 263-64; O. T. Owen, "One Hundred and Fifty Three Fishes," *ExpTim* 100 (1988): 52-54; John M. Ross, "One Hundred and Fifty-three Fishes," *ExpTim* 100 (1989): 375; Kenneth Cardwell, "The Fish on the Fire: Jn. 21:9," *ExpTim* 102 (1990): 12-14; Michael Labahn, "Fishing for Meaning: The Miraculous Catch of Fish in John 21," in *Wonders Never Cease: The Purpose of Narrating Miracle Stories in the New Testament and Its Religious Environment*, ed. Michael Labahn and Lietaert Peerbolte, LNTS 288 (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006), 125-45. For fuller discussions of various interpretive attempts, see Neil J. McEleney, "153 Great Fishes (John 21:11): Gematriacal Atbash," *Bib* 58 (1977): 411-17; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1231-33; Manning, *Ezekiel in John*, 189-94.

<sup>134</sup>Romeo, "Gematria and John 21:11," 263-64. Also see Robert McQueen Grant, who says, "The significance of the number 153 is not to be found in any collection of species of fish but rather in the symbolic value of its components, and in the total reached by triangulating their sum" ("One Hundred Fifty-three Fish' [John 21:11]," *HTR* 42 [1949]: 275). On the ancient origins of rabbinical gematria, see Stephen J. Lieberman, "A Mesopotamian Background for the So-called *Aggadica* 'Measures' of Biblical Hermeneutics," *HUCA* 58 (1987): 157-225.

<sup>135</sup>Mark Kiley suggests a solution that he develops in six stages: (a)  $1+5+3=9$ ; (b) this scene follows the crucifixion where eight total people were present; (c)  $8+9=17$ ; (d)  $9 \times 17=153$ ; (e) the fact 153 is the result of adding and multiplying echoes to the command  $\alpha\upsilon\tilde{\zeta}\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$  και  $\pi\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$  in Gen 1:22, 28 LXX; (f) the multitude of fish compliments John's statement that it is necessary for Jesus  $\alpha\upsilon\tilde{\zeta}\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\upsilon\iota$  (3:30) ("Three More Fish Stories [John 21:11]," *JBL* 127 [2008]: 529-31).

<sup>136</sup>William G. Fowler, "The Influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel: Intertextuality and Interpretation" (Ph.D. diss., Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, 1995), 202-07.

Ezekiel 47:10.<sup>137</sup> While the details of Bauckham's argument may be plausible, like all such reconstructions they are not entirely provable. His interpretation, however, is strengthened by the multiple connections to Ezekiel throughout the narrative of John. Gary Manning notes, "Some early Christians may have seen the connection between Ezekiel 47 and John 21, even without the use of gematria."<sup>138</sup> Interpreters as early as Jerome saw a link between this miraculous catch and living water flowing from the temple in Ezekiel 47.<sup>139</sup> Given our previous discussion of the allusions to Ezekiel 36:25-27 and 37:1-14 in John 3:5-8 and Ezekiel 47 in John 4; 7:37-39; and 19:34, this connection suggests that the author is drawing on this imagery to paint a picture of the results of the fulfillment of the expected giving of the Spirit as living water flowing from the eschatological temple.

**The significance of shepherding.** The connection to Ezekiel in chapter 21 is strengthened by the additional allusion to the shepherd imagery in 21:15-17. Manning has compellingly argued that Jesus' shepherding imagery in John 10:1-30 contains strong verbal allusions to Ezekiel 34:23 and 37:24.<sup>140</sup> The language of shepherding in the restoration of Peter is at least an echo of this imagery from John 10.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>137</sup>Bauckham builds on the work of Martin J. J. Menken (Bauckham, "153 Fish," 274-76; Menken, *Numerical Literary Techniques in John: The Fourth Evangelist's Use of Numbers of Words and Syllables*, NovTSup 55 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985]). Also see Bruce H. Grigsby, "Gematria and John 21:11—Another Look at Ezekiel 47:10," *ExpTim* 95 (1984): 177-78; Paul Trudinger, "The 153 Fishes: A Response and a Further Suggestion," *ExpTim* 102 (1990): 11-12.

<sup>138</sup>Manning, *Ezekiel in John*, 194 n. 143.

<sup>139</sup>Beasley-Murray, *John*, 401-02; George J. Brooke, "4Q252 and the 153 Fish of John 21:1," in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Koll, BZNTW 97 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 253-65; Jane S. Webster, *Ingesting Jesus: Eating and Drinking in the Gospel of John*, Academia Biblica 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 137.

<sup>140</sup>Manning, *Ezekiel in John*, 111-24.

<sup>141</sup>Kirsten Nielsen, "Old Testament Imagery in John," in *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives. Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel in Århus 1997*, ed. Johannes Nissen and Sigfred Pedersen, JSNTSup 182 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 70, 76-80; Manning, *Ezekiel in John*, 131-32.

## The Theme of Dwelling

One motif related to the theme of dwelling that is developed in this chapter is the metaphor of night and day. After an unsuccessful night of fishing (3),<sup>142</sup> a transition to morning is described by the phrase πρωΐας δὲ ἤδη γενομένης (4). Is this merely another example of the common chronological indicators throughout the Gospel?<sup>143</sup> Or is their evidence that this could be intended as a double entendre?<sup>144</sup> Of the other three references to night in the Fourth Gospel only 21:3 is arguably an indicator for the time of day.<sup>145</sup> The case for taking these three references to night as a reference to a spiritual reality is strengthened upon consideration of the broader motifs of light and darkness.

We have already discussed the use of the metaphor of night in the visit between Nicodemus and Jesus in John 3. Another piece of evidence that νυκτὸς could be an example of a double entendre is the reminder when Nicodemus and Joseph retrieve the body of Jesus from the cross that Nicodemus is ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς τὸ πρῶτον (19:38-39).<sup>146</sup> In verse 38 Joseph is described as ὢν μαθητῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ κεκρυμμένος δὲ διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων. The explicit attribution of the secrecy of Joseph's

---

<sup>142</sup>Köstenberger notes that nighttime fishing was preferred so that the catch could be sold fresh the next morning (*John*, 589). Night fishing was typically a better time to fish on the Sea of Galilee. See Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 1069; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 457; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1227. Carson acknowledges the evidence for night fishing but does not cite any sources (*John*, 670). He suggests the possibility of symbolic significance. Bernard cites Luke 5:5 as evidence for night as the best time for fishing (*Gospel according to St. John*, 695). Also see the discussion of Burge, *John*, 583-84.

<sup>143</sup>Chronological indicators include οὔσης οὖν ὀψίας τῆ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη τῆ μιᾷ σαββάτων (20:19) and μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀκτώ (20:26).

<sup>144</sup>Carson, *John*, 670. Several have noted the relationship between night and day with the catch including Bruns, "Use of Time in the Fourth Gospel," 290. See also David W. Wead, "The Johannine Double Meaning," *ResQ* 13 (1970): 119.

<sup>145</sup>Bernard notes, "Jn. never has πρωΐα in the body of the Gospel, while πρωΐ occurs 18:28, 20:1 (see also on 1:41). Mt. has πρωΐα (Mt. 27:1)" (*Gospel according to St. John*, 695).

<sup>146</sup>Brown views this reminder as evidence of symbolic import (*John I-XII*, 130 n. 25). But Wead argues that it could also be a typical Johannine reminder of historical detail about characters as with Mary in 11:2, Caiaphas in 18:14, and the beloved disciple in 21:20 ("The Johannine Double Meaning," 119).

discipleship to the fear of the Jews seems to serve as a confirmation that Nicodemus's original visit was conducted secretly due to political fear. How one takes τὸ πρῶτον in verse 39 influences whether verse 38 should be taken in this explanatory sense or whether a difference nuance might be intended.

This curious detail is offered again when Judas leaves Jesus and the rest of the disciples to betray Jesus with the simple phrase ἦν δὲ νύξ (13:30). Although some have argued that this is merely an incidental fact, others have argued for understanding it as a double entendre where night reflects spiritual as well as chronological circumstances.<sup>147</sup> Given these uses of the metaphor of night earlier in the narrative, it is significant that the book ends with a supernatural catch of fish in the light of the presence of Jesus.

Another motif related to dwelling is the fulfillment of Ezekiel's promises related to the establishment of the eschatological temple. Given that the previously discussed themes related to Ezekiel 47 are woven into the fishing episode, this chapter in many ways is the culmination of the expectation for the Spirit to flow like a river from the eschatological temple.

The Gospel ends with the physical presence of Jesus with the disciples but anticipating his future return (21:22-23). Although some have argued that it is theologically impossible for the Paraclete to be present if Jesus is present, our study has shown that this requirement goes beyond what the text actually says. Could the presence of Jesus in this chapter not be intended to portend the reality of the presence of Jesus through the Paraclete among those who will believe?

### **Conclusion**

The emphasis in John on glorification as a condition for the giving of the Spirit is not on its temporal aspect or whether it has been completed or its necessity. Rather the

---

<sup>147</sup>Wead comments, "Not only did Judas go out into darkness but also into the control of the powers of darkness condemning himself to eternal darkness" (ibid.).

condition of glorification serves as vehicle for the revelation of Jesus as the giver.

The Johannine pneumatological themes are fulfilled in a way that the reader would expect for the Paraclete to function in his or her life upon their belief in Jesus. Although the functions attributed to the Paraclete in the Farewell Discourse are not emphasized after John 20:19-23, they are not entirely absent. The themes related to the expectation of the Spirit throughout the narrative of John are brought to a thoughtful literary conclusion. The struggle between light and darkness has ended in day. The themes from Ezekiel including the flow of living water which will result in the expansion of life seems to be fulfilled. The Great shepherd from Ezekiel will continue to restore and shepherd his people.

Those who believe in Jesus are able to receive the Spirit-Paraclete from the time Jesus announces his availability in John 20:19. Based on the influence of Ezekiel on John, perhaps a better analogy of describing the activity of the Spirit-Paraclete is the prophesied flow of the river of living water in Ezekiel 47:1-5. The river is now flowing. It might be a trickle but it is flowing.

## CHAPTER 5

### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOHANNINE AND LUKAN PNEUMATOLOGICAL FULFILLMENT

#### Introduction

The previous three chapters have sought to delineate the themes that the author of John develops to create expectation and demonstrate fulfillment of the giving of the Holy Spirit. Another key component of the various positions regarding the fulfillment of Johannine pneumatological expectations is the relationship between the giving of the Spirit on Easter in John 20:22 and the Lukan account of the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost in Acts 2. Carson accuses those who hold the two gift view of sounding “as if they are hostage to Acts 2.”<sup>1</sup> Lyon dismisses the symbolic view “precisely because it is an attempt to understand John’s text within the framework of Acts 2.”<sup>2</sup> Keener argues, “Even if the giving of the Spirit in the tradition behind 20:22 represents merely a symbolic or partial impartation, it must bear in John’s narrative the full theological weight equivalent to Luke’s Pentecost.”<sup>3</sup>

It is not surprising that the pneumatology of Luke-Acts invites a comparison with the Fourth Gospel.<sup>4</sup> Based on the frequency of the use of πνεῦμα alone, the emphasis

---

<sup>1</sup>D. A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 650. Cf. Thomas R. Hatina, “John 20,22 in Its Eschatological Context: Promise or Fulfillment?,” *Bib* 74 (1993): 202-03, who points out Carson’s inconsistency in requiring chronological consistency between John and Luke-Acts regarding the bestowal of the Spirit but not regarding the cleansing of the temple.

<sup>2</sup>Robert W Lyon, “John 20:22, Once More,” *Asbury Theological Journal* 43 (1988): 76.

<sup>3</sup>Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 1199.

<sup>4</sup>On the question of whether the Gospel of Luke and the book of Acts should be considered

on pneumatology in the Lukan narrative is more prominent than either of the other Synoptic Gospels.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the book of Acts contributes a unique window into the role of the Spirit-Paraclete in the life of the early church that stretches beyond the literary horizons of the Fourth Gospel.

Because an attempt to provide a comprehensive Lukan pneumatology would prohibitively lengthen and unnecessarily complicate the argument of this chapter, the discussion of this chapter is restricted to how its themes relate to the fulfillment of the Johannine themes identified in our previous chapters.<sup>6</sup> The limited burden here is to attempt to understand the relationship between how the respective authors create

---

together or separate, see the survey and defense of their unity by I. Howard Marshall, "Acts and the 'Former Treatise'," in *Ancient Literary Setting*, ed. B. W. Winter and A. D. Clarke, *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 1* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 163-82. See also the concerns of Mikeal C. Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context*, JSNTSup 21 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987); Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), and the summaries of Steve Walton, "Acts: Many Questions, Many Answers," in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, ed. Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 236; David G. Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 6-8. This study will consider them together as the work of one author with intended thematic continuity.

<sup>5</sup>Of the 19 Matthean occurrences of the noun πνεῦμα, 4 refer to unclean spirits (8:16; 10:1; 12:43, 45), 3 to the human spirit (5:3; 26:41; 27:50) and 12 are references to the Holy Spirit (1:18, 20; 3:11, 16; 4:1; 10:20; 12:18, 28, 31-32; 22:43; 28:19). Of the 23 Markan occurrences, 14 refer to unclean spirits (1:23, 26, 27; 3:11, 30; 5:2, 8, 13; 6:7; 7:25; 9:17, 20, 25 [2x]), 3 refer to the human spirit (2:8; 8:12; 14:38), and 6 refer to the Holy Spirit (1:8, 10, 12; 3:29; 12:36; 13:11). The noun πνεῦμα occurs 106 times in Luke-Acts: 36 in Luke (Luke 1:15, 17, 35, 41, 47, 67, 80; 2:25-27; 3:16, 22; 4:1, 14, 18, 33, 36; 6:18; 7:21; 8:2, 29, 55; 9:39, 42; 10:20-21; 11:13, 24, 26; 12:10, 12; 13:11; 23:46; 24:37, 39) and 70 in Acts (Acts 1:2, 5, 8, 16; 2:4, 17-18, 33, 38; 4:8, 25, 31; 5:3, 9, 16, 32; 6:3, 5, 10; 7:51, 55, 59; 8:7, 15, 17-19, 29, 39; 9:17, 31; 10:19, 38, 44-45, 47; 11:12, 15-16, 24, 28; 13:2, 4, 9, 52; 15:8, 28; 16:6-7, 16, 18; 17:16; 18:25; 19:2, 6, 12-13, 15-16, 21; 20:22-23, 28; 21:4, 11; 23:8-9; 28:25). The author of Luke-Acts uses πνεῦμα 8 times to refer a human spirit (Luke 1:47, 80; 8:55; 13:11; 23:46; Acts 7:59; 17:16; 18:25); 2 times to an angelic spirit (Acts 23:8, 9); 19 times to a demonic or unclean spirit (Luke 4:33, 36; 6:18; 7:21; 8:2, 29; 9:39, 42; 10:20; 11:24, 26; Acts 5:16; 8:7; 16:16, 18; 19:12, 13, 15, 16); 2 times to a ghost (Luke 24:37, 39); and 1 time to the spirit of Elijah (Luke 1:17).

<sup>6</sup>A full treatment of any of the issues related to Lukan pneumatology could be the subject of individual dissertations. For fuller studies of Lukan pneumatology, see Robert P. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology: Supplement Series 6* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994); Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 9* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, ed., *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); Edward Woods, *The Finger of God and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*, JSNTSup 205 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001); Ju Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, JSNTSup 211 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2004).

pneumatological expectation and demonstrate its fulfillment by exploring the historical, literary and theological connections between Lukan and Johannine development of pneumatological themes.

### **Historical Relationship**

A common assumption of those who hold that John 20:19-23 functions as John's version of Pentecost is that John wrote as though he did not expect his readers to have knowledge of Luke-Acts.<sup>7</sup> Pretlove argues that John purposefully used ambiguous language in 20:19-23 because he was writing for two audiences, readers who were informed about Acts 2 and readers who had no knowledge.<sup>8</sup>

Criticizing the tendency of many to read John 20:22 "with a Gospel harmony in our head, if not in our hands," Bartlett suggests that the endeavor of harmonizing does not appreciate that John "may sometimes mean to modify or correct what his predecessors said."<sup>9</sup> Reading John apart from a preconceived harmony would result in a different interpretation of the giving of the Spirit on Easter. Based on the lack of evidence that either the author of John or Luke-Acts "was aware or making allowance for the other's approach to the question," Brown argues that any attempt to harmonize John and Luke-Acts is "bad methodology."<sup>10</sup> Marsh also cautions against attempts to harmonize

<sup>7</sup>Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 148. Burge is approvingly quoted by Keener (*Gospel of John*, 1200).

<sup>8</sup>John Pretlove, "John 20:22—Help from Dry Bones?," *CTR* 3 (2005): 100-01.

<sup>9</sup>W. Bartlett, "The Coming of the Holy Ghost according to the Fourth Gospel," *ExpTim* 37 (1925): 72.

<sup>10</sup>Raymond E. Brown outlines his view of the relationship between the author's accounts, "We may hold that functionally each is describing the same event; the one gift of the Spirit to his followers by the risen and ascended Lord. The descriptions are different, reflecting the diverse theological interests of the respective authors; but do we not have the same phenomenon of variance among the Gospel descriptions of the same event in Jesus' ministry? In particular, there is no insurmountable obstacle in the fact that John and Acts assign a different date to the gift of the Spirit. As we have acknowledged, John's dating of Jesus' first appearance is artificial, for Galilee has a better claim than Jerusalem to be the original site of this appearance. But there is also much symbolic in Acts' choice of Pentecost, for Luke is using the background of the Sinai covenant motif associated with that feast in his description of the coming of the



John's account with Luke.<sup>11</sup> Likewise, Dunn warns against assuming "that John and Luke-Acts are more or less narrative histories of the same sort, so uniform in their manner of presenting facts and events that they can immediately be dovetailed into each other in a straightforward chronological fashion."<sup>12</sup>

Downplaying the significance of the need to harmonize the two accounts, Cook emphasizes, "More important than the chronological difficulties is the fact that John is in theological harmony with the rest of the New Testament in identifying the gift of the Spirit with the equipping of the church for its mission."<sup>13</sup> Haenchen comments on John 20:22 in language similar to Bultmann, "At this point East and Pentecost fall together."<sup>14</sup> For Haenchen, the author of John sets aside any historical concerns to express his theological point. For Lightfoot, John 20:22 "may be regarded as St. John's counterpart for the scene described in Acts 21-13 at Pentecost."<sup>15</sup>

---

Spirit" (*The Gospel according to John XIII-XXI*, AB, vol. 29A [New York: Doubleday, 1966], 1038-39).

<sup>11</sup>John Marsh states, "It is a vain operation to try to harmonize this account with the report Luke gives in Acts of the Day of Pentecost, or Whitsun. Both authors set the gift of the Spirit in a certain historiographical scheme, and it is to miss the points of their respective narratives to debase them into simple chronological puzzles" (*Saint John*, Westminster Pelican Commentaries [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968], 640).

<sup>12</sup>James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970), 173. For a more positive approach to the possibility of harmonization, see C. F. D. Moule, "The Post-resurrection Appearances in the Light of Festival Pilgrimages," *NTS* 4 (1957): 58-61; Grant R. Osborne, *The Resurrection Narratives: A Redactional Study* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984), 246-51; John Wenham, *Easter Enigma: Are the Resurrection Accounts in Conflict?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 105-09.

<sup>13</sup>James I. Cook, "John 20:19-23, an Exegesis," *RefR* 21 (1967): 9

<sup>14</sup>Ernst Haenchen, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, ed. Robert W. Funk and Ulrich Busse, trans. Robert W. Funk, 2 vols., Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 2:211. For Haenchen, however, this is not because of a remembrance of an older tradition than Luke. He states, "He understood the Easter tradition as a cipher for the coming of the spirit. But in so doing he does not deal adequately with the folk tradition. His picture of the risen one, which suffers from the tension between literalness and what he really intends to say, was painted over in traditional style and thereby becomes quite a puzzle, entirely apart from the victory of the beloved disciple who competes with Peter. Only the one who becomes immersed in the text of the Gospel of John, both lovingly and critically, can still discern the original contours and colors of this painting" (*ibid.*, 2:217).

<sup>15</sup>R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary*, ed. C. F. Evans (London: Oxford

Richardson begins his discussion of the giving of the Spirit at Pentecost with the observation that although “the NT writers agree that the giving of the Holy Spirit was withheld until after the resurrection and exaltation of Christ,” there is “no agreement about the manner and time” of its bestowal.<sup>16</sup> Because the accounts given by John and Luke “differ in every particular except that the event took place in Jerusalem,” we cannot read them “as wholly literal descriptions of ‘what happened’.”<sup>17</sup> Although the Church has historically based its calendar on the Lukan presentation of historical sequence, Richardson argues that John is probably closer to the historical reality and Luke is a theological adaptation based on contemporary rabbinic understandings of the Feast of Pentecost.<sup>18</sup>

Barrett has a low view of the historical reliability of both Luke and John. In his monograph, Barrett remarks concerning the giving of the Spirit, “We cannot be sure when this took place, or if it took place on one occasion only. There may have been two accounts of ‘Pentecost’ preserved in Acts itself.”<sup>19</sup> In his commentary on John, Barrett comments,

It does not seem to possible to harmonize this account of a special bestowing of the Spirit with that contained in Acts 2; after this event there could be no more “waiting” (Luke 24.48f.; Acts 1.4f.); the Church could not be more fully equipped for its mission. The existence of divergent traditions of the constitutive gift of the Spirit is not surprising; it is probable that to the first Christians the resurrection of Jesus and his appearances to them, his exaltation (however that was understood), and the gift of the Spirit, appeared as one experience, which only later came to be described in separate elements and incidents.<sup>20</sup>

---

University Press, 1960), 331.

<sup>16</sup>Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1958), 116.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, 117.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, 117-18. Richardson suggests, “The Lukan scheme would appear to be based upon theological reflection rather than upon historical reminiscence, and it is probable that the Johannine account preserves the more primitive apostolic teaching in this matter” (*ibid.*, 117).

<sup>19</sup>C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1966), 159-60.

Although these comments might suggest that Barrett favored the historical reliability of John over Luke, comments in an earlier article demonstrate his view that John's doctrine of the Spirit was a modification of synoptic eschatology:

It is not correct then that John substitutes his doctrine of the Spirit for the synoptic eschatology. It is nearer to the truth to say that he retains the synoptic eschatology, though in a reduced and modified form, and introduces his doctrine of the Spirit in place of the synoptic realized eschatology.<sup>21</sup>

It is noteworthy that Barrett's resistance to harmonizing the two accounts is more based on his assertion that John's gift of the Spirit precluded waiting for a later gift than on any real demonstration of historical discrepancies based on evidence.

Arguing that John was published by the author's pupils after his death, Hengel states that John "knows the Synoptic Gospels, but views them critically as insufficient, and sees himself as widely distanced from them."<sup>22</sup> Sloyan sees the Lukan account as an later adaptation of the earlier Johannine account. He suggests, "The resurrection of Jesus, his appearances as glorified, and the giving of the gift of Spirit may all have been experienced as unitary in the community's earliest days. The separate stories will then have come later."<sup>23</sup>

Summing up his view of the historicity of the giving of the Spirit to the Johannine and Lukan accounts, Beasley-Murray concludes,

The Fourth Evangelist does not specify the Easter events according to chronology. He could perfectly well have been aware of the Pentecostal tradition and write exactly as he has done. But there is no question of viewing the sending of the Spirit as taking place at Easter *and* at Pentecost. It is one or the other, in view of the nature

---

<sup>20</sup>C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 570.

<sup>21</sup>C. K. Barrett, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 1 (1950): 5. On Johannine eschatology, see C. K. Barrett, "The Place of Eschatology in the Fourth Gospel," *ExpTim* 59 (1947): 302-05.

<sup>22</sup>Martin Hengel, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 384.

<sup>23</sup>Gerard S. Sloyan, *John*, Interpretation (Atlanta: John Knox, 1988), 225.

of each Evangelist's presentation of the event. In the judgment of the present writer, the Lukan narrative in Acts 2 is an authentic account of the coming of the Spirit at the celebration of the giving of the law, when the company of the new covenant received power to proclaim the message of the new covenant in tongues for the whole world to hear, just as the word of the old covenant was so proclaimed amidst flames of fire [emphasis his].<sup>24</sup>

Concerning the veracity of Johannine chronology, Burge argues that the author of John "has disregarded chronology altogether for the sake of theological emphasis."<sup>25</sup>

A weakness of Burge's arguments is his uncritical acceptance of the community theories posited by Cullmann, Käsemann, Schnackenburg, Brown, Martyn, Boismard, and Culpepper.<sup>26</sup> Burge remarks, "We shall urge that the Johannine community was a vital, pneumatic community, but that its pneumatology was entirely christocentric."<sup>27</sup> In my estimation two developments in recent Johannine scholarship have weakened the community theory to a point that it is no longer tenable to assume it as a basis for interpretation.<sup>28</sup> The first development is the continued scholarly comparison of the language and theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the language and theology of the Fourth Gospel.<sup>29</sup> The many parallels between these two corpora have given renewed credibility to the early first century Palestinian provenance of Johannine language. The second development is the increased interest in the role of eyewitnesses in

---

<sup>24</sup>George R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., WBC, vol. 36 (Dallas: Word, 1999), 382.

<sup>25</sup>Burge, *Anointed Community*, 123.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., 44. See also Gary M. Burge, "Situating John's Gospel in History," in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*, ed. Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 35-46.

<sup>27</sup>Burge, *Anointed Community*, 45.

<sup>28</sup>On the collapse of community theories, see D. Moody Smith, "The Contribution of J. Louis Martyn to the Understanding of the Gospel of John," in *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 1-19; Robert Kysar, *Voyages with John: Charting the Fourth Gospel* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005), 237-45.

<sup>29</sup>James H. Charlesworth, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John," in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 65-97.

the writing of the Gospels.<sup>30</sup> While a growing number of scholars are recognizing the weaknesses of the community theory and the strengths of acknowledging the role of an eyewitness in the writing of the Fourth Gospel, recent scholarship has also grown in support of the historical reliability of Luke-Acts.<sup>31</sup>

Assuming that holding the Johannine Pentecost position requires John to not have known about Pentecost, Ladd rejects it because “It is difficult to think that any Christian writing in Ephesus in the first century did not know about Pentecost.”<sup>32</sup>

Blomberg notes, “John undoubtedly knows the traditions of Christ’s ascension and outpouring of the Spirit fifty days after the resurrection (Acts 1-2) and can assume that his audience knows the basic storyline, too.”<sup>33</sup>

The complications surrounding the relationship of the giving of the Spirit in

<sup>30</sup>Kevin J. Vanhoozer, “The Hermeneutics of I-Witness Testimony: John 21.20-24 and the ‘Death’ of the ‘Author’,” in *Understanding Poets and Prophets: Essays in Honour of George Wishart Anderson*, ed. A. Graeme Auld, JSOTSup 152 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995), 366-87; Richard Bauckham, “For Whom Were Gospels Written?,” ed. Richard Bauckham, *The Gospels for all Christians: Rethinking the Gospel audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 9-48; Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 3; Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006); Edward W. Klink III, *The Sheep of the Fold: The Audience and Origin of the Gospel of John*, SNTSMS 141 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Richard Bauckham, “The Fourth Gospel as the Testimony of the Beloved Disciple,” in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 120-39; C. Stephen Evans, “The Historical Reliability of John’s Gospel: From What Perspective Should It Be Assessed?,” in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 91-119. But see also the concerns of Philip Francis Esler, “Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham’s Gospels for All Christians,” *SJT* 51 (1998): 235-48; David C. Sim, “The Gospels for All Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham,” *JSNT* 84 (2001): 3-27; Andrew T. Lincoln, “The Beloved Disciple as Eyewitness and the Fourth Gospel as Witness,” *JSNT* 85 (2002): 3-26; Wendy E. Sproston North, “John for Readers of Mark? A Response to Richard Bauckham’s Proposal,” *JSNT* 25 (2003): 449-68. For an overview of the debate, see Edward W. Klink III, “The Gospel Community Debate: State of the Question,” *CBR* 3 (2004): 60-85.

<sup>31</sup>For studies supporting the historical reliability of Luke-Acts, see W. Ward Gasque, “The Historical Value of Acts,” *TynBul* 40 (1989): 136-57; Colin Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990); John B. Polhill, *Acts*, NAC, vol. 26 (Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 50-52.

<sup>32</sup>George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 325.

<sup>33</sup>Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John’s Gospel: Issues and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001), 266. Ladd poignantly remarks, “It is difficult to think that any Christian writing in Ephesus in the first century did not know about Pentecost” (*Theology*, 325).

John with the giving of the Spirit in Luke-Acts are a reflection of the larger debate concerning the question of literary dependence between the two authors. The relationship between John and the synoptic Gospels has long been a touchpoint of controversy for New Testament scholarship which has yet to reach consensus.<sup>34</sup> Some have argued that the literary evidence shows that John was directly dependent upon Luke.<sup>35</sup> Other argue that John knew and used all of the synoptics.<sup>36</sup> A recent study has made a compelling case that there is more evidence that Luke used John as a literary source.<sup>37</sup>

While definitively demonstrating direct literary dependence has proven elusive, other have tried to explain the relationship between the two authors in other ways. Based on his study of the four dominical sayings in John 13:16; 12:25; 13:20; and 22:23, Dodd concluded that “John is to be regarded as transmitting independently a special form of the common oral tradition, and not as dependent upon the Synoptic Gospels.”<sup>38</sup> Lindars envisioned common sources behind the synoptic and Johannine

---

<sup>34</sup>Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel according to Saint John*, BNTC 4 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 26. For a thorough discussion of the history of this debate, see D. Moody Smith, *John Among the Gospels*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2001). Also see H. F. D. Sparks, “St. John’s Knowledge of Matthew: The Evidence of John 13,16 and 15, 20,” *JTS* 3 (1952): 58-61; F. E. Williams, “Fourth Gospel and Synoptic Tradition: Two Johannine Passages,” *JBL* 86 (1967): 311-19; Robert H. Stein, “The Matthew-Luke Agreements Against Mark: Insight from John,” *CBQ* 54 (1992): 482-502; David Ball, “Some Recent Literature on John: A Review Article,” *Them* 19 (1993): 13-18; Richard Bauckham, “John for the Readers of Mark,” in *The Gospels for All Christians*, ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 147-71.

<sup>35</sup>Manfred Lang, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Ein redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse von John 18-20 vor markinischen und lukanischen Hintergrund*, FRLANT 182 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999). Thomas L. Brodie argues for a direct literary dependence upon Matthew, Mark, Luke-Acts, the Pentateuch, and Paul’s epistle to the Ephesians (*The Quest for the Origin of John’s Gospel: A Source-oriented Approach* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1993], 32-33).

<sup>36</sup>John Henry Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, 2 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929), xcix-xc.

<sup>37</sup>Andrew Gregory, “The Third Gospel? The Relationship of John and Luke Reconsidered,” in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, WUNT 222 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 109-34.

<sup>38</sup>C. H. Dodd, “Some Johannine Herrnworte with Parallels in the Synoptic Gospels,” *NTS* 2 (1955): 86. Also see idem, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 144 n. 1.

accounts of the resurrection.<sup>39</sup> Kümmel suggested that John probably used synoptic material from memory<sup>40</sup>

Regardless of one's position on the literary dependence of the original authors, the fact remains that it is impossible for modern interpreters to read one with no regard for the other. While the Johannine author's knowledge of Luke may be a matter of debate, the modern reader's knowledge of Luke should be fully acknowledged. Even though Burge's exhortation to follow Dunn's advice to "Let John be John" should certainly be heeded at every step in the exegetical process, the difficulty for a modern reader to interpret John without referencing Luke-Acts creates opportunity for exegetical error and overreading.<sup>41</sup> It is easy for modern interpreters to claim a goal of not letting their understanding of Lukan pneumatology shape their approach to interpreting John even as their concerns are driven by their understanding of Luke.

### Literary Relationship

Our survey of the scholarly discussion of the historical connections between Luke-Acts and the Fourth Gospel has shown the lack of consensus due to the complexity of the issue. One problem in determining the literary relationship between John and the Synoptics is that there is evidence of influence both ways.<sup>42</sup> While one should probably not argue for a literary dependence of John on Luke, there is sufficient reason to believe that the two authors shared a common tradition.<sup>43</sup> The evidence for common sources

---

<sup>39</sup>Barnabas Lindars, "The Composition of John 20," *NTS* 7 (1961): 142-47.

<sup>40</sup>Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. Howard Clark Kee, rev. ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), 145.

<sup>41</sup>Max Turner and Gary M. Burge, "The Anointed Community: A Review and Response," *EvQ* 62 (1990): 266. See James D. G. Dunn, "Let John Be John: A Gospel for Its Time," in *The Gospel and the Gospels*, ed. Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 293-322. See also Lyon's insistence that one must not read John through Lukan lenses ("John 20:22," 76).

<sup>42</sup>Blomberg, *John's Gospel*, 53-54. See also Leon Morris, *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 40-63; Carson, *John*, 52-55.

<sup>43</sup>For a detailed defense of the plausibility of a common Christian tradition between John and

based in eyewitness accounts seems to be sufficient to warrant an investigation of both texts for both differences and commonalities that would illuminate the relationship between Johannine and Lukan pneumatological themes.

### **The Use of πνεῦμα in Luke-Acts**

One of the more obvious differences between the Fourth Gospel and Luke-Acts is the discrepancy in the frequency of the use of the noun πνεῦμα. In contrast to the 24 occurrences in the Gospel of John, the noun occurs 36 times in the Gospel of Luke and 70 times in the book of Acts.<sup>44</sup> Besides its more frequent use in Luke-Acts, there are differences in how the Spirit functions as a character in the Lukan narrative.<sup>45</sup>

**The birth of Jesus.** Whereas John more closely resembles Mark by beginning their accounts of Jesus' earthly history with the public launch of his ministry (Mark 1:1-11; John 1:19-34), Luke and Matthew both include birth and childhood narratives (Matt 1:18-2:23; Luke 1:26-2:52). Matthew's two references are simple reminders that Mary's conception of Jesus should be attributed to the supernatural activity of the Spirit rather than to Joseph (Matt 1:18, 20). The Lukan account has multiple scenes related to the birth of Jesus where the Spirit plays a prominent role. The manner of his conception is described to Mary by the angel Gabriel who tells her πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι (Luke 1:35). When Mary and Elizabeth meet for the first time after becoming pregnant with John and Jesus, Elizabeth ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος

---

the synoptic Gospels without direct literary dependence, see Stephen S. Smalley, *John, Evangelist and Interpreter*, New Testament Profiles (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 14-44. Also see Osborne, *Resurrection Narratives*, 246-51. On the historicity of John, see Richard Bauckham, "Historiographical Characteristics of the Gospel of John," in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 93-112.

<sup>44</sup>F. F. Bruce suggests that the book of Acts could legitimately be titled "The Acts of the Holy Spirit" (*The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990], 21-22). John Chrysostom similarly referred to Acts as the "gospel of the Holy Spirit" (Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, BECNT [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007], 23, 36).

<sup>45</sup>As with our study of the Johannine πνεῦμα passages, we will limit our study of the Lukan use of πνεῦμα to those passages that clearly refer to the Holy Spirit.



ἀγίου (Luke 1:41). When Jesus is presented at the temple for ritual purification, it is said of Simeon that πνεῦμα ἦν ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτόν (Luke 2:25), that the fact that he would see the Christ was revealed ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἀγίου (Luke 2:26), and he came to the temple ἐν τῷ πνεύματι (Luke 2:27).

**John the Baptist.** Unique to Luke is the role of the Spirit in relation to the birth of John the Baptist. Before his birth Gabriel tells Zechariah that John πνεύματος ἀγίου πλησθήσεται ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ (Luke 1:15). Upon obeying the command of the angel to name his son John, Zechariah ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἀγίου καὶ ἐπροφήτευσεν (Luke 1:67).

**The ministry of Jesus.** The first texts that are common to both Gospels are the texts related to the ministry of Jesus. Similar to John 1:26-27, 32-33, Luke records John's confession that the ministry of Jesus would be superior to his own by contrasting his baptism with water with the ability of Jesus to baptize ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ πυρί (Luke 3:16). Whereas the Fourth Gospel omits the actual baptism of Jesus and makes the reader's knowledge of the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus dependent upon the witness of John the Baptist, the narrator of Luke records καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶς εἶδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν (Luke 3:22).

One aspect of the relationship between Christology and pneumatology in Luke is the way in which Luke depicts the active role of the Holy Spirit in the ministry of Jesus. Immediately following his baptism, Jesus is said to be πλήρης πνεύματος ἀγίου and ἦγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil (Luke 4:1).<sup>46</sup> Upon successfully resisting his temptation, Jesus returned to Galilee ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος (Luke 4:14). Teaching in the synagogue there, Jesus proclaims that the prophecy of Isaiah 61:1-2 that πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμὲ is being fulfilled in his ministry

---

<sup>46</sup>Bernard thinks that Jesus was probably tempted before he was identified by the Baptist in John 1:29-34 (*Gospel according to St. John*, 43).

(Luke 4:18).

In his sermon to the household of Cornelius, the apostle Peter reflects upon the role of the Spirit in the earthly ministry of Jesus. Peter says that God ἔχρισεν Jesus of Nazareth πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει (Acts 10:38). Although the word πνεῦμα is not used in Luke 11:20, the phrase “the finger of God” is most likely a reference to the Holy Spirit.<sup>47</sup>

**The teaching of Jesus.** In the Gospel of John, the Spirit relates to the teaching of Jesus in two ways. First, there are the explicit statements about the Spirit by Jesus (John 3:5-8; 34; 6:63; 14:16-17, 25-26; 15:26-27; 16:5-15). Second, there is the relationship between the Spirit and the words of Jesus (John 3:34; 6:63). In contrast, the Spirit is only mentioned in relation to the teaching of Jesus four times in Luke. First, upon the return of the seventy-two disciples from their ministry, Jesus rejoiced [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ as he taught them about their spiritual authority (Luke 10:21).<sup>48</sup> Second, Jesus teaches that the Father δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον to those who ask (Luke 11:13).<sup>49</sup> Third, blasphemy εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα will not be forgiven (Luke 12:10). Finally, his disciples should not worry about what to say when called upon to witness before earthly authorities because τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει them what to say (Luke 12:12).

The role of the Spirit in teaching ministry of Jesus is also highlighted in the book of Acts. The prologue to Acts describes the teaching ministry of Jesus for the forty days between the resurrection and the ascension (Acts 1:1-3). Jesus gave commands to

---

<sup>47</sup>Cf. Matt 12:28. See Woods, *The Finger of God and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*, 246-47.

<sup>48</sup>Concerning the preposition ἐν, Bruce Manning Metzger notes, “Since the Septuagint frequently construes ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι with a preposition (ἐν or ἐπί), the Committee decided to retain the ἐν but, in view of its absence from such witnesses as P75 A B C W Δ Θ Ψ f f 28 565 700 al, to enclose it within square brackets” (*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition a Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (London: United Bible Societies, 1994), 128).

<sup>49</sup>Cf. John 14:16-17; 15:16.

the Apostles διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου until his ascension (1:2). Jesus' actual teaching about the Spirit is recorded three times. First, Jesus recounts the anticipation of John the Baptist that ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἁγίῳ in his instruction for them to stay in Jerusalem until they receive that promise (Acts 1:5). He restates this promise again when he tells them λήμψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς which would result in their becoming witnesses (Acts 1:8). Finally, Peter reflects on the teaching of Jesus echoing John the Baptist as the basis for believing that the Holy Spirit was given to Cornelius's household (Acts 11:16).

**The death of Jesus.** At the time of Jesus' death, Luke records that he said εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου (Luke 23:46). The presence of the possessive pronoun identifies the referent of τὸ πνεῦμά μου as the human spirit of Jesus and removes any potential ambiguity regarding whether one should take it as pneumatological or anthropological. Although there is no fulfillment formula accompanying this statement, it is an exact quote of Psalm 31:5 (30:6). As we have already noted in our discussion of John 19:30 in chapter 4 of this study, there are lexical connections with John's use of παραδίδωμι and Isaiah 53:12. Similarly some Lukan scholars have discerned the influence of Isaiah 53:12 in Luke's use of Psalm 31:5.<sup>50</sup>

**The resurrection of Jesus.** Another significant difference between the Johannine and Lukan narratives is that Luke does not directly mention the Spirit in his account of the resurrection.<sup>51</sup> The two occurrences of the word πνεῦμα in Luke 24 are references to the disciples thinking that they were seeing a ghost when the risen Jesus appeared to them (24:37, 39).

---

<sup>50</sup>Suggesting that David's reference to himself as doulos and dikaios (Pss 31:16, 18) echoes Isa 53:12, David W. Pao and Eckhard J. Schnabel refer to the quotation of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37 "as the hermeneutical key of the passion narrative" ("Luke," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007], 399).

<sup>51</sup>See previous discussion of John 20:19-23 in chap. 4 of this study.

**Pentecost and the ongoing work of the Spirit.** One of the most obvious distinctions between the Fourth Gospel and Luke-Acts is that the author of Luke recorded the ongoing work of the Spirit in the life of the early church immediately following the resurrection and ascension of Jesus. While the frequency of πνεῦμα passages is greater in Acts than in Luke, there are several parallels between the activity of the Spirit in the life and ministry of Jesus and in the ministry of the first leaders of the church. The outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost is clearly anticipated at the end of Luke's Gospel in the promise of Jesus to his disciples that he would send τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς which includes their being clothed ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν (Luke 24:49). That this promise refers to the Holy Spirit is clarified in the recounting of this scene at the beginning of Acts where Jesus equates this promise with the baptism of the Spirit (Acts 1:4-5). He also explains that the power they are to receive will occur ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς (Acts 1:8). The activity of the Spirit marks the reception of the Spirit as the promise of Acts 1:8 is fulfilled through the expansion of the Gospel geographically to Jerusalem (2:1-41), Judea and Samaria (8:1-40) and the end of the earth (10:1-11:30; 19:1-6).<sup>52</sup>

The Spirit also plays a role in the ministries of the leaders of the church in fulfillment of the promise of Joel 2:28-32 that the Spirit would be poured out on all flesh resulting in a new season of prophecy (Acts 2:17-18). The activity of the Spirit is emphasized in the ministries of Peter (Acts 4:8; 10:19; 10:44; 10:45; 11:12), Stephen (Acts 6:5, 10), Philip (Acts 8:29, 39), Barnabas (Acts 13:2, 4), Paul (Acts 13:2, 4), and Agabus (Acts 11:28). The role of the Spirit in the teaching ministry of Jesus and the early Christians is also echoed in the the Lukan attribution of the inspiration of Scripture to the Spirit (Acts 1:16; 4:25; 28:25).

---

<sup>52</sup>On the expansion of the Gospel in the narrative of Acts, see Brian S. Rosner, "The Progress of the Word," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 215-33.

As in the Gospel of John, Luke uses the verbs δίδωμι (Acts 5:32; 8:18; 15:8) and λαμβάνω (Acts 2:33, 38; 8:15, 17, 19; 10:47; 19:2) to describe the giving and reception of the Spirit.<sup>53</sup> Additionally, the author uses other verbs to describe the way in which people experience the Spirit including ἐκχέω (Acts 2:17, 18) and ἐκχύνω (Acts 10:45) meaning ‘poured out’, ἐπιπίπτω (Acts 10:44; 11:15) meaning ‘fell’, ἐπέρχομαι (Luke 1:35; Acts 1:8), and the verb ἔρχομαι with the prepositional phrase ἐπ’ αὐτούς (Acts 19:6) meaning ‘come upon them’. The verbs πληρόω (Acts 13:52) and πίμπλημι (Luke 1:15, 41, 67; Acts 2:4; 4:8, 31; 9:17; 13:9) and the noun πλήρης (Luke 4:1; Acts 6:3, 5; 7:55; 11:24) are also used to describe the filling of the Spirit.<sup>54</sup>

### Key Lukan Concepts in John

The previous survey of the use of πνεῦμα in Luke-Acts demonstrates that there are differences between the Johannine and Lukan presentations of the Spirit. Another line of evidence that suggests the possibility of a shared tradition is the language associated with the Holy Spirit that John has in common with Luke but only uses once in his Gospel.<sup>55</sup> The most significant examples of this literary phenomenon include the baptism

---

<sup>53</sup>Max Turner, “The Concept of Receiving the Spirit in John’s Gospel,” *VE* 10 (1977): 25. While Turner’s distinction between various nuances concerning this phrase is helpful, his examples from Luke 3:21ff and Acts 2:33 are not. The word λαμβάνω does not occur in Luke 3 and its use in Acts 2:33 is not equivalent to the other uses in John or Acts since it refers to Jesus receiving the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father. The only occurrence of the verb λαμβάνω with πνεῦμα in the Gospel of Luke is a reference to an unclean πνεῦμα that seizes a boy (9:39). In Acts they occur in 8 verses which all refer to the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:8; 2:33, 38; 8:15, 17, 19; 10:47; 19:2).

<sup>54</sup>James Merrill Hamilton Jr., “Rushing Wind and Organ Music: Toward Luke’s Theology of the Spirit in Acts,” *RTR* 65 (2006): 15-33.

<sup>55</sup>Lincoln asserts, “The difference between the language of the Johannine Jesus and that of the Synoptic Jesus, on the one hand, and the similarity between the language of the Johannine Jesus and that of the Johannine epistles, on the other, confirm that, when Jesus speaks in this Gospel’s narrative, he speaks the characteristic language of the evangelist and his community” (*The Gospel according to Saint John*, 148). But others have noted the similarities between Johannine idioms and the contemporary language represented in the Dead Sea Scrolls. See James H. Charlesworth, “A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1Qs iii,13-iv,26 and the ‘Dualism’ Contained in the Fourth Gospel,” *NTS* 15 (1969): 389-418; idem, “Reinterpreting John: How the Dead Sea Scrolls Have Revolutionized Our Understanding of the Gospel of John,” *BibRev* 9 (1993): 19-25, 54; J. C. O’Neill, *Who Did Jesus Think He Was?*, Biblical Interpretation Series 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1995); Charlesworth, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John,” 65-97. There are also several key Johannine words and phrases that are not as prominent in Luke-Acts. See

of the Spirit, the kingdom of God, and the gift of God.

**The baptism of the Spirit.** One of these examples is John's use of baptism language in regard to the Holy Spirit. As we have seen, John introduces many of his pneumatological themes at the baptism of Jesus. In both John and Luke, John the Baptist contrasts his ministry of baptism with water with Jesus' ministry of baptism with the Holy Spirit (Luke 3:16; John 1:33). One of the striking differences between John and Luke, however, is that while Luke uses baptism language to speak of the outpouring at Pentecost (Acts 1:4-5), this language is conspicuously missing from any of the fulfillment passages in John.<sup>56</sup>

**The kingdom of God.** The connection of the necessity of being born ἄνωθεν with seeing τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ in John 3:3 and being born of water and Spirit with entering it in 3:5 raises an exegetical question regarding the significance of this phrase to the author of John. Although the theological importance of the phrase to the Johannine narrative is apparent since the goal of being born again is related to the kingdom of God, it is striking that this phrase is not mentioned again in the entire Johannine narrative. The importance of the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ for the Lukan narrative is evidenced by its frequent occurrence throughout Luke-Acts.<sup>57</sup>

**ἡ δωρεά τοῦ θεοῦ.** Another parallel in word usage between John and Luke is their use of δωρεά. This word, a hapax legomenon in John, is used by Jesus in his offer of

---

Bernard, *Gospel according to St. John*, cviii-cxxi; Dodd, "Some Johannine Herrnworte with Parallels in the Synoptic Gospels," 75-86. For example, the word ζωή occurs 13 times in Luke-Acts (Luke 10:25; 12:15; 16:25; 18:18, 30; Acts 2:28; 3:15; 5:20; 8:33; 11:18; 13:46, 48; 17:25) while variations of the phrase ζωὴ αἰώνιος only occur 5 times (Luke 10:25; 18:18, 30; Acts 13:46, 48).

<sup>56</sup>See James D. G. Dunn, "Baptized' as Metaphor," in *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R. E. O. White*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, JSNTSup 171 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 294-310.

<sup>57</sup>The phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ occurs 38 times in 37 verses (Luke 4:43; 6:20; 7:28; 8:1, 10; 9:2, 11, 27, 60, 62; 10:9, 11; 11:20; 13:18, 20, 28-29; 14:15; 16:16; 17:20-21; 18:16-17, 24-25, 29; 19:11; 21:31; 22:16, 18; 23:51; Acts 1:3; 8:12; 14:22; 19:8; 28:23, 31).

living water to the Samaritan woman (John 4:10). As Dunn has observed, the connection of δωρεά with “the living water,” the parallel with the Spirit and springs of living water in 7:38-39, and the association of ἄλλομαι with the work of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament strongly implies that it refers to the Holy Spirit.<sup>58</sup> Luke uses this term exclusively as a reference to the Holy Spirit throughout the narrative of Acts (2:38; 8:20; 10:45; 11:17). Dunn concludes that the use of the phrase ἡ δωρεά τοῦ θεοῦ by both John and Luke suggests that it was a “standard expression” in the early Church for the Holy Spirit.<sup>59</sup>

### **Theological Relationship**

Our study of the literary connections between the Gospel of John and Luke-Acts has focused on the differences in their use of respective words and phrases to describe the activity of the Spirit. This section will compare the role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts with the Johannine pneumatological themes of revelation, witness, mission, empowerment, life, and dwelling as well as the conditions for the giving of the Spirit.

#### **The Theme of Revelation**

Several elements of Lukan pneumatology correspond to the Johannine theme of revelation. This section will examine revelatory motifs of the inspiration of Scripture, the fulfillment of Scripture, the pre-Pentecost activity of the Spirit-Paraclete, and the post-Pentecost activity of the Spirit-Paraclete.

**The inspiration of Scripture.** In addition to the explicit quotation of Scripture in relation to the Spirit, the author of Luke-Acts often attributes the inspiration of Scripture to the Holy Spirit. Peter quotes two Psalms that he says that the Holy Spirit

---

<sup>58</sup>James D. G. Dunn, “Δωρεά as the Gift of the Holy Spirit,” in *Pneumatology*, vol. 2 of *The Christ and the Spirit: Collected essays of James D. G. Dunn* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 207.

<sup>59</sup>*Ibid.*, 209.

spoke through the mouth of David (Acts 1:16; 4:25).<sup>60</sup> Paul expresses his agreement with Isaiah 6:9-10 which he says τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησεν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου (Acts 28:25-27).

**The fulfillment of Scripture.** The author of Luke explicitly quotes two Old Testament texts as fulfilled by the activity of the Spirit. First, Jesus claims that the language in Isaiah 61:1-2 about the results of the anointing of the Spirit of the Lord was being fulfilled in his ministry (Luke 4:18-19). Second, Peter points to the prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit in Joel 2:28-32 as being fulfilled in the activity of the Spirit at Pentecost (Acts 2:16-21).

The term for the Spirit in Jesus' commission at the end of the Gospel of Luke is ἡ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ πατρὸς μου (24:49). Conceptually this promise could refer to several Old Testament texts that look forward to a future giving of the Spirit including Isaiah 32:15; 44:3; Ezekiel 39:29; and Joel 2:28.<sup>61</sup> Lexically, however, the strongest connections suggest that the author has Isaiah 32:15 and Joel 2:28 in mind. That the promise entails being clothed with power ἐξ ὕψους echoes the language of Isaiah 32:15 where the Spirit comes ἀφ' ὕψιλοῦ.<sup>62</sup> The influence of Joel 2:28-32 (3:1-5 LXX) on the language of promise is strengthened by its quotation in Peter's sermon in Acts 2:17-21 as an explanation for the outpouring of Pentecost. Strengthening this observation is the use of ἐπαγγελία again at the end of the sermon as a reference to the Spirit and salvation (2:38-39).<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup>The inspiration of Pss 69:25 (68:26) and 109:8 (108:8) in Acts 1:20 is made clear by the phrase προεἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ (Acts 1:16). See I. Howard Marshall, "Acts," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 529. The inspiration of Ps 2:1-2 is highlighted by the phrase ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ παιδός σου εἰπών (Acts 4:25-26).

<sup>61</sup>Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 402.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.

<sup>63</sup>Robert P. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 171.



A prominent feature of the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost is the use of Joel 2:28-32 (3:1-5 LXX) by Peter in Acts 2:17-21 to describe its significance as a fulfillment of Old Testament promises. The paucity of references to Joel and the preeminence of allusions to Isaiah and Ezekiel in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel might tempt one to emphasize the differences between the gifts of the Spirit in John 20 and Acts 2.<sup>64</sup> Regarding the role of Ezekiel in the Lukan narrative, Turner comments, “Luke does not spell out his pneumatology, like Paul, in terms of the fulfillment of Ezekiel 36, and new creation but in terms of Joel 3.1-5 (EVV 2.28-32).”<sup>65</sup> However, a closer look at the context of this passage in Joel reveals strong connections with the Old Testament passages that influenced the pneumatology of John.

In light of the recognition throughout this dissertation regarding the influence of Ezekiel on Johannine pneumatology, it is necessary to investigate the possible connections between the Lukan outpouring at Pentecost and the Spirit prophecies of Ezekiel.<sup>66</sup> In his study on the role of the temple in biblical theology, Beale has highlighted several aspects of this connection.<sup>67</sup> Beale states, “The fact that several Old

---

<sup>64</sup>Although Gary T. Manning Jr. sees a potential allusion to Joel 3:18 (4:18 LXX) in John 7:38 based on the lexical cohesion provided by the verb ῥέω and the noun ὕδωρ (*The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*, JSNTSup 270 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2004), 178). See also Keener, *Gospel of John*, 724.

<sup>65</sup>Turner, *Power from on High*, 352.

<sup>66</sup>On the potential influence of Ezekiel on Luke, Joseph A. Fitzmyer remarks, “Though Luke never appeals to a passage like Ezek 36:26, which promises a ‘new spirit’ to be put within Israel, he seems to be thinking along these lines” (*The Gospel according to Luke I-IX: Introduction, Translation and Notes*, AB, vol. 28 [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981], 229). Also see Hamilton, “Rushing Wind and Organ Music,” 19. On the influence of Isaiah in Acts, see David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, Biblical Studies Library (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002).

<sup>67</sup>Beale’s work on the temple in Acts was originally included as chap. 6 in G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, ed. D. A. Carson, NSBT 17 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004). He significantly expanded his investigation in two subsequent articles (G. K. Beale, “The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 1: The Clearest Evidence,” *TynBul* 56, no. 1 [2005]: 73-102; G. K. Beale, “The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 2: Corroborating Evidence,” *TynBul* 56, no. 2 [2005]: 63-90).

Testament texts prophesy that the end-time theophanic presence will be revealed to God's people in a new expanded non-architectural temple enhances our view that this is just what Acts 2 portrays as beginning (see Isa. 4:2-6; 30:27-30; Jer. 3:16-17; Zech. 1:16-2:13; cf. Ezek. 40-46 and Sib. Or. 5:414-432).<sup>68</sup> One allusion to Ezekiel 10:3-4; 43:5; 44:3 is the language in Acts 2:2 where God's presence fills the house.<sup>69</sup> In addition to this allusion to Ezekiel in the text of Acts, a study by John Strazicich has shown that Joel 2:28-32 (3:1-5 LXX) also contains several allusions to Ezekiel.<sup>70</sup>

In an article that is primarily concerned with demonstrating against Dodd that John's pneumatology is more influenced by Old Testament themes than Hellenistic thought, Walt Russell emphasizes the continuity between Lukan and Johannine motifs based on their common indebtedness to Old Testament categories. Russell describes his view of the relationship between Luke and John,

While John uses more intimate and personal language, both he and Luke nevertheless speak consistently of the Holy Spirit in the terminology of OT eschatology. This common backdrop results in a Lukan and Johannine sharing of at least two themes: that the giving of the Spirit inaugurates a new age centered in Messiah and his eschatological program, and that the Spirit empowers believers to engage in a "prophetic" and universal ministry of proclaiming the gospel.<sup>71</sup>

An appreciation of the common influence of the Old Testament on both authors suggests more continuity between the Johannine and Lukan gifts of the Spirit than is sometimes recognized.

**Jesus as the giver of the Spirit.** A pneumatological motif of the Johannine theme of revelation is that the identity of Jesus is revealed in his role as the giver of the

---

<sup>68</sup>"Clearest Evidence," 75.

<sup>69</sup>Beale, "Corroborating Evidence," 64.

<sup>70</sup>John Strazicich, *Joel's Use of Scripture and the Scripture's Use of Joel: Appropriation and Resignification in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, Biblical Interpretation Series 82 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2007), 205-53.

<sup>71</sup>Walt Russell, "The Holy Spirit's Ministry in the Fourth Gospel," *GTJ* 8 (1987): 149-50.

Spirit-Paraclete (John 1:33; 3:34-35; 4:10; 7:37-39; 15:26; 20:22). Similarly Luke portrays Jesus as having a unique role both in possessing and giving the Spirit. As in John, the verb *δίδωμι* is used to designate God as the ultimate giver of the Spirit (Luke 11:13; Acts 5:32; 15:8). Another similarity to the Johannine motif is the superiority of Jesus to John the Baptist as the one who is able to baptize in the Spirit (Luke 3:16; Acts 1:5). The uniqueness of the relationship of the Spirit to Jesus is emphasized through the exclusive use of the verb *χρίω* to describe his anointing (Luke 4:18; Acts 4:27; 10:38). Similar to John 15:26 where the verb *πέμπω* is used in the first person to describe Jesus' promise to send the Paraclete, the verb *ἀποστέλλω* is used in the first person in Luke 24:49 in his promise to send the Spirit. Perhaps the clearest depiction of Jesus as the giver of the Spirit is Acts 2:33 where Jesus is said to have received (*λαμβάνω*) τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου and to have poured him out (*ἐκχέω*).<sup>72</sup>

**The Spirit as the Spirit of Jesus.** In the Fourth Gospel, the Spirit-Paraclete is called another Paraclete which implies a close continuity with the person and ministry of Jesus. This continuity is also implied and explicitly stated in Luke-Acts. This relationship between Jesus and the Spirit is implied in a possible allusion to the ministries of Elijah and Elisha in Acts 1:10. Marshall notes, “The fact that the disciples saw Jesus going up corresponds to the way in which Elisha saw Elijah ascending and thereby was assured that he would receive a double portion of his spirit (2 Kings 2:9–12).”<sup>73</sup> A more explicit connection between the Spirit and Jesus is found later in the narrative of Acts where the Holy Spirit is referred to as the Spirit of Jesus (Acts 16:6-7).

---

<sup>72</sup>The pattern of Jesus receiving the Spirit and giving the Spirit in 2:32-36 resembles established pattern of Son receiving and giving in John. Peterson points out the trinitarian implications of this verse (*John*, 60).

<sup>73</sup>Marshall, “Acts,” 528. On the echoes of the Elisha narratives in the Fourth Gospel, see Edward W. Klink III, “What Concern Is That to You and to Me? John 2:1-11 and the Elisha Narratives,” *Neot* 39 (2005): 273-87.

**Pre-Pentecost activity of the Spirit-Paraclete.** Some who reject that the Spirit-Paraclete could have been given in John 20:22 point to the apparent lack of activity in the rest of John that could be attributed to the Spirit-Paraclete as evidence that the Spirit could not have been given before Pentecost. However, a careful consideration of the activity of the Spirit between the resurrection and Pentecost shows a continuity that could be interpreted as a real work of the Spirit during this unique time in salvation history.

All of the themes that are fulfilled in the Johannine account are represented in Luke 24:45-49. Carson states, “John 20:22 is the acted equivalent not of Acts 2.1ff. but of Luke 24.45-9.”<sup>74</sup> But he then argues, “This ‘giving’ of the Spirit is not a gift different from the one in Acts, nor a sort of private proleptic downpayment, but an acted parable pointing ahead.” While I agree that John 20:22 is not the equivalent of Acts 2:1ff., I disagree that John 20:22 or Luke 24:45-49 should be considered a mere parable.<sup>75</sup> The theme of inward revelation is present in Luke 24:45 when Jesus διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup>D. A. Carson, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility: Biblical Perspectives in Tension*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 143. Also Augustus Tholuck, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*, trans. Charles P. Krauth (Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co, 1859), 416; Turner, “Receiving the Spirit in John’s Gospel,” 29; F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 396-97; Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 1987), 167-68; Marianne Meye Thompson, “The Breath of Life: John 20:22-23 Once More,” in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 77. Turner cites Porsch for details, but notes the alternative view of MacDonald, who argues that 20:22 parallels Luke 24:44-46 (Turner, “Receiving the Spirit in John’s Gospel,” 29; Felix Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums* [Frankfurt: Knecht, 1974], 354f; William Graham MacDonald, “Problems of Pneumatology in Christology: The Relationship of Christ and the Holy Spirit in Biblical Theology” [Th.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1970], 242-69).

<sup>75</sup>John Calvin seems to believe this when he comments, “The Spirit was given to the apostles now in such a way that they were only sprinkled with His grace and not saturated with full power. For when the Spirit appeared on them in tongues of fire, they were entirely renewed. And He did not appoint them to be heralds of His Gospel so as to send them forth immediately to the work, but ordered them to wait quietly, as we read elsewhere (Luke 24.49)” (*The Gospel according to St John 11-21 and the First Epistle of John*, trans. T. H. L. Parker, Calvin’s Commentaries [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961], 205).

<sup>76</sup>Ignace de la Potterie, “Parole et Esprit dans s Jean,” in *L’Évangile de Jean: Sources*,

The verb *διανοίγω* is the same word used in 24:31, 33 where the disciples eyes were opened to recognize the identity of the risen Jesus as well as to understand the Scriptures as explained by Jesus.<sup>77</sup> This new understanding is a contrast to the earlier inability of the disciples to understand Jesus' pre-resurrection explanation of his impending suffering and resurrection as the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies (Luke 9:44-45; 18:31-34).<sup>78</sup>

Scholars disagree over what the exact cause of this opening of the minds of the disciples. Plummer comments, "It was by the gift of the Spirit that their minds were open to understand."<sup>79</sup> Bock dismisses Plummer's interpretation by merely stating,

It is responding to Jesus in belief that enlightens. The Spirit is not given here, as Plummer argues (see Luke 24:49 and Acts 2). What is given is understanding and insight into God's plan. Since these disciples have witnessed God's plan and now understand it, they are commissioned to proclaim it.<sup>80</sup>

Fitzmyer also disagrees with Plummer when he says,

Nothing is said about how this "opening" takes place; *pace* A. Plummer, it is not yet done through the Spirit, because that is not yet given in the Lucan story. If anything, the scene seems to suggest that it is faith in the risen Christ himself that is the key.<sup>81</sup>

Neither of these arguments against Plummer's assertion satisfactorily answer what has changed that now helps the disciples understand or have faith. Litwak is more helpful when he suggests that "something 'new' must be brought into the exegetical method of

---

*Rédaction, Théologie*, ed. M. de Jonge, BETL 44 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), 197; Ignace de la Potterie, *The Hour of Jesus: The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus according to John* (New York: Alba House, 1989), 177-78.

<sup>77</sup>The verb *διανοίγω* occurs 8 times in the NT, 7 of which are in Luke-Acts (Mark 7:34; Luke 2:23; 24:31-32, 45; Acts 7:56; 16:14; 17:3).

<sup>78</sup>Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*, ICC (London: T&T Clark, 1896): 562; Robert H. Stein, *Luke*, NAC, vol. 24 (Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 620; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 1937.

<sup>79</sup>Plummer, *Gospel according to St. Luke*, 562.

<sup>80</sup>Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1938.

<sup>81</sup>Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV: Introduction, Translation and Notes*, AB, vol. 28A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 1583.

the disciples to read Scripture in a new way, and the only new thing in the text is Jesus' recent experience."<sup>82</sup> While it is true that the reality of the suffering and resurrection of the Messiah is certainly critical to the disciples new grasp of the Scriptures, the Lukan use of the verb *διανοίγω* seems to suggest the possibility of divine action. A similar construction occurs in Acts 16:14 where *ὁ κύριος διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν* of Lydia to pay attention to Paul.

Another activity of the Spirit-Paraclete before Pentecost is the instruction of Jesus given *διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου* before he ascended (Acts 1:2).<sup>83</sup> Although some have taken this phrase to modify *ἐκλέγομαι* instead of *ἐντέλλω*, Fitzmyer rightly rejects that rendering because it “unduly forces the flow of the Greek text, and there is no mention of the Spirit in the choice of the apostles in Luke 6:12–13.”<sup>84</sup> I disagree, however, with Fitzmyer's assertion that “Luke does not tell us how the Spirit ‘instructed’ the apostles, but that is something that we learn as we read between the lines of the developing story in Acts.” Because it is clear that Jesus is one teaching through the Holy Spirit, it seems best to look back to the example of his teaching in Luke 24:49 which is recounted in Acts 1:8 than forward to the developing story.<sup>85</sup> Based on our previous discussion of Jesus opening the disciples mind to understand his teaching on the Scripture, it seems most natural to take that as the most natural referent for this statement. In his commentary on Acts, Bruce cites John 20:22 as an example of one of the occasions to which Luke is referring in Acts 1:2. Bruce states, “In the Johannine account of the commission laid on his disciples by the risen Christ, he indicated the power by which they were to carry out their commission

---

<sup>82</sup>Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts. Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*, JSNTSup 282 (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 119.

<sup>83</sup>J. Ramsey Michaels, *John: A Good News Commentary*, NIBC (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989), 349.

<sup>84</sup>Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB, vol. 31 (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 196. Also see C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), 69.

<sup>85</sup>So *ibid.*

when he ‘breathed into them’ and said, ‘Receive the Holy Spirit’ (John 20:22).”<sup>86</sup>

One aspect of Lukan pneumatology that needs to be considered in the context of the pre-Pentecost activity of the Spirit-Paraclete is the relationship between faith and empirical evidence. As previously discussed in chapter four of this study, the role of the Spirit in the faith of Thomas is sometimes downplayed because he insists on seeing and touching the resurrected body of Jesus. Besides the arguments already given for the authenticity of Thomas’s faith as Johannine faith, it should also be noted that there is room in Lukan pneumatology for a similar interplay between the revelatory work of the Spirit and a witness that is based on empirical proof of the bodily resurrection of Jesus. When the risen Jesus appears to the disciples in Luke 24, he invites them to look at him and touch him to prove to themselves that he is not an incorporeal spirit (24:39-40).<sup>87</sup> During his forty days of ministering to the disciples before his ascension, Jesus demonstrated the reality of his resurrection ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις (Acts 1:3).

In addition, if we take seriously that John and Luke share a common tradition, John should inform our understanding of Luke as much as Luke should inform our understanding of John. Guthrie takes the shared tradition seriously enough to comment, “It may not unjustly be claimed that the Paraclete sayings in John provide the key for the right understanding of the Spirit’s activity in Acts.”<sup>88</sup>

**Post-Pentecost activity of the Spirit-Paraclete.** A less controversial observation is that the functions attributed to the Johannine Spirit-Paraclete are discernible in the Lukan narrative after Pentecost. In addition to the aforementioned

---

<sup>86</sup>F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 31.

<sup>87</sup>Cf. John 20:27.

<sup>88</sup>Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1981), 530.

examples of the Spirit's role in inspiring Scripture that is fulfilled by his ministry, the Spirit is depicted as communicating both directly and through individuals.

The Johannine expectation that the Spirit-Paraclete will teach believers is also present in the Lukan narrative (John 14:26). Jesus promises his disciples that the Holy Spirit διδάξει them what they should say when they are brought before the authorities to defend themselves (Luke 12:12). The Spirit tells Philip to go and talk to the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8:29).<sup>89</sup> The Spirit tells Peter that men are looking for him (Acts 10:19). Peter recounts the Spirit's role in telling him to go with the men to visit Cornelius (Acts 11:12). The Spirit tells the leadership at Antioch to set apart Barnabas and Paul for missionary work (Acts 13:2). Agabus foretells a future famine διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος (Acts 11:28) and reports what the Holy Spirit says to Paul concerning his impending capture in Jerusalem (Acts 21:11). The disciples at Tyre also warned Paul διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος about his fate in Jerusalem (Acts 21:4).

Another possible parallel between the Johannine Paraclete and the Spirit in Acts is apparent in the use of ὁδηγέω to describe the Ethiopian eunuch's need for Philip to explain the meaning of Isaiah 53:7b-8 in Acts 8:31. Although this revelatory function is not directly attributed to the Spirit, it does reflect the purpose of the Spirit's activity in directing Philip to minister to the eunuch.<sup>90</sup>

### **The Theme of Witness**

The theme of witness is emphasized as a Lukan pneumatological theme through the use of the nouns μαρτυρία and μάρτυς and the verb μαρτυρέω.<sup>91</sup> The

---

<sup>89</sup>A more subtle connection between Acts 8:26-35 and John 16:13 is the Ethiopian's need for someone to guide him regarding the interpretation of Isa 53:7b-8.

<sup>90</sup>That Philip was carried away by πνεῦμα κυρίου in 8:39 echoes similar activity of the Spirit with Elijah (1 Kgs 18:12; 2 Kgs 2:16) and Ezekiel (Ezek 3:14). So Marshall, "Acts," 575.

<sup>91</sup>The noun μαρτυρία occurs 14 times in the Gospel of John (John 1:7, 19; 3:11, 32-33; 5:31-32, 34, 36; 8:13-14, 17; 19:35; 21:24) and 2 times in Luke-Acts (Luke 22:71; Acts 22:18). Luke prefers μάρτυς which occurs 15 times (Luke 11:48; 24:48; Acts 1:8, 22; 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 6:13; 7:58; 10:39, 41; 13:31; 22:15, 20; 26:16) and 35 times in NT but not in John. The verb μαρτυρέω occurs 12 times in Luke-



prominence of this theme is evidenced by the use of these words at the end of Luke and at the beginning of Acts (Luke 24:46-49; Acts 1:8).<sup>92</sup> The role of the Spirit in the effectiveness of the apostolic witness is first anticipated in the teaching of Jesus. When Jesus instructs the disciples on how they should defend themselves before the authorities, he tells them that the Holy Spirit will teach them what to say (Luke 12:12).<sup>93</sup>

Additionally, as in the Fourth Gospel, the Spirit himself acts as a witness in Luke-Acts.<sup>94</sup> When the apostles are tried before the Sanhedrin, Peter tells them that not only are they witness of the suffering and exaltation of Jesus but so is the Holy Spirit (Acts 5:32). The externality of the Spirit's witness can be seen in gift of tongues that is used in the narrative to validate the faith of each people group through an observable experience with the Spirit (Acts 2:1-4). When the Samaritans received the Spirit, Simon the Sorcerer must have observed some sort of external phenomenon that made him want to have that power (Acts 8:18-19). The relationship of an external witness to the believer's reception of the Spirit is clearly seen in Acts 10:44-47 where the Spirit falls (ἐπιπίπτω) and is poured out (ἐκχύνω) as evidence that the believing Gentiles had received (λαμβάνω) the Spirit.

There is a debate on whether the concept of witness reflects a technical designation that should be limited to the apostles,<sup>95</sup> but the ministry of Philip in Acts 8 shows that the Spirit is the primary actor regarding witness. While the presence of Peter and John at the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Samaritan believers emphasizes the importance of the apostolic witness (8:14-17), the role of the Spirit in the ministry of

---

Acts (Luke 4:22; Acts 6:3; 10:22, 43; 13:22; 14:3; 15:8; 16:2; 22:5, 12; 23:11; 26:5).

<sup>92</sup>Concerning his suffering and resurrection, Jesus tells the disciples, ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων (Luke 24:48). Upon a future outpouring of the Spirit Jesus promises them, ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες (Acts 1:8).

<sup>93</sup>John 14:26.

<sup>94</sup>John 1:29-34; 15:26-27.

<sup>95</sup>Peterson, *Acts of the Apostles*, 79-83.

Phillip shows that Spirit empowered witness is not limited to the Twelve (8:29, 39).

When Peter recounts the experience of witnessing the Spirit falling upon the Gentile believers (ἐπιπίπτω), he equates their experience with the initial experience at Pentecost and relates both outpouring to the baptism of the Spirit (Acts 11:15-16).

Another aspect of the theme of witness that Luke and John have in common is their dependence upon eyewitness accounts as a claim for the truthfulness of their narrative (Luke 1:1-4; John 19:35; 21:24).<sup>96</sup> Although it is impossible to prove or disprove, who is to say that the Beloved Disciple or at least one or more of his disciples could have been one of the eyewitnesses to whom Luke refers?

### **The Theme of Mission**

As in the Fourth Gospel, the themes of mission and witness “are integrally related” in Luke-Acts.<sup>97</sup> The theme of mission is developed through the motif of sending using cognates of the verbs ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω.<sup>98</sup> The verb ἀποστέλλω is used to describe the mission of Gabriel to Zechariah and Mary in the birth narratives (Luke 1:19, 26), Jesus (Luke 4:18, 43; 9:48; 10:16; Acts 3:20, 26), John the Baptist (Luke 7:27), the apostles (Luke 9:48; 11:49), the seventy-two (Luke 10:1, 3), prophets (Luke 11:49; 13:34), the Spirit (Luke 24:29), Moses (Acts 7:34, 35), Ananias (Acts 9:17), Cornelius’s

---

<sup>96</sup>James H. Charlesworth, *The Beloved Disciple: Whose Witness Validates the Gospel of John?* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995); Richard Bauckham, “The Beloved Disciple as Ideal Author,” in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 73-91.

<sup>97</sup>Peter Bolt, “Mission and Witness,” in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 195. On the significance of the theme of mission to Luke-Acts, see Andreas J. Köstenberger and Peter T. O’Brien, *Salvation to the Ends of the Earth: A Biblical Theology of Mission*, NSBT 11 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001), 111, 157.

<sup>98</sup>The verb ἀποστέλλω occurs 50 times in 49 verses in Luke-Acts (Luke 1:19, 26; 4:18, 43; 7:3, 20, 27; 9:2, 48, 52; 10:1, 3, 16; 11:49; 13:34; 14:17, 32; 19:14, 29, 32; 20:10, 20; 22:8, 35; 24:49; Acts 3:20, 26; 5:21; 7:14, 34-35; 8:14; 9:17, 38; 10:8, 17, 20, 36; 11:11, 13, 30; 13:15; 15:27, 33; 16:35-36; 19:22; 26:17; 28:28); ἐξαποστέλλω occurs 10 times (Luke 1:53; 20:10-11; Acts 7:12; 9:30; 11:22; 12:11; 13:26; 17:14; 22:21); πέμπω occurs 21 times (Luke 4:26; 7:6, 10, 19; 15:15; 16:24, 27; 20:11-13; Acts 10:5, 32-33; 11:29; 15:22, 25; 19:31; 20:17; 23:30; 25:25, 27); ἐκπέμπω occurs twice (Acts 13:4; 17:10).

men (Acts 10:20), and Paul (Acts 26:17). The mission of Paul to the Gentiles is also described by ἐξαποστέλλω (Acts 22:21). The verb πέμπω is only used in conjunction with the divine mission of Elijah (Luke 4:26), while ἐκπέμπω describes the sending of Paul and Barnabas by the Holy Spirit (Acts 13:4).<sup>99</sup> Similar to the Johannine motif of sending, there does not seem to be any significant exegetical difference between the Lukan use of these words.

Three aspects of the relationship of the Spirit to this mission motif highlight its importance to Lukan pneumatology. First, the mission of Jesus is introduced through the use of ἀποστέλλω in the context of a quotation from Isaiah 61:1-2 regarding the Spirit's role in messianic ministry (Luke 4:18-19). Second, the mission of the Spirit is emphasized by the use of ἀποστέλλω in the promise of Jesus that he would send the Spirit at the end of the Gospel of Luke (24:49).<sup>100</sup> Third, the role of the Spirit is emphasized in the sending of Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey from Antioch (Acts 13:4).

### **The Theme of Empowerment**

The pneumatological theme of empowerment is more prominent in Luke-Acts than in the Fourth Gospel. Whereas the Johannine narrative leaves the concept of the baptism of the Spirit unexplained beyond its introduction by John the Baptist (John 1:33), its significance in Luke is explained by its fulfillment in Acts. As in John, Luke uses the comparison between John the Baptist as one who baptizes with water and Jesus as one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit as a means of expressing the superiority of Jesus (Luke 3:16). This language is not used again in the narrative until Jesus equates the promised outpouring of the Holy Spirit with the baptism of the Spirit to which John the Baptist

---

<sup>99</sup>Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 495. Polhill points out that τὸ ἔργον functions in Acts 13:2 and 14:26 as an "inclusion" to bracket the entire mission (*Acts*, 290).

<sup>100</sup>Bock notes, "This sending of the Spirit is another link between the end of Luke and the beginning of Acts" (*Acts*, 7).

referred (Acts 1:5). In this way, the Lukan narrative clearly equates the baptism of the Spirit with the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost. As Hamilton points out, the fact that the only other occurrence of the concept of the baptism of the Spirit in Acts is a remembrance of Jesus' words by Peter (Acts 11:16) could mean "that he regards it as a unique experience."<sup>101</sup> However it should be noted that the reason Peter is citing Jesus' words regarding the baptism of the Spirit is to equate the reality of the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentile believers in the household of Cornelius with the apostolic outpouring at Pentecost.

A verb that is used consistently in the context of empowerment is *πίμπλημι*, Luke's most used verb to describe the filling of the Spirit. This verb is used to describe the filling of John the Baptist in the womb (Luke 1:15). Elizabeth is filled with the Spirit and speaks a word of prophecy (Luke 1:41). Zacharias is filled and prophesies (Luke 1:67). The believers at Pentecost are filled and speak in tongues (Acts 2:4).<sup>102</sup> Peter is filled and preaches to the rulers of Israel (Acts 4:8). After the apostles prayed in response to the threats of the Sanhedrin, they were filled and spoke with boldness (Acts 4:31). Upon Paul's filling, he regains his sight (Acts 9:17) and rebukes Elymas the magician (13:8-10). Another verbal construction that seems to be primarily used in contexts signifying the theme of empowerment is *ἔρχομαι* with the preposition *ἐπί*. The compound form is used in Acts 1:8 when Jesus promises the disciples will receive power *ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*.<sup>103</sup> It is also used to describe the confirming activity of the Spirit with the disciples of John at the hands of Paul in Acts 19:6 (*ἔρχομαι ἐπ' αὐτούς*). The use of this construction along with the comparison to John's baptism and the external

---

<sup>101</sup>Hamilton, "Rushing Wind and Organ Music," 18.

<sup>102</sup>The referent of *πάντες* could either be limited to Matthias and the eleven apostles in 1:26 or could include the undesignated number of women, Mary mother of Jesus, the brothers of Jesus, and others numbering around 120 in 1:13-15.

<sup>103</sup>This compound form is also used in Luke 1:35 to describe the Spirit's role in the conception of Jesus.

witness of tongues and prophesy are probably designed to echo Pentecost as a way of validating the apostleship of Paul.

Another Lukan expectation for pneumatological empowerment is created when Jesus tells his disciples ἐνδύσθητε ἐξ ὑψους δύναμιν (Luke 24:49). There are at least two lexical echoes from Septuagint texts regarding the Spirit in this promise.<sup>104</sup> First, the verb ἐνδύω is used in several Old Testament contexts including the empowerment of Gideon (Judg 6:34) and Azariah (2 Chr 24:20).<sup>105</sup> Second, the preposition phrase ἐξ ὑψους i Luke 24:49 echoes the similar phrase ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ in Isaiah 32:15.<sup>106</sup>

### **The Theme of Life**

The relationship between pneumatology and soteriology in Luke-Acts is a matter of some debate. Menzies declares, “The soteriological dimension is entirely absent from the pneumatology of Luke.”<sup>107</sup> Although the pneumatological elements of the theme of life are more explicit in the Fourth Gospel than the Lukan narrative, there are two aspects of Luke’s presentation that highlight the Spirit’s role in salvation.

First, Peter’s instructions at Pentecost to those who heard his sermon connect the forgiveness of sins with the gift of the Spirit (Acts 2:38). The Lukan motif of forgiveness of sin is fairly prominent. Of the nineteen occurrences of the noun ἁμαρτία in Luke-Acts, every instance is in the context of forgiveness (Luke 1:77; 3:3; 5:20, 21, 23, 24; 7:47, 48, 49; 11:4; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 3:19; 5:31; 7:60; 10:43; 13:38; 22:16; 26:18).<sup>108</sup>

The second evidence of a pneumatological aspect of salvation is the external

<sup>104</sup>Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture*, 144-45.

<sup>105</sup>Litwak points out that Azariah’s empowerment included speaking the Word of the Lord (ibid., 144).

<sup>106</sup>Pao and Schnabel, “Luke,” 402.

<sup>107</sup>Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 256.

<sup>108</sup>Luke’s preferred word for forgiveness is the noun ἄφεσις (Luke 1:77; 3:3; 4:18; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43; 13:38; 26:18) and the verb ἀφίημι (Luke 5:20–21, 23–24; 7:47–49; 11:4).

witness provided by the Spirit to the authentic faith of new groups as the Gospel spreads geographically and ethnically. When Peter delivers his report of the Spirit's activity confirming the faith of the Gentiles, the other apostles responded by acknowledge that God had granted the Gentiles τὴν μετάνοιαν εἰς ζωὴν (Acts 11:18).

### **The Theme of Dwelling**

The pneumatological motifs related to the theme of dwelling are developed in Luke-Acts through the relationship of the Spirit to the believer and the temple. First, the noun πλήρης and the verb πληρόω are used to describe an aspect of the filling of the Spirit that emphasizes the indwelling of the believer.<sup>109</sup> The first use of πλήρης in Luke describes the filling of Jesus in contrast to the use of πίμπλημι to describe the fillings of those in the narrative before him (Luke 4:1). Also in contrast to the use of πίμπλημι to describe empowerment, πλήρης is used to describe fillings that result in internal states more than action. The first deacons are full of the Spirit and wisdom (Acts 6:3). Stephen is full of faith and the Holy Spirit (Acts 6:5). Stephen is full of the Holy Spirit when he is able to see the heavenly scene of Jesus standing at God's right hand (Acts 7:55). Barnabas is full of the Holy Spirit and faith (Acts 11:24). The verb πληρόω is used to describe how the disciples were filled with joy and the Holy Spirit (Acts 13:52).

Another motif related to the Lukan theme of dwelling is relationship of the presence of God to the temple. While Pentecost probably occurred at the temple, the presence of God expands beyond the physical temple in Jerusalem.<sup>110</sup> The use of λειτουργέω in Acts 13:2 to describe the worship of the believers at Antioch when the Spirit called Paul and Barnabas is revealing. The verb λειτουργέω is used in the Greek Old Testament to describe the service of priests in the tabernacle and the temple.<sup>111</sup> The

---

<sup>109</sup>Hamilton, "Rushing Wind and Organ Music," 25-29.

<sup>110</sup>Beale, "Corroborating Evidence," 65.

<sup>111</sup>Polhill, *Acts*, 290; Barrett, *Acts of the Apostles*, 604; Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 582. Examples include Exod 28:35, 43; 29:30; 30:20; 35:19; Num 1:50; 3:6, 31; 4:3, 9, 12, 14, 23-24, 26, 30,

only other occurrence of this cognate in Luke-Acts is the noun λειτουργία which describes the temple service of Zachariah in Luke 1:23.

### **The Conditions for the Giving of the Spirit**

Another difference between Johannine and Lukan pneumatology is the stark contrast between how each author builds expectation for the giving of the Spirit through the establishment of certain conditions. Our study of the Fourth Gospel showed that the author of John established the conditions of the exaltation and glorification of Jesus in the coming hour through his departure.

In contrast to the careful creation of pneumatological expectation developed in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel, the author places relatively little emphasis on creating conditions in the narrative of the Gospel of Luke. Jesus creates the expectation that the Father will give the Spirit to those who ask (Luke 11:13) and the help of the Spirit is promised to those who will be persecuted (Luke 12:12).<sup>112</sup> The key term before Pentecost for the giving of the Spirit is ἐπαγγελία (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4; 2:33, 39).

While some place a good deal of exegetical weight on the role of the ascension in John, our study showed that the narrative does not clearly set it forth as a requirement for the giving of the Spirit.<sup>113</sup> In contrast to John, the Lukan ascension is witnessed by the

---

35, 37, 39, 41, 43; 8:22, 26; 16:9; 18:2, 6–7, 21, 23; Deut 10:8; 17:12; 18:5, 7; 1 Sam 2:11, 18; 3:1; 1 Kgs 1:11; 2 Kgs 25:14; 1 Chr 6:32; 15:2; 16:4, 37; 23:13, 28, 32; 26:12; 2 Chr 5:14; 8:14; 11:14; 13:10; 23:6; 29:11; 31:2; 35:3; Neh 10:36; Joel 1:9, 13; 2:17; Jer 52:18; Ezek 40:46; 42:14; 43:19; 44:11–12, 15–17, 19, 27; 45:4–5; 46:24.

<sup>112</sup>Graham H. Twelftree's contention that Luke 11:13 should be understood to mean that the Spirit is given in Acts to those who are devout in prayer generally rather than as a gift given to those who specifically ask for the gift seems forced ("Prayer and the Coming of the Spirit in Acts," *ExpTim* 117 (2006): 271–76). Luke seems to suggest that the Spirit is given when people respond positively to the offer of salvation and the promise of the Spirit (Acts 2:16–21, 38–41). Would prayer not be included in Peter's instructions for people to repent in order to receive forgiveness and the Spirit?

<sup>113</sup>Carson argues, "If Jesus finally returned to the Father only once (upon which the gift of the Spirit depends), what warrant is there for thinking the Spirit was bestowed twice?" (*John*, 650). Dunn remarks, "John presents as a unitary conceptual whole the Son of Man's redemptive acts in dying, rising, ascending and giving the Spirit. The decisive act of salvation is not complete until the Son of Man has

disciples in Luke 24:50-53 and Acts 1:9-11 and explained in Peter's sermon in 2:32-36.<sup>114</sup> Jesus' ascension into heaven provides a clear division in Luke-Acts based on before and after Jesus was taken up. Barrett aptly states, "The Ascension plays such an important part at the end of the gospel and at the beginning of Acts that it seems probable that Luke would refer to it as the dividing line separating the first volume from the second."<sup>115</sup>

While there is a clearer relationship of the ascension to the giving of the Spirit in Luke-Acts, the author does not seem to make the ascension a requirement for the outpouring of the Spirit.<sup>116</sup> The giving of the Spirit serves as a witness to the ascension of Jesus and his place at the right hand of the Father but it is not as clear that this should be considered some sort of condition.

### Conclusion

Our study of the relationship between Johannine and Lukan pneumatology has revealed a complex interdependence that should not be simplified in such a way that favors one account over the other. Rather than seeing alternate traditions competing against one another, it is better to see both books in light of their stated purpose. While there are some important differences, both authors seem to be aware of the emphases of the other.

This complex relationship might be best understood as a difference in the purpose of each author. Indeed their given purpose statements reflect those differences.

---

ascended and bestowed the Spirit" (*Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 174).

<sup>114</sup>διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (Luke 24:51); ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὗς ἐξελέξατο ἀνελήμφθη (Acts 1:2). The verb ἀναλαμβάνω occurs 13 times in 13 verses (Mark 16:19; Acts 1:2, 11, 22; 7:43; 10:16; 20:13–14; 23:31; Eph 6:13, 16; 1 Tim 3:16; 2 Tim 4:11).

<sup>115</sup>Barrett, *Acts of the Apostles*, 68.

<sup>116</sup>Carson states, "Luke himself, of course, connects the gift of the Spirit with the exaltation of Christ (Acts 2:32–33); John's theological structure demands that he move the gift of the Spirit back from Pentecost to Easter, implicitly 'including the story of the Ascension in the Easter narrative' (Beasley-Murray, p. 382, emphasis his)" (*John*, 651).



While Luke seeks to provide an accurate account of the historical events surrounding both Jesus and the early church (Luke 1:1-4), John is concerned to present only the events that are necessary for the reader to believe in Jesus (John 20:30-31). Both authors establish the veracity of the historicity of their accounts on the testimony of eyewitnesses. Thus, while both should be considered theological and historical, Luke certainly seems to be more phenomenological in his description of how the Spirit was experienced than John.

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSION

This study has sought to delineate the pneumatological themes that the author of John develops to create expectation and demonstrate fulfillment of the gift of the Holy Spirit. The primary question asked in this investigation has focused on the extent to which Johannine pneumatological expectation can be said to have been fulfilled within the narrative of the Fourth Gospel. A common expression of this question has been debated in terms of the relationship of the Johannine gift on Easter in John 20:19-23 to the Lukan outpouring on Pentecost in Acts 2. While numerous scholars have contributed articles or chapters in broader studies to this issue, this dissertation is the first monograph length investigation of this issue.

Previous discussions of this issue have often been clearly committed to one of three broad positions regarding the relationship between Easter and Pentecost. The first proposal is that the scene in John 20 serves as an alternate Johannine version of the Lukan Pentecost. Some who hold this view offer either historical or theological arguments for the historicity of one account at the expense of the other. Others deemphasize the historical implications but argue that the Johannine narrative demands a full giving of the Spirit within the literary horizons of book itself. A second position is the Symbolic View which seeks to uphold the historicity of both accounts by positing that the Easter gift is merely anticipatory of the fuller outpouring at Pentecost. The third perspective is sometimes called the Two Gift View. While this position represents a variety of proposals concerning the exact relationship between the two gifts, proponents

generally argue that both gifts are real gifts of the Spirit.

The approach of this study has been to examine the development of pneumatological expectation in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel through an exegetical analysis of its πνεῦμα and παράκλητος passages. This analysis has yielded several pneumatological themes as well as a number of conditions for the giving of the Spirit. In addition to identifying the themes related to the expectation of the gift of the Spirit, this study has also examined the texts related to the fulfillment of those themes to determine the extent to which it can be said the Spirit is given within the narrative of the Fourth Gospel. Having identified the themes related to Johannine expectation and fulfillment, their relationship to Lukan pneumatological themes has also been examined.

### **Johannine Expectation of the Giving of the Spirit**

The centrality of the themes of revelation, witness, mission, dwelling and life is clearly demonstrated in the way they are intricately woven into the tapestry of the Fourth Gospel. These themes of expectation are connected in such a way that it is impossible to separate them from one another.

### **The Theme of Revelation**

The revelation of God in Jesus is a central theme woven through every section of the Fourth Gospel utilizing a variety of motifs. Verbs of knowing are used to contrast the inferiority of the earthly knowledge of sinful humans with the superiority of the revelatory knowledge of Jesus. This motif of knowing is central to the encounters of Jesus with John the Baptist (1:29-34), Nicodemus (3:5-8), and the woman at the well (4:4-30).

The motif of Scripture fulfillment is a major element of the theme of revelation. While the pericope with John the Baptist has several allusions to Isaiah 52:13-53:12, Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus is pregnant with allusions to Ezekiel 36:25-27 and 37:1-14. The encounter of Jesus with the Samaritan woman at the well

draws on an even broader selection of Old Testament allusions but especially reflects an allusion to eschatological temple in Ezekiel 47:1-12. These allusions reach their climax in the invitation of Jesus in John 7:37-39.

Another aspect of the theme of revelation highlighted especially in the dialogue with Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman is the motif of misunderstanding. The tendency of characters to misunderstand the true meaning of what Jesus is saying creates a sense of need in the narrative for a helper to assist those who believe in Jesus.

The relationship of the theme of revelation to the Spirit-Paraclete becomes explicit in the παράκλητος passages in several ways. First, the Paraclete is called the Spirit of truth (14:17; 15:26; 16:13). Second, the Spirit-Paraclete will teach the disciples and help them remember the teachings of Jesus (14:26; 16:13).

### **The Theme of Witness**

The theme of witness is highlighted by its prominence in the first πνεῦμα passage about the witness of John the Baptist to Jesus (1:29-34). The use of words related to witness are prominent throughout the narrative. The motif of receiving and rejection are also woven throughout the narrative as part of the theme of witness.

The Spirit himself functions as a witness to the identity of Jesus for John the Baptist. The expectation of the Spirit-Paraclete both to empower Jesus' disciples to witness as well as function as a witness himself is developed in the παράκλητος passages (15:26-27; 16:7-11).

### **The Theme of Mission**

Closely related to the theme of witness, the theme of mission is primarily developed in John through the interchangeable verbs of sending. God has sent Jesus. Jesus sends the Spirit to those who believe. The disciples of Jesus are sent to witness.

### **The Theme of Dwelling**

The theme of dwelling is multifaceted in the Fourth Gospel. The dwelling of the Spirit with Jesus is emphasized in the witness of John the Baptist that the Spirit descended from heaven and remained on him (1:33). That the dwelling of the Spirit would expand beyond the physical confines of a temple is part of the revelation of Jesus to the Samaritan woman (4:21-24). Jesus alludes both to the permanence and the indwelling of the Spirit in his offer of water that would well up in her unto eternal life (4:14). This connection of living water to indwelling is strengthened by the language of thirst and living water in 7:37-39.

### **The Theme of Life**

The relationship of the Spirit to the theme of life is introduced in Jesus' explanation to Nicodemus of the necessity of being born of the Spirit (3:5-8). Life is also the result of receiving living water to satisfy the thirst of human spiritual need (4:4-30; 7:37-39). The theme of life is also explicitly connected to the Spirit as τὸ ζῶοποιεῖν in John 6:63.

### **The Theme of Empowerment**

The theme of empowerment is developed in the Fourth Gospel primarily in the direct statements found in the παράκλητος passages. Jesus tells the disciples that it is an advantage to them for him to depart and send the Spirit-Paraclete because he will empower their witness (15:26-27; 16:7-11). He also indicates that they will be better equipped to receive all that he wants them to know with the help of the Spirit (16:12-13).

### **The Conditions for the Giving of the Spirit**

We also found that John creates an expectation for several conditions to be met before the Spirit is given. In the πνεῦμα passages, the conditions of exaltation, the coming hour, and glorification are developed. The theme of exaltation is found in the

context of the conversation with Nicodemus as Jesus explains his role in making the new birth possible. In an allusion to the deliverance of the children of Israel through the lifting of the bronze serpent by Moses, Jesus says that Son of Man must be lifted up (3:14). The key word related to this condition is ὑψώω. The condition of the coming hour is developed in the πνεῦμα passage related to the conversation with the Samaritan woman (4:23-24). The most explicit condition for the giving of the Spirit is the necessity of Jesus' glorification that is developed in John 7:39. The full meaning of glorification is further developed in the fulfillment texts in John 12. The παράκλητος passages introduce the expectation for the conditions of departure and asking.

### **Johannine Fulfillment of the Giving of the Spirit**

Our study of the fulfillment texts focused on how the conditions for the Spirit that were developed in πνεῦμα and παράκλητος passages are shown to be fulfilled. The relationship between the three conditions emphasized in the πνεῦμα passages is made clear in John 12:20-50. Jesus clearly states that the hour has come and ties it to both his glorification (12:23) and his exaltation (12:32). These two concepts are drawn together in this passage through the echoes of Isaiah 52:13. The conditions of the coming hour and glorification are further alluded to throughout the remainder of the fulfillment passages.

Another condition that is often debated in relation to the Johannine giving of the Spirit is the relationship of the ascension to the glorification of Jesus. While there is some debate regarding the exact timing of the ascension in John, it seems even less clear that the ascension itself is necessarily a requirement for the giving of the Spirit. Our exegesis of the crucifixion, the resurrection, and the fishing scenes suggests that the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 52:13 has been glorified and the Spirit is now flowing from the eschatological temple of Ezekiel 47.

The Spirit is fully given within the literary and theological framework of the Fourth Gospel. The author has created the expectation that the Spirit that was active both

in creation and the history of Israel has now been given in fulfillment primarily of the prophecies of Isaiah and Ezekiel. The pneumatological themes of the Fourth Gospel are fulfilled within the literary horizons of the book itself in order to fulfill the stated purpose of the book.

### **The Relationship of Easter to Pentecost**

A reader of the Fourth Gospel who is well versed in the Old Testament can read John apart from Luke-Acts and fully expect to receive the Spirit-Paraclete upon believing in Jesus. For the reader of the Fourth Gospel who is seeking to understand it in light of Luke-Acts, there is enough evidence that both accounts reflect the theological depth of minds saturated by Old Testament themes as well as the historical detail expected by the reports of eyewitnesses.

Perhaps the designation of the Fourth Gospel as theological and Luke-Acts as historical has some value if appropriately nuanced. While the historicity of the Fourth Gospel should be appreciated, the language related to the giving of the Spirit seems to be focused on showing its theological significance as the fulfillment of the promises of the Old Testament. This emphasis explains why the primary pneumatological metaphor is built on the verbs δίδωμι and λαμβάνω. The main burden of John seems to be to show that indeed the expected gift of the Spirit has been given. All that is necessary to describe the human response to this gift is that it can be received by those who believe.

While the Lukan account is no less theological than the Fourth Gospel, it does seem to offer a more phenomenological account of the how the Spirit was experienced by the early Christian community. This difference should be expected based on the stated purposes of both books.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983 and 1985.
- Elliger, K., and W. Rudolf, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977, 1997.
- Epstein, I., ed. *Hebrew - English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud: Sanhedrin*. Translated by Jacob Shachter and H. Freedman. London: Soncino, 1969.
- García Martínez, Florentino. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Nestle, Eberhard, Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27<sup>th</sup> ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven: Yale, 1988.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta, Id est Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- Schneemelcher, Wilhelm. *New Testament Apocrypha*. 2 vols. Translated and edited by R. McL. Wilson. Rev. ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991, 1992.

### Secondary Sources

#### Books

- Ashton, John. *The Interpretation of John*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Bailey, John Amedee. *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*. Novum Testamentum Supplement Series 7. Leiden: Brill, 1963.



- Ball, David Mark. *'I Am' in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 124. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. London: SPCK, 1966.
- Barry, John D. *The Resurrected Servant in Isaiah*. Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2010.
- Bauer, Walter. *Das Johannesevangelium*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 6. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Siebeck), 1933.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Bauckham, Richard, and Carl Mosser, eds. *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Bauer, Walter. *Das Johannesevangelium*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 6. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Siebeck), 1933.
- Beale, G. K. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. Edited by D. A. Carson. New Studies in Biblical Theology 17. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. *Baptism in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Gospel of Life: Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 36. Dallas: Word, 1999.
- Bennema, Cornelis. *The Power of Saving Wisdom: An Investigation of Spirit and Wisdom in Relation to the Soteriology of the Fourth Gospel*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.148. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

- Bernard, John Henry. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929.
- Bésobrasoff, Cassien. *Pentecôte johannique (Jn 20, 19-23)*. Valence-sur-Rhône: Imprimeries Reunies, 1939.
- Betz, Otto. *Der Paraklet: Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannes-Evangelium und in neu gefundenen*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums 2. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel: Issues and Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 1987.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Acts*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 1:1-9:50*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 9:51-24:53*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.
- Boers, Hendrikus. *Neither on This Mountain Nor in Jerusalem: A Study in John 4*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 35. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Bonney, William. *Caused to Believe: The Doubting Thomas Story at the Climax of John's Christological Narrative*. Biblical Interpretation Series 62. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Borchert, Gerald L. *John 12-21*. The New American Commentary, vol. 25B. Nashville: Broadman Press, 2002.
- Borgen, Peder. *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John*. Novum Testamentum Supplement Series 10. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Breck, John. *The Origins of Johannine Pneumatology*. Vol. 1 of *Spirit of Truth: The Holy Spirit in Johannine Tradition*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991.
- Brodie, Thomas L. *The Gospel according to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-oriented Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

- Brouwer, Wayne. *The Literary Development of John 13-17: A Chiastic Reading*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 182. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel according to John I-XII: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. Anchor Bible, vol. 29. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel according to John XII-XXI: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. Anchor Bible, vol. 29A. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*. Edited by Francis J. Moloney. New York: Doubleday, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *An Introduction to New Testament Christology*. New York: Paulist Press, 1994.
- Brown, Tricia Gates. *Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-Scientific Perspective*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 253. London: T. & T. Clark, 2003.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of the Acts*. Rev. ed. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- Burge, Gary M. *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John*. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.
- Calvin, John. *The Gospel according to St John 11-21 and the First Epistle of John*. Translated by T. H. L. Parker. Calvin's Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.
- Carson, D. A. *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility: Biblical Perspectives in Tension*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel according to John*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Casey, Maurice. *Is John's Gospel True?* London: Routledge, 1996.
- Casurella, Anthony. *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers: A Study in the History of Exegesis*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- Charlesworth, James H. *The Beloved Disciple: Whose Witness Validates the Gospel of John?* Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus within Judaism: New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries*. London: SPCK, 1988.
- Chevallier, Max-Alain. *Souffle de Dieu: Le Saint-Esprit dans le Nouveau Testament*. 3 vols. L'apôtre Paul, Les écrits johanniques, L'héritage paulinien, Réflexions finales 2. Paris: Beauchesne, 1990.
- Clarkson, John F., ed. and trans. *The Church Teaches: Documents of the Church in English Translation*. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1961.
- Coloe, Mary L. *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel*. Colleagueville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Crown, Alan David. *The Samaritans*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Daly-Denton, Margaret. *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the Psalms*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 47. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000.
- Davies, Margaret. *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 69. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Day, Janeth Norfleete. *The Woman at the Well: Interpretation of John 4:1-42 in Retrospect and Prospect*. Biblical Interpretation Series 61. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- de Jonge, Marinus. *Christology in Context: The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *God's Final Envoy: Early Christology and Jesus' Own View of His Mission*. Studying the Historical Jesus. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God: Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective*. Edited by John E. Steely. Translated by John E. Steely. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- de la Potterie, Ignace. *The Hour of Jesus: The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus according to John*. New York: Alba House, 1989.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Background of the Fourth Gospel*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1953.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus Remembered*. Vol. 1 of *Christianity in the Making*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Durrwell, F. X. *Holy Spirit of God: An Essay in Biblical Theology*. London: Chapman, 1986.
- Ellis, Peter F. *The Genius of John: A Composition-critical Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Collegetown, MN: Liturgical Press, 1984.
- Erwin, Howard M. *Conversion-initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Critique of James D. G. Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Spirit-Baptism: A Biblical Investigation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987.
- Evans, Craig A. *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 89. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Evans, Craig A., and William Richard Stegner, eds. *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Vol. 104 of *Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible, vol. 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. Anchor Bible, vol. 28. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. Anchor Bible, vol. 28A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- Fortna, Robert T., and Tom Thatcher, eds. *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Franck, Eskil. *Revelation Taught: The Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 14. [Lund]: CWK Gleerup, 1985.
- Freed, E. D. *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*. Novum Testamentum Supplement Series 11. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Fuller, R. H. *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*. New York: Macmillan, 1971.
- Gench, Frances Taylor. *Back to the Well: Women's Encounters with Jesus in the Gospels*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004.
- Glasson, T. F. *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*. Studies in Biblical Theology 40. London: SCM, 1963.
- Greer, Rowan A. *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Exegete and Theologian*. London: Faith Press, 1961.
- Grelot, Pierre. *The Language of Symbolism: Biblical Theology, Semantics, and Exegesis*. Translated by Christopher R. Smith. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006.
- Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Introduction*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1981.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Edited by Robert W. Funk and Ulrich Busse. Translated by Robert W. Funk. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Hamid-Khani, Saeed. *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: A Theological Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

- Hamilton, James Merrill, Jr. *God's Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old & New Testaments*. Edited by E. Ray Clendenen. New American Commentary Studies in Bible & Theology. Nashville: B & H Academic, 2006.
- Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991.
- Harner, Philip B. *The "I Am" of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Johannine Usage and Thought*. Edited by John Reumann. Facet Books Biblical Series 26. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970.
- Harstine, Stan. *Moses as a Character in the Fourth Gospel: A Study of Ancient Reading Techniques*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 229. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002.
- Harvey, Anthony E. *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel*. London: SPCK, 1976.
- Hawthorne, Gerald F. *The Presence and the Power: The Significance of the Holy Spirit in the Life and Ministry of Jesus*. Dallas: Word, 1991.
- Heil, J. P. *Blood and Water: The Death and Resurrection of Jesus in John 18-21*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 27. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1995.
- Heitmüller, Wilhelm. *Das Johannes-Evangelium*. Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1918.
- Hemer, Colin. *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Johannine Question*. London: SCM Press, 1989.
- Heron, I. C. *The Holy Spirit: The Holy Spirit in the Bible, the History of Christian Thought, and Recent Theology*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983.
- Hoegen-Rohls, Christina. *Der nachösterliche Johannes: Die Abschiedsreden als hermeneutischer Schlüssel zum vierten Evangelium*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.84. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Holwerda, David Earl. *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John: A Critique of Rudolf Bultmann's Present Eschatology*. Kampen: Kok, 1959.
- Hoskins, Paul M. *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*. Paternoster Biblical and Theological Monographs. 2006.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn Clement. *The Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Francis Noel Davey. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Faber and Faber, 1947.

- Hur, Ju. *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 211. London: T. & T. Clark, 2004.
- Johnston, George. *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 12. Cambridge: University Press, 1970.
- Jones, Larry Paul. *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 145. 1997.
- Keener, Craig S. *Gift and Giver: The Holy Spirit for Today*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Three Crucial Questions About the Holy Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.
- Kellum, L. Scott. *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13:31-16:33*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 256. London: T. & T. Clark, 2004.
- Kerr, Alan. *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 220. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002.
- Kesich, Veselin. *The First Day of the New Creation*. Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1982.
- Klink, Edward W., III. *The Sheep of the Fold: The Audience and Origin of the Gospel of John*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 141. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Knight, George W. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Koester, Craig R. *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Koester, Craig R., and Reimund Bieringer, eds. *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 222. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. *Encountering John: The Gospel in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999.



- \_\_\_\_\_. *John*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples according to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel's Purpose and the Mission of the Contemporary Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studies on John and Gender: A Decade of Scholarship*. Studies in Biblical Literature 38. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J., and Peter T. O'Brien. *Salvation to the Ends of the Earth: A Biblical Theology of Mission*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 11. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001.
- Kruse, Colin G. *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction and Commentary*. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 2004.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by Howard Clark Kee. Rev. ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.
- Kysar, Robert. *John*. Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Voyages with John: Charting the Fourth Gospel*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005.
- Ladd, George Eldon. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Edited by Donald Hagner. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Lang, Manfred. *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Ein redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse von John 18-20 vor markinischen und lukanischen Hintergrund*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des alten und neuen Testaments 182. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
- Leivestad, Ragnar. *Jesus in His Own Perspective: An Examination of His Sayings, Actions, and Eschatological Titles*. Translated by David E. Aune. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1987.
- Lightfoot, R. H. *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary*. Edited by C. F. Evans. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *The Gospel according to Saint John*. Black's New Testament Commentaries 4. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.

- Lindars, Barnabas. *The Gospel of John*. New Century Bible Commentary. London: Oliphants, 1972.
- Lioy, Dan. *The Search for Ultimate Reality: Intertextuality between the Genesis and Johannine Prologues*. Studies in Biblical Literature 93. New York: Lang, 2005.
- Litwak, Kenneth Duncan. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts. Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 282. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Malina, Bruce J., and Richard L. Rohrbaugh. *Social-science Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
- Manning, Gary T., Jr. *The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 270. London: T. & T. Clark, 2004.
- Marsh, John. *Saint John*. Westminster Pelican Commentaries. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *New Testament Theology: Many Witnessess, One Gospel*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Origins of New Testament Christology*. Rev. ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990.
- Marshall, I. Howard, and David Peterson, eds. *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 2003.
- McHugh, John F. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1-4*. Edited by Graham N. Stanton. International Critical Commentary. London: T & T Clark, 2009.
- Menken, Martin J. J. *Numerical Literary Techniques in John: The Fourth Evangelist's Use of Numbers of Words and Syllables*. Novum Testamentum Supplement Series 55. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985.
- Menzies, Robert P. *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 54. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology: Supplement Series 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition a Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. London: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Meyer, Ben F. *The Aims of Jesus*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 48. San Jose, CA: Pickwick Publications, 2002.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. *John: A Good News Commentary*. New International Bible Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989.
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John*. Sacra Pagina Series 4. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1988.
- Morgan, George Campbell. *The Gospel according to John*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1909.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel according to John*. Rev. ed. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.
- Newman, Barclay M., and Eugene A. Nida. *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John*. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies, 1980.
- Ng, Wai-ye. *Water Symbolism in John: An Eschatological Interpretation*. Studies in Biblical Literature 15. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Nicholson, G. C. *Death as Departure: The Johannine Descent-Ascent Schema*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1979.
- O'Neill, J. C. *Who Did Jesus Think He Was?* Biblical Interpretation Series 11. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Odeberg, Hugo. *The Fourth Gospel Interpreted in Its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-oriental World*. Chicago: Argonaut Publishers, 1968.
- Olsson, Birger. *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel: A Text-linguistic Analysis of John 2:1-11 and 4:1-42*. Translated by Jean Gray. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1974.

- Osborne, Grant R. *The Resurrection Narratives: A Redactional Study*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.
- Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Packer, J. I. *Keep in Step with the Spirit*. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1984.
- Painter, John. *Reading John's Gospel Today*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1980.
- Pao, David W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. Biblical Studies Library. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 21. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Parsons, Mikeal C., and Richard I. Pervo. *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Peterson, David G. *The Acts of the Apostles*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Pokorný, Petr. *The Genesis of Christology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987.
- Polhill, John B. *Acts*. The New American Commentary, vol. 26. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.
- Popp, Thomas. *Grammatik des Geistes: Literarische Kunst und theologische Konzeption in Johannes 3 und 6*. Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 3. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2001.
- Porsch, Felix. *Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums*. Frankfurt: Knecht, 1974.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 234. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Pryor, John W. *John, Evangelist of the Covenant People: The Narrative and Themes of the Fourth Gospel*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1992.
- Reim, G. *Studien zum Alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangelium*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

- Richardson, Alan. *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1958.
- Ridderbos, Herman N. *The Gospel according to John: A Theological Commentary*. Translated by John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. 6 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932.
- Ruckstuhl, Eugene. *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums: Der gegenwärtige Stand der einschlägigen Forschungen*. Novum testamentum et orbis antiquus 5. Freiburg Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
- Sanders, E. P. *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. London: Penguin, 1993.
- Sanders, J. N. *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Schenke, Ludger. *Johannes*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1998.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel according to St. John*. Translated by David Smith and G. A. Kon. 3 vols. Herder's Theological Commentary on the New Testament. New York: Crossroad, 1990.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *1, 2 Peter, Jude*. The New American Commentary, vol. 37. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Schuchard, Bruce G. *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 133. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Schwankl, Otto. *Licht und Finsternis: Ein metaphorisches Paradigma in den johanneischen Schriften*. Herders Biblische Studien 5. Freiburg: Herder, 1995.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *Ego Eimi: Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 56. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939.

- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*. Translated by W. Montgomery. New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- Segovia, Fernando F. *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Sloyan, Gerard S. *John*. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *What Are They Saying About John?* New York: Paulist Press, 1991.
- Smalley, Stephen S. *John, Evangelist and Interpreter*. New Testament Profiles. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- Smith, D. Moody. *John*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John*. Proclamation Commentaries Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John Among the Gospels*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of the Gospel of John*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Staley, Jeffrey Lloyd. *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 82. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Stanton, Graham N., Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen Barton, eds. *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Stein, Robert H. *Luke*. The New American Commentary, vol. 24. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.
- Stibbe, Mark W. G. *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel*. SNTS 73. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Strachan, Robert Harvey. *The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: SCM, 1917.
- Strazicich, John. *Joel's Use of Scripture and the Scripture's Use of Joel: Appropriation and Resignification in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*. Biblical Interpretation Series 82. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2007.

- Swete, Henry Barclay. *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1966.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1992.
- Thielman, Frank. *Theology of the New Testament: A Canonical and Synthetic Approach*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.
- Tholuck, Augustus. *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*. Translated by Charles P. Krauth. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co, 1859.
- Turner, Max. *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts—Then and Now*. Rev. ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Um, Stephen. *The Theme of Temple Christology in John's Gospel*. Library of New Testament Studies 312. London: T & T Clark, 2006.
- van der Watt, Jan G. *Family of the King: Dynamics of Metaphor in the Gospel according to John*. Biblical Interpretation Series 47. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Waetjen, Herman C. *The Gospel of the Beloved Disciple: A Work in Two Editions*. New York: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wead, David W. *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel*. Theologische Dissertationen 4. Basel: Komm. Friedrich Reinhardt, 1970.
- Webster, Jane S. *Ingesting Jesus: Eating and Drinking in the Gospel of John*. Academia Biblica 6. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Wenham, John. *Easter Enigma: Are the Resurrection Accounts in Conflict?* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- Westcott, B. F. *The Gospel according to St. John: The Authorized Version with Introduction and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel according to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*. London: John Murray, 1908.

- Wiles, Maurice. *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*. Cambridge: University Press, 1960.
- Wilkins, Ulrich. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. Das Neu Testament Deutsch 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Winter, Bruce, ed. *The Book of Acts in Its First-Century Setting*. 6 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Witherington, Ben, III. *The Christology of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Wolfe, Rolland E. *How the Easter Story Grew from Gospel to Gospel*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1989.
- Woods, Edward. *The Finger of God and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 205. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 2. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John for Everyone*. London: SPCK, 2004.
- Zerwick, Max, and Mary Grosvenor. *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1996.
- Zerwick, Maximilian. *Biblical Greek Illustrated By Examples*. Translated by Joseph Smith. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963.
- Yee, Gail A. *Jewish Feasts and the Gospel of John*. Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1989.

## Articles

- Ackroyd, Peter R. "The 153 Fishes in John xxi.11—A Further Note." *Journal of Theological Studies* 10 (1959): 94.
- Agourides, Savas. "The Purpose of John 21." In *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament in Honor of Kenneth Willis Clark*, 127-32. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Structure and Theology in the Gospel of John." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 47 (2002): 111-37.



- Aker, Ben C. "‘Breathed’: A Study on the Biblical Distinction between Regeneration and Spirit-Baptism." *Paraclete* 17 (1983): 13-16.
- Aloisi, John. "The Paraclete’s Ministry of Conviction: Another Look at John 16:8-11." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 47 (2004): 55-69.
- Anderson, Paul N. "Gradations of Symbolization in the Johannine Passion Narrative: Control Measures for Theologizing Speculation Gone Awry." In *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*, ed. Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann, 157-94. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 200. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Aune, David E. "John, Gospel of." In *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*, 243-49. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.
- Bacon, Benjamin Wisner. "The Displacement of John xiv." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 13 (1894): 64-76.
- Balabanski, Victoria. "‘Let Anyone Who Is Thirsty Come to Me’: John 7:37-38 in Dialogue with Josephus and the Archaeology of Aqueducts." *Lutheran Theological Journal* 39 (2005): 132-39.
- Balfour, Glenn. "The Jewishness of John’s Use of the Scripture in John 6:31 and 7:37-38." *Tyndale Bulletin* 46 (1995): 357-80.
- Ball, David. "Some Recent Literature on John: A Review Article." *Themelios* 19 (1993): 13-18.
- Bammel, Ernst. "The Farewell Discourse of the Evangelist John and Its Jewish Heritage." *Tyndale Bulletin* 44 (1993): 103-16.
- Bampfylde, Gillian. "John 19:28: A Case for a Different Translation." *Novum Testamentum* 11 (1969): 247-60.
- Barrett, C. K. "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel." *Journal of Theological Studies* 1 (1950): 1-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1947): 155-69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Place of Eschatology in the Fourth Gospel." *Expository Times* 59 (1947): 302-05.
- Barrosse, Thomas. "The Seven Days of the New Creation in St. John’s Gospel." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 21 (1959): 507-16.

- Bartlett, W. "The Coming of the Holy Ghost according to the Fourth Gospel." *Expository Times* 37 (1925): 72-75.
- Bassler, Jouette M. "Nicodemus in the Fourth Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 635-46.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The 153 Fish and the Unity of the Fourth Gospel." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 271-84. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Audience of the Gospel of John." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 113-23. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Beloved Disciple as Ideal Author." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 73-91. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "For Whom Were Gospels Written?" In *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, ed. Richard Bauckham, 9-48. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Fourth Gospel as the Testimony of the Beloved Disciple." In *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser, 120-39. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Historiographical Characteristics of the Gospel of John." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 93-112. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John for the Readers of Mark." In *The Gospels for All Christians*, ed. Richard Bauckham, 147-71. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Nicodemus and the Gurion Family." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 137-72. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why." *Studia theologica* 47 (1993): 135-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Qumran Community and the Gospel of John." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 125-36. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sonship of the Historical Jesus in Christology." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 31 (1978): 245-60.

- Beale, G. K. "The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 1: The Clearest Evidence." *Tyndale Bulletin* 56, no. 1 (2005): 73-102.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 2: Corroborating Evidence." *Tyndale Bulletin* 56, no. 2 (2005): 63-90.
- Beare, F. W. "The Risen Jesus Bestows the Spirit: A Study of John 20:19-23." *Canadian Journal of Theology* 4 (1958): 95-100.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. "John 3:3, 5: Baptism, Spirit and the Kingdom." *Expository Times* 97 (1986): 167-70.
- Beckerledgge, Gwilym. "Jesus' Authority and the Problem of His Self-consciousness." *Heythrop Journal* 19 (1978): 365-82.
- Belleville, Linda. "'Born of Water and Spirit': John 3:5." *Trinity Journal* 1 (1980): 125-41.
- Bennema, Cornelis. "The Giving of the Spirit in John's Gospel: A New Proposal?" *Evangelical Quarterly* 74 (2002): 195-213.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spirit-Baptism in the Fourth Gospel: A Messianic Reading of John 1,33." *Biblica* 84 (2003): 35-60.
- Best, Ernest. "Spirit Baptism." *Novum Testamentum* 4 (1960): 236-43.
- Bieringer, Reimund. "Greater Than Our Ancestor Jacob?" *Bible Today* 44 (2005): 301-05.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "I Am Ascending to My Father and Your Father, to My God and Your God' (John 20:17): Resurrection and Ascension in the Gospel of John." In *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, 209-35. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 222. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Spirit's Guidance into All the Truth: The Text-critical Problems of John 16,13." In *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, 183-207. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Blenkinsopp, J. "John 7:37-39: Another Note on a Notorious Crux." *New Testament Studies* 6 (1959): 95-98.
- Boismard, M. E. "Le Chapitre xxi de S. Jean: Essai de critique littéraire." *Revue biblique* 54 (1947): 473-501.

- Bolt, Peter. "Mission and Witness." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 191-214. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Borgen, Peder. "The Prologue of John: An Exposition of the Old Testament." In *Philo, John and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity*, 75-101. Brown Judaic Studies 131. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Boring, M. E. "The Influence of Christian Prophecy on the Johannine Portrayal of the Paraclete and Jesus." *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978): 113-23.
- Boyle, John L. "Last Discourse (Jn 13,13-16,33) and Prayer (Jn 17): Some Observations on Their Unity and Development." *Biblica* 56 (1975): 210-22.
- Brawley, Richard L. "An Absent Complement and Intertextuality in John 19:28-29." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 427-43.
- Breck, John. "John 21: Appendix, Epilogue or Conclusion?" *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 36 (1992): 27-49.
- Brooke, George J. "4Q252 and the 153 Fish of John 21:1." In *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Bernd Kollmann, 253-65. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 97. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.
- Brown, Raymond E. "Did Jesus Know He Was God?" *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 15 (1985): 74-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "How Much Did Jesus Know? A Survey of Biblical Evidence." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1967): 315-45.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 13 (1967): 113-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Paraclete in Light of Modern Research." *Studia evangelica* 4 (1968): 158-65.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums*, by Felix Porsch. *Theological Studies* 37 (1976): 684-85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers: A Study in the History of Exegesis*, by Anthony Casarella. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48 (1986): 738-39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, by George Johnston. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33 (1971): 268-70.

- Bruns, J. Edgar. "Use of Time in the Fourth Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 13 (1967): 285-90.
- Büchsel, Friedrich. "δίδωμι κτλ." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated and Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 2:166-73. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Bullock, C. Hassell. "Ezekiel, Bridge between the Testaments." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 25 (1982): 23-31.
- Burge, Gary M. "The Literary Seams in the Fourth Gospel." *The Covenant Quarterly* 48 (1990): 12-25.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Revelation and Discipleship in St. John's Gospel." In *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, 235-254. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 222. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Situating John's Gospel in History." In *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*, ed. Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher, 35-46. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Water." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1992.
- Byrne, Brendan. "The Faith of the Beloved Disciple and the Community in John 20." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 23 (1985): 83-97.
- Cahill, P. J. "Narrative Art in John 4." *Religious Studies Bulletin* 2 (1982): 41-47.
- Caird, George B. "Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics." *New Testament Studies* 15 (1969): 265-77.
- Cardwell, Kenneth. "The Fish on the Fire: Jn. 21:9." *Expository Times* 102 (1990): 12-14.
- Carey, George Leonard. "The Lamb of God and Atonement Theories." *Tyndale Bulletin* 32 (1981): 97-122.
- Carson, D. A. "The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7-11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98 (1979): 547-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John and the Johannine Epistles." In *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, 245-64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:30-31 Reconsidered." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 639-51.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Syntactical and Text-critical Observations on John 20:30-31: One More Round on the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2005): 693-714.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel." *Tyndale Bulletin* 33 (1982): 59-91.
- Cassian, Bishop. "John xxi." *New Testament Studies* 3 (1956): 132-36.
- Ceroke, Christian P. "The Divinity of Christ in the Gospels." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 24 (1962): 125-39.
- Charles, J. Daryl. "'Will the Court Please Call in the Prime Witness?': John 1:29-34 and the 'Witness'-motif." *Trinity Journal* 10 (1989): 71-83.
- Chapman, Benjamin C. "Kidron." In *New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology*, ed. E. M. Blaiklok and R. K. Harrison. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983.
- Charlesworth, James H. "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1Qs iii,13-iv,26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Fourth Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 15 (1969): 389-418.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John." In *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black, 65-97. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reinterpreting John: How the Dead Sea Scrolls Have Revolutionized Our Understanding of the Gospel of John." *Bible Review* 9 (1993): 19-25, 54.
- Chevallier, Max-Alain. "'Pentecôtes' lucaniennes et 'Pentecôtes' johanniques.'" *Recherches de science religieuse* 69 (1981): 301-13.
- Collins, John J. "A Messiah before Jesus?" In *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. John J. Collins and Craig A. Evans, 15-35. Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Colson, F. H. "Triangular Numbers in the New Testament." *Journal of Theological Studies* 16 (1914): 67-76.
- Cook, James I. "John 20:19-23, an Exegesis." *Reformed Review* 21 (1967): 2-10.
- Cortés, Juan B. "Yet Another Look at John 7:37-38." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1967): 75-86.
- Cotterell, F. P. "The Nicodemus Conversation: A Fresh Appraisal." *Expository Times* 96 (1985): 240-41.

- Dahms, John V. "Isaiah 55:11 and the Gospel of John." *Evangelical Quarterly* 53 (1981): 78-88.
- de Jonge, Marinus. "Nicodemus and Jesus: Some Observations on Misunderstanding and Understanding in the Fourth Gospel." In *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God: Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective*, 29-47. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- de la Potterie, Ignace. "'Naître de l'eau et naître de l'Esprit': Le texte baptismal de Jn 3:5." *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 14 (1962): 417-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Parole et Esprit dans S. Jean." In *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, Rédaction, Théologie*, ed. M. de Jonge, 177-201. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 44. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977.
- Deeley, Mary Katharine. "Ezekiel's Shepherd and John's Jesus: A Case Study in the Appropriation of Biblical Texts." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 252-64. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Dodd, C. H. "Some Johannine Herrnworte with Parallels in the Synoptic Gospels." *New Testament Studies* 2 (1955): 75-86.
- Dunn, James D. G. "'Baptized' as Metaphor." In *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R. E. O. White*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, 294-310. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 171. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John 6: A Eucharistic Discourse?" *New Testament Studies* 17 (1971): 328-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Let John Be John: A Gospel for Its Time." In *The Gospel and the Gospels*, ed. Peter Stuhlmacher, 293-322. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spirit and Fire Baptism." *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 81-92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Δωρεά as the Gift of the Holy Spirit." In *Pneumatology*. Vol. 2 of *The Christ and the Spirit: Collected essays of James D. G. Dunn*, 207-09. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Ellis, Peter F. "The Authenticity of John 21." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 36 (1992): 17-25.
- Emerton, John A. "The Hundred and Fifty-three Fishes in John 21:11." *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1958): 86-89.

- Enz, Jacob J. "The Book of Exodus as a Literary Type for the Gospel of John." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76 (1957): 208-15.
- Esler, Philip Francis. "Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham's Gospels for All Christians." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 51 (1998): 235-48.
- Eslinger, Lyle. "The Wooing of the Woman at the Well: Jesus, the Reader and Reader-response Criticism." *Literature and Theology* 1.2 (1987): 167-83.
- Evans, C. Stephen. "The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel: From What Perspective Should It Be Assessed?" In *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser, 91-119. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Evans, Craig A. "The Baptism of John in a Typological Context." In *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, 45-71. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 234. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Obduracy and the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." In *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring, 221-36. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On the Quotation Formulas in the Fourth Gospel." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 26 (1982): 79-83.
- Farmer, William R. "Reflections Upon 'the Historical Perimeters for Understanding the Aims of Jesus'." In *Crisis in Christology: Essays in Quest of Resolution*, ed. William R. Farmer, 175-97. Livonia, MI: Dove, 1995.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Ascension of Christ and Pentecost." *Theological Studies* 45 (1984): 409-40.
- Fowler, Russell. "Born of Water and Spirit (John 3:5)." *Expository Times* 82 (1970): 159.
- Fuller, Ronald H. "The Clue to Jesus' Self-Understanding." In *Christ and Christianity: Studies in the Formation of Christology*, ed. Robert Kahl, 37-46. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- Gasque, W. Ward. "The Historical Value of Acts." *Tyndale Bulletin* 40 (1989): 136-57.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "The Archive of Excess: John 21 and the Problem of Narrative Closure." In *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black, 240-52. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.



- Gilmour, S. MacLean. "Easter and Pentecost." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 62-66.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. "ἕδωρ." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated and Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 8:314-333. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Grant, Robert McQueen. "'One Hundred Fifty-three Fish' (John 21:11)." *Harvard Theological Review* 42 (1949): 273-76.
- Grayston, Kenneth. "The Meaning of Parakletos." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 13 (1981): 67-82.
- Gregory, Andrew. "The Third Gospel? The Relationship of John and Luke Reconsidered." In *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, 109-34. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 222. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Grigsby, Bruce H. "The Cross as an Expiatory Sacrifice in the Fourth Gospel." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 15 (1982): 51-80.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Gematria and John 21:11—Another Look at Ezekiel 47:10." *Expository Times* 95 (1984): 177-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'If Any Man Thirsts': Observations on the Rabbinic Background of John 7:37-39." *Biblica* 67 (1986): 101-08.
- Gruenler, Royce Gordon. "Implied Christological Claims in the Core Sayings of Jesus: An Application of Wittgenstein's Phenomenology." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 20 (1981): 66-77.
- Hamilton, James Merrill, Jr. "The Influence of Isaiah on the Gospel of John." *Perichoresis* 5 (2007): 139-62.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Rushing Wind and Organ Music: Toward Luke's Theology of the Spirit in Acts." *Reformed Theological Review* 65 (2006): 15-33.
- Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. "John's Use of Scripture." In *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 358-79. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Harm, Frederick R. "Distinctive Titles of the Holy Spirit in the Writings of John." *Concordia Journal* 13 (1987): 119-35.

- Harrill, J. Albert. "Cannibalistic Language in the Fourth Gospel and Greco-Roman Polemics of Factionalism (John 6:52-66)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 133-58.
- Harstine, Stan. "Un-doubting Thomas: Recognition Scenes in the Ancient World." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 33 (2006): 435-47.
- Hatch, W. H. P. "The Meaning of John XVI, 8-11." *Harvard Theological Review* 14 (1921): 103-05.
- Hatina, Thomas R. "John 20,22 in Its Eschatological Context: Promise or Fulfillment?" *Biblica* 74 (1993): 196-219.
- Hengel, Martin. "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 12 (1990): 19-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." In *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 380-95. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Hengel, Martin, and Daniel P. Bailey. "The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in the pre-Christian Period." In *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher, 75-146. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Hodges, Zane C. "Rivers of Living Water: John 7:37-39." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136 (1979): 239-48.
- Hofius, Otfried. "Das Wunder der Wiedergeburt: Jesu Gespräch mit Nikodemus Joh 3,1-21." In *Johannesstudien: Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Vierten Evangeliums*, ed. Otfried Hofius and Hans-Christian Kammler, 33-80. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 88. Tübingen: J C B Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Er gibt den Geist ohne Mass' Joh 3,34b." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 90 (1999): 131-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Fourth Servant Song in the New Testament Letters." In *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher, 163-88. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Hooker, Morna D. "John's Baptism: A Prophetic Sign." In *Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton, 22-40. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

- Hoskyns, Edwyn Clement. "Gen. 1-3 and St. John's Gospel." *Journal of Theological Studies* 21 (1920): 210-18.
- Howard, John M. "The Significance of Minor Characters in the Gospel of John." *Bibliotheca sacra* 163 (2006): 63-78.
- Hui, Archie W. D. "John the Baptist and Spirit-Baptism." *Evangelical Quarterly* 71 (1999): 99-115.
- Isaacs, Marie E. "The Prophetic Spirit in the Fourth Gospel." *Heythrop Journal* 24 (1983): 391-407.
- Jayachitra, L. "A Postcolonial Exploration of Water in the Fourth Gospel." *Bangalore Theological Forum* 37 (2005): 114-29.
- Johnston, George. "The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John." *Perspective* 9 (1968): 29-38.
- Johnstone, G. Patrick. "The Promise of the Paraclete." *Bibliotheca sacra* 127 (1970): 333-45.
- Judge, Peter J. "John 20,24-29: More Than Doubt, Beyond Rebuke." In *The Death of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. G. van Belle, 911-30. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium* 200. Leuven: University Press, 2007.
- Kiley, Mark. "Three More Fish Stories (John 21:11)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 529-31.
- Klink, Edward W., III. "The Gospel Community Debate: State of the Question." *Currents in Biblical Research* 3 (2004): 60-85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Concern Is That to You and to Me? John 2:1-11 and the Elisha Narratives." *Neotestamentica* 39 (2005): 273-87.
- Knapp, Henry M. "The Messianic Water Which Gives Life to the World." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 19 (1997): 109-21.
- Koester, Craig R. "Hearing, Seeing and Believing in the Gospel of John." *Biblica* 70 (1989): 327-48.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. "'The Disciple Jesus Loved': Witness, Author, Apostle — A Response to Richard Bauckham's *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 18 (2008): 209-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Greater Works' of the Believer according to John 14:12." *Didaskalia* 6 (1995): 36-45.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "John." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, 415-512. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Two Johannine Verbs for Sending: A Study of John's Use of Words with Reference to General Linguistic Theory." In *Studies on John and Gender: A Decade of Scholarship*, 129-47. *Studies in Biblical Literature* 38. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Labahn, Michael. "Fishing for Meaning: The Miraculous Catch of Fish in John 21." In *Wonders Never Cease: The Purpose of Narrating Miracle Stories in the New Testament and Its Religious Environment*, ed. Michael Labahn and Liettaert Peerbolte, 125-45. *Library of New Testament Studies* 288. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006.
- Lacomara, Aelred. "Deuteronomy and the Farewell Discourse (Jn 13:31-16:33)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 65-84.
- Lasor, William Sanford. "Kidron, Brook; Kidron Valley." In *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. 3. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Leaney, A. R. C. "The Johannine Paraclete and the Qumran Scrolls." In *John and Qumran*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 38-61. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972.
- Lee, Dorothy. "Partnership in Easter Faith: The Role of Mary Magdalene and Thomas in John 20." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 58 (1995): 37-49.
- Lieberman, Stephen J. "A Mesopotamian Background for the So-called Aggadic 'Measures' of Biblical Hermeneutics." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 58 (1987): 157-225.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. "The Beloved Disciple as Eyewitness and the Fourth Gospel as Witness." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 85 (2002): 3-26.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "The Composition of John 20." *New Testament Studies* 7 (1961): 142-47.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John and the Synoptic Gospels: A Test Case." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 287-94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Δικαιοσύνη in Jn. 16:8 and 10." In *Mélanges Bibliques En Hommage Au R. P. Bédard Rigaux*, ed. Albert Decamps and R. P. André de Halleux, 275-85. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.
- Louw, J. P. "On Johannine Style." *Neotestamentica* 20 (1986): 5-12.

- Lutkemeyer, Lawrence J. "The Role of the Paraclete: Jn 16:7-15." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 8 (1946): 220-29.
- Lyon, Robert W. "John 20:22, Once More." *Asbury Theological Journal* 43 (1988): 73-85.
- Mackay, Cameron. "Ezekiel in the New Testament." *Church Quarterly Review* 162 (1961): 4-16.
- MacRae, George W. "The Meaning and Evolution of the Feast of Tabernacles." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 22 (1960): 251-76.
- Mann, C. S. "Pentecost, the Spirit, and John." *Theology* 62 (1959): 188-90.
- Maritz, Petrus, and Gilbert van Belle. "The Imagery of Eating and Drinking in John 6:35." In *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*, ed. Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann, 333-52. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 200. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "Acts." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, 513-606. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Acts and the 'Former Treatise'." In *Ancient Literary Setting*, ed. B. W. Winter and A. D. Clarke, 163-82. *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting* 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- McCabe, Robert V. "The Meaning of 'Born of Water and the Spirit' in John 3:5." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 4 (1999): 85-107.
- McDonald, B. A. "Theodore of Mopsuestia." In *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald K. McKim, 65-69. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998.
- McEleney, Neil J. "153 Great Fishes (John 21:11): Gematriacal Atbash." *Biblica* 58 (1977): 411-17.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972): 44-72.
- Menken, Martin J. J. "Observations on the Significance of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." In *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. G. van Belle, Jan G. van der Watt, and P. Maritz, 155-75. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium* 184. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.

- Meyer, Ben F. "Jesus' Ministry and Self-Understanding." In *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans, 337-52. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- Meyer, Paul W. "The Problem of the Messianic Self-consciousness of Jesus." *Novum Testamentum* 4 (1960): 122-38.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. "By Water and Blood: Sin and Purification in John and First John." In *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, 149-62. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 234. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Miller, Paul. "'They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him': The Gospel of John and the Old Testament." In *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, 127-51. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Minear, Paul Sevier. "The Original Function of John 21." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 85-98.
- Moore, Stephen D. "Are There Impurities in the Living Water That the Johannine Jesus Dispenses? Deconstruction, Feminism, and the Samaritan Woman." In *The Interpretation of John*, ed. John Ashton, 279-99. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Morgan-Wynne, John E. "References to Baptism in the Fourth Gospel." In *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R. E. O. White*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, 116-35. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 171. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Morgan, Richard. "Fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel: The Old Testament Foundations." *Interpretation* 11 (1957): 55-65.
- Moule, C. F. D. "The Holy Spirit in Scriptures." *Church Quarterly* 3 (1971): 279-87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Post-resurrection Appearances in the Light of Festival Pilgrimages." *New Testament Studies* 4 (1957): 58-61.
- Mounce, William D. "The Origin of the New Testament Metaphor of Rebirth." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Essex Fells, NJ, 17 December 1982.
- Nielsen, Jesper Tang. "The Lamb of God: The Cognitive Structure of a Johannine Metaphor." In *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*, ed. Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann, 217-56. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 200. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

- Nielsen, Kirsten. "Old Testament Imagery in John." In *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives. Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel in Århus 1997*, ed. Johannes Nissen and Sigfred Pedersen, 66-82. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 182. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Nilsen, Tina Dykesteen. "The True and the False: The Structure of John 4,16-26." *Biblische Notizen* 128 (2006): 61-64.
- North, Wendy E. Sproston. "John for Readers of Mark? A Response to Richard Bauckham's Proposal." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 25 (2003): 449-68.
- O'Day, Gail R. *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections*. In vol. 9 of *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck, 491-865. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.
- Olson, Mark J. "Pentecost." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman, 5:222-23. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Owen, O. T. "One Hundred and Fifty Three Fishes." *Expository Times* 100 (1988): 52-54.
- Packer, J. I. "Holy Spirit." In *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Sinclair B. Ferguson and J. I. Packer, 316-20. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1988.
- Painter, John. "The Farewell Discourses and the History of Johannine Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 525-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Glimpses of the Johannine Community in the Farewell Discourses." *Australian Biblical Review* 28 (1980): 525-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Johannine Symbols: A Case Study in Epistemology." *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 27 (1979): 26-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'The Light Shines in the Darkness': Creation, Incarnation, and Resurrection in John." In *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, 21-46. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 222. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b-43." In *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 429-58. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Pamment, Margaret. "John 3:5, 'Unless One Is Born of Water and the Spirit, He Cannot Enter the Kingdom of God'." *Novum Testamentum* 25 (1983): 189-90.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Meaning of Doxa in the Fourth Gospel." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 74 (1983): 12-16.
- Pao, David W., and Eckhard J. Schnabel. "Luke." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, 251-414. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Paschal, R. Wade, Jr. "Sacramental Symbolism and Physical Imagery in the Gospel of John." *Tyndale Bulletin* 32 (1981): 151-76.
- Pazdan, Mary Margaret. "Nicodemus and the Samaritan Woman: Contrasting Models of Discipleship." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 17 (1987): 145-48.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*. International Critical Commentary. London: T&T Clark, 1896.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Can Traditional Exegesis Enlighten Literary Analysis of the Fourth Gospel? An Examination of the Old Testament Fulfillment Motif and the Passover Theme." In *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and William Richard Stegner, 396-428. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Pretlove, John. "John 20:22—Help from Dry Bones?" *Criswell Theological Review* 3 (2005): 93-101.
- Pryor, John W. "Covenant and Community in John's Gospel." *RTR* 47 (1988): 44-51.
- Renz, Gabi. "Nicodemus: An Ambiguous Disciple? A Narrative Sensitive Investigation." In *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, 255-83. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 222. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Richard, Earl J. "Expressions of Double Meaning and Their Function in the Gospel of John." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 96-112.
- Romeo, Joseph A. "Gematria and John 21:11, the Children of God." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 263-64.
- Rosner, Brian S. "The Progress of the Word." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 215-33. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Ross, John M. "One Hundred and Fifty-three Fishes." *Expository Times* 100 (1989): 375.
- Russell, Walt. "The Holy Spirit's Ministry in the Fourth Gospel." *Grace Theological Journal* 8 (1987): 227-39.



Schneiders, Sandra M. "History and Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel." In *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, Rédaction, Théologie*, ed. M. de Jonge, 371-76. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 44. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. "John 21:1-14." *Interpretation* 43 (1989): 70-75.

Scholtissek, Klaus. "The Johannine Gospel in Recent Research." In *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, ed. Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne, 444-72. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Relecture und Réécriture: Neue Paradigmen zu Methode und Inhalt der Johannesauslegung aufgewiesen am Prolog 1,1-18 und der ersten Abschiedsrede 13,31-14,31." *Theologie und Philosophie* 75 (2000): 1-29.

Segovia, Fernando F. "The Theology and Provenance of John 15:1-17." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 115-28.

Seynaeve, J. "Les verbes ἀποστέλλω et πέμπω dans le vocabulaire théologique de Saint Jean." In *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, Rédaction, Théologie*, ed. Marinus de Jonge, 385-89. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 44. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977.

Sim, David C. "The Gospels for All Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 84 (2001): 3-27.

Simonetti, Manlio. "Theodore of Mopsuestia (ca. 350-428)." In *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, ed. Charles Kannengiesser, 799-828. The Bible in Ancient Christianity 2. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.

Smalley, Stephen S. "The Sign in John xxi." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 275-88.

Smith, D. Moody. "The Contribution of J. Louis Martyn to the Understanding of the Gospel of John." In *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, 1-19. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_. "John 16:1-15." *Interpretation* 33 (1979): 58-62.

\_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums*, by Felix Porsch. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 (1977): 458-59.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New." In *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*, ed. James M. Efird, 3-65. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Have I Learned about the Gospel of John?" In *What Is John? Readers and Reading of the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Fernando F. Segovia, 217-35. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 3. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Sparks, H. F. D. "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew: The Evidence of John 13,16 and 15, 20." *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1952): 58-61.
- Spriggs, D. G. "Meaning of 'Water' in John 3:5." *Expository Times* 85 (1973): 149-50.
- Spurrell, John Mark. "Interpretation of 'I Thirst'." *Church Quarterly Review* 167 (1966): 12-18.
- Stanley, David. "Go and Tell John What You Hear and See: Jesus' Self-understanding in the Light of His Earthly Ministry." In *Who Do People Say I Am?*, ed. Francis A. Eigo, 47-90. Villanova: Villanova University Press, 1980.
- Stein, Robert H. "The Matthew-Luke Agreements Against Mark: Insight from John." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54 (1992): 482-502.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. "Isaiah 53 in the Gospels and Acts." In *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher, 147-62. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spiritual Remembering: John 14:26." In *Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton, 55-68. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Swanccutt, Diana M. "Hungers Assuaged by the Bread from Heaven: 'Eating Jesus' as Isaian Call to Belief: The Confluence of Isaiah 55 and Psalm 78 (77) in John 6.22-71." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 218-51. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Swetnam, James. "Bestowal of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel." *Biblica* 74 (1993): 556-76.
- Thielman, Frank. "The Style of the Fourth Gospel and Ancient Literary Critical Concepts of Religious Discourse." In *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Duane F. Watson, 169-83. Journal for the Study of the New Testament 50. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Thomas, John Christopher. "Max Turner's *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1996): An Appreciation and Critique." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 12 (1998): 3-22.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Spirit in the Fourth Gospel." In *The Spirit and the Mind: Essays in Informed Pentecostalism*, ed. Terry L. Cross and Emerson B. Powery, 87-104. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Spirit in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Explorations." In *The Spirit of the New Testament*, 157-74. Leiden: Deo, 2005.
- Thompson, Marianne Meye. "The Breath of Life: John 20:22-23 Once More." In *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton, 69-78. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Trudinger, Paul. "The 153 Fishes: A Response and a Further Suggestion." *Expository Times* 102 (1990): 11-12.
- Turner, C. H. "On the Punctuation of John 7:37-38." *Journal of Theological Studies* 24 (1922): 66-70.
- Turner, Max. "Atonement and the Death of Jesus in John: Some Questions to Bultmann and Forestell." *Evangelical Quarterly* 62 (1990): 99-122.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Concept of Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel." *Vox evangelica* 10 (1977): 24-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Holy Spirit." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. J. B. Green, S. McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 341-45. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Holy Spirit." In *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus and the Spirit in Lucan Perspective." *Tyndale Bulletin* 32 (1981): 3-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Readings and Paradigms: A Response to John Christopher Thomas." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 12 (1998): 23-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Significance of Receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts: A Survey of Modern Scholarship." *Trinity Journal* 2 (1981): 131-58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Spirit and the Power of Jesus' Miracles in the Lucan Conception." *Novum Testamentum* 33 (1991): 124-52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Spirit and Salvation in Luke-Acts." In *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton, 103-16. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spirit Endowment in Luke-Acts: Some Linguistic Considerations." *Vox evangelica* 12 (1981): 45-63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Spirit of Prophecy and the Power of Authoritative Preaching in Luke-Acts: A Question of Origins." *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 66-88.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Spirit of Prophecy' as the Power of Israel's Restoration and Witness." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 327-48. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now." *Vox evangelica* 15 (1985): 7-64.
- Turner, Max, and Gary M. Burge. "The Anointed Community: A Review and Response." *Evangelical Quarterly* 62 (1990): 253-68.
- Twelftree, Graham H. "Prayer and the Coming of the Spirit in Acts." *Expository Times* 117 (2006): 271-76.
- van Belle, Gilbert. "The Death of Jesus and the Literary Unity of the Fourth Gospel." In *The Death of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. G. van Belle, 3-64. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 200. Leuven: University Press, 2007.
- van der Watt, Jan G. "Double entendre in the Gospel according to John." In *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. G. van Belle, Jan G. van der Watt, and P. Maritz, 463-81. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 184. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of Αἰώνιος in the Concept Ζωή Αἰώνιος in John's Gospel." *Novum Testamentum* 31 (1989): 217-28.
- van Rossum, Joost. "The 'Johannine Pentecost': John 20:22 in Modern Exegesis and in Orthodox Theology." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 35 (1991): 149-67.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. "Body-piercing, the Natural Sense, and the Task of Theological Interpretation: A Hermeneutical Homily on John 19:34." *Ex Auditu* 16 (2000): 1-29.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Hermeneutics of I-Witness Testimony: John 21.20-24 and the 'Death' of the 'Author'." In *Understanding Poets and Prophets: Essays in Honour of George Wishart Anderson*, ed. A. Graeme Auld, 366-87. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 152. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995.
- Vawter, Bruce. "Ezekiel and John." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 26 (1964): 450-58.

- von Wahlde, Urban C. "The Samaritan Woman Episode, Synoptic Form-Criticism, and the Johannine Miracles: A Question of Criteria." In *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. G. van Belle, Jan G. van der Watt, and P. Maritz, 501-18. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 184. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- Wallace, Daniel B. "Greek Grammar and the Personality of the Holy Spirit." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 13 (2003): 97-125.
- Walton, Steve. "Acts: Many Questions, Many Answers." In *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, ed. Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne, 229-50. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- Watson, Nigel M. "Risen Christ and Spirit/Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel." *Australian Biblical Review* 31 (1983): 81-85.
- Wead, David W. "The Johannine Double Meaning." *Restoration Quarterly* 13 (1970): 106-20.
- Weidemann, Hans-Ulrich. "Der Gekreuzigte als Quelle des Geistes." In *The Death of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. G. van Belle, 567-79. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 200. Leuven: University Press, 2007.
- Wiarda, Timothy. "John 21:1-23: Narrative Unity and Its Implications." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 46 (1992): 53-71.
- Wiles, Maurice F. "Theodore of Mopsuestia as Representative of the Antiochene School." In *From the Beginnings to Jerome*. Vol. 1 of *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Edited by Peter R. Ackroyd, Christopher Francis Evans, G. W. H. Lampe, and S. L. Greenslade, 489-510. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.
- Wilkinson, John. "Incident of the 'Blood and Water' in John 19:34." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 28 (1975): 149-72.
- Williams, F. E. "Fourth Gospel and Synoptic Tradition: Two Johannine Passages." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86 (1967): 311-19.
- Windisch, Hans. "The Five Johannine Paraclete Sayings." In *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. John Reumann, 1-26. Facet Books Biblical Series 20. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Witherington, Ben, III. "The Waters of Birth: John 3:5 and 1 John 5:6-8." *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 155-60.
- Witkamp, Leonard Theodor. "Jesus' Thirst in John 19:28-30: Literal or Figurative?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 489-510.

- Woll, D. Bruce. "The Departure of 'the Way': The First Farewell Discourse in the Gospel of John." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980): 225-39.
- Wooden, R. Glenn. "Guided by God: Divine Aid in Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." In *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. John J. Collins and Craig A. Evans, 101-20. Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Woodhouse, H. "Hard Sayings—IX: 'The Holy Ghost Was Not Yet Given' (Jn 7:39)." *Theology* 67 (1964): 310-12.
- Young, Franklin W. "Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 46 (1955): 215-33.
- Zimmermann, Ruben. "Imagery in John: Opening Up Paths into the Tangled Thicket of John's Figurative World." In *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*, ed. Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann, 1-43. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 200. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Zumstein, Jean. "Jesus' Resurrection in the Farewell Discourses." In *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, 103-26. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 222. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

### **Dissertations and Theses**

- Enrique Becerra. "Le symbolisme de l'eau dans le Quatrième Évangile." Docteur ès Sciences Religieuses, Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, 1982.
- Fowler, William G. "The Influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel: Intertextuality and Interpretation." Ph.D. diss., Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, 1995.
- Hamid-Khani, Saeed. "Johannine Expressions of Double Meaning: A Literary-Exegetical Analysis." Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1992.
- Hamilton, James Merrill, Jr. "He Is with You and He Will Be in You: The Spirit, the Believer, and the Glorification of Jesus." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003.
- Keener, Craig S. "The Function of Johannine Pneumatology in the Context of Late First-century Judaism." Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1991.

- Kipp, John Lewis. "The Relationship between the Conceptions of 'Holy Spirit' and 'Risen Christ' in the Fourth Gospel: A Study of John." Th.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1967.
- Klink, Edward W., III. "The Breath of Jesus: An Examination and Interpretation of the 'Johannine Pentecost' in John 20:19-23." Th.M. thesis, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2002.
- Kowalski, Judith A. "'Of Water and Spirit': Narrative Structure and Theological Development in the Gospel of John." Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 1987.
- MacDonald, William Graham. "Problems of Pneumatology in Christology: The Relationship of Christ and the Holy Spirit in Biblical Theology." Th.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1970.
- Mansure, Arthur Lee. "The Relation of the Paraclete to the Spiritual Presence of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel." Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1950.
- Mathews, Revi J. "The Spirit-Paraclete in the Testament of Jesus according to Saint John's Gospel." Ph.D. diss., Fordham University, 1992.
- Simon, William Bradley. "The Role of the Spirit-Paraclete in the Disciples' Mission in the Fourth Gospel." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002.
- Suurmond, Jean-Jacques. "The Ethical Influence of the Spirit of God: An Exegetical and Theological Study with Special Reference to 1 Corinthians, Romans 7:14-8:30, and the Johannine Literature." Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1983.
- Tew, Grady Timothy. "The Pneumatology of John as Seen in the Fourth Gospel." Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993.
- Turner, Max. "Luke and the Spirit: Studies in the Significance of Receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts." Ph.D. diss., Cambridge, 1980.

## EXPECTATION AND FULFILLMENT OF THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

Russell Dale Quinn, Ph.D.  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2010  
Chair: Dr. William C. Cook

This study seeks to delineate the pneumatological themes that the author of John develops to create expectation and demonstrate fulfillment of the gift of the Holy Spirit. The primary question asked in this investigation focuses on the extent to which Johannine pneumatological expectation can be said to have been fulfilled within the narrative of the Fourth Gospel. A common expression of this question has been debated in terms of the relationship of the Johannine gift on Easter in John 20:19-23 to the Lukan outpouring on Pentecost in Acts 2.

In chapter 1 the three major positions on the relationship are surveyed including the Johannine Pentecost view, the Symbolic view, and the Two Gift view.

Chapters 2 and 3 consist of an exegetical analysis of what are often referred to as the πνεῦμα (1:29-34; 3:5-8; 3:34; 4:4-30; 6:63; 7:37-39) and παράκλητος passages (John 14:16-17; 14:25-26; 15:26-27; 16:7-11, 12-15). This exegesis focuses on the development of pneumatological expectation regarding the themes of revelation, witness, mission, dwelling, life and empowerment and the conditions of exaltation, the coming hour, glorification, asking, and departure.

In chapter 4 the texts that show how the narrative demonstrates the fulfillment of the giving of the Spirit are discussed (John 12:20-50; 13:1-4, 31-35; 17:1-5; 19:28-37; 20:1-18, 19-23, 24-29; 21).



Chapter 5 explores the relationship between the Johannine themes that have been identified in the previous chapters with Lukan pneumatology. A harmonization between the Johannine and Lukan accounts of the giving of the Spirit is not only possible but preferable.

In chapter 6 the results of the previous chapters are summarized. The Johannine Spirit is realized in the themes of revelation, witness, mission, dwelling, and life. An expectation of empowerment is created but not fulfilled. The Johannine and Lukan accounts of the giving of the Spirit are complementary.

## VITA

Russell Dale Quinn

### PERSONAL

Born: December 22, 1970, Hayti, Missouri  
Parents: Albert Dale and Brenda Kay Quinn  
Married: Laura Ellen Click, June 12, 1993  
Children: Hannah Grace, August 7, 1996  
Sarah Katherine, February 26, 1998  
Ellen Elizabeth, July 21, 2000  
Abigail Rose, June 19, 2006

### EDUCATIONAL

Diploma, New Madrid County Central High School, New Madrid, Missouri,  
1989  
B.S., Union University, Jackson, Tennessee, 1993  
B.A., Union University, Jackson, Tennessee, 1993  
M.Div., Beeson Divinity School, Samford University, Birmingham, Alabama,  
1997

### MINISTERIAL

Minister to College Students, First Baptist Church, Gardendale,  
Alabama, 1994-1997  
Minister of Media, First Baptist Church, Gardendale, Alabama, 1997-2003  
Director of Communication, Highview Baptist Church, Louisville, Kentucky,  
2003-2007  
Pastoral Research Assistant, First Baptist Church, Gardendale, Alabama,  
2004-2006  
Pastoral Research Assistant, Bellevue Baptist Church, Cordova, Tennessee,  
2005-2006  
Lead Pastor, Spencer County Campus of Highview Baptist Church, Louisville,  
Kentucky, 2006-2007  
Minister, Bellevue Baptist Church, Cordova, Tennessee, 2007-

### ACADEMIC

Garrett Fellow, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004