

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Vox Evangelica* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_vox\\_evangelica.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_vox_evangelica.php)

## *The Concept of Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel*

M.M.B. Turner

[p.24]

### I. PRELIMINARIES

There are difficulties in speaking of receiving the Spirit which are not automatically obvious. Moses, Bezalel (Ex. 31: 3), Samson, David, the prophets, the Qumran community, occasional rabbis (perhaps),<sup>1</sup> Jesus, and his disciples, may all be said to have 'received the Spirit'—or at least this claim, or an equivalent<sup>2</sup> was made on their behalf. Each was understood to be the locus of a 'power', 'vitality' or 'life' that manifested the presence of God.<sup>3</sup> Further, the Spirit of God was usually conceived as acting through these men for the benefit of the covenant community as a whole;<sup>4</sup> this much they have in common, but little more.

When we press the question of the significance of the claims that an individual or group 'had' the Spirit, we encounter diversity more than unity. To speak of Bezalel having God's Spirit is to say neither more nor less than that his craft in making cultic 'furniture' was divinely enabled. When a pagan ruler, Cyrus, who has no knowledge of Yahweh (Isa. 45: 5), is spoken of as God's anointed what is meant is that his future victory over Babylon, which will release Israel from exile, is to be understood as the locus of Yahweh's power to redeem Israel. When the teacher of righteousness(?) at Qumran thanked God for the Spirit (e.g. 1QH7: 6; 14: 13; 16: 2f, 6f, 12ff; 17: 26f) he was primarily showing gratitude for that presence of God with him which had revealed the meaning of the Law for the eschatological community (and that is what he meant by receiving the Spirit).<sup>5</sup> Finally, when Paul told his converts that they had

---

<sup>1</sup> On this controversial issue see the different perspectives offered by J. Abelson, *The Immanence of God in Rabbinic Judaism* (London 1912 and New York: Hermon Press, 1969), 174-272; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: SPCK, 1970) 208ff.; R. Leivestadt, 'Das Dogma von der prophetenlosen Zeit' (*NTS* 19), 288-300 and P. Schäfer, *Die Vorstellung vom heiligen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur* (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1972), 124-134. Broadly speaking we must accept the position of Davies, Leivestadt and Schäfer that the rabbinic view is summed up in the dictum 'since... the last prophets, the Spirit has ceased out of Israel' (tSot 13: 2ff.; P. Schäfer, *op. cit.*, 94-98); though there were exceptions in the fixing of the *terminus a quo* of the withdrawal of the spirit of prophecy and the dictum was a general rule of thumb, which permitted exceptions, rather than a universal law. Philo and Josephus, while accepting the general rule, were more generous in allowing exceptions amongst whom they included themselves (cf. *De Gigantibus*, 22f., 27; *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit*, 265; *De Specialibus Legibus*, 4: 49 and especially *De Somniis*, 252 and *De Cherubim*, 27. For Josephus' claim see *BJ*, 3.399-408.

<sup>2</sup> There is no difference between saying the Spirit is 'on' (*c*) e.g. Moses (Nu. 11: 16) while 'in' (*b*) Joshua (Nu. 27: 18), or 'clothed with' Gideon (*ibš*, Jdg. 6: 34)—at least no difference is to be attributed to whether the Spirit is located 'outside' or 'inside' a man (*pace* much pentecostalist and some confirmationist exegesis). Each is a way of speaking of an endowment of the Spirit given by God by which to lead Israel.

<sup>3</sup> See especially A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1964), 26-39; *idem.*, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1961), 15ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. W. J. Dumbrell, 'Spirit and Kingdom of God in the Old Testament', *RefThR* 33, 1-11; compare J. Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962), 93ff. Amongst the rabbis the gift of the spirit of prophecy appears much more individualistically orientated and, of course, there was considerable difference between the rabbis, the Qumran sectarians and the Christians, as to the limits and nature of the covenant community.

<sup>5</sup> For the exegetical basis of this see H. -W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung and gegenwärtiges Heil* (Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1966), 117-75.

received the Spirit of God, the significance is different again. He is affirming that the power of God, which has raised Jesus from the dead and constituted Him *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, was even now beginning the same process in the Christian community thereby giving them a foretaste of their resurrection existence centred on Christ; the image of God to whom we shall then be conformed (Rom. 8: 29; 1 Cor. 15: 49 and cf. 2 Cor. 3: 18).<sup>6</sup> The Spirit was, for Paul, 'the advancing presence of the future'.<sup>7</sup>

The point in all this is that the language of 'having' (*mutatis mutandis* for 'receiving'; 'being filled with' etc.) the Spirit is not concrete and self-explanatory in the same way as, say, having an apple is. It contains a similar kind of ambiguity to that involved in speaking of 'having transport', in that it may still be necessary to specify whether this last takes the form of a ship, a horse, or a bicycle. Of course the Spirit is the presence of God, not an abstract class like 'transport', but this should not hide the similarity: in both cases ('having transport' or 'having the Spirit') the phrase may be specified in a variety of distinct ways. 'Receiving' or 'having' the Spirit may effectively mean quite different things in adjacent contexts. To be more precise we should say that any statement about Spirit-endowment is made within a particular frame of reference which, if elucidated, serves to define the meaning of that statement. For example, in 1 Samuel 10: 6 (cf. 16: 13) it is implied that the Spirit of Yahweh 'came mightily upon' (*šlh*) Saul shortly after his

[p.25]

anointing. We may deduce from 1 Samuel 16: 14 that the editor of this work conceived the Spirit as being with Saul at least from this point until the anointing of David.<sup>8</sup> Of the latter in turn it is said 'the Spirit came mightily on (*šlh*) David from that day forth' (1 Sam. 16: 13); apparently dynamistic language. These statements about Spirit-endowment appear to be made within a frame of reference in which it is held that Israel's leadership is a locus of Yahweh's 'life' or 'power' amongst his people, and they are a way of bringing this belief to expression.<sup>9</sup> In 1 Samuel 11: 6f., however, we find another model superimposed: here it is Saul's righteous anger, and the deeds that spring therefrom, that together are seen as the expression of God's activity in and through him. It is this that is now articulated in the sentence 'the Spirit of Yahweh came mightily (*šlh*) on Saul when he heard these words'. What might at first be thought of as a formal contradiction between the statements of 1 Samuel 10: 6; 16: 13f. and

---

<sup>6</sup> For an attempt to justify this see M. M. B. Turner, 'The Significance of Spirit Endowment for Paul', *VoxEv* 9, 56-69 [[http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/vox/vol09/spirit\\_turner.pdf](http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/vox/vol09/spirit_turner.pdf)].

<sup>7</sup> Words taken from G. W. Locher, 'Der Geist als Paraklet', *EvT* 26, 578, where they are applied to the figure of the Paraclete in John. The translation is that of R. Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975), 236.

<sup>8</sup> Pace L. Neve, *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (Tokyo: Seibunsha 1972), 27.

<sup>9</sup> So H. W. Hertzberg, *1 and 2 Samuel* (London: SCM 1964), 140; E. R. Dalgish, *Psalm Fifty-One in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Patternism* (Leiden: Brill, 1962), 159ff. and those whom he cites at note 327. Whether the narrator viewed the *ruach* as bestowed sacramentally through the anointing and only confirmed in the onrush of prophetic Spirit at Gibeon, or whether he saw the promise of the Spirit on Saul as actually initiated in that onrush of *ruach Yahweh*, we cannot be certain. The point is, as Mauchline comments, 'the encounter with these ecstasies gave Saul a token that his deepest need as *nagid* would be met, he would be inspired and energised by the Spirit of Yahweh' (*I and II Samuel* (London: MMS 1971), 99; cf. Hertzberg, *op. cit.*, 85).

that in 1 Samuel 11: 6 is now seen to be the product of assertions made from different frames of reference.<sup>10</sup>

So much is obvious and no serious recent scholarship has assumed otherwise. The propositions 'the Spirit came upon Jesus at his baptism' and 'the Spirit came upon Samson at Lehi' (Jdg. 15: 14) clearly move at different levels.<sup>11</sup> When we turn to the field of New Testament studies, however, certain observations make us wonder whether the point has in fact been made clearly enough. After all, bearing in mind that there was no unified concept of the role of the Spirit in the future hope of the OT writings,<sup>12</sup> that no such unified concept developed in the intertestamental period,<sup>13</sup> and that Jesus is not usually believed to have

---

<sup>10</sup> A similar state of affairs exists in the relationship between the Spirit-anointing(?) of Samson in Mahaneh Dan (Jdg. 13: 25 and see the comments of J. Gray, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth* (London: MMS 1967), *ad loc.*) and the Spirit 'rushing on' (*šlh* again) Samson in 14: 6, 19 and 15: 14.

<sup>11</sup> Though it would be quite wrong to contrast the latter with Jesus' experience as though this, with the other mentioned occasions of charisma, were the sum total of Samson's relationship with the Spirit. This position is usually part and parcel of a more general thesis that asserts that there is an evolution in the OT from early ideas involving merely temporary and violent irruptions of the Spirit into the life of men, to later understanding which allows for a permanent endowment of (e.g.) Moses (Nu. 11: 17, 25): so *inter multos alios* D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings* (Cambridge: CUP, 1967), 207 and 209; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (ET London: SCM, 1967) Vol. 2, 50-55. Development there may be, but the proposed analysis is much too simplistic. It fails to take account of the fact that dynamistic and animistic language appears side by side in *both* early (cf. what we have seen above with respect to Saul) and much later material—indeed this phenomenon persists into the New Testament (compare Luke's use of πνεῦμα ἅγιον λαμβάνειν and πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθῆναι throughout Acts).

<sup>12</sup> Just as we cannot speak of an OT hope for some single redemptive activity, but must speak of many facets of future redemption (cleansing of the heart; the coming of a(?) messianic figure; the glory of Zion etc.), so also we cannot speak of a single or unified hope for the coming of the Spirit—merely of a consensus expecting more intense activity of the Spirit in a wide variety of spheres (from the anointing of a messianic figure with wisdom, counsel etc. (Isa. 11: 1-4), to the multiplication and blessing of Israel (Isa. 44: 3f.); from the spirit of prophecy given to the cleansed, restored Israel (Ezek. 36: 25ff.; Joel 3: 1), to the whole nexus of God's self-revealing End-events (Ezek. 37; 39:29) including the restoration of Israel). Indeed, Spirit language was by no means an essential feature in prophetic oracles dealing with the eschaton: the same activities could be spoken of with, and without, reference to God's *ruach* (cf. Jer. 31: 31ff. and Ezek. 36: 25ff. on the new covenant). Spirit-motifs were not of central importance to the OT writers when they came to express their future hope.

<sup>13</sup> There is an even greater scarcity of Spirit-motifs in the eschatological expectations of the intertestamental writers than in the OT itself. In this respect the indices of standard works on Judaism are fairly representative: neither the early work by E. Schürer (*A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, ET Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark 1886) nor the very recent one by E. P. Sanders (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, London: SCM 1977) even mentions the Spirit in Jewish literature! The pseudepigraphical writings barely refer to God's Spirit at all in their extensive coverage of God's eschatological dealings beyond the occasional mention of expectation of a Spirit-anointed messiah (cf. Ps. Sol. 17: 37 etc.).

At Qumran the situation is complex (for the literature see J. Schreiner, 'Geistbegabung in der Gemeinde von Qumran' (*BZ* 8) 161). Entry into the holy community to which God's Spirit has revealed the cleansing and sanctifying truth of the Law involves (*ipso facto*) purification by the same Spirit, which also strengthens the community in a 'reacting nomism' (cf. R. N. Longenecker, *Paul, Apostle of Liberty* (London: Harper and Row, 1964) 78). At the End (1 QS 4.20) a further, fuller cleansing by the Spirit is expected, but this virtually exhausts future hope for the Spirit beyond the usual expectation of a Spirit-anointed messianic figure (cf. esp. 11Q Melchizedek). The rabbis make passing references to a future hope in the spirit of prophecy being poured out on Israel, but again it hardly plays an important part in their soteriology. As far as diaspora writers were concerned there was even less interest. As M. Isaacs correctly observes, they "were not primarily orientated towards eschatological thinking. It is not, therefore, surprising that πνεῦμα is not used in an eschatological context in the literature of Hellenistic Judaism", *The Concept of the Spirit* (London: Heythrop Monographs, 1976), 82. It is true, as J. Vos maintains (*Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Paulinischen Pneumatologie*, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1973, 46-73), that to receive the Spirit is always, in some sense, to receive 'salvation'; but it is not true that salvation is always associated with the Spirit (in Judaism), and in any case the category 'salvation' in his

taught much on the subject,<sup>14</sup> it is quite remarkable to hear scholars, especially from Germany, unselfconsciously referring to 'receiving the Spirit' as a technical term in the earliest church. And even where this is not said in so many words it is nevertheless implied often enough in the way the Spirit-traditions are handled. One of the clearest examples of this is to be found in the way writers not infrequently treat John 20: 22 as a 'Johannine Pentecost'; a rival tradition to that in Luke-Acts as to when the Spirit was 'definitely given'.<sup>15</sup>

But it is precisely the assumption, smuggled in with the last few words, that I wish to dispute. Was it really a question of receiving the Spirit *either* on Easter Sunday *or*, say, at Pentecost but not on both? Does the very phrase τὸ πνεῦμα λαμβάνειν contain within it a concept which would be denied by applying the language to several occasions within the life of the same individual or group? Was there, in fact, only a single, 'definitive' giving of the Spirit? Or have we in the New Testament (as in the OT) evidence that an affirmation such as 'Peter received the Spirit' could be made of several occasions and from complementary frames of reference? We shall argue that the latter is nearer the truth.

We may start by pointing out that our case is at least true from Luke's perspective. If we substitute the name of Jesus for that of Peter in the last question then it must be answered in the affirmative; for it could legitimately be said of Jesus that he received the Spirit both at his baptism (Lk. 3: 21f.) and at his exaltation (Acts 2: 33)<sup>16</sup> and in strikingly different senses. For this writer at least τὸ πνεῦμα λαμβάνειν is not a well-defined formula. We may then add that in the light of what we have said about Paul's pneumatology it is all but impossible that he meant that Christians 'received the Spirit' in anything like the same sense as could be predicated of the earthly Jesus. Of course Jesus and his followers received the same Spirit if, by this, all that is meant is that they both came to experience God's

[p.26]

presence with them in and through the Spirit. But this is barely a significant statement when what is entailed in 'receiving the Spirit' is so completely different in the two cases.<sup>17</sup> For Paul,

---

usage is so broad that it is hard to imagine any Spirit-motif that could not be included. His thesis that the understanding of the Spirit in intertestamental Judaism fully prepares the way for such assertions as 1 Corinthians 15: 44f. (which, strangely, he regards substantially as pre-Pauline baptismal tradition) represents a one-sided and very misleading conclusion drawn from scant evidence.

<sup>14</sup> C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK 1970), 122-62, would fairly represent the sceptical attitude of a broad segment of scholarship towards the authenticity of Jesus' teaching on a future bestowal of the Holy Spirit (especially as presented in the Johannine material). Even those who accept that Jesus expected a period of the church (and of the Spirit) beyond his crucifixion are wont to argue that John has considerably expanded a much smaller core of historical tradition in portraying the Paraclete promises, so e.g. R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, Vol. 2 (London: Chapman, 1971) *ad loc.*

<sup>15</sup> Compare, most recently, R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, III Teil (Freiburg: Herder 1976) 386; 'Meint man mit "joh. Pfingsten" die definitive Geistverleihung an alle Glaubenden im Unterschied zu einer erst vorläufigen bzw. spezifischen Geistbegabung der "Apostel", so wird man in der Tat jenen Ausdruck wahlen dürfen und müssen.' Others will be noted in subsequent pages.

<sup>16</sup> On this occasion the language is supplied for the most part by Psalm 67: 19 (LXX) which Luke *peshers*; see, for example, J. Dupont, 'Ascension du Christ et don de L'Esprit d'après Actes 2: 33' in *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament*, (eds.) B. Lindars and S. Smalley (Cambridge: CUP, 1973), 219-28.

<sup>17</sup> Hence the attempt made by many authors to make Jesus' experience paradigmatic in this respect (so, most recently, by T. Smail, *Reflected Glory: The Spirit in Christ and in Christians* (London: Hodder, 1975), *passim*; J. 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* (London: SCM, 1975) part 1) must be accounted a failure. It is not

then, as well as for Luke, the words τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα λαμβάνειν are unlikely in themselves to have been anything more than an ambivalent expression demarcating the beginning of some (unspecified) relationship between an individual (or group, cf. Gal. 3: 2, 5?) and God's Spirit. This is not to deny that when Paul spoke of converts receiving the Spirit he meant something very specific, but the precision is not contained in the expression τὸ πνεῦμα λαμβάνειν itself, *but is brought to it* from Paul's understanding of conversion and its relationship to the work of the Spirit. Had the expression been a technical term for Paul he could barely have brought himself to pen the gibe in 2 Corinthians 11: 4 (ἡ πνεῦμα ἕτερον λαμβάνετε ὃ οὐκ ἐλάβετε) where, in context, πνεῦμα ἕτερον λαμβάνετε could only mean something like 'you come under the sway of some alien power expressing itself in and through the false apostles' preaching'.<sup>18</sup>

In what remains of this paper we shall attempt to show that within John's writing the language of receiving the Spirit could be used at least at two levels. There is a sense in which disciples of Jesus can be said to receive the Spirit in the earthly ministry of Jesus and, side by side with this, affirmations which appear to deny it, but which, in our view, are better understood as statements made from a complementary frame of reference. We shall start by examining the significance of the promise of the Paraclete. We shall then turn to the question of the meaning of John 20: 22 and enquire whether or not the evangelist understood it as the giving of the Spirit-Paraclete. We shall argue that he did not, neither did he consider it to be a piece of purely prophetic symbolism referring to a future possibility, rather he understood it as a climax of receiving the Spirit within the ministry of Jesus.

## II. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PARACLETE PROMISES

The significance of the Paraclete promises in the Fourth Gospel has been obscured by the interplay of four factors: (i) The general unity of the Paraclete material with the rest of the Fourth Gospel was once strongly disputed (following H. Windisch<sup>19</sup>) but now appears to be established theologically and linguistically.<sup>20</sup> (ii) The term παράκλητος is rare in the period and studies of its background have not proved conclusive. (iii) Whereas the primary background of παράκλητος<sup>21</sup> is forensic, not all the functions performed by the Paraclete are

---

possible to identify, from Jesus' experience of the new age, covenant and kingdom by the Spirit, an archetypal element which was later shared by Christians. The Christian existential experience of the salvation-historical tension (and of life of the new age) which Paul outlines could hardly be applied to Jesus. Our experience of these is bound up with our being 'flesh' (σὰρξ—and this in precisely the senses that Paul *cannot* attribute to Jesus) and with our experience of new life 'in Christ' made possible by the decisive Christ-event.

<sup>18</sup> See the commentaries *ad loc.*

<sup>19</sup> 'Die fünf johanneischen Parakletsprüche' in *Festgabe für A. Julicher* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1927), 110-37—following earlier attempts by J. Wellhausen, F. Spitta, H. Delafosse and H. Sasse.

<sup>20</sup> G. Bornkamm, 'Der Paraklet im Johannes-Evangelium' in *Geschichte and Glaube*, Vol. 1 (Munich: Kaiser Verlag 1968) 68, sums up the present position with the words 'ihr fester Platz in den Abschiedsreden stehen ausser Frage'. So also R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (London: Chapman, 1971), 642ff., though he identifies a number of redactional stages in the material before finally all the 'comings' of Jesus (save the parousia) are seen as fulfilled in and through the Spirit (cf. 601ff.; 643ff. and 699ff.). G. Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John* (Cambridge: CUP 1970) 61-79 offers the most thorough linguistic analysis.

<sup>21</sup> For the history of the investigation see above all O. Betz, *Der Paraklet: Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannes-Evangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften* (Leiden: Brill 1963), 4-35; G. Johnston, *Spirit-Paraclete*, 80-118; R. E. Brown, 'The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel' (*NTS* 13) 113ff. and D. E. Holwerda, *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John*, (Kampen : Kok, 1959) 26ff. For more recent material touching the problem, see A. R. C. Leaney, 'The Johannine Paraclete and Qumran' in *John and*

obviously forensic in nature. (iv) The precise relationship between the Paraclete promises and other Spirit-material in John has been difficult to ascertain.

Two scholars have made contributions of particular importance towards elucidating the function of the paraclete material in John:

1. R. E. Brown<sup>22</sup> tested the parallels between what is said of the Paraclete and of Jesus. He discovered that the relationships which Jesus sustains with (a) the Father, (b) the disciples and (c) the world are mirrored by a similar set of functional relationships held by the Paraclete with (a) the Father and Jesus together, (b) the disciples and (c) the world. In more detail:

(a) As Jesus 'came' into the world (5: 43; 16: 28; 18: 37) and 'came forth' (16: 27) from the Father, so also the Paraclete (15: 26; 16: 7, 8, 13; 14: 26). Both are 'sent' by the Father (3: 16f.; 15: 26; 16: 7).

(b) If the Spirit is ἄλλος παράκλητος, then Jesus is the first (14: 16). Spirit

[p.27]

of Truth (14: 17) corresponds to Jesus as the Truth (14: 6). The Paraclete as 'Holy' Spirit (14: 26)<sup>23</sup> parallels Jesus as the 'Holy' one of God (6: 39).

(c) As the disciples 'know' or 'recognise' Jesus (14: 7, 9) so also with the Paraclete (14: 17). Jesus and the Paraclete will dwell 'in' them (14: 17, 20; 15: 1-10; 17: 23). Jesus and the Paraclete are both distinguished as teachers (14: 25f. and *passim*); Jesus as Messiah reveals all things (4: 25f.), supremely himself and the Father; the Paraclete after him will also reveal all things to the disciples—particularly the glorified Jesus (16: 14; 15: 26f.).

(d) If the world will not 'receive'<sup>24</sup> Jesus neither will it receive the Paraclete (14: 17 cf. 1: 12 etc. Compare also 15:26, 18-25). The Spirit will continue Jesus' ministry of conviction of sin, judgement and righteousness (16: 8-11).<sup>25</sup>

The first two Paraclete sayings are sandwiched with sayings about 'leaving' and yet 'returning' (with the Father) to dwell with the obedient disciple. If Jesus and the Father are going to make their abode with the Christian (14: 23) and if Jesus is to appear to the disciples, but not to the world (14: 17, 19, 21f.), and if, again, he is not going to abandon them as so many orphans (14: 18), it is because the coming Paraclete will mediate the presence of the Father and the Son, just as the Son had represented the Father in his earthly life (14: 7). Brown concludes '...it is our contention that John presents the Paraclete as the Holy Spirit in a

---

*Qumran* (London: Chapman, 1972), (ed.) J. H. Charlesworth, 38-61; E. Bammel, 'Jesus and der Paraklet in Johannes 16', in *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament* (as at note 16), 199ff. and F. Porsch, *Pneuma and Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Frankfurt am Main: Knecht, 1974). The last is a most impressively documented and argued thesis which unfortunately only became available to me relatively late in the process of preparing this paper.

<sup>22</sup> In the works cited at notes 20 and 21.

<sup>23</sup> Though perhaps with G. Johnston, *Spirit-Paraclete* 31, we should omit ἅγιον following syr<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>24</sup> Pace O. Betz, the λαμβάνειν/διδόναι language cannot prove the nature of the Spirit to be impersonal, for the same language is used of Jesus: cf. Porsch, *Pneuma*, 320 and R. E. Brown, 'The Paraclete', 124.

<sup>25</sup> For fuller parallels see the works cited; compare Porsch, *Pneuma*, 239ff.

special role, namely as the personal presence of Jesus in the Christian while Jesus is with the Father'.<sup>26</sup>

Brown's thesis has been strenuously attacked by G. Johnston, but much of his comment appears to be a misunderstanding of Brown's position,<sup>27</sup> the broad outline of which commends itself.

2. D. E. Holwerda<sup>28</sup> recognises that the term παράκλητος is essentially forensic in character and also that C. K. Barrett<sup>29</sup> and J. G. Davies<sup>30</sup> have much to offer when they explore the relationship between the Paraclete and the long-awaited παράκλησις of Israel (cf. Lk. 2: 25). He only departs from their insistence that παράκλητος is derived directly from παράκαλεῖν and Christian paracesis: Barrett, he contends, has not proved that the messianic comfort cannot be related to the Paraclete qua intercessor or representative.

Essentially Holwerda's contribution lies in his successful attempt to demonstrate that all the functions of the Spirit-Paraclete are properly construed as forensic and as conducted on behalf of the disciples, who would otherwise be left in the proverbial situation of orphans (14: 18): defenceless. He first draws out the juridical implications of a number of the motifs related to Jesus' ministry, especially to the theme of witness against the κόσμος as handled by John (48ff.). After the death and departure of Jesus the situation is seen to remain the same, only the Spirit acting through the disciples is now the chief witness in the cosmic trial. The hostility that once faced Jesus now passes to his representatives (16: 1-4) who would be 'orphans' but for the Paraclete (50ff.). But Jesus' departure, the occasion of the Paraclete's advent, will be to the advantage of the disciples (16: 7) because the Spirit will convict the world of sin, of righteousness and of imminent judgement, thus bringing them assurance that victory has been given to their Lord. Thus, while the Paraclete is in one sense Jesus'

---

<sup>26</sup> *John*, 1139—without denying a parousia hope: cf. *idem.*, *NTS* 13, 132, n. 2.

<sup>27</sup> Essentially the criticism is that attention must not be given to a *successor* to Jesus, however invisible, but to the apostolic church to which the promises are made: the concept of the *Spirit-Paraclete* directs attention to the evidence in the life of the community of wisdom, vitality, virtue and graces that Christians could only explain as the signs of divine power and God's very presence (*Spirit-Paraclete*, 126). But this is so close to what Brown says that Johnston's distinction between the Spirit as 'the representative of Jesus' and Brown's 'the presence of Jesus when Jesus is absent' appears hypersubtle. Brown neither underemphasises the corporate dimension of the Spirit's work nor does he regard OT tandem relationships (e.g. Moses/Joshua) as strict parallels to that of Jesus and the Spirit beyond the fact that the function(s) of the first member is carried on in the second (*pace* Johnston, *ibid.*, 95). The attempt to shift attention to the church's new gifts without stressing the 'successor' (of Jesus), from whom they are derived, is reminiscent of a grin without the Cheshire cat.

Johnston's own position is somewhat less convincing than Brown's and pays too little attention to the context of the Paraclete promises in the farewell discourses. He argues against Betz's view (*Der Paraklet*, 156) that John identifies the Paraclete as the angel Michael; Johnston insists rather that the Paraclete material is a deliberate rebuttal of claims for an angel intercessor as the spiritual guide or guardian of the Christian church. 'Paraclete' is a function not a personal title (the definite article used with it being merely demonstrative and the masculine ἐκεῖνος deriving from the relationship to Jesus or to God (123). John's readers could not simultaneously identify the Spirit of Truth as an angelic figure and the (invisible) power of paracesis; so by portraying the Paraclete as the latter John accomplishes his task (121). Unfortunately the premise is false. At Qumran the Spirit could apparently quite easily hover between being an angelic figure and being an invisible influence on men.

<sup>28</sup> As at note 21, 26-85.

<sup>29</sup> 'The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel' (*JTS* 1), 1-15.

<sup>30</sup> 'The Primary Meaning of ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ' (*JTS* 4), 35-8; for the purpose of this article Davies' work may simply be regarded as an extension of Barrett's position.



representative before the world,<sup>31</sup> it is no less true that he is (*ipso facto*) simultaneously advocate of the disciples who now officially represent their Lord (17: 18; 13: 20 cf. 15: 21 (p. 59f.)).

While the function of revelation to the disciples (14: 17, 26 and 16: 13)

[p.28]

would at first seem unrelated to forensic activities, it soon becomes clear, when it is realised that it is the disciples who bear the responsibility of witnessing to Jesus, that this revelatory function is part of the broader picture that has been painted. Revelation of the significance of Jesus for the community (and of his direction to the same) is juridical, in so far as it provides part of the folio delivered at the ongoing assize. The fact that, in part, this revelation of the truth also establishes communion between Jesus and his disciples does not contradict the general interpretation outlined above, for this 'mystical' relationship is clearly part and parcel of the whole juridical structure of John's presentation.<sup>32</sup>

The works of Holwerda and Brown are mutually complementary. The Spirit will mediate the presence of the Father, and of the ascended (crucified and glorified) Lord, and will thus bring fullness of life because he enables knowledge of him whom to know is life (17:3; 11:25).<sup>33</sup> The Spirit, as Paraclete, brings the disciples eschatological peace as he prosecutes Jesus' case before the κόσμος through (and in) Jesus' representatives. The ethos of these promises thus weighs against the reductionist tendencies of many modern exegetes.<sup>34</sup> At the same time, John's Paraclete is seen quite clearly to belong to the period after Jesus' ascension; he is not required as Jesus' replacement while Jesus himself is still with the disciples.

---

<sup>31</sup> So, emphatically, M. -F. Berrouard, 'Le Paraklet, défenseur du Christ devant la conscience du croyant (In. XVI, 8-11), (*RScPhilT* 33), 361-89 and J. M. Boice, *Witness and Revelation in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids; Zondervan, 1970), 153f.

<sup>32</sup> For complementary, but independent analysis arriving at broadly similar conclusions see A. Trites, *The New Testament Concept of Witness* (Cambridge: CUP, 1977), 78-122.

<sup>33</sup> Note that this appears to eliminate the possibility of the Paraclete being present with only a section of the community. The activity of the Spirit as Paraclete is a necessary and sufficient condition of authentic Christian experience after the ascension: *pace* F. Mussner, 'Die johanneischen Parakletsprüche and die apostolische Tradition' (*BZ* 5), 56-70 and much pentecostalist exegesis.

<sup>34</sup> Jesus is not to be identified with the Spirit (as Bornkamm, 'Der Paraklet'), nor is the Paraclete motif merely a way of describing the powers of the post-resurrection community (as Johnston appears to claim), nor, again, can we reduce the Paraclete to the power of Christian proclamation (as Bultmann and Schweizer); for a critique of these compare W. Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung and Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970<sup>2</sup>), 142ff., and Porsch, *Pneuma*, 381-9.

Porsch is undoubtedly correct in interpreting the primary means of the presence of Christ in terms of the Spirit-empowered (charismatic?) word (*op. cit.*, 390-404; with which may be compared A. R. C. Leaney (as at note 21) who argues that 'the presence of Christ' was a universal experience of the early church without which such traditions as Mark 13: 11, Luke 21: 15 could never have been attributed to Jesus). But there is no reason to assume that this was the exclusive mode of the Paraclete's activity envisaged at John 14: 15-24, even allowing that the 'word' in Porsch's thesis stands for more than simply the proclamation about Jesus. The experience of the Spirit as a paraclete in the early church was much more broadly based than this (cf. J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, esp. pt 111). A number of scholars who can hardly be accused of desiring to harmonise Luke and John at all costs have nevertheless noted that the book of Acts is one of the best commentaries on the Paraclete promises—so, from entirely different perspectives, R. Stamm, 'Luke-Acts and the Three Cardinal Ideas in the Gospel of John' (in *Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman*) and W. F. Lofthouse, 'The Holy Spirit in the Acts and the Fourth Gospel' (*ET* 52), 334-6.

### III. THE GIFT OF THE SPIRIT IN JOHN 20: 19-23

Few passages in John offer quite the range of problems that John 20: 19-23 presents. We shall attempt to sharpen the issues by giving a critique of two opposed theories each of which has received considerable scholarly support.

(a) The first hypothesis is that with this passage John depicts the full giving of the Paraclete.<sup>35</sup> The arguments which support this thesis are as follows. According to 7: 39f. the Spirit is to be given when Jesus is 'glorified'. But a careful analysis of John's multivalent use of δοξάζειν (glorify), ὑψοῦν (lift up) and ἀναβαίνειν (ascend) reveals that he moulded into one theological unit the death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus.<sup>36</sup> By John 20: 22 Jesus has been glorified (cf. 13: 31), has been 'lifted up' (cf. 12: 32f.) and, indeed, ascended—for while he has not yet fully ascended (cf. οὐπω ἀναβέβηκα... ἀναβαίνω in 20: 17) when, because of this, he forbids Mary to touch him, his reverse command in the case of Thomas (20: 27) shows that the process is by then complete. The difference between the two situations is also reflected in the different responses to Jesus made in 20: 16 and 20:28. Besides this, the joy of the disciples in 20: 20 is a fulfilment of the promise of 16: 22, and Jesus' words 'Peace be to you' (20: 19) also fulfil Paraclete promises (14: 27; 16: 33). Finally, the commission of the disciples requires an empowering and 20: 22 is the only recorded fulfilment of the johannine promises of the Spirit made from 1: 33 on.

But the counter arguments are telling. 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.<sup>37</sup> Further the risen Jesus,

---

<sup>35</sup> It is the most popular, having the support of (*inter alios*) C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to John* (London: SPCK, 1956), 474f.; J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint John* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928), 676; O. Betz, *Der Paraklet*, 169; R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John* (ET Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 756; F.-M. Braun, *Jean le Theologien* III/1 (Paris: Lecoffre, 1966), 225ff.; R. E. Brown, *John*, 1019ff.; F. Buchsel, *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1926) 497; Archimandrite Cassien, *La Pentecôte johannique* (Paris: Editeurs Réunis, 1939) *passim*; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: CUP, 1953), 442; K. Haacker, *Die Stiftung des Heils: Untersuchungen zur Struktur der johanneischen Theologie* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1972), 153ff.; S. H. Hooke, 'The Spirit was Not Yet' (*NTS* 9), 379; D. Hill, *Greek Words*, 287; Lake in BC 1, 323; A. R. C. Leaney, as in note 21, 49f.; J. Marsh, *The Gospel of Saint John* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), 639f.; J. N. Sanders and B. A. Mastin, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (London: A. and C. Black, 1968), 433; H. Schlier, 'Zum Begriff des Geistes nach dem Johannesevangelium' in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für J. Schmid* (eds., J. Blinzer, O. Kuss u. Mussner, Regensburg: Pustet, 1963), 234-6 etc.

<sup>36</sup> See particularly W. Thüsing, *Erhöhung, passim*; D. E. Holwerda, *Holy Spirit*, ch. 1; J. T. Forestell, *The Word of the Cross: Salvation as Revelation in the Fourth Gospel* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974), 58-101 and the (as yet unpublished) Cambridge dissertation *Predestination and Responsibility: Elements of Tension-Theology in the Fourth Gospel against Jewish Background*, by Don Carson, esp. 163-78; 197-252.

<sup>37</sup> As J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM, 1970), 177, wryly observes. G. Bampfylde brings new arguments to Hoskyn's case (*The Fourth Gospel*, London: Faber and Faber, 1947) for a giving of the Spirit from the cross. In 'John XIX: 28: A Case for a Different Translation' (*NT* 11), 246-60, Bampfylde argues that τελειόω = 'bring to fruition', and that the scripture is brought to fruition through Jesus' death in that the basic message of hope—the promise of the Spirit—is fulfilled when Jesus bowed his head and παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα. But even Bampfylde must admit that Jesus could only have bequeathed the Spirit at this stage and that the disciples experience this later. In that case 19: 28 stresses the theological unity of death and release of the Spirit without requiring any 'chronological foreshortening'. It could be, however, that the reference to πνεῦμα

in the appearance to Mary, distinguishes all too clearly between resurrection and ascension with the words οὐπω ἀναβέβηκα.<sup>38</sup> But if we allow a chronological period between resurrection and ascension the case for John's needing to bring the Paraclete bestowal

[p.29]

forward, to emphasise theological unity with the death/resurrection/exaltation complex, is lost, and with this the argument that Jesus' glorification is complete (by 20: 22) founders.<sup>39</sup>

---

here is purely anthropological—in which case we would have yet another parallel between the passion narratives of John and Luke (cf. Lk. 23: 46).

<sup>38</sup> These controversial words stand at the parting of the ways of those who hold the general hypothesis that 20: 22 is the johannine Pentecost. B. Schwank, 'Das leere Grab (20: 1-18)', *SeinSend* 29, 398 (cited by Brown, *John* §§ 68 and 69) regards the appearance to Mary as of an earthbound Jesus who 'ascends' and becomes 'heavenly' before 20: 19. But there is nothing in the text to suggest that 20: 19 is a fundamentally different type of appearance. The different responses to Mary and Thomas, the former being told not to cling to him (cf. C. F. D. Moule, 'The Individualism of the Fourth Gospel' (*NT* 5), 175; and Porsch, *Pneuma*, 348, for this interpretation of the *noli me tangere*) and the latter being invited to probe his wounds, are to be explained in terms of contrasting needs of the disciples and not by a change in Jesus' existence (Moule, *ibid.*). The words to Mary possibly emphasise that this is not Jesus' permanent mode of presence with the disciples which must await the Paraclete (so Brown, *John*, 1012—partly depending on Bultmann, *John*, 533). Alternatively, they may simply state the obvious—there is no need to cling to Jesus because he has not departed (Moule, *ibid.*); there is certainly no need to take Jesus' οὐπω ἀναβέβηκα to mean that the ascension has commenced! Nor is there better reason for assuming that the ἀναβαίνω is the reason for the command and that it refers to something imminent. As Dunn observes (*Baptism*, 176 (following Moule), the ἀναβαίνω (20: 17) is located in the message to be conveyed to the disciples—it is not given as the reason why Mary should desist from clinging to/touching Jesus. Nor, again, does ἀναβαίνω demand an immediate fulfilment any more than do the words ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχὴν μου (10: 17), as Carson notes (*Predestination*, 169). The words to Thomas simply offer the verification he demanded (20: 27, 25).

The different responses of Mary (20: 16) and Thomas (20: 28) to the appearances do not establish any difference in kind; especially as Mary reports her meeting with the words ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον—v. 18 and cf. v. 25 (Brown, *John*, 1014; Dunn, *Baptism*, 176). Mary, it is true, does not recognise Jesus immediately, while Thomas falls down and worships him; but both failure of recognition and worship are common to the gospel resurrection traditions (Lk. 24: 13-21; Mt. 28: 17 cf. Jn. 21: 12) and therefore cannot be used to demonstrate different types of appearance.

Brown's position is more cautious. For him there is no fundamental difference in mode of existence between 20: 17 and 23. Jesus is already 'ascended' (and glorified) when he appears to Mary, and John wishes his reader to understand that resurrection is part of ascension; the time lag between them is merely apparent. This will not do. If, for John, ἀνάστασις and ἀνάβασις are different ways of expressing the same truth, then the wording of v. 17 has conceded far more than was necessary to the readers John wishes to correct. If no more is required for complete 'ascension', then the reply to Mary (that resurrection 'is only part of the ascension' which must be completed ere the Spirit be given) is meaningless. If on the other hand we take the *prima facie* force of the balanced statement οὐπω ἀναβέβηκα... ἀναβέβηκα... ἀναβαίνω we must conclude that John does in some sense distinguish resurrection and ascension, even if the former is a door to, and integral part of, the latter. To refer to John 20: 17 as 'a theological statement contrasting the passing nature of Jesus' presence in his post-resurrectional appearances and the permanent value of his presence in the Spirit' (Brown, *John*, 1015) only confuses the issue, for the appearance in 20: 20 is not an appearance in the Spirit.

A third group (including Bultmann, Barrett, Betz and others) do not try to establish that Jesus has yet ascended by 20: 22 and thereby, in our view, admit defeat; John's own conditions for the giving of the Paraclete are then not fulfilled (Holwerda, *Holy Spirit, passim*; J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin: Reimer, 1908), 94; M. -J. Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon Saint Jean* (Paris: Gabalda, 1936), 515.

<sup>39</sup> F.-M. Braun correctly states 'les paroles ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου (xx, 17) seront réalisées lorsque le Verbe fait chair échangera sa condition terrestre en la condition céleste d'être auprès de Père, ainsi qu'il était avant sa venue en ce monde', *Jean*, 221 (cf. Jn. 17: 5). But these words are not fulfilled when applied to John 20: 20ff. (as Braun assumes): (a) the process of ὑπάγειν is as yet incomplete, even if it started with the cross (see Holwerda, *op. cit.*, 19Q (b) Jesus does not yet appear in all his pre-incarnate glory and (c) the ascension must

Two further observations hasten its fate. Firstly, it has been noted in the context of a rather different thesis, that very little in this scene (20: 19-23), if anything, corresponds to the promises of the Paraclete.<sup>40</sup> But secondly, 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.<sup>41</sup> John does not record the coming of the Paraclete.

(b) A second hypothesis is that Jesus here only symbolically promises the Paraclete. This is an ancient view—it has the distinction of being specifically condemned by the Council of Constantinople (Canon. 22)—introduced to harmonise Luke and John, but it may be able to stand on its own ground.<sup>42</sup> (a) The absolute ἐνεφύσησεν may simply be 'he expired a deep breath' rather than the interpretation given by Tatian, D, syr<sup>cur</sup>: 'he insufflated them' (ἐνεφύσησεν αὐτοῖς),<sup>43</sup> (b) The command λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον does not necessarily imply that the disciples were instantly able to obey—Jesus elsewhere uses imperatives which cannot be fully undertaken at the instant of command: for example 7: 37f. (c) The commission of the disciples in 20: 21 is strikingly similar to Luke 24: 36-49 where the promised Spirit is clearly only a future possibility.<sup>44</sup> (d) The sign—deep expiration—is no more difficult in its relationship to the gift of the Paraclete than are other johannine signs to the various spiritual realities they portray, nor is it more mysterious than what is depicted in some other NT resurrection appearances. John may have used it to re-emphasise the theological unity of the death/resurrection/ascension complex with the gift of the Spirit still to be fulfilled.

Attractive though this theory may be, we are disinclined to accept it. While the verb ἐμφυσᾶν *may* have lost the force of its compounded preposition, it is very difficult to find examples where this is obvious,<sup>45</sup> and ἐκπνεῖν would have served the purpose much better if all John wanted to say was that Jesus let out a deep breath. It should be noted, too, that John gives no

---

coincide (or reach completion) with the transfer from 'seeing and believing' to 'not seeing and believing' (20: 29).

<sup>40</sup> Compare the comment of J. Wellhausen, *Johannis*, 94: 'Der eingehauchte Geist, der aus Jesus kommt and ihm inne wohnt, entspricht nicht dem Parakleten in Kap 14, der vom Vater gesandt wird and als Hypostase gedacht ist,' and that of Lagrange, *Jean*, 515, 'Ils (those who consider Jn. 20: 22 to be the johannine Pentecost) doivent avouer que l'acte décrit ici (Jo. xx: 22) par Jo ne remplit pas les condition indiquées par Jo lui même (xiv: 16, 26; xvi: 7, 13) pour la mission de l'Esprit qui doit être envoyé par le Fils ou le Père mais après le retour du Fils auprès du Père, et pour supplier a l'absence du Fils'. In addition it should be noted that 20: 22 commands that the disciple receive πνεῦμα ἅγιον, not 'the Paraclete', cf. note 23.

<sup>41</sup> A point which is observed by Porsch, *Pneuma*, 375f. (to which we shall return later), by R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 387, and R. Bultmann, *John*, 756.

<sup>42</sup> The most recent, and by far the most plausible advocate is D. A. Carson, *Predestination*, 169f.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> For details see Porsch, *Pneuma*, 354f. But the parallels have been interpreted in a quite different way by W. G. Macdonald, *Problems of Pneumatology in Christology: The Relationship of Christ and the Holy Spirit in Biblical Theology* (unpublished ThD dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1970), 242-69, who argues that the gift of the Spirit in John 20: 22 corresponds to the illumination of the disciples in Luke 24: 44-6.

<sup>45</sup> In Si 43: 4 we should perhaps say that the sun breathes out fiery fumes, but even here the point lies in the comparison with a man blowing (out) into a furnace. In the remaining septuagintal contexts (3 Kg. 17: 21; Jb. 4: 21; Wis. 15: 11; Na. 2: 2; Ezek. 21: 31; 22: 20; 37: 9) the idea of blowing 'into' or 'onto' an object is always present. It is doubtful whether this connotation could be avoided even in the absolute use in John 20: 22.

indication that this 'expiration' is only a sign of some future possibility, contrary to his usual custom (cf. 2: 21f.; 7: 39; 12: 33; 13: 7, etc.). In addition, while Jesus elsewhere gives commands that cannot be fully carried out until after the death/resurrection/ascension complex, the emphasis must fall on the adverb; not 'fully'. Commands such as this one, which *prima facie* apply to the immediate situation, are not to be related to *purely* future possibilities.

The most obvious counter-example to this last statement would appear to be John 7: 37-39. On one reading of these verses Jesus commands men to drink, then and there, waters that would only later be released through Jesus' glorification.<sup>46</sup> But this interpretation of the passage is neither necessary nor entirely probable. Even if the 'quotation' is understood christologically<sup>47</sup> it need not mean more than that the *abundant* flow of the Spirit is located by the evangelist on our side of the cross<sup>48</sup> i.e. that the Spirit that they were about to receive (7: 39) was the Spirit to be experienced as rivers of living water

[p.30]

flowing from Jesus—without denying that they already experienced the Spirit in measure in and through the life and teaching of Jesus. If, however, the 'quotation' is to be applied to the believer—which seems more probable<sup>49</sup>—then this passage promises that those

---

<sup>46</sup> This is a common view. If vv. 37b-38a are punctuated with a stop before καθώς, a balanced couplet ('let him come to me who thirsts, and let him drink who believes in me') is formed which invites a christological interpretation of the 'quotation' which follows. (For this punctuation see *TDNT* 4, 277n73; Thüsing, *Erhöhung*, 160ff.; Brown, *John*, 319ff.; Schnackenburg, *Johannesevangelium II*, 213f.; Porsch, *Pneuma*, 57ff.). Verse 39 could then be taken to exclude any measure of fulfilment before the glorification of Jesus (especially if 19: 35ff. is understood as an allusion to these words and to the typology of Moses striking the rock in the wilderness; so Brown, *John*, *ad loc.*). The invitation of v. 37b is thus reduced to a promise about the post-resurrectional future.

<sup>47</sup> For the most cogent presentation of this case see R. E. Brown, *John*, 319-31 and the literature cited there.

<sup>48</sup> As οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα (for this is certainly the correct reading: the additions of (ἄγ.) δεδουμένον (B lat sy); ἄγ. ἐπ' αὐτοῖς (D\*f) being a reflection of scribal embarrassment) cannot be taken in an absolute sense—else it denies even 1: 32f.—there is room in which to manoeuvre. The words may simply mean 'the age of the Spirit' was not yet (cf. L. Morris, *The Gospel According to John* (London: MMS, 1971), 427) in the attenuated sense that the Spirit has not yet been experienced as the life of Jesus in the life of men (so S. H. Hooke, as at n. 35, 379f.—though he draws strongly on 1 Corinthians 15: 45 to interpret John at this point). In such an eventuality it would not be necessary to deny that the Spirit was active in a different sphere, in the disciples, before Jesus' glorification.

<sup>49</sup> Textually the evidence favours the traditional punctuation with a stop after πινέτω: thus P<sup>66</sup>, dating from the second century. This has the advantage that ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ then takes a common initial position in a Johannine sentence (Sanders, *John*, 213 n. 2 provides a parallel in 6: 39 to what would nevertheless be an unusual *nominativus pendens*) rather than the final position which is unparalleled in John. J. B. Cortes, 'Yet Another Look at John 7: 37-8' (*CBQ* 29), 81, further points out that all other uses of the phrase are followed by a statement about the resultant blessedness of the believer—a consideration which would certainly favour the traditional punctuation and the application of the 'citation' to the Christian.

It may be admitted that a christological application is inviting, but it is not clear that the OT passages used to support such a thesis necessarily apply exclusively in its favour. If the OT reference lying behind 7: 38 is based on Zechariah 14: 8ff.; Joel 3: 18 and Ezekiel 47: 1-12 (as association with the feast of tabernacles would suggest—see the commentaries *ad loc.*) then the imagery of the temple rock pouring out the waters of the Spirit could equally apply to Jesus or to the messianic community of which he is the head—or even to individuals as Si 24: 30f. takes it. While it is clear that Revelation 22: 1 connects the river of life with the throne of God and of the Lamb (while not precisely saying that Jesus was the source of those waters, as *TDNT* 6, 606f. observes) this general concept would not be denied were John 7: 38f. taken of believers. The source would still ultimately be Jesus, who issues the invitation (cf. J. B. Cortes, *CBQ* 29, 76, who rightly comments that those who opt for the christological interpretation are too often blind to this).

who come to Jesus and drink *now* will, after the glorification, become abundant sources in themselves of living water.<sup>50</sup> In other words their thirst will be more than quenched by Jesus' gift (4: 14).

But, it may be asked, how is drinking in the pre-resurrection ministry related to quenching of thirst and to the abundant streams of living water promised in respect of believers? This question leads us into one of the densest parts of the thickly-grown forest of johannine theology, namely the problem of the relationship of the disciples to the realised eschatology which marks the speeches and acts of Jesus. Basically, John's gospel binds the realised eschatology and vertical dualism of Jesus' words so tightly to the events of Jesus' 'hour'<sup>51</sup> that the death/exaltation must be understood as the sharply-defined focus of God's redemptive activity.<sup>52</sup> This imposes certain limits on the extent to which men can truly be said to believe in Jesus before his 'hour'. Where Jesus' hearers in the gospel account are said to believe, there are usually caveats introduced in the immediate context.<sup>53</sup> Even the confident exclamation of the disciples in 16: 30 ('now we know...') stands under the shadow of Jesus' question 'Do you now believe?' with its attached prophecy '...you will be scattered... you will leave me alone' (16: 31).

It is not surprising in view of this that a number of exegetes have concluded that Jesus' proclamation could not be experienced in its quality as Spirit-and-life (6: 63) until after the ascension.<sup>54</sup> In addition to the general argument outlined above it is also pointed out that the gift of living water offered in John 4 is couched in future terms (cf. δώσω in 4: 14) and that this is paralleled in John 6 by the gift of bread from heaven (cf. δώσω in 6: 51c) which is specifically identified as a symbol of Jesus' death for men (6: 50f.).<sup>55</sup> Further, the statement in 6: 63 that Jesus' words are Spirit and life comes after an allusion

---

Attempts to trace the imagery of v. 38 to the rock in the wilderness are at best only partially successful. If John evokes Exodus typology at all (cf. Brown, *John*, 322) then Jesus is identified with Moses here rather than with the rock (note 7: 40 where he is recognised as 'the Prophet'—compare 6: 14 and W. Meeks, *The Prophet King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (Leiden: Brill, 1967) thereon).

In the final analysis the view that the quotation applies to believers is easier to accept: (i) It allows the reader to take πινέτω with ἐάν τις διψᾷ rather than with ὁ πιστεύων; 'as thirsty, a man is properly summoned to come and drink; as a believer who has come and drunk, he can be the subject of a statement (such as is contained in Jn. 7: 38)' (Barrett, *John*, 270). (ii) This is further supported by the parallel ancient invitation issued before the passover: 'everyone who is hungry, let him come and be satisfied!' (*TDNT* 6, 607). (iii) This interpretation allows the smoothest flow between vv. 38 and 39 (B. Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (London: MMS, 1972), 301; Cortes (*CBQ* 29, 82). (iv) John does not expect the believer to need to drink (cf. 6: 35; 4: 14); rather it is the (as yet) unbeliever who is summoned to *come*—as elsewhere in John. The invitation is precisely to come to that belief which quenches thirst (so Cortes *CBQ* 29, 82) whence it follows that the words 'he who believes on me', cannot be taken with v. 37, but describe the result of one who takes up the invitation.

<sup>50</sup> Though as Cortes points out (*CBQ* 29, 76), the emphasis is not on overflow of the Spirit from the believer to others, but on the life-giving quality of the Spirit in the believer. Hence 7: 38 may stand in parallel to 4: 14 (*pace* Brown, *John*, 321) though see below for a different emphasis.

<sup>51</sup> On Jesus' 'hour'—a leitmotiv in the gospel—see *TDNT* 9, 679; Thüsing, *Erhöhung*, §6; Carson, *Predestination*, 163f.; 177ff.

<sup>52</sup> For a brief but excellent survey see Carson, *Predestination*, 165-79.

<sup>53</sup> D. A. Carson, *Predestination*, 222-3; J. Painter, 'Eschatological Faith in the Gospel of John in *Reconciliation and Hope* (ed.) R. J. Banks (Exeter: Paternoster, 1974), 36-53.

<sup>54</sup> So Brown, *John*, *ad loc.*; Dunn, *Baptism*, 184; Porsch, *Pneuma*, 53-212; and Thüsing, *Erhöhung*, 154 (cf. 261ff.), who writes of 6: 63 (in the light of 7: 39?) 'es ist nicht gesagt, dass der irdische Jesus schon eine Geistspendung vollziehe. Viehlmehr können ρήματα and πνεύμα gleichgesetzt werden, insofern die "Worte" durch den Geist, im zweiten Stadium des Heilswerkes, ihre lebenspendende Wirkung entfalten' (p. 155).

<sup>55</sup> J. D. G. Dunn, 'John VI—A Eucharistic Discourse?' (*NTS* 17), 336.

to 'ascension' (in 6: 62), which some take to define the *terminus a quo* of experiencing the message of Jesus in the sphere of πνεῦμα rather than in the sphere of σάρξ.<sup>56</sup>

But these assertions appear to push johannine thought into too tight a system and fail to do justice to other tendencies in the gospel:

(a) On a historical plane (and we must remember that John has not swamped chronology with theology; a process which is always in danger of dissolving salvation from history altogether) the *terminus a quo* of the eschatological age must stretch back to the ministry, if not to the incarnation of Jesus.<sup>57</sup>

(b) While the disciples have yet to attain to that full and 'authentic' faith which is possible for all believers after the ascension, they are nonetheless locked into a *process* which is leading to such faith. They are already in some sense Christ's sheep (cf. 10: 16; 6: 70). While it is possible to read too much into the statements that aver belief on the part of the disciples, the danger is at least equally great of making them say too little. When John places the statement that Jesus 'revealed his glory' side by side with the comment that the disciples ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν (2: 11) we must take this belief very seriously—else we empty the word ἐφανερώσεν of all content. Similarly, in a context of men being turned away by the grandeur of Jesus' claims, Jesus (6: 64) says to those who stay: 'some of you do not believe'. The corollary would appear to be that others, like Peter in 6: 68, really do believe and experience Jesus' teaching as the words of eternal life (*ibid.*). The same applies in the case of the man born blind in John 9 (cf. especially verses 35-39) who as a believer is willing to face persecution. Finally, whatever may be said of 16: 31 (and at very least it means that the disciples' belief is only a pale reflection of what it is yet to be), full belief is certainly implied at 20: 8 when the beloved disciple sees the empty tomb καὶ ἐπίστευσεν.<sup>58</sup>

[p.31]

—and yet this is *before* John 20: 22 and what some call the 'definitive' coming of the Spirit. For that matter, Thomas too believes (20: 29) without any recorded bestowal of Spirit.

(c) The proposed exegesis of John 4 and 6 is unconvincing. At John 4: 10ff. Jesus claims that he would have dispensed 'living water' if only the woman at the well had recognised who he was and asked him.<sup>59</sup> The significance of this is elucidated in 4: 23ff. where Jesus claims that the hour comes, and already is, when men shall worship in Spirit and in truth.<sup>60</sup> The future δώσω in 4: 14 is not to be deferred to the post-resurrection situation

---

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*; see also 331-2. Dunn follows Brown, *John*, *ad loc.* in this.

<sup>57</sup> D. A. Carson, *Predestination*, 163f.; 171f.

<sup>58</sup> The point is surely not simply that John believed Mary's testimony. As R. E. Brown, *John* 987, wisely comments: 'the evangelist certainly did not introduce the Beloved Disciple into the scene only to reach such a trite conclusion.'

<sup>59</sup> Porsch, *Pneuma*, recognises this. But he attempts to avoid the *prima facie* reading of 4: 10 (and 6: 63 and 7: 37) by reducing Jesus' offer to messianic teaching which will only become *pneuma* after ascension. He maintains that the water/Spirit equivalence would not be obvious to judaism, so Jesus' offer could only be revelatory teaching which would become the basis of authentic faith through the post-glorification activity of the Spirit. It would have been very difficult for John's readers to come to such conclusions! For the false antithesis involved in contrasting 'revelatory discourse' with activity of the Spirit *vide infra*.

<sup>60</sup> The reference to πνεῦμα here is not anthropological, nor equivalent to 'spiritually'—see Porsch, *Pneuma*, 151-60.

any more than is the διψήσει of the previous verse. The offer is made in the midst of a chapter which presents the realised component of eschatology even to the point of a successful Samaritan mission with a real response of faith (cf. 4: 35, 42). The eschatological tension of the situation is summed up in the expression in 4: 23 to which the καὶ νῦν ἔστιν<sup>61</sup> is no banal editorial identifying the time of fulfilment as that of the readers. The point is that the fruit of Jesus' hour, when revelation of him is made perfect through the cross and resurrection, is already tasted where men give him the kind of allegiance which is depicted in 4: 42 and elsewhere.

John 6: 62, far from pushing the reference of verse 63 into the period after the cross, in fact draws it into the period of the ministry. This is not a reference to the ascension of Jesus (which would be remarkably abrupt!); rather Jesus claims with these words that he does not need to ascend (as Moses did) in order to bring God's revelation—he was already there before (τὸ πρότερον cf. 1: 1, 18, 51) and has come down to men.<sup>62</sup> It is because he has descended the perfect revealer that the words he speaks are Spirit-and-life.

(d) Consistent with the above is the portrayal of Jesus as possessing the Spirit (1: 33f.). His words are guaranteed because the one who sent him 'gives the Spirit without measure' (Jn. 3: 34f.).<sup>63</sup> Jesus' words are 'charismatic' and this implies the activity of the Spirit in the hearer as well. The argument as to whether 'living water' in John 4 refers to messianic revelation or to the Spirit is barren,<sup>64</sup> precisely because receiving charismatic teaching cannot be separated from receiving the Spirit which inspires it. So much was assumed at Qumran,<sup>65</sup> by Paul<sup>66</sup> and by the wisdom literature.<sup>67</sup>

John 7: 37-39 contains the whole eschatological tension of the gospel in puce. On the one hand Jesus actually offers in his teaching to satisfy the thirst of the faithful; to mediate eternal life which consists in knowing the Son in the context of his mission. On the other hand faith in the Jesus revealed only comes to maturity through the events of the cross/exaltation complex which is the enacting of the revealed word. John 7: 39 insists that however much the messianic blessings of 'life' were felt in the message and person of Jesus of Nazareth, the true age of the Spirit was not yet. When the ministry is viewed from the perspective of the much deeper experience of the Spirit after Jesus' glorification, the words οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα are appropriate—albeit of relative force.

A parallel to the alleged sign of John 20: 22, which has been offered, is John 13 1-10, but it is not clear what should be deduced. For even the vivid prophetic symbolism<sup>68</sup> of the footwashing is not purely related to the future: 13: 10, if it is legitimate to combine this with

---

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Carson, *Predestination*, 164.

<sup>62</sup> See F. J. Moloney, *The Johannine Son of Man* (Rome: LAS, 1976), 121f.

<sup>63</sup> With, *inter alios*, R. Schnackenburg, *John*, 386f., though I de la Potterie, 'L'Esprit Saint dans l'Évangile de Jean' (*NTS* 18), 449, and W. Thüsing, *Erhöhung*, 154, argue for what we consider to be the less likely view that Jesus is the subject of δίδωσιν. In either case 'Es muss die Lehrer sein, dass die Offenbarung Jesus and die Geistmitteilung identisch sind' (*Erhöhung, idem*)—albeit in different senses.

<sup>64</sup> See R. Schnackenburg, *John*, 425-32; R. E. Brown, *John*, 178-9.

<sup>65</sup> *Vide supra* and n. 5.

<sup>66</sup> *Vide supra*, 24.

<sup>67</sup> Wisdom and the Spirit were already closely allied in the OT (see P. van Imschoot, 'Sagesse et Esprit dans l'Ancien Testament', *RB* 47, 23-49), but in Wis. 7: 22f. Spirit has been swallowed up by the more dominant concept of *sophia*. In 9: 17 they lie in parallel ('Who has known your counsel except you give them wisdom and send your Holy Spirit from above?'), while a similar relationship is to be assumed in the expression πνεῦμα σοφίας (e.g. Wis. 7: 7).

<sup>68</sup> For its import see, above all, J. D. G. Dunn, 'The Washing of the Disciples' Feet in John 13: 1-20' (*ZNW* 61, 247-52).



15: 3, states that the disciples are already cleansed by the word that has been revealed to them (even though their understanding will only be consummated through the event of the cross and resurrection). The double insistence that Jesus said 'You are not all clean' (v. 11) would appear unnecessary if the symbolism and its interpretation were purely concerned with a status after the crucifixion. The point that Jesus knew who would betray him has already been made (6: 70f.).

[p.32]

Finally it must be pointed out that if it is difficult to understand ἐνεφύσησεν as a simple act of exhalation, it would be much easier for John's readers to interpret the word in the light of OT usage (as later scribes did when they added But this requires that more than prophetic symbolism was involved and leads us to the hypothesis we must consider next. We must agree with Westcott; to regard the word and act of Jesus in 20: 22 as promise only, and symbol of the future gift, is unnatural.<sup>69</sup>

We have rejected two hypotheses: neither the view that the Paraclete was given (*simpliciter*) at 20: 22, nor the view that the scene merely symbolizes a future giving of the Paraclete appears to do justice to the text. This only leaves us with the possibility that receiving the Spirit, on this occasion, means something other than, or at least less than, experiencing the Spirit-Paraclete. There are numerous variations to the way this option has been spelt out in detail and it is difficult to classify them. Broadly speaking, however, we may distinguish four different approaches.

(i) A number of writers, of which the oldest I believe is Calvin, have contented themselves merely with saying that in some (very general) way this paschal gift is an earnest of Pentecost'.<sup>70</sup> Calvin suggests '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'.<sup>71</sup> More recent writers are not always more illuminating. Hoskyns, for example, is satisfied with saying, with respect to this gift, 'this is the inauguration, not the empowering for mission'.<sup>72</sup> Moulton and Milligan speak of an inner working of the Spirit later to be realised in power and person at Pentecost.<sup>73</sup> What these writers affirm may, in part, be true, but the statements are too general to be of much use, and no criteria are offered for making them more precise.

(ii) Several writers have taken the lead offered by John Chrysostom, in his homilies on the gospel (lxxxvi, 3), in distinguishing John 20: 22 as a power to forgive sins and, thus, different from the Spirit of Pentecost. No less an exegete of John's pneumatology than D. E. Holwerda summarizes his position with the words: '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 thus these verses report the renewal of the apostolic office and the power of keys. Therefore we

---

<sup>69</sup> B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (London: Clarke, 1958), 295; compare Hoskyns, *John*, *ad loc.*

<sup>70</sup> The words are those of J. A. Bengel, *Gnomon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1874), 492.

<sup>71</sup> J. Calvin, *The Gospel According to Saint John*, 11-21 (ET Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1961), 205.

<sup>72</sup> E. Hoskyns, *John*, 547.

<sup>73</sup> Moulton, J. and Milligan, G., *The Gospel According to Saint John*, *ad loc.*

conclude that this is neither the Johannine version of Pentecost nor the fulfillment of the promise of the Paraclete'.<sup>74</sup>

This position is difficult to defend. In the first place, the context does not confine what is said to the apostles. The horizons of the community which is 'sent', even as Jesus was 'sent', are much broader than the ten (Thomas and Judas *in absentia*) as the parallels in John 17: 18-21 readily show.<sup>75</sup> In addition we have no evidence elsewhere in the NT of a right of binding and loosing sins limited to the apostles. Usually the task of judgement is assigned rather to the *community* (so in Mt. 18: 18 which is a remarkably close verbal parallel to 20: 23; compare 1 Cor. 5: 1-11; 2 Cor. 2: 5-11) and the same is implied in the johannine epistles (cf. 1 Jn. 5: 16f.; 2 Jn. 10). Moreover, within the redactional setting of the gospel it is unlikely that the saying in verse 23 should be construed as the authority to *pronounce* an individual guilty or guiltless.<sup>76</sup> It is more probable that here the implications of 20: 21 (and 17: 18) are being spelt out: the Christian community, in continuing the ministry of Jesus, will perpetuate the division of judgement which

[p.33]

Jesus' presence brought to the world; 'some come to the light and receive forgiveness; some turn away and are hardened in their sin'.<sup>77</sup> In other words verse 23 does not speak of a granting of authority to specific individuals but spells out the enormous consequences of Christian witness to Christ.

(iii) Westcott adopted a different line of interpretation when he spoke of the paschal gift as a 'new life... communicated to them by Christ' which 'was the necessary condition for the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost'.<sup>78</sup> H. Ervin becomes more specific by equating the gift with regeneration which must (according to his relatively standard pentecostalist exegesis) precede baptism in Spirit at Pentecost.<sup>79</sup> A not altogether dissimilar position is maintained by J. D. G. Dunn who nevertheless stoutly denies that the apostolic experience can be paradigmatic; the anomaly of their experience being salvation-historically determined.<sup>80</sup> The key to each of these otherwise very diverse accounts is the recognition that the word ἐνεφύσησεν in 20: 22 evokes Genesis 2: 7—the breathing of the breath of life into Adam at creation—by analogy with which Jesus is understood to be breathing the 'life-principle' of the new creation into the disciples. John 20: 22 then becomes the *terminus a quo* of eschatological existence; the fulfilment of John 3: 5-8; 4: 10-14; 6: 63 and 7: 37-39, all of

---

<sup>74</sup> *Op. cit.*, 24.

<sup>75</sup> R. E. Brown, *John*, 1033-45 (esp. 1042f.); J. Marsh, *John, ad loc.*; Porsch, *Pneuma*, 366ff.

<sup>76</sup> B. Lindars, *John*, 613; compare R. E. Brown, *John*, 1042-3.

<sup>77</sup> R. E. Brown, *John*, 1043. Not a few commentators point to John 9: 40f. by way of a parallel; compare Sanders, *John*, 434.

<sup>78</sup> Westcott, *John*, 295. Note that Westcott assumes that the lack of a definite article before πνεῦμα ἅγιον is significant here (implying a gift of the Spirit, rather than the Spirit himself). It is not easy to accept this (see C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: CUP, 1959), 112); λαβέτε (ἐκ τοῦ) ἁγίου πνεύματος would have been a more obvious way of stating what Westcott assumes.

<sup>79</sup> H. M. Ervin, *These are not Drunken as ye Suppose* (Plainfield: Logos 1968), 25-33; W. G. MacDonald, as at n. 44, 256ff.

<sup>80</sup> *Baptism*, 178-82.

which refer to the 'life'-giving work of the Spirit. 'Until Jesus' resurrection it was not possible for them [the disciples] to experience the recreative breath of God.'<sup>81</sup>

The chief difficulty is that by proving too much this interpretation is liable to finish by proving too little. An event of such tremendous significance is hardly likely to have escaped John's pen with only the faintest echo of an OT passage to draw attention to its importance—we are not even told whether Thomas is permitted to enter this new age of grace which has dawned! We will take up the threads of this argument in more detail when one last position has been examined.

(iv) F. Porsch (like R. Schnackenburg and R. Bultmann) correctly observes that the closing scenes of the gospel assume that the Spirit is not yet active as the Paraclete.<sup>82</sup> Nevertheless, he feels that there is no evidence for a gift of the Spirit beyond the horizon of John's writing and that the time following the resurrection belongs to a special *Zwischenzeit* of its own. Within this period John 20: 22 depicts the definitive giving of the Spirit that will become the Paraclete after the last resurrection appearances.<sup>83</sup> So, he insists, it is a real event<sup>84</sup> that inaugurates the period of the church and its mission, rather than a merely symbolic one, and yet it is not the fulfilment of the Paraclete promises which, in any case, could not be described in a single event.<sup>85</sup>

Porsch's work on the Spirit in John is not matched for its sheer thoroughness and balanced judgement, and we would wish to agree with much of what he says. But in this one vital matter we remain unconvinced. It is not clear, for example, how the giving of the Spirit which will only become a Paraclete, but which does not yet act as the Paraclete, differs from a purely symbolic 'giving' of the Spirit as in hypothesis (b) considered above. Or, to put it another way, what would be the difference, on Porsch's view, between having the Spirit and not having the Spirit; between the ten and Thomas. If the Spirit received is neither more nor less than the Spirit which will become a Paraclete after the last resurrection appearances, then there is apparently no difference. Grammatically it may sound as though there is a difference, but theologically there is none. For the language of receiving the Spirit is only a cypher, a short-hand expression, for saying that the Spirit has

[p.34]

commenced some understood activity (however fitful) in and through a person, and this is precisely what is denied in saying that the Spirit will only become the Paraclete *later*. We should further add that when the Spirit did begin Paraclete activities—especially if this were a dramatic occasion such as depicted in Acts 2—then such language as 'the disciples received the Paraclete' (or 'were baptised in the Spirit') would be entirely justified even if the meaning of these expressions were not exhausted by the immediate events.

---

<sup>81</sup> J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 181.

<sup>82</sup> Porsch, *Pneuma*, ch. 2 § 1.

<sup>83</sup> *Pneuma*, 376.

<sup>84</sup> In contrast to Thüsing who sees it as a '*Bild*' of the future which will only become actual in the 'second stage' of Jesus' glorification (*Erhöhung*, 267f.).

<sup>85</sup> *Pneuma*, 376f.

It follows that while John does not describe what took place at 20: 22 as a receiving of the Paraclete, he nevertheless could have done so (had paraclete activity commenced then) and probably would so describe whatever point the Spirit began to act as Paraclete to the disciples. This in turn means that 'receive the Holy Spirit' in 20: 22 must have some other content than Paraclete activity. In the broader context of this paper as a whole we have got to the point where receiving the Spirit in John appears to be used at two different levels. From one frame of reference the disciples only receive the Spirit beyond the chronological horizons of the gospel account; only then do they receive the Spirit as Paraclete (14: 17, 26). But from another frame of reference it is possible to assert that the disciples receive the Spirit before this, at least at 20: 22. What has yet to be ascertained is in what sense this last is true; in what sense have they received the Spirit without yet receiving the Spirit *qua* Paraclete?

Within this general option, that the gift of 20: 22 is different from, or less than, the giving of the Paraclete, there is room for one further possibility. We have noted that John aligns Jesus' words with experience of πνεῦμα and ζωή (6: 63). His words correspond to the realm of τὰ ἐπουράνια (3: 12), the impact of which is to bring about birth from above (3: 3—which is also birth by the Spirit 3: 5f., 8). For John, a true understanding of Jesus' mission from baptism to glorification is only available through the Spirit experienced in the word; this alone is the source of life. The Fourth Gospel appears to depict this new birth of the disciples as a process (corresponding to their growing belief) which reaches a climax in the revelation of Jesus through his death and resurrection, before which belief (in the full meaning of the word) is not possible.

It is inviting to take this as the key to John 20: 22. On this interpretation the command of Jesus to receive the Spirit, and the evocative ἐνεφύσησεν (= he breathed new life into them)<sup>86</sup> are not so much an absolute beginning (this is what gives offense to the absence of Thomas and to the lack of more detailed comment by the evangelist) but a *climacteric* in the process which was already under way. The words 'receive the Spirit' would then stand 'in parallel' to (and be interpretive of) the appearance, the greeting and the commission (with their enormous implications) rather than being 'in series' (or additional) to them. Indeed the words of 17: 18 are so closely parallel to those of 20: 21 as to invite attention. In the context of the former the condition of being 'sent' into the world is sanctification by the word which is truth. In 17: 19 this is further linked to Jesus' act of sacrifice. There is no mention of the Spirit, but it is clear from the context that it is full 'authentic faith' that is envisaged as the basic requirement of the missionary community. John 20: 22 may then be understood as complementary to 17: 17-19 and a fulfilment of it. The disciples confronted by the risen Lord, and commissioned anew, now experience Jesus' message (in its totality) as Spirit and life at a much deeper level than has been possible until then. John's use of ἐνεφύσησεν

[p.35]

with its overtones of new life insufflated into the disciples through the situation, would answer to the prayer 'sanctify them in the truth' of 17: 17. As those who now (in the light of the resurrection—cf. 2: 22; 20: 8) have an overall grasp of the significance of Jesus' ministry, the disciples are in a position to proclaim the message that will either release or retain sins

---

<sup>86</sup> Four of the eight OT passages which use the word ἐμφυσᾶν have the meaning 'breath of life' or of 'new life' being imparted (Gen. 2: 7; 3 Kg. 17: 21; Wis. 15: 11; Ezek. 37: 9).

(20: 23). Similarly the resurrection appearance to Thomas, and its effect on him, is the climacteric in the process of his receiving the Spirit in the pre-ascension situation.

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS**

For John the Spirit was active in the disciples in the pre-ascension situation through the words of Jesus. This activity came to a climacteric in the resurrection appearances which bring the disciples to authentic faith. Beyond the ascension the Spirit will be a paraclete to the disciples, replacing Jesus' earthly presence with them. Corresponding to these two spheres of activity of the Spirit stand two levels of meaning of receiving the Spirit. Beyond the ascension this distinction may well be lost; for it is the Paraclete that will mediate the word of life, and coming to 'authentic faith' no longer requires the process involved before the full advent of Jesus' 'hour'. But to lose sight of this distinction before the ascension is to invite confusion.

---

© 1977 *London School of Theology* (<http://www.lst.ac.uk/>). Reproduced by permission.

Prepared for the Web in July 2007 by Robert I. Bradshaw.

<http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/>

---