

# The Spirit and Soteriology in the Fourth Gospel

**N Osei-Asante**

 **orcid.org/0000-0002-3881-4160**

**DipHE, BA, MA**

Thesis submitted for the degree *Philosophiae Doctor* in  
*New Testament* at the North-West University

Promoter: Prof Dr DT Lioy

Co-promoter: Prof GJC Jordaan

Graduation: October 2017

Student number: 26951649

## ABSTRACT

The role of the Spirit in salvation has received wide currency in Johannine scholarship. However, little special attention has been given to the exegetical analysis of the pneumatic soteriological passages in the Fourth Gospel, and the ways in which, they reveal the salvific role of the Spirit. More importantly, scholars have ignored the giving of the Son (John 3.16), the bread of life discourse (John 6.27-59) and the vine metaphor (John 15.1-8) as significant passages for our understanding of the soteriological role of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel. These passages are significant for three reasons. (1) The giving of the Son by the Father to the world was prompted by his love (John 3.16). This love becomes salvific only when a faith response is made towards it. This believing response is both provoked and sustained by the work of the Spirit. The world cannot come to Jesus and remain in Him without the work of the Spirit. To believe in the divine gift is to experience the work of the Spirit. (2) In the vine metaphor, to remain in Jesus and to bear much fruit is not possibility without the mediating agency of the Spirit. (3) In the bread of life discourse, not only is Jesus' gift of living bread a Christological symbol but a pneumatological one. His bread is life-giving simply because it is Spirit-imbued.

In developing the thesis that the Holy Spirit is both soteriologically significant and indispensable to the process of salvation revealed in the Fourth Gospel, the following steps were undertaken. First, scholarly views on the significant pneumatic- soteriological passages in the Fourth Gospel were reviewed. This helped develop the argument that the study is part of a broader theoretical scheme. Second, the concept of the soteriological role of the Spirit in the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism was examined as a possible conceptual backdrop to John's understanding. Third, a detailed exegetical study of the pneumatic soteriological passages in the Fourth Gospel was carried out to determine John's understanding of the role of the Spirit in salvation. Fourth, a comparative analysis of the soteriological role of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel and the rest of the New Testament (specifically, Luke and Paul) was examined to determine how far John's understanding is different. Fifth, the hermeneutical implication of the salvific role of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel was examined in order to determine the relevance of the Spirit's

soteriological role, as revealed in the Fourth Gospel, for the contemporary evangelistic mission of the church. Finally, it was concluded that the Holy Spirit is both soteriologically significant and indispensable to the process of salvation as described in the Fourth Gospel.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my warmest appreciation to a number of people, who in a variety of ways enabled me to complete this research project in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree *Doctor Philosophiae* in New Testament at the North-West University, in co-operation with Greenwich School of Theology.

I am greatly indebted to Prof. Cornelis Bennema, for his masterly supervision of my Master's Thesis at the London School of Theology. During this period, I had the privilege of reading his book *The Power of Saving Wisdom* for my research. His unfeigned perspective on Johannine pneumatology and soteriology really stretched and challenged me to explore the area further, hence my PhD research topic.

I owe a great debt to Prof. Daniel Liroy and Prof. Gert Jordaan for their wonderful, conscientious supervision of this work. I would not have come this far with my research without their fantastic collaborative scholarly guidance and support. I am privileged having them oversee my work.

I am grateful to Dr Stuart Rochester for taking time out of his busy schedules to peruse and edit the entire piece. Most of all, my wife Lordina, who provided me with continual moral support and helped in paying the household bills during my period of study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	iii
<b>Chapter 1 – INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Background and Problem Statement .....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Problem Statement .....	6
1.3 Aim and Objectives .....	6
1.4 Central Theoretical Argument .....	7
1.5 Methodology .....	7
<b>Chapter 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	<b>10</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	10
2.2 Birth of the Spirit .....	10
2.2.1 John Calvin.....	10
2.2.2 Herman Ridderbos .....	11
2.2.3 Max Turner .....	11
2.2.4 Craig S. Keener .....	12
2.2.5 D.A. Carson.....	13
2.2.6 H. Odeberg.....	13
2.2.7 Summary .....	14
2.3 The Spirit-Paraclete .....	14
2.3.1 John Calvin.....	14
2.3.2 Hans Windisch.....	15
2.3.3 Max Turner .....	16
2.3.4 Cornelis Bennema .....	17
2.3.5 Summary .....	18
2.4 The Nature of the Paschal Insufflation .....	19
2.4.1 John Calvin.....	19
2.4.2 Herman Ridderbos .....	19
2.4.3 Gary M. Burge .....	19
2.4.4 Max Turner .....	21
2.4.5 Summary .....	21
2.5 Conclusion .....	21

<b>Chapter 3 – SPIRIT AND SALVATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM</b> .....	24
3.1 Introduction .....	24
3.2 Genesis.....	24
3.3 Exodus.....	25
3.4 Judges .....	25
3.5 2 Chronicles.....	26
3.6 Job.....	26
3.7 Psalms .....	26
3.8 Isaiah .....	27
3.9 Ezekiel .....	27
3.10 Philo .....	28
3.11 Qumran.....	28
3.12 Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.....	30
3.13 Wisdom of Solomon.....	31
3.14 Conclusion .....	32
<b>Chapter 4 – EXEGETICAL EXAMINATION OF THE SOTERIOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL</b> .....	33
4.1 Introduction .....	33
4.2 The Spirit and Jesus .....	34
4.2.1 The Pneumatic Anointing (John 1.32) .....	34
4.2.2 The Baptist’s Prophecy (John 1.33).....	38
4.3 The Spirit and the Disciples/Believers.....	45
4.3.1 Birth of Water and Spirit (John 3.1-5) .....	45
4.3.2 The Giving of the Son (John 3.16).....	50
4.3.3 Offer of Living Water & Worship in Spirit and Truth (Jn 4.1-24) .....	51
4.3.4 The bread of life discourse (John 6.27-59).....	56
4.3.5 Living Water (John 7.37-39).....	63
4.3.6 The Vine Metaphor (John 15.1-8).....	67
4.3.7 Giving up the Spirit & the Blood and Water Symbol (Jn 19.30, 34) .	71
4.3.8 The Insufflation Gift (John 20.22) .....	75
4.3.9 Summary .....	82
4.4 The Spirit Paraclete and Salvation.....	82
4.4.1 The Paraclete as Spirit of Truth.....	89
4.4.2 The Paraclete as Indwelling and Abiding Presence (Jn 14.15-21)...	92

4.4.3 The Teaching and Anamnesis of the Spirit-Paraclete (Jn 14.26).....	96
4.4.4 The Spirit-Paraclete as one Who Testifies (Jn 15.26-27) .....	97
4.4.5 The Spirit-Paraclete who convinces the World (Jn 16.8-11) .....	99
4.4.6 The Spirit-Paraclete as Guide and Revealer (Jn 16.12-16) .....	100
4.4.7 Summary .....	103
4.5 Conclusion .....	103
<b>Chapter 5 – COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SOTERIOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE SPIRIT IN JOHN’S GOSPEL AND THE REST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO LUKE-ACTS AND THE PAULINE CORPUS .....</b>	<b>106</b>
5.1 Introduction .....	106
5.2 The Pneumatic Soteriology of Paul.....	106
5.2.1 Born of Water and Spirit .....	106
5.2.2 Baptism in/Baptism by the Spirit .....	107
5.2.3 The Spirit as Ethical Guide .....	110
5.2.4 The Spirit as the Convicting and Faith Quickening Power .....	111
5.2.5 The Life-Giving Spirit .....	112
5.2.6 The Spirit as the Power within and behind Worship .....	116
5.2.7 The Spirit as the Fulfilling Instrument of the New Covenant .....	117
5.2.8 The Spirit and Sonship/Adoption.....	118
5.2.9 The Spirit and Eschatology.....	122
5.2.10 The Spirit and Divine Revelation .....	124
5.2.11 The Spirit as Christ’s Indwelling Presence.....	125
5.2.12 The Summary .....	127
5.3 The Pneumatic Soteriology of Luke (Luke-Acts).....	128
5.3.1 The Spirit and Jesus.....	129
5.3.1.1 <i>The Spirit and New Creation (Luke 1.31-35)</i> .....	129
5.3.1.2 <i>The Baptist’s Prophecy (Luke 3.16-17)</i> .....	129
5.3.1.3 <i>The Temptation Account (Luke 4.1-16)</i> .....	130
5.3.1.4 <i>The Nazareth Manifesto (Luke 4.18-19)</i> .....	131
5.3.1.5 <i>The Beelzebul Controversy (Luke 11.20)</i> .....	132
5.3.2 The Spirit and Believers / Disciples .....	133
5.3.2.1 <i>The Forerunner (Luke 1.15-17)</i> .....	133
5.3.2.2 <i>The Spirit of the New Covenant (Acts 2)</i> .....	134
5.3.2.3 <i>The Spirit as the Source of Revelatory Wisdom</i> .....	137
5.3.2.4 <i>The Spirit and Conversion</i> .....	137

5.3.3 Summary .....	138
5.4 The Fourth Gospel, Luke and Paul Compared.....	139
5.5 Conclusion .....	140
<b>Chapter 6 – THE SOTERIOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE CONTEMPORARY EVANGELISTIC MISSION OF THE CHURCH .....</b>	<b>141</b>
6.1 Introduction .....	141
6.2 Jesus’ Anointing and the Church .....	141
6.3 The Gift of the Father and the Church .....	142
6.4 Remaining in the Son and the Church .....	143
6.5 The Paschal Insufflation and the Church .....	143
6.6 The Spirit-Paraclete and the Church.....	144
6.7 Conclusion .....	147
<b>Chapter 7 – CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>148</b>
7.1 What is the relevant state of scholarship up to present on the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel?.....	148
7.2 What is the theological influence of the Old Testament and the writings of Second Temple Judaism on the understanding of the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel?.....	149
7.3 What does the Fourth Gospel reveal about the Holy Spirit’s involvement in the process of salvation?.....	150
7.4 How does the teaching in the Fourth Gospel about the Holy Spirit’s soteriological role compare to and contrast with the rest of the teachings in the New Testament, with specific reference to Paul and Luke?.....	150
7.5 What is the relevance of the Spirit’s soteriological role, as revealed in the Fourth Gospel, for the contemporary evangelistic mission of the church?.....	151
7.6 In what way is the Holy Spirit soteriologically significant to the process of salvation revealed in the Fourth Gospel?.....	151
7.7 Gaps in the area of Johannine pneumatic soteriology filled by the study.....	151
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>154</b>

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

### 1.0 BACKGROUND & PROBLEM STATEMENT

#### 1.1 *Background*

While the soteriological role of the Spirit in John has received much affirmation in Johannine scholarship, scholars are divided on the interpretation of individual pneumatic soteriological texts:

First, Calvin's position on the soteriological role of the Spirit in the fourth gospel ascribes soteriological functions both to the Spirit in John 3-7 (1959:64-65) and the Paraclete in 14-16 (1961:82-122). While admitting the soteriological functions of the Spirit in 3-7 (1971:141-142), Bultmann (1971:560) appreciates the soteriological functions of the Paraclete in 14-16 when he stresses that the intention of the Spirit Paraclete as revealer is to protect the believer from turning back to himself and to give him an eternity of the future. Menzies (2004:50) insists that the Spirit in John 3-7 comes as a source of regeneration, whereas in contrast, the Paraclete in 14-16 comes exclusively as empowering gift in order to enable the disciple's witness. On the other hand, Bennema (2002:160-242) argues that both the Spirit in 3-7 and the Paraclete in 14-16 are soteriologically necessary. In view of his strong conviction on the two-stage theologically distinct giving of the Spirit (1994:232-243; 2004:52), Menzies' construct fails to acknowledge the soteriological role of the Spirit Paraclete. The perspective of Windisch (1968:2,3) implicitly denies the soteriological role of the Spirit Paraclete in its assertion that the Spirit Paraclete is just an additional gift, for what the disciples possessed spiritually was sufficient to give them all they needed; hence, the Spirit Paraclete is not needed at all, neither now nor in the future. The exegesis of Köstenberger (2004:438) on the term 'Spirit of truth' (John 14:17; 16:13) reveals the weakness in Windisch's position. Köstenberger observes that one aspect of the meaning of the term 'Spirit of truth' is that the Spirit is operative in both 'worship and sanctification.'

Second, on John 3:1-5, Calvin (1959:65) holds the view that the phrase 'birth of water and Spirit' simply points to the inward cleansing and quickening of the Spirit since 'water' is the same as 'Spirit' in this context. For Bultmann

(1971:141), 'water' refers to this present human existence and 'Spirit' refers to the power of miraculous event where man enjoys authentic existence. Bennema (2002: 170) maintains the view that the phrase probably describes two different, although related, activities under one single concept, and not one activity or two identical activities (also Turner, 2005:67-8; Hamilton, 2006:131; Köstenberger, 2004:124; Carson, 2006:195). Keener (1997:151) maintains that by the phrase 'born of water and Spirit' the Johannine Jesus calls Nicodemus to 'a conversion effected by the purifying Spirit of God, a new birth.' Ridderbos (1997:128) argues along similar lines but with different emphasis when he stresses that the term can be used of the birth needed to enter the kingdom: 'baptism as the putting off of the old, the Spirit as the creator and gift of new life.' For Beasley-Murray (1991:66), the phrase means possibly that 'baptism in water and baptism in Spirit' are to become a unified experience for one who repents and believes in the crucified and risen Lord. For Forestel (1974:125), it denotes Christian baptism and the interior renewal of the Spirit. Barrett (1962: 848) conjectures that 'born of water' may point to the sacrament of baptism or ordinary human birth, whereas 'born of the Spirit' may imply an origination from God.

Third, on John 3:15-16 scholars like Bruce (1983:89-90), Ridderbos (1991:138), Köstenberger (2004:129) and Bennema (2005:48-49) stress the salvific efficacy of God's love for humanity. While their observations reflect the exegetical force of the passage, they fail to explore the role of the Spirit in this salvific process: to what extent is, the Spirit involved in 'believing in Jesus' and the eternal life that this belief yields? Carson (1991:206) and Keener (2003a:569) touch on the Spirit's involvement, yet on a cursory level, when they observe that the eternal life (3:15-16) resulting from belief in Jesus is a life birthed by the Spirit from above (3:5-6).

Fourth, scholars like Brown (1988:47), Bennema (2005:81), Filson (1962:114), Forestell (1974:142-143), Carson (2005:297-8), Köstenberger (2004:210) and Fortna (1988:89) rightly identify the 'living bread' in the 'bread of life discourse' (6:22-59) with the salvific implication of belief in Jesus. However, the Spirit's involvement and significance in this process has not been convincingly shown. Burge, (1987:180) Dunn (2010:184) and Brown (1988:46-47) give hints of the

pneumatic implications of the 'bread of life discourse' when they identify the salvific import of the food with the Spirit. Beasley-Murray (1991:67) comes closer when he comments on the 'discourse' that the Spirit's work is implied in all that is said concerning the gift of life through the Son in the Gospel. Ridderbos (1997:243) argues that the eternal life that the bread gives consists of remaining in Jesus and the continual exercise of fellowship with him. While this is a cogent observation, it fails to demonstrate how this fellowship and living in Jesus is achieved and how the Spirit is involved in all of this. While Morris (1987:247) rightly observes in his commentary on the discourse (v. 63) that the eternal life that Jesus makes available is effected by the Holy Spirit, he fails to bring this insight to bear on the meaning of the term, 'living bread.'

The work of Swete (1909:142) on the discourse exegetically captures the pneumatic element therein. He argues on the 'bread of life symbol' that it is the Spirit in the humanity of Jesus which is conveyed to believers as food which leads to eternal life. While Swete's work should be appreciated for attributing the life-giving efficacy of the food to the agency of the Spirit, what is lacking in his exegesis and that of the others noted above is an explanation of how the Spirit performs this life-giving function in the life of the believer upon feeding on the food.

Fifth, on John 15:1-9 Bultmann (1971:530) observes that the vine is a tree of life in that it permeates its shoots with vital power to grow and bear fruits; however, he fails to comment on the nature of this power. Scholars like Carson (1991:516-519), Köstenberger (2004:450-455) and Brown (1979:129) stress the Christological significance of the 'vine discourse' with no hint on its pneumatological and soteriological implications. Lindars (1972:489) identifies a moral dimension to the mutual indwelling (v.4); however, he fails to comment on how the Spirit is involved in this moral union. For Morris (1971:671-2), the concept of 'mutual indwelling' projected by the discourse is the condition for fruitfulness, true discipleship, and effectual prayer. While this is an excellent observation, it fails to account for the Spirit's involvement in these spiritual dynamic processes. Ridderbos (1997:517) observes that the phrase 'and I in you' in the 'vine discourse' should be understood 'as much as an active "remaining" by the propulsive effect of his [Jesus'] word and Spirit.' While

Ridderbos significantly notes the involvement of the Spirit in mutual indwelling, his exegesis fails to detail the 'how' of this pneumatic involvement and its soteriological import. Keener (2003b:999) moves a step further by showing how the Spirit is involved in this reciprocal indwelling. For him, the teaching function of the Spirit is the unifying factor in this organic union. While Keener's observation is tenable, it does not exhaust the involvement of the Spirit in this mutual indwelling and its soteriological import.

Sixth, on the nature of the Spirit in John 20:22, Calvin (1961:205-206) holds the view that the Spirit given to the apostles was a sprinkling of God's grace which was necessary for the embassy of forgiveness committed to their charge. While scholars like Turner (2012:87), Atkinson (2011:111), Ervin (1970:136-138), Levison (2009:371) and Menzies (2004:49) see the Spirit as the Spirit of salvation in John 20:22, Bultmann (1971:692), Burge (1987:123), Beasley-Murray (1991:80) and Dodd (1953: 430), on the other hand, see John 20:22 as a record of a Johannine counterpart of the Lukan Pentecost. For Windisch (1968: 33-34), it functions as an authority to forgive sins. Keener (2003:1204-5) and Ridderbos (1997:463) bifurcate the role of the Spirit in 20:22 as regeneration and empowerment for mission.

Finally, on the giving of the Spirit in John 20:22, Burge (1987:123) and Keener (2003b:1204) propose a full giving of the Spirit (sometimes called the Johannine Pentecost), while Carson (2006:652) and Köstenberger (2004:574) maintain that it is a symbolic act pointing to Acts 2. Turner (1996: 99), Ridderbos (1997:643) and Hamilton (2006:99) propose a two-stage giving. Bennema (2012:104) proposes three stages. While the above proposals are telling in their own rights, what they lack is the fact that they fail to bring the symbolic references to the Spirit in John to bear on the meaning of 20:22.

The inquiry into the soteriological involvement of the Spirit in John which this study is set to embark will include a survey of the soteriological significance of the Spirit in the Old Testament (Genesis, Exodus, Judges, 2 Chronicles, Job, Psalms, Isaiah, Ezekiel) and Second Temple Judaism (Philo, Qumran, Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Wisdom of Solomon).

The objective of this approach is to see how the soteriological functions of the Spirit understood in Judaism serve as illuminating background to the understanding of the soteriological functions of the Spirit in John. The rationale for choosing this background is because John's allusions to Jewish concepts, imageries, symbols and motifs is ample evidence to suggest that he was very much vexed with the Old Testament and Second Temple Jewish thought: 'Lamb of God' - Jn. 1:29, 35/ Ex. 12:1-12; 'the lifting up of the serpent' - Jn. 3:14; 8:28; 12:32/ Num. 21:8-9; 'Bread' - Jn. 6:31-33/ Num. 11:7-9; Ex. 16:4, 15; Neh. 9:15; Ps. 78:24; 105:40; *Wis.* 16.20-26; 'living water' - Jn. 7:38/ Isa. 35:6; 44:3; 49:10; 55:1; 58:11; *Sir.* 15.3; 24.21-26, 30-31; 51.24; Philo, *Dreams* 2.245; 1QH 5.4, 16; 2 *Bar.* 77.13-16; 1 *Enoch* 48.1, 10; 49.1; 'Light' - Jn. 1:4-9; 3:19-21; 8:12/ Isa. 2:5; 60:1, 19, 20; Ps. 27:1; 43:3; 112:4; 4 *Ezra* 14.20-22, 35; 1 *Enoch* 48.4; 1QS 3.19-26; 'Vine' - Jn. 15:1-5/ Jer. 2:21; Hos. 10:1; Joel 1:12; 'Shepherd' - Jn. 10:1-16/ Num. 27:17; Ps. 80:1; Isa. 40:11; Jer. 34:12; 'Spirit of truth' - Jn. 16.13/ 1QS 3.19; *Test. Judah* 20.1-3, 5; 'Eternal life' - Jn. 3.16; 17.3/ 1QS 4.7-8. Hence, a Jewish background survey would be a reasonable step forward in this study.

As the preceding brief survey shows, much study has been conducted on the Spirit's soteriological role in the Fourth Gospel. However, little attention has been given in these studies to the following passages: 'the giving of the son of God' (3:15-16); 'the bread of life discourse' (6:22-59); 'the Spirit Paraclete' (14:16-17, 25-26; 15:26-27; 16:7-11, 12-15); and the 'vine discourse' (15:1-11) - passages that from the above survey seem to be vital to the understanding of the soteriological role of the Spirit. These deficiencies require further research in Johannine pneumatic soteriological studies in order to address them.

The central aim of this study is to investigate the ways in which the Holy Spirit is soteriologically significant to the process of salvation revealed in the Fourth Gospel. The study will, as part of its exegetical analysis, examine in much detail the passages mentioned above in order to determine their pneumatological and soteriological significance.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

Therefore the basic problem that lies at the basis of this study, is the fact that no thorough scholarly investigation has been done about the way in which the soteriological significance of the Holy Spirit is revealed in the Fourth Gospel.

Questions emerging from the primary research questions are:

- ❖ What is the relevant state of scholarship up to present on the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel?
- ❖ What is the theological influence of the Old Testament and the writings of Second Temple Judaism on the understanding of the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel?
- ❖ What does the Fourth Gospel reveal about the Holy Spirit's involvement in the process of salvation?
- ❖ How does the teaching in the Fourth Gospel about the Holy Spirit's soteriological role compare to and contrast with the rest of the teachings in the New Testament, with specific reference to Paul and Luke?
- ❖ What is the relevance of the Spirit's soteriological role, as revealed in the Fourth Gospel, for the contemporary evangelistic mission of the church?

## **1.3 Aim and Objectives**

### **Aim**

The main aim of this study is to investigate the ways in which the Holy Spirit is soteriologically significant to the process of salvation revealed in the Fourth Gospel.

### **Objectives**

The specific objectives of this study are:

- ❖ To examine the state of scholarship up to present on the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel.

- ❖ To discover the possible theological influence of the Old Testament and the writings of Second Temple Judaism on the understanding of the soteriological role of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel.
- ❖ To investigate what the Fourth Gospel reveals about the Holy Spirit's soteriological role.
- ❖ To investigate how the teaching in the Fourth Gospel about the Holy Spirit's soteriological role compares to and contrasts with the rest of the teachings of the New Testament with specific reference to Paul and Luke.
- ❖ To discover the relevance of the Spirit's involvement in the process of salvation, as revealed in the Fourth Gospel, for the contemporary evangelistic mission of the church.

#### ***1.4 Central Theoretical Argument***

The central theoretical argument of this study is that the Holy Spirit is both soteriologically significant and indispensable to the process of salvation revealed in the Fourth Gospel.

#### ***1.5 Methodology***

Literary critical approach to biblical text involves the study of the compositional dynamics of a text, style, images and symbols employed by the author, the aesthetic character of the text, etc. (Hayes & Holladay, 1982:73). The objectives of this study detailed in section 2.2 fall within the focus of literary critical, hence its adoption as the research rationale.

Within the crucible of the literary critical approach, the following methods are employed in the fulfilment of the research objectives: narrative criticism, semiotic analysis and narrative enquiry. The use of these methods is indicated in the following:

- ❖ The state of scholarship up to present will be investigated by reviewing the literature, using a scoping method. This method helps identify the recent state of research on the topic, the consensus or lack of consensus in the area, and then, 'using a critical analysis of the gaps in

knowledge, it helps refine the research questions, concepts and theories to point the way to future research' (Jesson *et al*, 2001:15). A literature review is significant for this study because, as Bloomberg and Volpe observe (2012:44), it helps develop the argument for the study by showing how the study is part of a broader theoretical scheme, as well as drawing insights from others to inform the study.

- ❖ The theological influence of the Old Testament and the writings of Second Temple Judaism on the pneumatic soteriology of John's Gospel will be studied by means of 'narrative enquiry.' This method concerns 'the experiences as expressed in lived and told stories of individuals or cultures' (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012:34).
- ❖ What the Fourth Gospel reveals about the soteriological activity of the Holy Spirit in the process of salvation will be investigated by means of the following exegetical methods: narrative criticism – this approach is concerned with the analysis of plot, motifs, characters, style, figures of speech, word patterns, etc. of a narrative in order to understand its message (Klein *et al.*, 1993:432); structural analysis – this concerns the analysis of the monologue, the dialogue among the characters, the interactions between the characters and objects in a narrative (Klein *et al.*, 1993:428); semiotic analysis – the analysis of signs and how they function in a text (Goring *et al.*, 2001:167) and discourse analysis – analysing the way in which language is used to construct meaning in texts and contexts (Henn *et al.*, 2009:263); as well as critical engagement with current scholarship.
- ❖ The teachings in the Fourth Gospel about the Holy Spirit's role in salvation will be compared and contrasted with the rest of the New Testament by means of comparative analysis.
- ❖ The relevance of the Spirit's soteriological role, as revealed in the Fourth Gospel, for the contemporary evangelistic mission of the church will be studied by means of the hermeneutical method of contextualisation. This is that process of interpretation which brings out the significance of a religious or cultural document of a distant historical milieu for contemporary application (Osborn, 1991:318). In accordance with this method, the following principles will be adopted: (i) whenever

our contemporary situation is the same as that of the first century hearers, our application of God's word will be a direct application (Fee & Stuart, 2003:75); and (ii) whenever we have a situation that is incomparable with that of the text we must seek the internal principle embedded in the text (Osborn, 1991:335).

## CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

### **2.1 Introduction**

The chapter examines the question: what is the relevant state of scholarship up to present on the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel? This examination will be presented thematically as follows: (i) Birth of the Spirit – this section examines the scholarly impute on the significance of the Holy Spirit in the phrase, ‘born of water and Spirit’ in John 3.5; (ii) the Spirit-Paraclete – this section reviews scholarly contributions on the soteriological role of the Spirit as ‘Paraclete’ in the farewell discourse (14.16-18; 25-26; 15.26-27; 16.5-11; 16.12-15) and (iii) the Paschal insufflation – this section examines the state of scholarship on the soteriological significance of the gift of the Holy Spirit in John 20.22. These themes have been selected because they present a significant synopsis of Johannine pneumatic soteriology: to be born from above/born of water and Spirit is proven by the Jesus-Nicodemus discourse as the quintessential basis for salvation/entry into the kingdom (3.5). The promised Paraclete is to represent Jesus on earth to the disciples while he is away and to continue his salvific teaching/revelatory ministry, both for the continuous salvation of the disciples and for the salvation of the world (14.26; 15.26-27; 16.13). The Paschal insufflation demonstrates the re-creative and life-giving efficacy of experiencing the Spirit, either through belief in Jesus, or as a result of direct impartation (3.16; 4.14; 6.51; 7.38; 8.51; 11.25; 17.3; 20.22). To the first theme the study now turns.

### **2.2 Birth of the Spirit**

#### 2.2.1 John Calvin

Regarding the phrase born ‘of water and Spirit’ (ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος) in Jesus’ reply to the question posed by Nicodemus about ‘rebirth’ (John 3.1-5), Calvin (1959:64), while admitting the necessity of baptism in the process of salvation, disagrees with the position which identifies the water in the phrase with baptism (cf. Ridderbos 1997:127-128; Koester 2008:140; Sanders 1968:124; Strachan 1941:135; Westcott 1894:49; McDonnell & Montague 1991:61, on the identification of water with the sacrament of baptism). He

stresses that this water is the same Spirit who cleanses, renews and imparts to us the energy of the heavenly life (p. 65). For him, water is connected to the Spirit in this context as an attestation and a seal to the new life imparted by the Spirit of God in that process of rebirth (p. 64). Talbert (1992:99) sympathises with this position when he stresses that the construction in Greek is that of two nouns that are connected by *kai* ('and') and governed by one (or: the same) preposition, normally point to one act. Hence; the water in 3.5 refers to Spirit.

### 2.2.2 Herman Ridderbos

Ridderbos (1997:127-28) disagrees with the position which identifies 'water' in the phrase born 'of water and Spirit,' as a symbol for 'Spirit' and maintains that the best possible background against which the phrase must be understood is baptism. He makes this assertion because for him, the kingdom message from the beginning has been bound with repentance, water baptism and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Hence he maintains that, the phrase 'of water and Spirit' should be understood in terms of baptism as the putting off of the old, and the Spirit as the creator of new life. He goes further to define birth 'of water and Spirit' thus: 'the subjection of the flesh to the reign of the Spirit, of reconciliation, forgiveness, and renewal, a reign that deeply enters the sphere of the flesh.'

### 2.2.3 Max Turner

On this subject, Turner (2005:67) argues that birth 'of water and Spirit' is a *hendiadys* and must be construed as a single metaphorical 'birth' by a combination of water and Spirit (cf. Dunn, 2010:192; Burge, 1957:166; Bennema, 2002:169; Montague, 1976:343; and Jones, 1997:71). He dismisses the interpretation of the 'water' in this phrase as a metaphor for biological/natural birth maintained by Odeberg (1969:48-52) and admits that while water baptism might be at the background of this assertion, it is not the primary referent as maintained by Morris (1971:218; cf. Lindars, 1972:152; Bruce, 1983:84; Beasley-Murray, 1991:66; Koester, 2003:183) (pp. 67-8). Arguing further, he stresses that if the phrase born 'of water and Spirit' is something Jesus expects Nicodemus to be familiar with because of his background, then the most probable background explanation to this phrase is Ezekiel 36:25-27 (cf. *Jubilees* 1.23-25; Ps. 51.120) (p. 68).

While sympathising with this position, Hamilton (2006:130-143) tends to bifurcate the meaning of the Spirit birth in 3.5 and that of regeneration. He argues that the new birth in 3.4-5 brings spiritual ability while regeneration (7.39; 14.17; 20.22) enables believing. Köstenberger (2004:123) disagrees with this position when he stresses that the concept of new spiritual birth in 3.5 is not dissimilar to regeneration. Carson's observation (2006:194-6) tends to undermine Hamilton's bifurcation, for, he calls the rebirth in 3.5 regeneration which is to be experienced after Jesus' glorification. Calvin (1959:64); Thiselton (2013:137); Bennema (2007:172); Menzies (2004:50) and Turner (1996:67-68) *contra* Hamilton, associate the rebirth in 3.5 with regeneration.

Turner argues further that although this passage does not indicate a new birth by 'water and Spirit', it depicts the promise of the eschatological purgation of God's people with water and their inner transformation by the Spirit (p. 68). This new creation, he stresses, will come about as a result of the Spirit illuminating/revealing the significance of the Christ event to the believer which in turn ignites an authentic faith or belief in the heart of the believer (p. 69). This sort of belief, he admits can only be possible after Jesus' death, glorification, ascension and the gift of the Spirit (p. 69).

#### 2.2.4 Craig S. Keener

Like Turner, Keener (2003a: 547-552) rejects the proposals by Odeberg (1929:49-52; cf. Morris, 1971:218; Lindars, 1972:152; Koester, 2003:183) on the meaning of 'water' in the phrase born 'of water and Spirit' and argues that since converts to Judaism were apparently seen as new-born children, and proselyte baptism was the most appropriate ritual required for their conversion, it is most probable that the expression points to a requirement on the part of Nicodemus to become a true Israelite and a true child of Abraham. For him, Jesus uses the image of proselyte baptism for conversion, in this case not via water baptism but in the Spirit. That is, a spiritual proselyte baptism (p. 549). Kostenberger (2004:124) also observes that the phrase may allude to proselyte baptism, where a Gentile convert is considered a new born child.

Keener, like Turner, appeals to Ezekiel 36 as a possible background to John's use of the water image. He stresses that the admission of Ezekiel 36 as a

possible background confirms his position that the water image is employed as an illustration for proselyte spiritual baptism (p. 551). He further consolidates this point by appealing to Qumran (1QS 3.8-9; 4.21) and the Old Testament (Isa. 44.3; Ezek. 39.29; Joel 2.28) which associates the Spirit with purifying water (pp. 551-552).

#### 2.2.5 D.A. Carson

Carson (2006:194-6) conjectures that the phrase born 'of water and Spirit' plausibly rests on three pegs: 1. One birth is in view here since the expression is connected to the term 'from above;' 2. The phrase is a conceptual unity since it is governed by the proposition 'of;' and 3. The fact that Jesus expects Nicodemus to understand the phrase because of his background suggests that the most plausible place to appeal for the meaning of the phrase should be the Old Testament Scriptures. Hence, the following observations are crucial:

- The idea that Israel was referred to as God's son (Ex. 4.2; Dt. 32.6; Hos. 11.1) presents a potential background for the understanding of divine begetting.
- The identification of the Spirit with life and creation (Gen. 2.7; 6.3; Job 34.14)
- The eschatological expectation of the cleansing, transforming and inner renewing operations of the Spirit (Joel 2.28; Isa. 32.15-20; 44.3; Ezek. 11.19-20; 36.26-7; 39.29)
- When water is conjoined with the Spirit it habitually refers to cleansing or renewal, most especially in Ezekiel 36.25-27.

Carson concludes after these observations that born 'of water and Spirit' signals 'a new begetting, a new birth that cleanses and renews, the eschatological cleansing and renewal promised by the Old Testament prophets' (2006:195).

#### 2.2.6 H. Odeberg

Odeberg (1969:48-49) espouses the view that water in the phrase born 'of water and Spirit' should be understood as a reference to terrestrial birth and that what is to enter a second time is not the born child but the semen that is to give birth to the child. For him, the water is that which in the Spiritual process

corresponds to the semen in the sarcical process. Witherington (1995:97) subscribes to this position in his assertion that the 'water and Spirit' in v. 5 is explained in v. 6 as referring to physical and spiritual birth. He argues further that John 3.5-6 is a development of themes already introduced in John 1.13, where there is a contrast between physical human birth and birth from God. G. Brown (2003:121-122) also identifies the link between John 1.13 and John 3.3-5 and concludes that there is the possibility for the water in 3.5 to symbolise sexual human relations. Bultmann (1971:141) argues along similar lines but from another perspective when he argues that the water refers to the nothingness of man's whole existence. Barrett (1962:848), while admitting the possibility of water baptism as a referent to the water, identifies physical human birth as another possible referent.

### 2.2.7 Summary

Interpretations given to the phrase, born 'of water and Spirit' as presented by scholars above includes the following: the water is the same as the Spirit, expressing the cleansing and renewing work of the Spirit (Calvin); the water points to water baptism and the Spirit, the creator of new life (Ridderbos); the phrase is a *hendiadys* and must be construed as a single metaphorical 'birth', expressing the cleansing and life transforming work of the Spirit (Turner); the phrase emphasises the purifying effect of the Spirit's work (Keener); the water symbolises natural birth contrasted with Spiritual birth (Odeberg); and the water as nothingness of human existence contrasted with Spiritual existence. Although these contributions remain significant to the understanding of this Johannine pneumatic soteriological metaphor, they have failed to put the final nail in the coffin of the debate; hence, the need for an alternative proposal.

## **2.3 The Spirit-Paraclete**

### 2.3.1 John Calvin

The soteriological significance of the Spirit-Paraclete has been admitted by Calvin (1961:82-122) in several veins. He argues that the ministry of the Spirit-Paraclete is to make believers partakers of Christ himself and of all his blessings (p. 82). The Spirit-Paraclete as the 'Spirit of truth' has a soteriological/ethical import for Calvin, that is, without His inward teachings the

minds of believers are held by vanity and falsehood (p. 82). Turner (1996:85) subscribes to this observation when he stresses that the revelatory ministry of the Spirit-Paraclete would also be regarded as the power of the new ethical life of the believer as the Spirit convicts of sin. For Koester (2008:148), the Paraclete as the Spirit of truth conveys God's truth as revealed in Christ in order to free people from bondage to sin, to awaken authentic faith, and to prompt life-giving actions. Strachan (1941:286) also argues that the Spirit-Paraclete was the source of faith and courage of the apostles. Bultmann (1971:560) argues that the significance of the revelatory agency of the Spirit Paraclete is to set believers free and to give them a certain eternal future.

Concerning the testimony of the Spirit-Paraclete through the apostles, Calvin observes that: (i) there is no faith until the Spirit enlightens and seals the heart of the receiver of the testimony (p. 110); (ii) It is the Spirit who penetrates into minds, takes root there and at last yields fruit, renewing and transforming humans (p. 116); and (iii) It is the Spirit who by the sound of the human voice (the gospel testimony), constrains humans, who before were not subject to His rule, to acknowledge and submit to it (p. 117).

Calvin further observes that the purpose of the teaching ministry of the Spirit Paraclete is to bestow the fullness of Christ's blessings on believers: to be cleansed by Christ's blood; sin to be blotted out in us by His blood; our old man to be crucified; and His resurrection to be efficacious in reforming us to newness of life (pp. 121-122).

### 2.3.2 Hans Windisch

The work of Windisch (1968) on the Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel shows his denial of the soteriological significance of the Spirit-Paraclete. He espouses the view that the Spirit-Paraclete is a *donum superadditum*, an additional gift received with no soteriological necessity, either now or in the future (1968:2, 3). For Windisch, the Spirit-Paraclete has no ethical/soteriological influence on the believer as He is not given until after obedience has taken place. Rather, He is the power of revelation who enables the disciples to persevere in the 'truth', to proclaim this truth and to explore it (p. 6). He further observes that the Spirit-Paraclete has a double function: (i) for the disciple, He will be teacher,

remembrancer, revealer of the glory of Jesus, companion and protector: (ii) for the world, He will be a prophetic attorney and one who convicts the unbelieving of their errors (pp. 14-15).

Windisch strongly emphasises that the Spirit-Paraclete has nothing to do with the salvation or protection of believers. Rather, His main operation is teaching: maintaining and completing the historical revelation in Jesus (p. 17). He summarises the exclusive prophetic function of the Paraclete thus: witness, helper, counsellor, and teacher (p. 17). Menzies (2004:50, 52) follows this line of argument in his admission that for John, the Spirit in Jn. 3-7 is theologically distinct from the Spirit-Paraclete in 14-16 in that the former comes as a source of regeneration while the latter comes as a source of the apostolic evangelistic witness.

### 2.3.3 Max Turner

The work of Turner (2002) presents a fundamental understanding of the soteriological significance of the Spirit-Paraclete in John. Turner (2002:85-88) makes several observations concerning the salvific functions of the Spirit Paraclete as revealed in the Fourth Gospel:

- The Spirit-Paraclete as the Spirit of Truth (John 14.16; cf. 4.24) is the power of the congregation's worship in that the work of the Spirit in revealing and illuminating the Christ-event elicits praise and worship (p. 85) (cf. Köstenberger 2004:438).
- The Spirit is the power of the ethical life of the believer as the Spirit convicts of sin (cf. John 16.8) and enables the communion of the believer with the Father and Son (p. 85; cf. for the function of the Paraclete as the medium of bond between the believer and the Father/Son see Bultmann (1971:615); Bennema (2002:220-221); G. Brown (2003:220-221); Dodd (1953:405); Forestell (1974:15); Swete (1909:152).
- The charismatic revelation and wisdom afforded by the Spirit-Paraclete enables the believer to integrate this theology with praxis (p. 88).
- The Spirit-Paraclete is more than a *donum superadditum*, a 'second grace' (*contra* Windisch, 1968:2 and Menzies, 2004:50) in the sense that if knowing the Father and Son in the Fourth Gospel is understood as

'eternal life' then it follows that the prophetic functions of the Spirit-Paraclete are also soteriologically significant (p. 88).

- The illuminating function of the Spirit-Paraclete is necessary for authentic understanding of the gospel which in turn enables re-creation.

Based on these observations Turner concludes that the Spirit-Paraclete is both soteriologically and prophetically significant (p. 88).

#### 2.3.4 Cornelis Bennema

Bennema (2002) takes Turner's conception of the soteriological significance of the Spirit-Paraclete further and deeper in his work on the soteriological significance of the Spirit and Wisdom in the Fourth Gospel. Bennema (2002:221-248) makes a significant contribution by devoting a section of his studies to the soteriological functions of the Spirit-Paraclete. The following points detail his position:

- If the Spirit-Paraclete is the mode of communication and the bond of union between the believer and the Father/Son, then it is plausible to argue that the Spirit-Paraclete is not merely a *donum superadditum* but soteriologically necessary (pp. 222-223).
- Those in life-giving relationship with Jesus are his friends (John 3.29; 11.11; 15.14-15), and such a saving relationship is created and maintained by the Spirit-Paraclete (14.23) (pp. 224-225).
- 'Truth' is the salvific revelation of God in Jesus. Hence; the Spirit-Paraclete as the 'Spirit of truth' mediates saving truth to believers and indirectly to the world via the believers' witness. The Spirit of Truth is thus a soteriological title/label (pp. 226-227).
- The phrase, 'he will guide you into all truth,' (16.13) is a metaphor for leading people to and keeping them in salvation. Hence, the Spirit-Paraclete as the 'Spirit of Truth' guides people into the saving truth of Jesus' revelatory teachings (cf. Swete, 1909:153 argues along similar lines when he notes that the guidance of the Spirit-Paraclete leads to 'Life'). Thus the Spirit-Paraclete functions as a soteriological necessity. The role of the Paraclete is therefore the continuation of the life-giving revelatory work of Jesus (p. 231)

- If the Spirit-Paraclete recalls, reveals and opens up Jesus' life-giving revelatory words (John 6.63) then the Spirit-Paraclete as Teacher/Revealer is soteriologically necessary (p. 233; cf. Forestell, 1974:137 observes that although the Spirit-Paraclete exercises a revelatory life giving role, this role is not independent of Christ).
- If Jesus' ministry of advocacy is primarily salvific, and if the Spirit-Paraclete is to continue this ministry of advocacy, then it follows that the Paraclete's role as advocate has a soteriological dimension (pp. 235, 242).
- The Spirit-Paraclete as the Spirit of Truth mediates saving knowledge to both believers and the world with the effect of increasing the understanding of the 'Truth' of the former while inducing faith/belief responses in the latter (p. 244). Hence the Spirit as Paraclete is also depicted as a life-giving cognitive agent (p. 247).

In the light of these observations, Bennema concludes *contra* Windisch, that the Spirit as Paraclete is soteriologically necessary (p. 243).

### 2.3.5 Summary

The soteriological function of the Spirit-Paraclete has divided scholars into two opposing poles: those who deny the salvific role of the Paraclete (Windisch and Menzies) on the one side, and those who subscribe to the salvific function of the Paraclete (Bennema and others) on the other side. It is suggestive, based on the portrait of the Paraclete in the farewell discourse, that there is room for associating soteriological functions to the Paraclete. Hence, the contribution of Bennema on the subject deserves support against Windisch and Menzies. Such support is needed to investigate further into the salvific role of the Spirit-Paraclete in the farewell discourse in order to formulate a broader perspective of the Fourth Gospel on the salvific function of the Spirit. This study then becomes significant in the light of the need of this further investigation.

## **2.4 The Nature of the Paschal Insufflation**

### 2.4.1 John Calvin

On the Paschal insufflation Calvin (1961:204) is of the view that the 'breathing' was for the institution of the apostles and for their inspiration for ministry: to govern the church of God, to bear the embassy of eternal salvation; and to set up God's kingdom on earth.

He stresses that the giving of the Spirit to the apostles in this context is just a sprinkling of divine grace and not a saturation of the Spirit with full power which is to be realised afterwards (p. 205). The fundamental purpose of this bestowal, he stresses, is so that the apostles might do nothing of themselves (p. 206). For Carson (1991:655), the giving of the Spirit should be understood as an acted symbol or parable pointing forward to a full endowment to be realised afterwards. Köstenberger (2004:575) argues that the breathing constitutes the apostles as the new messianic community in anticipation of the future outpouring of the Spirit.

### 2.4.2 Herman Ridderbos

On the nature of the Paschal insufflation, Ridderbos (1997:643) rejects the position that the insufflation event is the Johannine form of the Lucan Pentecost and argues that the Spirit is given in this context as empowerment for the mission and authorisation of the Disciples (p. 643). He admits that the 'breathing' recalls text like Genesis. 2.7, Ezekiel 35.5f and Wisdom 17.11, which capture the giving of God's life-giving breath, hence; the text can also point to God breathing on the disciples to grant them eternal life (p. 643). Thus, for Ridderbos, the giving of the Spirit has significance for missiology, ordination and soteriology.

### 2.4.3 Gary M. Burge

Burge (1987:125) argues that John 20:22 is the Johannine version of the Lucan Pentecost (Acts 2), and thus the actual giving of the Spirit-Paraclete (cf. Dodd, 1953:430). He presents the following evidence in support of this claim:

- By virtue of the giving of the Spirit in John 20:22, the process of glorification is complete (p. 125).
- The use of the term, 'to breath' echoes Genesis 2.7 (LXX) which emphasises Jesus as the re-creator (p. 125).
- The absence of the definite article in the use of 'Spirit' in John 20.22 parallels the usage in the Baptist's prophecy (1.33). This connection suggests that 20.22 is a fulfilment of 1.33, which can refer only to Pentecost (p. 126).
- The use of the verb 'receive' in conjunction with the 'Holy Spirit' is common to the New Testament (John 7.39; 20.22; 14.7; Rom. 8.15; 1 Cor. 2.12; 2 Cor. 11.4; Gal. 3.2, 14; Acts 1.8; 2.38; 8.15, 17, 19; 10.47; 19.2) (p. 126).
- Jesus' greetings in the text (20.19, 21) is more than a Semitic salutation and it carries a threefold blessing of peace (20.19, 21, 26), corresponding to the restoration of the disciple's peace by the coming of the Paraclete (14.27; 16.33) (p. 126).
- John's Gospel, as with the early church, expects only one climactic giving of the Spirit to inaugurate the church (pp. 126-127).
- There is a striking parallel between John 20 and Acts 2:
  - Both events occur at Jerusalem in seclusion (setting) (p. 127).
  - Both events entail the charge of witness (commission) (p. 127).
  - Both entail the ministry of forgiveness (ministry) (p. 127).
  - Both employ the traditional image/metaphor of wind/breath (pp. 127-128).

Bultmann (1971:692) argues that in this giving of the Spirit, recreation has been conjoined with missiology. Beasley-Murray (1991:79-80) argues that this giving does not constitute the beginning of new creation, rather it is the beginning of the incorporation of humanity into this new creation actualised in believers by the Holy Spirit; Johnston (1970:11) understands the giving as the 'baptism' of divine breath; G. Brown (2003:111-11) and Keener (2003b:1204) understand the giving both as recreation and the ordination/commissioning of the disciples; Talbert (1992:255) argues that the giving is ethically (for community oneness) and missiologically significant.

#### 2.4.4 Max Turner

Turner (1996:96) argues that the giving of the Spirit in 20.22 should be understood not as the fulfilment of the giving of the Spirit-Paraclete (interpreted as the Johannine Pentecost), but as an eschatological new creation, alluding to Genesis 2.7 and Ezekiel 37.9 (cf. Menzies, 2004:49; Bennema, 2002:144; Levison, 2009:371-372; Atkinson, 2011:111; Ervin, 1984:137-138; Swete, 1909:166; Hoskyns, 1947:23; Westcott, 1894:295). For him, following this experience, John expects the coming of the Spirit as Paraclete with the removal of Jesus from the earthly scene (p. 99). Turner captures the role of the Spirit-Paraclete as the one who teaches and illuminates the Christ-event; as the one who continues Jesus' presence with the disciples, and as the one who continues the witness of the Christ event through the disciples (p. 99). *Contra* Burge (1987:125), Turner (1996:93-94) argues that Jesus is not fully glorified until he is totally removed from the world, hence, the condition for the giving of the Spirit in fullness is not yet met (cf. Menzies, 2004:49).

#### 2.4.5 Summary

The meaning of the Paschal insufflation has provoked diverse scholarly interpretation, which includes the following: the gift understood as a sprinkling of divine grace upon the disciples (Calvin), as impartation of new life to the disciple, as well as an empowerment for their mission (Ridderbos and others), as Johannine counterpart of the Lukan Pentecost given for the mission of the disciples (Burge and others), and as impartation of new creative life to the disciples. These interpretations, however telling they seem in their own right, have failed to settle the issue. Hence, an alternative interpretation is in order.

### **2.5 Conclusion**

From the above discussion, the following findings are significant for the understanding of the state of scholarship on the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel. First, although scholars are divided as to the soteriological significance of the Spirit on some passages, there is some form of

agreement on the salvific role of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel, at least on the grounds of John 3.5.

Second, there is no scholarly consensus regarding the meaning of the phrase, born 'of water and Spirit' in the Fourth Gospel (3.5). Those who take the water symbol to mean natural birth seem to overstretch the evidence, while those who take it to mean baptism seem to oversimplify the deduction. The identification of the water with the nothingness of human existence as Bultmann observes is quiet alien to the conceptual thought of the context. Keener's observation tends to reduce the significance of the phrase to the purifying work of the Spirit. The separation of the soteriological relevance of the phrase from the regenerative work of the Spirit in Hamilton's thought is quite unnatural. The reading of Turner, Carson and others is more viable as it captures the purifying and life-transforming essence of the phrase.

Third, two opposing views revolve around the role of the Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel: (1) those who argue against the soteriological significance of the Spirit-Paraclete; and (2) those who argue for the soteriological significance of the Spirit-Paraclete. It is interesting to note that to deny the salvific relevance of the Spirit-Paraclete as in Windisch and Menzies is a very bold step especially, amidst the designation of the Paraclete in the Gospel as the 'Spirit of Truth' and 'another Paraclete'. The former implies that the Paraclete embodies divine salvific truth, while the later implies that the Paraclete is another salvific figure in God's salvific history. The association of the Spirit Paraclete with salvation as in Bennema and the others is a careful and unbiased interpretation of the evidence.

Fourth, several views have been proposed on the nature of the Pascal insufflation gift. The view that the gift should be understood as a sprinkling of divine grace, not a saturation of the Spirit with full power (Calvin) tends to circumscribe the effect of Spirit reception. Carson's symbolic view undermines the significance of the giving. The apostolic constitution view espoused by Köstenberger might be composite of the significance of the gift. The Johannine Pentecost view (Burge, Dodd, etc.) begs the question of 'how far the giving in

this context parallels that of Acts 2?’ The interpretation of the gift as having both re-creative and missiological significance (Bultmann and Ridderbos) might be probable. The new-creation view (Turner, Bennema and others) tends to represent one side of the referent.

In the Fourth chapter, this study shall (1) challenge the identification of the water in the phrase, born ‘of water and Spirit’ with baptism (Ridderbos), natural birth (Odeberg), and the nothingness of human existence (Bultmann) and propose a more viable interpretation which will account for the purpose and function of the water symbol in the phrase; (2) challenge the position of Windisch and Menzies on the subject and seek to establish that the Spirit-Paraclete is soteriologically significant; and (3) challenge the Johannine Pentecost view and establish that after the insufflation gift, the Fourth Gospel still expects the coming of the Spirit as Paraclete in accord with the Lukan Pentecost.

Before plunging into the above investigation, understanding the soteriological significance of the Spirit in the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism is crucial, as that might serve as possible background to such a thought in the Fourth Gospel. This exercise shall be the main focus of the next chapter. It shall survey how the Spirit was understood soteriologically in the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism.

## **Chapter 3: SPIRIT AND SALVATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM**

### ***3.1 Introduction***

This chapter is set to address the following question: what is the theological influence of the Old Testament and the writings of Second Temple Judaism on the understanding of the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel? It approaches this question through the lens of narrative enquiry: that is, by examining how the Spirit was soteriologically understood through the lived and told stories of the Old Testament (Genesis, Exodus, Judges, 2 Chronicles, Job, Psalms, Isaiah and Ezekiel) and Second Temple Judaism (Philo, Qumran, Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs and Wisdom of Solomon), and how that insight prepares for the understanding of the soteriological role of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel. These books have been selected because they present significant insight into the subject under scrutiny. As the Old Testament writings precede the Second Temple writings, starting with the writings of the former is a plausible step.

### ***3.2 Genesis***

In the creation account, the divine Spirit is associated with the creation of the universe (Genesis 1.2). The Hebrew *ruach elohim* is best translated in this context as the Spirit of God. Like a bird, the Spirit of God brooded (hovered) upon the formless, lifeless cosmic egg to bring the universe into being (Simpson and Bowie, 1952:466; Douglas, 1990:6). In its chaotic and formless state the universe was both sustained and quickened into orderly and lively existence by the Spirit of God. Montague (1970:67) views the creative activity of the divine Spirit from a different yet complementary perspective when he notes that ‘the Spirit of God thus disposes the chaos to hear in obedience the word of God.’ That is, for him, the hovering effect of *ruach elohim* is that of quickening and stirring of the dead universe to respond to God. For Grudem (1994:267), the hovering indicates ‘a preserving, sustaining, governing function of the Spirit.’ What all these perspectives have in common is that the Spirit is associated with the creation of the universe.

In 2.7 the Spirit of God is presented as an animation principle of life the Lord. God formed the man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the 'breath of life' (*neshmah chayyim*) and the man became a living being (NIV). 'This verse uses *neshmah chayyim* as a synonym for *ruach*, which, in this context, means the animating principle of life itself' (Kaiser, 2014:5). The divine Spirit is here portrayed fundamentally as a life-giving agent (cf. Ezek. 37:1-14; Ps. 33:6; 104:29-30; Job 33:4). Breck (1991:8) puts it thus: 'It [the breath of life] is a life-force of divine origin that animates an otherwise lifeless material body'.

### **3.3 Exodus**

According to the song of Moses in Exodus 15.8-10, it was the breath of God, the divine Spirit that defended the people of God and saved them from the hands of their enemies by exterminating them with the waters of the sea. Since salvation was conceived in Jewish circles mainly as national deliverance and restoration (Isa. 27.12-13; 33.20-22; 42.1-6; 51.4-5; 52.7-10; 54.1-8; 61.1-3; Ezek. 20.40-44; 39.25-26; 47.13-48; Mic. 7.14-20; 9.11-13; Amos 9.11-13; Zech. 14.1-1), the activity of the divine breath in this context is soteriologically significant.

### **3.4 Judges**

In the days when Israel had no king and 'everyone did what was pleasing to his own eyes' (Judges 17.6) God raised judges to lead his covenant people. The precise roles of these judges are not certain. However, three main roles associated with these judges are discernible in the accounts. First, the judges saved the people from their enemies (2.16; 3.9-11, 15; 6.14; 10.1-3; 11.29-33; 16.28-30). Second, the fact that the people reverted to the service of other gods immediately after the death of the judges strongly suggests that the judges ensured covenant fidelity of the people (2.19; 3.11-12; 8.33; 10.5-6). Lastly, the judges ensured the procurement of social justice amongst the people (4.5). The judges were able to perform these roles because the Spirit of Yahweh was with them (3.10; 11.29; 13.25; 14.6, 19). If covenant fidelity is salvific in consequence (Exod. 19.5-6) and if deliverance from national enemies is understood as salvation in Jewish terms, then the Spirit as the empowering presence behind the activities of the judges is construed as a soteriological

agent. Wenk (2000:62-63) sympathises with this line of argument when he observes that 'the role of the Spirit cannot be restricted to empowering for ministry but was instrumental in realising the salvific benefits of God for his people.' The Spirit on the judges had not only a charismatic character, but a soteriological one as well.

### **3.5 2 Chronicles**

The activity of the Spirit as narrated by the chronicler shows the ethical/soteriological place of the Spirit in the pre-exilic period. The apostasy encouraged by King Joash (2 Chronicles 20.17-18), was an aberration from the Sinaitic covenantal conditions (Exod. 19.5-6). The prophetic declaration of Zachariah son of Jehoiada the priest, after the Spirit of God had come upon him was a call to covenantal faithfulness and religious/ethical purity (20.20). Since salvation/deliverance in pre- and post-exilic periods was predicated on covenantal fidelity and religious purity (Exod. 19.5-6; 23:20-33, Deut. 4.23-27; 32.15-52; 1Kgs. 14.7-11; Ezek. 16; Hos. 1-3) the Spirit as the empowering presence behind Zachariah's prophetic utterance is depicted as having a soteriological/ethical import.

### **3.6 Job**

In Job 33.4, the writer alludes to the creative efficacy of the Spirit in Genesis 2:7. The Spirit is here closely associated with the creation of mankind and is also depicted as the animation principle of human life. This latter emphasis is again highlighted in 34.14-15. This text presents the Spirit as having a life-sustaining attribute. In 32:8, understanding is portrayed as a gift from the 'breath of God.' This gift of understanding is expressed in ethical terms as 'what is right' (v. 9). To 'live right' in the wisdom literature is to have a saving relationship with God (Prov. 3.32-33; 11.30; 15.29; 28.28; Ps. 1.6; 5.12; 14.5; Job 1.1). Understood within this conceptual framework, the gift of understanding given by the Spirit of God is an ethical/soteriological product.

### **3.7 Psalms**

The oracle of salvation captured in the remorseful prayer of the Psalmist (51.7-12), alludes to the transforming/re-creative and purifying work of the Spirit in the new covenant (Jer. 31.33; Ezek. 11.19-20; 36.25-27). The petition of the

Psalmist with respect to the Spirit in vv. 11-12 shows the indispensability of the Spirit in this re-creative process. Montague (1970:76), observes this connection when he stresses that the Psalmist here sings 'of his longing for the new life which only God's Spirit could create in his life.' Elsewhere, the Psalmist again attests to the creative agency of the Spirit (33.6; 104.3). In Psalm 143.10 LXX, the Psalmist associates the Spirit of God with moral guidance: 'Teach me to do thy will; for thou art my God; thy good Spirit shall guide me in the straight way.' The request of the Psalmist in this text captures the promise in Ezekiel regarding the guidance of the Spirit towards covenantal faithfulness in the new covenant (Ezek. 36:27). As understood by the Psalmist, walking in the ways of God leads to divine salvific blessings (Pss 1; 119; 128). Hence; the depiction of the Spirit in this context as a moral guide in the ways of God is construed as a soteriological/ethical one.

### **3.8 Isaiah**

Like those of Ezekiel, the oracles of Isaiah ascribe creative work to the Spirit of God (40.13-14). In the formation of the waters, the heavens and the earth, the Spirit of God is said to have received no counsel, knowledge or understanding from anyone. He was an independent agent in the creation of the universe (cf. Ps. 104.30). Montague (1970:50) expresses it thus: 'The Spirit of the Lord is here specifically associated for the first time in our sources with God's infinite power and wisdom as creator.' The creative power of the Spirit is also expressed in terms of transformation/restoration of the eschatological community (4.2-6; 32.15; 44.1-5). The Jewish eschatological hope of salvation proclaimed in 61.1-3 is connected to the power of the Spirit. The Isaianic eschatological prophet will accomplish the salvific liberation of Zion because of the Spirit upon him. The Spirit is here projected as the empowering agent behind the promised renewal/recreation of Zion (cf. 42:1-4).

### **3.9 Ezekiel**

The eschatological cleansing, regeneration and covenant renewal of Israel is identified by Ezekiel to be accomplished by the agency of the Spirit (36.23-31). As in Isaiah (44.3-4), Ezekiel uses water imagery for the Spirit to describe the cleansing effect of the Spirit on Israel (v.25). The Spirit is also indispensable in

the regenerative and ethical transformation of Israel (vv.25-26). The ultimate effect of this pneumatic transformation is expressed in Old Testament covenant language - 'You will live in the land I gave to your forefathers; you will be my people, and I will be your God' (v.28; cf. Ex. 6.7; 19.5-6; Hos. 2:20, 23).

The Spirit is also connected to the recreation of Israel pictured in the resurrection of dry bones (37.1-14). The Spirit will not only effect the resurrection to life of the bones of dead Israel (vv.5, 6, 10) but will be a life-sustaining power for their existence (v.14). The effect of this recreation is again expressed in covenant categories – Israel will be called 'my people' (v.13) and they will possess the land and know the Lord (v.14). The Spirit has creative, life-sustaining and covenant renewing power.

### **3.10 Philo**

The works of Philo contribute to our understanding of the soteriological role of the Spirit in the conception of Hellenistic Judaism. In *De Gigantibus* 22, the Spirit of God is associated with the creation of the universe. This text suggests that it was the Spirit of the Lord brooding upon the waters that brought about the 'Light,' the third element in addition to the water, in the process of creation. Here, Philo makes the role of the Spirit in the creation account more explicit. In *De Gigantibus* 47 and 48 'Spirit of wisdom' is a soteriological phrase since in Philo wisdom is understood as an agent of divine knowledge (*Poster. C.* 18; *Deus Imm.* 2-3). It is the Spirit of wisdom affording divine knowledge to mankind that causes us to fear God and to desist from doing wrong. The link between the divine Spirit and divine knowledge can also be noted in *Legum Allegoriarum.* 36-38. The saving act of the Spirit is also given expression in *De Gigantibus* 55 (cf. *Op. Mund.* 144). Here, the divine Spirit is always standing by Moses conducting him in every right way. This text suggests that the salvific ministry of Moses is indebted to the support of the divine Spirit.

### **3.11 Qumran**

Qumran writings evidence a close relation between pneumatology and soteriology. 1QS 3.6b-8a (cf. 1QH 8.19-21) shows a distinction between the understanding of the Qumran community and that of the New Testament church on atonement. According to the preceding text, the

community understands the Spirit as the mediator of divine reconciliation and the life that proceeds after, by atoning for the sins of its members. The Spirit is thought of as a cleansing, reconciliatory and life giving agent to the eschatological community. For the New Testament church, it is the atoning work of Christ by which reconciliation and new life come about (2Cor. 5.19, 21; Rom. 3.22-26; 5.9; 1Pet. 1.18-19). On the concept of the two Spirits in 1QS 3.13 – 4.26, the description of the 'Spirit of truth' (3.19) suggests that it is an external force acting on the individual. This observation favours the identification of the 'Spirit of truth' with the divine Spirit rather than with the anthropological spirit. The divine Spirit is associated with regeneration (4.2), ethical purity (4.3-6), the giving of eternal life (4.7-8), purification (4.20-21; cf. 1QH 8.10-20), and covenant renewal (4.22; cf. 1Q34 frag. 3, col. 2.5-7).

The Spirit is also identified in the Qumran community as the sustaining power of their religious/covenantal life (1QH 15.6-7; cf. 4Q504 5.15-16; 1QSb 2.22-24). In 1QH 15.32, mankind, who is conceived as vacuous and the master of vanity, lacks divine understanding. However, by the Holy Spirit, the community comes to divine understanding (1QH 6.12-13, 25; cf. 1QH 20.11-12). The conception of the Spirit as a facilitating agent of the religious worship of the community is further given expression in 1QH 8.14-15. Here, it is by virtue of the enabling power of the Spirit that the community is able to hold fast to the covenant and the love of God. For the community, covenantal faithfulness and true religious service come about by cleaving to the Spirit. This in turn results in God delighting in them (1QH 17.32). The Spirit is at the centre of their salvific relationship with God.

The author of the commentaries on Isaiah envisions a time when the Spirit of the Lord will rest upon the Isaianic eschatological figure to accomplish the eschatological restoration of the people of God (4Q161 frag. 8-10. 15-29). This restoration is a salvific expectation of the people of God to be accomplished by the root of Jesse, only because the Spirit of the Lord rests upon him.

### **3.12 Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs**

The testaments attributed to prominent Old Testament religious figures in intertestamental Judaism contribute to our understanding of the soteriological role of the Spirit in Judaism. *The Testament of Levi* 18.6-7 alludes to the baptismal pneumatic empowerment of the Messianic Son in the New Testament (Luke 3.21-22; Matt. 3.16-17; Mark 1.10-11; cf. Ps. 2.7/Isa. 42.1).

The soteriological significance of the Spirit is revealed in the role of the Spirit anointed priest of the Most High evidenced in verses 9-13. In the anointed vocation of the priest of the Most High the following is evident:

- i. Knowledge of the Lord shall abound on earth and the people shall be illuminated by the grace of the Lord (v. 9a). The illumination that the ministry of the priest shall cause is soteriological and an allusion to the illumination effected by the gospel of Jesus Christ in 1 Corinthians 4.3-6. As those who are ignorant of this illumination shall perish, Israel shall perish and be darkened by her ignorance of the illumination brought by the priest of the Most High.
- ii. Sin shall cease and the righteous shall rest in him (v. 9b).
- iii. He will grant to the saints to eat the tree of life (v.11)
- iv. He will effect eternal reconciliation between the people and the Lord (v. 11)
- v. He will cause the people to be clothed in righteousness.

The priest of the Most High shall be able to accomplish the above soteriological vocation because the Spirit of understanding, sanctification and holiness (vv. 7b, 11b) of the Most High shall take permanent residence upon him.

*The Testament of Judah* 24:1-5 presents similar thoughts. Here, the Spirit shall be poured on the shoot of God Most High as a blessing and he will in turn pour the spirit of grace on the people (cf. Joel 2:28-29). The effect of this universal out-pouring of the Spirit of grace on the people will be a soteriological/ethical one, that is, the people will be adopted as sons of the Most High and will walk by his decrees (cf. Rom. 8.15-16; Gal. 4.6; 5.16). By virtue of the gift of the Spirit of grace given by the shoot of God, he is called the fountain for the life of all humanity. This soteriological quality of the gift of the Spirit as fountain of life

in Qumran thought is also shared by John (7.36-39; cf. 4.10). The Spirit is depicted as a fountain of water that gives eternal life to all those who drink it.

In *The Testament of Benjamin* 8.1-3 (cf. Test Levi 2.3), the Spirit is associated with ethical purity and moral rectitude. The 'sun analogy' painted in this passage suggests that (1) the Spirit resting upon the individual becomes an ethical sustaining power guiding him through the corrupted earth and (2) it is by virtue of the Spirit of God resting on the individual that he has no pollution in his heart but edifies God instead – that is, the Spirit maintaining a saving relationship between the anointed individual and God.

### **3.13 Wisdom of Solomon**

In *The Wisdom of Solomon* (1.5-7) the Spirit is associated with moral discipline and ethical propriety and one who gives life to the universe by holding all things together. The moral discipline by the Holy Spirit in this context is inherently soteriological in the sense that, the context of the above passage (vv. 3-4) emphasises that dishonesty and sin as a whole separate an individual from God. The disciplinary role of the Spirit in the light of this understanding is therefore geared towards the maintenance of a healthy relationship with God. In *The Wisdom of Solomon* 7.22-8.1 wisdom is used interchangeably with the Spirit. Wisdom/Spirit is a divine force who re-creates (v. 27) and makes mankind acceptable to God (v. 28). Here the 'justification' role of faith in Jesus in the New Testament (Rom. 3.28; 5.1; Gal. 2.16; Phil. 3.9) is transferred to the acquisition of wisdom/Spirit. Wisdom/Spirit sustains and gives life to the entire universe (8.1).

In *The Wisdom of Solomon* 9.17-18 (NEB; cf. 7.7, 22, 25), wisdom is identified with the Holy Spirit. Wisdom/Spirit mediates revelational knowledge of God's purpose, His ways and will to mankind. This revelational knowledge perfects the ways of mankind and makes peace with God. Thus, the acquisition of wisdom/Spirit is soteriologically significant. In the light of this assertion, Menzies (1994:58) is right in his emphasis that for the author of *Wisdom*, the Spirit is the essential source of moral and religious life; hence the possession of the Spirit is significant for salvation. *Wisdom* 12.1 (cf. 15.11) attributes the

source of physical life to the Spirit. For the author of *Wisdom*, the Spirit is the source of ethical, religious and physical life.

### **3.14 Conclusion**

This survey has revealed that, in the Old Testament the Spirit is associated with creation/new creation, ethical purity, covenant fidelity and salvation, understood as deliverance and national restoration. The Spirit is also understood as having a life-giving and a life-sustaining attribute. In the writings of Second Temple Judaism, the soteriological conception of the Spirit is more developed as compared to the Old Testament: The Spirit is associated with creation/recreation, moral guidance, divine reconciliation, divine illumination, covenantal faithfulness and sanctification. The Spirit is also understood as capable of mediating life-saving revelatory wisdom and knowledge. It is therefore plausible, in view of the above examination, to conclude that, in the Old Testament, as in Second Temple Judaism, the Spirit was conceived as having a soteriological import. In view of the question: what is the theological influence of the Old Testament and the writings of Second Temple Judaism on the understanding of the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel, the following conclusion can be made, based on the insight drawn from this examination – that, it is possible the soteriological aspect of the Spirit's work evidenced in the Fourth Gospel was influenced by its Old Testament and Second Temple Jewish antecedent. This understanding is significant as it shall serve as luminary backdrop to our understanding of the salvific role of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel that the next chapter is set to examine.

## **CHAPTER 4: EXEGETICAL EXAMINATION OF THE SOTERIOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL**

### ***4.1 Introduction***

The question of the soteriological role of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel has long been given an affirmative answer in Johannine scholarship. However, there still remain a gap in this branch of Johannine studies in that the salvific role of the Spirit in passages like the giving of the son of God (3:15-16); the bread of life discourse (6:22-59); the Paraclete sayings (14:16-17, 25-26; 15:26-27; 16:7-11, 12-15); and the vine discourse (15:1-11) has not received in-depth attention on the subject, hence, this chapter. The aim of this chapter is to investigate the ways in which the Holy Spirit is soteriologically significant to the process of salvation revealed in the Fourth Gospel. It exegetically examines in more detail the pneumatic passages in the Fourth Gospel, including those mentioned above, in order to determine their soteriological significance. While engaging with the relevant state of scholarship up to present on the subject, this study will also draw insight gained from the previous chapter on the understanding of the soteriological role of the Spirit in the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism to deepen and broaden the scope of this discussion.

These texts are grouped under two main sections. The first section, the Spirit and Jesus, examines the soteriological role of those pneumatic passages relative to Jesus. The second section, the Spirit and the believers/disciples, examines the soteriological significance of those pneumatic passages relative to believers/disciples. This division is an artificial construct to give special attention to the examination of how the Spirit performs soteriological role in the life of Jesus on one side and that of the believer on the other, so that, the conclusion will reflect a holistic representation of the ways in which the Holy Spirit is soteriologically significant to the process of salvation revealed in the Fourth Gospel. It is crucial to add that for the sake of conceptual flow and clarity, the soteriological role of the Spirit-Paraclete will be given a separate treatment under the second section.

## 4.2 *The Spirit and Jesus*

### 4.2.1 The Pneumatic Anointing (John 1.32)

The Fourth Gospel departs from the testimony of the synoptic Gospels by omitting the water baptism of Jesus and recording only the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus. The reason for this omission could probably be that the fourth evangelist wanted to emphasise the significance of Jesus' pneumatic anointing to his entire ministry (1.33; 3.5, 34; 4.14; 7.38-39; 14.16-17, 26; 15.26; 16.7-11, 12-15; 20.22) over that of 'water baptism'. Like his synoptic counterparts (Matt. 3.16; Mark 1.10; Luke 3.22), John records the Spirit descending upon Jesus like a dove, however, he alone stresses the fact that the Spirit remained (Greek *menein*) upon Jesus. This emphasis is probably, to heighten the ontological and functional bond between the *Logos* and the *pneuma* in the ministry of Jesus. John tells his readers in the beginning of his testimony that Jesus is the incarnate *Logos* (1.1-14). This eternal *Logos*, for John, speaks the word of God because he possesses the Spirit without measure (3.34). He alone gives up the Spirit on the cross after his earthly ministry (19.30; cf. 19.34) and breathes the Spirit upon his disciples after his resurrection. For John, the *pneuma* and the *Logos* are inseparable (cf. 6.63).

The dove symbolism has received interesting interpretations among scholars. For Calvin (1959:34), the dove is the symbol of the Spirit. That is, 'the Spirit by metonymy' (cf. Carson, 1991:153; Hoskyns, 1947:177). The frailty of this construct is that it does not reveal anything more than an emphasis on what the text says, '*the descent of the Spirit as dove*'. Strachan (1941:116) understands the dove symbol as having an adverbial thrust. That is, for him, the fourth evangelist possibly understood the descent of the Spirit in terms of 'bird-like' flight, hence indicating the gentleness of the Messiah (cf. Westcott, 1894:21). Strachan skews the evidence in favour of his perspective as the 'bird-like flight' is likened to the Spirit in the text and not the personality of the Messiah. A plausible reading will ascribe the gentleness to the Spirit and not the Messiah. Gero (1976:19) argues for a *dove election motif* on the basis that 'the descent of a bird, (in particular, a dove) upon a chosen person as a sign is a common motif in Ancient Near Eastern legend.' While the concept of election lurks beneath the pneumatic anointing (Isa. 11.2; 42.1; 61), it is quite uncertain that an Ancient

Near East background influenced the use of the dove symbol in the Fourth Gospel.

Köstenberger (2004:69-70) argues that the dove was often associated with Israel, hence the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus as a dove is possibly to mark him as the perfect Israel (cf. Morris, 1971:151 n. 73; Lane, 1974:57). The problem with this interpretation is that it is difficult to understand conceptually, how the descent of Israel (dove) upon Jesus marks him as a perfect Israel. If anything, it should rather mark Jesus as the carrier of Israel's burden (which could also be interpreted as their saviour) according to the association. Similarly, Johnston (1970:20) observes the possible background of Genesis 8.8f and Isaiah 11.2 and 63.14 to the use of the dove symbol, and concludes that 'as the dove found its resting place in the midst of the flood waters, so the spirit of God found a resting place in Israel.' Again, the identification of Jesus as 'Israel/perfect Israel' with the descent of the Spirit, and not as 'Israel's messiah' in this context, does not do justice to the theological thrust of Jesus' baptismal narrative.

Rejecting the *Israel/dove* association, Keener (2003a:460) links the dove symbol with Noah's dove (Gen. 8.10-12), and concludes that the dove as a symbol of a harbinger of new life or new-creation is the most likely link (cf. Dunn, 2010: 27; Thiselton, 2013:35). Ryken *et al.* (1998:217) support the new creation referent, but they link the basis of such a reading to the following: Genesis 1.2, where Spirit, water and the hovering characteristic of a bird merge; the Talmudic identification of the Spirit with a dove (*b. Hag.* 15a); and the eschatological hovering of the Spirit over the saints (4Q521). The evidence marshalled by Keener, Ryken and the others in support of the new life or new-creation referent is telling. However, this interpretation does not exhaust the meaning of the dove symbol, especially in the context of the pneumatic soteriology of the Fourth Gospel.

It is worth stressing that finding a possible referential meaning to the dove symbol from within the writings of the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism is a plausible step, as John has amply shown his close familiarity with these texts in the Fourth Gospel. The dove sent by Noah brought to him a freshly plucked olive leaf (Genesis 8.11). This gift to Noah, which was a new

creation, gave him a revelatory knowledge of the situation on the earth, ‘*and Noah knew that the waters had receded from the earth*’ (11b). The dove is here associated with ‘new-creation’ and ‘revelatory knowledge’. Viewed within the purview of the pneumatic soteriology of the Fourth Gospel, the use of the dove symbol in connection with the Spirit in Jesus’ baptism is, for John, to emphasise the significance of the Spirit upon Jesus in terms of new creation (John 3.5; 4.14; 6.63; 7.38-39; 20.22) and revelatory knowledge (14.16-17, 26; 15.26; 16.12-15). The Spirit descending upon Jesus as a dove is not only a harbinger of life and new-creation (Keener, Ryken *et al.*) but revelatory knowledge, and in the Fourth Gospel the former is contingent upon the latter (17.3). Another possible shade of meaning is proposed by Lioy (2007:40; cf. Dunn, 2010:27). For him, the dove ‘signalled that Jesus as Torah was inaugurating the promised age of covenant renewal for the people of God.’ This reading takes into account all the revelatory and life-giving work of the Spirit as promised in the new covenant (Jer. 31.31-34; Ezek. 36.25-27; Joel 2.28)

Burge (1987:57-8) rejects the association of Noah’s dove with the baptismal narrative and its subsequent new creation referent (cf. 1991:135) and argues that in view of Isaiah 11.2 (and possibly *T. Levi* 18) as a possible background to the baptismal tradition, the dove symbol is to stress the resting of the anointing upon Jesus. Unfortunately, such a construct is a shallow perspective on the subject. This is because the use of the term μένειν (*menein* to remain) is sufficient to make such a theological emphasis without the association of the dove symbol. Hence, it is quite exegetically shaky to conjecture that the dove symbol heightens the resting of the anointing upon Jesus.

On the significance of the Spirit’s anointing for Jesus and his ministry, Dunn (2010:25) argues that it is a mark of Messiahship and signifies Jesus’ entry into a new epoch in God’s plan of redemption, an initiation into the new covenant age. The strength of this claim lies in two elements: (1) the idea of an eschatological ‘Spirit anointed servant’ of the Lord who will deliver his people (messianic vocation) was prominent in the Old Testament (Isa. 11.2; 42.1; 48.16; 61.1) and Second Temple Judaism (*T. Jud.* 24.2; 1 Enoch 49.3; 62.2; 4Q161 frag. 8-10.15-29; *T. Lev.* 18.6-7; Ps. Sol. 17.37). Viewed in this light, it is possible that Jesus’ anointing confirms his identification with this eschatological

messianic servant of the Lord (cf. Köstenberger, 2004:69). (2) It is the Spirit upon the servant/prophet which will empower him to effect his messianic vocation (Isa. 42:6-7; 61:1), signifying the dawn of the new age, the in-breaking of the eschatological kingdom. This is however, not to claim that Jesus is initiated into the new age by the anointing as Dunn maintains. Such a claim is reductionist in perspective, thus it makes Israel's Servant/Messiah, himself an object of God's eschatological redemption.

For Calvin (1950:35), it was for Jesus an empowerment for his baptism mission (cf. Perkins, 1990:952; Brown, 1966a:66; McDonnell and Montague, 1991:57). G. Brown (2003:96) notes that this *baptism* view is reductionism, and argues that Jesus' Spirit anointing signifies him as the bearer and giver of the heavenly benefits of the Spirit. Although G. Brown leaves his readers blank as to what the heavenly benefits of the Spirit are, his critique of the *baptism* view is laudable in the sense that Jesus' Jordan anointing was not only significant for his baptism ministry, but for other benefits of the Spirit to the believer as well (John 3.5; 4.14, 23-24; 6.63; 7.37-39; 16.7-15; 20.22).

Büchsel (1926:165) espouses an *adoptionist* view. For him, the Jordan anointing is for Jesus an initiation into a unique divine sonship status. The problem associated with this view for the Fourth Gospel is that, the cotext (John 1.14) strongly suggests that John, (and by implication Jesus) understood Jesus' unique filial relationship with the Father before the pneumatic anointing. Turner (1996:199) is right when he notes that Jesus' Jordan anointing functions 'primarily as an empowering for the messianic task of one who is already eschatological Son.'

For Köstenberger (2004:69-70), the anointing marks Jesus as a 'consummate Israelite' in the light of the dove symbolism. The problem associated with this position is that (1) it de-emphasises, if not neglects, the significance of the Spirit for Jesus' ministry; and (2) It is quite easy to find scriptural allusions for the messianic view of Jesus' Spirit anointing (Isa. 11.2; 42.1; 48.16; 61.1), but the same is not true for the *consummate Israel* view. Notwithstanding these weaknesses, the strength of this position is that it rightly identifies a link between the dove symbolism and the anointing.

Ridderbos (1997:76) argues that it was, for Jesus, an empowerment for his divine redemptive mission (cf. Bruce, 1983:53; Johnston, 1970:21; Turner, 1996:191; Menzies, 1991:137). This position is probably the most persuasive and compelling amongst all. The significance of Jesus' anointing in the light of Isaiah 11.2, 42.1 and 61.1 (cf. 1 *Enoch* 49.3; Ps. Sol. 17.37; *T. Lev.* 18.2-14; *T. Jud.* 24.2-3) was to empower him for his messianic ministry of redemption. This redemptive mission is construed in the Fourth Gospel as the giving of eternal life in abundance (John 10.10b). This eternal life consists in the knowledge of the Father and Son, and the relationship existing between them (John 17.3). This salvific knowledge is mediated to the believer via Jesus' Spirit-imbued teachings (John 3.34-36; 4.14, 41-42; 5.24; 6.63-69; 7.37-39; 8.31-32; 14.10; 17.8) and the Spirit-Paraclete (John 14.16-17, 26; 15.26-27; 16.12-14). It should be noted that Jesus was able to baptise (1.32; 14.16-17) and to communicate salvific knowledge to the believer, simply because the Father gave him the Spirit without measure (John 3.34). The significance of Jesus' anointing with the Spirit encompasses both his baptism and revelatory ministry, understood as his messianic redemptive ministry (cf. Burge, 1987:55, 62, 78-110).

#### 4.2.2 The Baptist's Prophecy (John 1.33)

John's prophetic oracle concerning the coming one who will baptise with the Holy Spirit and with fire has spawned various interpretations among New Testament scholars. Matthew (3.11-12) and Luke (3.16-17) report that the coming one will baptise with the Holy Spirit and fire. Mark (1.8) and John (1.33) omit the fire symbol and the winnowing metaphor and have only baptism with the Holy Spirit. For John, the reason for this omission might be that the main purpose of his testimony was to present Jesus as Messiah and Son of God who gives eternal life/salvation (cf. Carson, 1991:152). In view of this, it is reasonable for him to omit the fire symbol which has a composite judgemental overtone.

In the Fourth Gospel scholars are divided on the meaning of the 'baptism' **metaphor** in relation to the 'Holy Spirit' and whether this Spirit baptism of the coming one has a soteriological import. Köstenberger (2004:71) argues that the Messiah's baptism was in keeping with Old Testament eschatological restoration (Isa. 32.15; 44:3; Ezek. 36.25-27; Joel 2.28-32; cf. 2 *Esdr.* [4 *Ezra*]

6.26; *T. Jud.* 24.3; 1QS 4.20-21), hence the phrase 'baptise with the Holy Spirit' is related to the removal of sin (cf. Ridderbos, 1997:77; Keener, 2003a:463; Turner, 1996:177-187; Dunn, 2010:8-14; Lindars, 1972:111; Westcott, 1894:22; Aune, 1983:132; Rowland, 1985:131). While Köstenberger rightly observes the soteriological dimension of the phrase 'baptise with the Holy Spirit,' his identification of Spirit baptism with the removal of sin or cleansing without exegetical justification as to how the Spirit achieves this cleansing effect makes such a position assailable. This is because it is difficult to see a direct connection of the Spirit with cleansing, or the removal of sin, in the Fourth Gospel. For Morris (1997:153), Dodd (1953:311), Smalley (1978:227), Murray (1991:64), and McDonnell & Montague (1991:58), new creation is in view. For Delorme (1964:57), regeneration and new creation is the emphasis. Marshall (2004:496) argues for deliverance from sin. Lightfoot (1956:98) argues for rebirth into the kingdom of God. Hughes (1972:200) espouses the view that it is the work of God himself with the possibility of cleansing and life-giving significance.

A brief examination of the dynamics of 'metaphor' is a good starting point, as it will help in the understanding of the baptism phrase. The basic notion about metaphors is that they cannot be understood literally (cf. Guthrie, 1980:641). In metaphorical relations the attribute(s) of the predicate that can sensibly apply to the subject is salient. This salient feature is not immediately obvious or predominant as a characteristic of the subject (Guthrie, 1980:641). That established it is imperative to note that the baptism metaphor cannot be understood literally. Moreover, it should be noted that the salient feature(s) of water baptism that can sensibly apply to Spirit baptism is not immediately obvious.

It is reasonable to admit, based on the cleansing significance of baptism in Second Temple Judaism (*B. Pesah.* 92a; *B. Yeb.* 47b; *Sib. Or.* 4.160-70), that cleansing (soteriological dimension) is implicit in the Spirit baptism of 'the coming one' as maintained by Köstenberger and others mentioned above. However, these positions leave a vacuum: how does the Spirit achieve this cleansing, new life, and new creation within John's theology of salvation in the Fourth Gospel? In tackling this question it is appropriate, as a starting point, to

investigate the possible meaning of the Baptist's use of the term 'baptism,' and the possible background conceptions that might have motivated such usage.

In the Old Testament two types of uncleanness are discernible: (1) cultic uncleanness, a result of crossing the line of Israel's cultic purity for example, bodily discharge, contact with corpse, seminal discharge, etc. (Lev. 11; 13; 14; 15; 17; 20.18; Deut. 21.1-9; 23.10-11; Num. 19.11-16; 31.19-24) and (2) moral/ethical uncleanness, a result of sin or moral failure (Lev. 20.21; Deut. 23.14; Ps. 51.2; Isa. 6.5; Ezek. 36.29; 39.24; Zech. 13.1). In order to be restored to a normal state of purity or cleanliness, a cleansing agent is needed. This could be water (e.g., Lev. 15.7; Ps. 51.1-2); blood (e.g., Lev. 14.5-7); fire (e.g., Num. 31.23); and live coals (e.g., Isa. 6.6). The cleansing agent which is significant to this study, and which is given considerable attention below is water.

When water was employed as a cleansing agent in the Old Testament, (1) it was sprinkled upon the unclean (Lev. 14.50-53; Num. 8.7; 19.18; 31.19-24; Ezek. 36.25) and (2) the unclean was washed or immersed in it (Exod. 19.10; 29.17; Lev. 1.9, 13; 6.28; 8.21; 9.14; 11.25, 28, 32, 40; 13.6, 34, 58; 14.8-9; 15.5-13, 17, 21-22, 27; 16.26, 28; 17.15-16; Num. 8.7, 21; 19.7-10, 19, 21; 31.19-20, 23-24; 2 Chron. 4.6; Ezek. 40.38). The idea behind the washing was to purge the unclean of the contagion, if the impurity was cultic, and of sin, if the impurity was moral/ethical. In the case of the latter, the washing or purification was not literal, but spiritual. That is, the image of washing or purifying with water in the literal sense is employed as a metaphor to depict washing/purification of moral/ethical contagion in the Spirit realm (Ps. 51.2; Ezek. 36.25; Zech. 13.1).

Evidence found in Second Temple literature shows signs of spillage of the concept of water as a cleansing agent from the Old Testament. As in the Old Testament, water was used as a cultic purifying agent (*Sib. Or.* 3.591-93; *War* 1.148-53; 2.129-132, 138, 149-150, 161; 5.227; 7.189; *Ant.* 3.263; 18.36-38, 249; *Spec. Leg.* 1.119) and as a metaphor to depict washing/purification of moral/ethical contagion in the Spirit realm (*Deus Imm.* 7; *Spec. Leg.* 1.257-60; *Jub.* 7.20-21; 1 *En.* 10:18-22; *War.* 2.128; *T. Levi* 2.3B1-2, 7-8, 11, 14; *Sib. Or.* 4.162-70; 1QS 2.5-3.9; 4.19-22).

Moreover, during the Second Temple period, uncleanness could be purged by the use of the *mikveh*, a pool constructed out of rock which was generally filled with rain water (that is, natural or heavenly water) (cf. Taylor, 1997:60; Keener, 1997:141; Baskin, 2001:132; Ricks, 1996-7: 279). The *mikveh* was very significant for ritual purity: priestly purity (*B. Ber.* 2b), menstrual purity (*Yoma* 6b) and cultic vessel purity (*Miqw.* 9.5-7; *Hag.* 3.8). Baskin (2001:132) notes that the eighth day after the cessation of menstrual flow, wives, after thorough cleansing, must immerse in the *mikveh* before resuming marital relations with their husbands.

Jewish proselyte baptism is another case in point in the light of the use of the *mikveh*. Baskin (2001:132) notes that the *mikveh* was also used for the immersion of Gentile converts to Judaism as part of the conversion ceremonial requirements. Gentiles were normally considered unclean (*War* 2.150; *t. Yom.* 4.20; cf. Witherington, 1992:386; McKnight, 2000:839; Lacey, 1993:336; Slee, 2003:7-52; Esler, 1994:66-67) and purification was necessary for Gentile converts into Judaism, probably in order to get rid of the impurities of having been a Gentile (*B. Pesah.* 92a; *B. Yeb.* 47b; *Sib. Or.* 4.160-70; *m. Pes.* 8.8; cf. Barrett, 1947:31; Pusey, 1993:13). Taylor (1997:68) argues that the baptism or immersion of the proselyte does not constitute rebirth or new-creation, but a new legal and new community status (*m. Seb.* 109; *Yebam.* 11:2; *m. Hul.* 10.4). *Contra* Taylor, Webb (1991:129) argues that the new status obtained by the convert signifies a passing from death into life and forgiveness of sins (*b. Yeb.* 22a, 48b). Although the meaning of the 'rebirth' is pre-eminently and quintessentially legalistic, as Taylor maintains, Webb's observation is plausible. This is because, first, the connotation of moral/ethical purification in the proselyte immersion makes sense of forgiveness of sins in that context (*B. Pesah.* 92a; *B. Yeb.* 47b; *Sib. Or.* 4.160-70; *m. Pes.* 8.8; cf. Bamberger, 1939:44; Webb, 1991:129; Pusey, 1993: 143-145; Taylor, 1997:68; Barrett, 1947:31). Second, if after the immersion the proselyte was considered an Israelite in all respects (*b. Yeb.* 47b), then it is convincing to suggest that this change of communal status, for the Gentile convert, was implicitly life-saving as the convert became part of the covenant community of Yahweh (*b. Ker.* 9a).

Taylor (1997:68) argues that proselyte baptism was not an initiation rite strictly speaking, but purificatory. While this position is probable, it is plausible to suggest that, if by immersion and other initiatory rites the Gentile entered into Jewish nationalism (*b. Ker. 9a*), then proselyte immersion was at least initiatory in principle (cf. Pusey, 1993:143-145; Webb, 1991:129; Witherington, 1992:386; Rowley, 1959:225). It was also conversional in the sense that the Gentile convert to Judaism no longer adhered to the practices of the heathen, but to Judaism (*b. Pes. 92a*). In this light, proselyte immersion could be argued to have had a purificatory, initiatory and conversional impact on the convert.

When the baptism of John the Baptizer is set against the background of the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism, the following deductions emerge: first, John's audience would possibly have identified his baptismal effect with cleansing/purification (cf. Bultmann, 1971:88; Bennema, 2003:38). Hence, John's baptism should be understood as a symbolic theatre depicting washing/purification of moral/ethical contagion (cf. Hunter, 1950:35; Crossan, 1991:231; Witherington, 1992:368; Dockery, 1992:56; Robinson, 1957:183; Pusey, 1993:50; Laurin, 1984:587). This washing/purification of moral/ethical contagion equals the forgiveness of the sin of the baptised (cf. Barrett, 1947:32; Ricks, 1996:282).

Second, the nature of the Baptizer's ministry strongly suggests that he was calling and gathering a people from Judea and Jerusalem (Mark. 1.5) and the Jordan region (Matt. 3.5); Sadducees and Pharisees (Matt. 3.7); tax collectors (Luke 3.12); soldiers (Luke 3.14) with a repentant heart through his preaching and baptism. On the basis of the initiatory significance of proselyte baptism in the Judaism of John's milieu, it is possible John may have thought of his baptism as an initiatory rite (*contra* Taylor, 1997:69; Christiansen, 1995:192-99) into this eschatological ingathering. He may have thought of his baptism as a preparatory ritual for the repentant within Israel for the baptism of the coming one, which was to be the ultimate constitution power of the group and which would provide its eschatological identity. Robinson (1957:183) is right when he notes that John's preaching and baptism was 'to create a pure and penitent nucleus in Israel.' Barrett (1947:32) espouses a similar view when he stresses that John's baptism is related to proselyte baptism in as much as it provided a

means of entry into the true Israel' (cf. Witherington, 1992:386; Dockery, 1992:56; Ricks, 1996:282; Pusey, 1993:50; Delorme, 1964:53-54; McKnight, 2000:845).

Third, it was a baptism which revolutionised Jewish soteriological consciousness, rooted in their Abrahamic pedigree (Matt. 3.9; Luke 3.8) and divine election (Deut. 14.2; 26.17-19; 2 Sam. 7.23-24; 1 Kgs 8.53; 10.91 Chr. 17.20-21; Ps. 135.4; Isa. 41.8; 43.1-3; 44.21; Jer. 31.1-4; 46.27-28). John shifts this conceptual focus to his baptism and that of the Mightier One, preceded by repentance, as the means of escaping the impending eschatological divine wrath (Matt. 3.7-12; Lk. 3.7-18).

So far, this exploration has shown that the consistent thread that runs through the practice of baptism/immersion from the Old Testament to John the Baptist has been cleansing/purification. This observation, together with the Jewish eschatological expectation of the pouring out of the Spirit to cleanse Israel (Ezek. 36.25-27; Jub. 1.23; *T. Jud.* 24.3; 1QS 4.20-21), built a strong case in favour of the argument that Jesus' baptism with/in the Spirit was quintessentially, if not preeminently, purificatory. It is also initiatory, as those who receive it are initiated into the realm of God (Jn. 3.6) where divine saving communion, in all its aspects, is made possible (Jn. 14.16-20; 15.26; 16.7, 12-15; cf. 15). It follows from this observation that 'Spirit baptism' has a broad soteriological implication for the recipient.

If Jesus' Spirit baptism is purificatory, initiatory, and soteriologically significant, what is left to investigate now is how the Spirit achieves these effects within the corpus of the soteriology of the Fourth Gospel. To this task, the study turns.

Salvation/eternal life in the Fourth Gospel is by revelational knowledge of the Father and Son, and the communal relationship between them (John 1.18; 8.19; 13.31-36; 14.9-11; 15.15), revealed in Christ and acquired via a belief/faith response to his teachings (John 17.3; 3.15, 36; 4.41-42; 5.24; 6.35; 11.25; cf. Calvin 1961:136; Filson, 1962:114; Carson, 1991:556; Köstenberger, 2004:487; Bennema, 2002:115; Forestell, 1974:113; Simon, 1957:103; Brown, 1966a:752). This revelatory knowledge is Spirit-imbued (John 6.63). Upon reception of Jesus' revelatory Spirit-imbued teachings, the Spirit facilitates

understanding in the receiver (14.26; 16.12-15). When this understanding induces a belief/faith response in the believer (4.39) by the same Spirit (6.63), the result is cleansing/forgiveness of the sin of the believer (John 15.3; 17.17), and hence the believer is said to have received eternal life (John 3.15, 36; 4.41-42; 5.24; 6.35; 11.25) or to have been born anew (John 3.5). Consequently, the believer, by virtue of the Spirit, begins a life of discipleship, and as Bennema (2002:139-140) observes, this discipleship has the following evidential components: love (13.34-35; 14.15-23; 15.1-17); fruit bearing (4.14; 12.24-26; 15.4-5, 8, 16); remaining in Christ (6.56; 8.31; 14.20, 23; 15.1-10); and mission (15.26-27). It follows from this sketch that Spirit baptism, within the purview of the Fourth Gospel, is primarily soteriological, and secondarily prophetic. It is a baptism which initiates the believer into the realm of the Spirit (John 3.6), where the illumination, meaning and significance of Jesus' life-saving revelatory teachings (this also includes that of the cross) which result in cleansing/forgiveness of sin, rebirth, and discipleship (love, fruit-bearing, remaining in Christ, and mission) are made possible (cf. Bennema 2003:52).

Guillet (1964:94-95) rightly observes the purificatory significance of the link between the Spirit and the 'Lamb of God' imagery (1.29); however, he leaves his readers with a question regarding how this link effects the cleansing/purification. G. Brown (2003:91) argues that Jesus' baptism with the Spirit has no cleansing/purificatory significance. He further observes that the sacrifice of Jesus, the Lamb of God, does not remove sin through purification, but through revelation. While this observation is peripherally true, what G. Brown fails to grasp at a deeper level, is the fact that the mediation of this revelation, the facilitation of its meaning and significance, as well as the quickening of the faith response in the believer for a subsequent forgiveness/purification and rebirth, are all the works of the Spirit (3.5; 6.63; 13.7; 14.19-20, 26; 15.26; 16.12-15). This means that the sacrificial death of Jesus, the Lamb of God, as divine revelation, is purificatory (*contra* G. Brown) via the work of the Spirit (cf. Koester, 2003:178; Bennema, 2002: 228-247). Nielsen (1999:252) misses the significance of the Spirit in this cleansing process when he stresses that the soteriological meaning of Jesus as the paschal lamb is evidenced by the removal of the sin of the world by his death. (Bultmann (1971:97) presents a cogent summary of this insight thus: '[H]e

[John] nowhere else attaches the gift of the forgiveness of sins specifically to Jesus' death, but understands it as the effect of his word (8.31f).' The confession, 'Behold! The lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world' (John 1.29) found within the context of 'baptism with the Spirit' (1.34), is plausibly a literary technique to connect, theologically, Jesus' Spirit baptism with his role as the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (cf. 19.30, 34).

The above investigation questions the Pentecostal position which views Spirit baptism in the New Testament as a charismatic empowerment distinct from and subsequent to regeneration. Scholars like Menzies (1991:232), Ervin (1984:133-140), Stronstad (1984:49-62), and Atkinson (1984:111) fall within this camp of interpretation. Turner (1996:147-156), Fee (1991:105-120), Bennema (2005:31), Welker (2006:109-125), and Brunner (1970:214) object to this strand of interpretation and argue for an inseparability between the regenerative and the charismatic dimension of Spirit baptism in the New Testament. The objection of Turner, Bennema and the others to the Pentecostal position is plausible because, as this study has shown, Spirit baptism for John, and possibly for the New Testament writers, entails the soteriological and empowering work of the Spirit in the life of the believer. The Spirit that gives new creation to the believer (John 3.5) is the same Spirit who empowers for the life of discipleship (4.14; 8.31; 12.24-26; 13.34-35; 14.20, 23; 15.1-17, 23, 26-27; 16.13). The Fourth Gospel betrays the regeneration/empowerment dualism propounded by the Pentecostals with respect to Spirit baptism, as regeneration and charismatic empowering are two theologically indistinct progenies of 'Spirit baptism' in the Fourth Gospel.

### **4.3 The Spirit and the Disciples/Believers**

#### **4.3.1 Birth of Water and Spirit (John 3:1-5)**

The dialogue between Jesus and Nicodemus is centred on how one can enter into the eschatological Kingdom. Jesus emphasised that entry into God's Kingdom required being born *ἄνωθεν* (*anōthen*), meaning from above or again. Jesus further explains this *anōthen* as being born 'of water and Spirit'. A host

of scholarly views have been presented as to the meaning of the 'water' in the soteriological phrase, born 'of water and Spirit.' These views mainly revolve around four strands. First, that water here refers to water baptism. Within this camp, Ridderbos (1997:128) proposes Christian water baptism as the possible referent (cf. Lightfoot, 1956:116; Hoskyns, 1947:214; Barrett, 1950:7; Koester, 2003:183; McDonnell & Montague, 1991:61; Forestell, 1974:125; Ervin, 1984:144; Smith, 1995:26; Servotte, 1994:19; De Boer, 1988:99; Sanders, 1968:124). Ridderbos stresses that what is needed for Nicodemus to enter into the Kingdom is 'baptism as the putting off of the old, the Spirit as the creator of new life.' It is less likely, if not impossible, for the water in the phrase to refer to Christian baptism, as it is hard to find evidence for the practice of Christian baptism during the time of Nicodemus. Also, if birth 'of water and Spirit' is something Jesus expects Nicodemus to understand as a teacher (v. 10), then the meaning of the water should be identified with a Jewish/Old Testament concept or a prevailing concept during the time of Nicodemus. Burge (1987:163), on the other hand, admits a reference to John's baptism (cf. Westcott, 1894:50; Howard, 1931:206; Dunn, 1970:190; Beasley-Murray, 1991:94). The reference to John's baptism is unlikely in the light of the following observations. (1) The phrase describes a *birth* which is *anōthen*, from above. This heavenly emphasis dispels any earthly association; (2) the emphasis of the *birth* is on the Spirit (3.6b, 8b), and thus betrays any association with the practice of physical water lustration; and (3) the identification of the 'One' in John's statement, '*I baptise with water, but there stands One among you whom you do not know*' (1.26) with Jesus in 1.33, is revealing. This identification makes the 'but' in John's statement a contrasting conjunction, disconnecting John's water baptism with Jesus' Spirit baptism. This observation rules out John's baptism as a possible referent to the water in the phrase, which is set in the context of Spiritual rebirth.

Second, there are those who argue that the water in the phrase refers to natural birth. Within this position, Odeberg (1968:48, 49) conjectures 'sarcical semen' for the water referent, arguing that the contrast in verse 6 provides a plausible context for such interpretation: celestial-spiritual reality versus terrestrial-physical reality (cf. Witherington, 1995:97; G. Brown, 2003:122). Pamment (1983:190), on the other hand, argues for the breaking of the water

in natural birth, as a plausible referent. John 3.6 presents a strong case against the association of the water in the phrase with natural birth. In 3.6, natural birth is contrasted with Spiritual birth. If the water in the phrase is a referent to natural birth, this will make the conceptual flow of the narrative inconsistent, for how can natural birth be a part of the process of heavenly birth and at the same time, a contrast to it? Such a conclusion is not only artificial, but exegetically unwarranted. It is also alien to the *hydro-pneumatic soteriology* of the Fourth Gospel (4.14; 7.37-39). Moreover, 1:13 confirms that the birth experience by those who believe is not of natural descent, nor human decision, but of God. The birth of 'water and Spirit' is Spiritual, and excludes any natural agency.

Third, there are those who argue that the conjunction καὶ in the phrase functions epexegetically, that is, the noun following the conjunction functions to expatiate the noun which precedes it. In this case, water is identified with the Spirit, and thus pointing to the cleansing and renewing activity of the Spirit. Scholars like Calvin (1959:65), Morris (1971:218), Brown (1966a:140), and Jones (1997:71) fall under this construct. While this conclusion is plausible in the light of the identification of water with Spirit in the Fourth Gospel (4.14; 7.37-39, and probably 19.34), it is unlikely that such identification is implied here. This is because in these texts where water is identified with Spirit, water is not used *together* with Spirit as in the John 3.5 phrase. Moreover, when this 'identification' formula is used for similar phrases in the Fourth Gospel: Spirit and Truth; blood and water (4.24; 19.34), the result is not convincing.

While agreeing that the phrase functions epexegetically, Keener (1997:150-151) arrives at a different conclusion. He draws from the concept of proselyte baptism, and concludes that the water 'refers to a proselyte baptism by the Spirit, and thus refers to a spiritual purification by the Spirit.' Keener's conclusion is strong on the basis of the purifying effect of water and Spirit in the Old Testament and in Jewish thought (Ex. 29:4; Lev. 14:5-9; Num. 8:7; Ezek. 36.25-27; Isa. 44.3-5; *Ant.* 18:18; 1QS 3:4-9; *Jub.* 1.23-25). More striking, is the fact that the Gentile proselyte acquires the status of a new born child (*b. Yeb.* 22a, 62a, 48b, 97b; *b. Bek.* 47a), an impressive allusion to the new birth in John 3.5. Also, proselyte immersion was practised within the

Judaism of Nicodemus' time, which makes it a plausible option in terms of conceptual background to the phrase. Notwithstanding these attractive observations, Keener's conclusion is reductionist. It reduces the phrase to only one aspect of the Spirit's work (purification) in the re-creative process.

Fourth, Köstenberger (2004:123-124) and others (Carson, 1991:194-195; Thiselton, 2013:137; Pryor, 1992:19; Turner, 1996:67; Bennema, 2002:170-171) see the phrase as a conceptual unity that is due to the governance of the preposition (ἐξ, *ex*), pointing to the cleansing and renewing activity of the Spirit, with eschatological passages like Ezekiel 36.25-27, Joel 2.28-29 and Zachariah 14.8, serving as possible background. This position is the most convincing among all four positions, for the following reasons: (1) the text gives a clue as to the matrix for the meaning of the water image. In the text, Jesus queries Nicodemus as to how he can be a teacher and not understand the meaning of the phrase. As a teacher, Nicodemus was probably a scribe whose tasks included some or all of the following: interpreting and preserving the Law, teaching the Law, elaborating the Law, guarding of the Law, curator of the Law, and judge over the Law. In this light, the Law (the OT scriptures) becomes the legitimate context from where Jesus expects Nicodemus to dredge the meaning of his point from. Hence, examining the OT for the meaning of the water image is a sound step forward. In the OT, water was used as a cleansing/purifying agent (Exod. 19.10; 29.17; Lev. 1.9, 13; 6.28; 8.21; 9.14; 11.25, 28, 32, 40; 13.6, 34, 58; 14.8-9; 15.5-13, 17, 21-22, 27; 16.26, 28; 17.15-16; Num. 8.7, 21; 19.7-10, 19, 21; 31.19-20, 23-24; 2 Chron. 4.6; Ezek. 40.38; cf. *Sib. Or.* 3.591-93; *Spec. Leg.* 1.119; 1 *Enoch* 10.18-22; *T. Lev* 2.3B1-2). Both water and Spirit were connected in the eschatological cleansing and transforming/recreation of Israel (Isa. 32.15-17; 44:3-5; 55.1-5; Ezek. 36.25-27; 37.1-14; 39.29; 47:9; Jer. 17:13; Zech. 14:8; Joel 2.28; cf. 1 QS 4:20-22; *Jub.* 1.23; *T.Jud.* 24.3). Viewed within the purview of the purificatory significance of water in the OT evidenced above, the water in the phrase functions as an intensifying metaphor, intensifying the purificatory aspect of the Spirit's work in the entire process of rebirth (cf. Swetnam, 1993:562). The meaning of the phrase then emerges as a description of the cleansing/purifying (represented by the water) and life transforming/indwelling work of the Spirit (represented by the Spirit) in the new birth (cf. Ezek. 36.25-27) – for why would

water be conjoined with Spirit in the phrase when water is a symbol of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel (4.14; 7.37-39; 19.34). This interpretation means that in the process of the new birth, the purifying/cleansing and renewing/indwelling work of the Spirit are inseparably bound together. This dual effect of the Spirit's work is evident in the Old Testament and Second Temple thoughts (1 QS 4.20-21; 1 QH 8.10-20; Isa. 44.3-4; Ezek. 11.19-20; 36.25-29; 37.1-14; Ps. 51.11-12) as examined in the second chapter.

While agreeing with this position, Hamilton (2006: 131, 132) argues further that the cleansing and renewing activity of the Spirit in 3.5 is not indwelling, but regeneration. For him, indwelling is only possible after the cross (7.39). This position poses a theological problem, in that it places a theological distinction between the re-creative and the indwelling work of the Spirit, a dichotomy which is difficult to support in the Fourth Gospel. The new birth of the Spirit in 3.5 is proleptic, pointing to the work of the Spirit after the cross. It is not an event that was to happen before the cross as Hamilton maintains. The Spirit was received before the cross via Jesus' Spirit imbued teachings, which had the power to cleanse (8.31; 15.3: 17.17), recreate or give new life (3.15; 4.14; 6.35, 63) and indwell (6.56; 15.1-16). After the cross, believers experience the Spirit as Paraclete. It is the Spirit Paraclete who will indwell the believer (14.16) and recreate (3.5) by revealing the truth about the Father and Son, facilitating a life-saving understanding, and maintaining a communal relationship between the believer and the risen Christ (14.26; 15.26; 16.12-15). The renewing and indwelling work of the Spirit is not bifurcated but a unitary experience (cf. Bennema, 2002:172).

Bultmann (1971:141) diverges completely from the four main positions discussed above. For him, the water refers to 'the nothingness of man's whole existence,' while the Spirit refers to a mode of being 'in which man enjoys authentic existence.' Although his interpretation of the 'Spirit' in the phrase is valid within the broad spectrum of the new birth, Bultmann's existential perspective of the 'water' image is foreign to the water symbolisms in the Fourth Gospel. Also, such interpretation does not dovetail well with the conceptual flow of the narrative, as the emphasis of the phrase is centred on the Spirit.

It is very significant at this point to emphasise, prior to the examination of the next pneumatic soteriological text that with the phrase born 'of water and Spirit' the Fourth Gospel affirms the agency of the Spirit as an indispensable requirement for entry into the kingdom of God. Menzies (2004:45) puts it thus: 'We conclude that John, drawing upon Ezek. 36.25-27, presents the Spirit as a soteriological agent in Jn. 3.5.' By emphasising that unless one is reborn 'of water and Spirit', one cannot enter the kingdom, the Johannine Jesus announces that the Spirit is the *sine qua non* of salvation.

#### 4.3.2 The Giving of the Son (John 3.16)

John 3.16 has always been interpreted by scholars within the context of God's love for the world with no emphasis on its pneumatological significance (e.g. Calvin, 1959:73-74; Bultmann, 1971:154; Keener, 2003a:566-570; Köstenberger, 2004:128-129; Ridderbos, 1997:138; Hunter, 1950:120; Barrett, 1975:73). Interestingly, the love of God for the world that looms large in the text, and which has so often captured the attention of scholars, cannot benefit the world without the agency of the Spirit. The acceptance and appropriation of this divine gift by the world is not possible without the Spirit, as the following paragraphs reveal.

In the light of the co-text of John 3.16 (3.14-15; cf. 6.40), the object of belief stressed in 3.16 is the cross: the sacrificial death and glorification of Jesus. However, the emphatic 'believe in him' in the text also centres the object of this belief in Jesus and his wisdom teachings. The question now left to answer is how the believer receives eternal life by 'believing', and how the Spirit is involved in all this.

In the Fourth Gospel, belief is a quickening activity of the Spirit (6.63). It is the Spirit that quickens the belief response in the sinner upon hearing the truth about Jesus. This thought is given further emphasis when Jesus designates the enabling or quickening of the Spirit in the believer as an act of the Father (6.63-65). In view of this, Jesus reveals that coming to him is solely contingent upon the initiative of the Father (6.37; cf. Köstenberger, 2004:213). 'Belief' in the Fourth Gospel therefore becomes both a pneumatic and soteriological diction (cf. Acts 2.38; 19.2).

The enabling/quickenning activity of the Spirit in the process of 'believing' is captured in the vocation of the Spirit-Paraclete. When the sinner hears about Jesus, it is the Spirit who testifies about Jesus to the sinner and convinces them about the fact that what they have heard about Jesus (his sacrificial death and glorification, as well as his teachings) is the truth (15.26). It is the Spirit who teaches and constantly brings to the remembrance of the believer the salvific significance of this revelatory truth (14.26). It is the Spirit who guides the believer in the appropriation of this revelatory truth to their lives (16.13-15). The result is a spiritual life transformation, interpreted in Johannine terms as birth from above, consisting of spiritual renewal and the washing away of sins (3.5-6; cf. Carson 1991:206). The ultimate reward of this belief process is that the one born from above is raised up at the last day by Jesus (6.39), for the possession of the Kingdom (3.3). This is the promised eternal life (3.15, 16, 36; 4.14, 36; 5.24, 39; 6.27, 40, 54, 68; 10.28; 12.25, 50) given to all who believe or come to Jesus. Morris (1987:246) observes the role of the Spirit in the gift of eternal life to the world when he writes that the eternal life made available by Jesus to believers is effected by the work of the Spirit (cf. Smalley, 1978:203; Burge, 2014:110). It should also be noted that prior to the coming of the Paraclete it was the Spirit already present in Jesus' teachings who performed the soteriological works of the Paraclete just outlined.

The ultimate purpose of God's love is to give eternal life to the world through his Son. Receiving his Son or coming to him is tantamount to eternal Life. This eternal life is made possible via the agency of the Spirit. Rejecting the Son is tantamount to condemnation (3.18) and alienation from the Spirit (14.17). It follows from this deduction that 'belief in Jesus' and its resultant procurement of eternal life/salvation in the Fourth Gospel is a pneumatic construct. To believe in Jesus is to have a life-giving encounter with the Spirit (4.14; 7.37-39; 14.12-17; 20.22). The Spirit is indispensable to the exercise of faith in Jesus and the mediation of the heavenly blessing which that faith provokes. The Spirit, for John, is a soteriological necessity. Based on this conclusion, a reading of John 3.16 solely through the lens of God's love for the world is a one sided representation of the theological thrust of the text.

#### 4.3.3 Offer of Living Water / Worship in Spirit and Truth (John 4:1-24)

The story of Jesus' encounter with the woman of Samaria at the well of Jacob in Sychar relates not only a clash between the clean (Jesus, a Jew and male) and the unclean (the opponent, a Samaritan and a woman), but more importantly between two dispensational modes of divine worship (ritualistic versus spiritual). The discourse between them begins with Jesus asking for natural water, but later digresses and is overturned, as the discourse proceeds into Jesus' offer to give the woman 'living water' instead. This 'living water' surpasses the natural water from the well of Jacob in that it is a gift of God. It is given through Jesus (the *Logos*, 1.14), it is living or life-giving, its quenching effect is everlasting, and it has a dynamic operational quality (it wells up). There is an unsettled debate among scholars as to the meaning of this gift of 'living water' that Jesus offered to the woman. For Carson (1991:220), it is a 'reference to the Spirit who alone gives life (6.63)' (cf. Calvin, 1959:93; Köstenberger, 2004:150; Morris, 1971:254; Keener, 2003:603; Talbert, 1992:113; Burge, 1987:98; Sanders, 1968:143; G. Brown, 2003:135). This position is solid for many reasons, of which the following are the most important. (i) The Spirit is understood as a *gift* from God (John 4.10 / Acts 2.38). (ii) Living water was identified with the Spirit in the Old Testament (Isa. 44.3; Zech. 14.8-9; Ezek. 36.25-27; cf. 1QS4.21). (iii) The stream of living water which Jesus will give (7.38) is interpreted as the Spirit (7.39). (iv) In the Old Testament and Jewish writings, living water was associated with salvation (Isa. 12.3; 49.10; 55.1-3; Joel 2.28; cf. *Sir.* 24.21; 1 *Enoch* 48.1), an attribute ascribed to the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel (3.5; 6.63); (v) The culmination of the discourse with the worship of God in 'Spirit and Truth' (v. 23), suggests that the 'living water' is most likely a reference to the 'Spirit' (cf. Turner, 1996:61). Notwithstanding these compelling observations, the exegetical hurdle facing this position is the fact that John 7.39 refers to the true giving of the Spirit as a futuristic event that will happen after the cross. More significant is the fact that the following structure suggests that the Samaritan woman and her city received this 'living water' unto salvation prior to the cross. This structure is proposed because it helps provide a clearer link between the Samaritan pericope and other themes elsewhere in the gospel, which helps in the deduction of the significance of the Spirit lurking behind the pericope.

A<sup>1</sup> - Now this is eternal life: that they may know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent (John 17.3).

A<sup>2</sup> - Yet to all who received him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God (John 1.12).

A<sup>3</sup> But these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name (John 21:31).

## **B**

B<sup>1</sup> - Indeed, the water I give him will become in him a spring of water welling up to eternal life (John 4.14b).

## **C**

C<sup>1</sup> - Many of the Samaritans from that town believed in him because of the woman's testimony (John 4.39).

C<sup>2</sup> - And because of his words many more became believers (John 4. 41).

C<sup>3</sup> - They said to the woman, 'We no longer believed just because of what you said; now we have heard for ourselves, and we know that this man really is the saviour of the world (John 4. 42).

From the above structure, it is exegetically sound to construct an argument that if belief in Jesus and his words constitutes eternal life/salvation **A** (A<sup>1</sup>, A<sup>2</sup>, A<sup>3</sup>), and if possession of the gift of 'living water' evokes eternal life **B** (B<sup>1</sup>), then belief in Jesus equals the possession of the gift of 'living water' which leads to eternal life/salvation (Jn. 7.38). According to this deduction, if the Samaritans believed in Jesus **C** (C<sup>1</sup>, C<sup>2</sup>, C<sup>3</sup>), then such belief should lead to the possession of eternal life **A** (A<sup>1</sup>, A<sup>2</sup>, A<sup>3</sup>), and thus the possession of the gift of 'living water' **B** (B<sup>1</sup>). The confession of the Samaritans confirms their taste of this salvific living water because of their belief: *Now we have heard for ourselves, and we know that this man really is the saviour of the world* (John 4.42).

The preceding analysis problematizes the reference of the 'living water' to the Spirit in this discourse, as it suggests that this 'living water' has been given out prior to the cross, an assertion which contradicts the future giving of the Spirit in 7.39.

Bultmann (1971:184-185) circumvents this difficulty by proposing that the 'living water' should be understood through the lens of gnostic usage, and thus as divine revelation or the gift bestowed by the revelation (cf. Montague 1976:345; Koester 2003:191). While the gnostic background employed in support of his construct is quite alien, Bultmann's conclusion still remains valid in the light of the following evidence: (i) living water is identified with divine wisdom in the OT (Prov. 13.14; 18.4; Isa. 11.9) and in Jewish writings (*Sir.* 15.3; 24.23-29; 1QH 12.11; *Bar.* 3.12; 4 *Ezra* 14.47; 1 *Enoch* 48.1; *De Somniis* 2.240-242; *De Fuga et Inventione* 166; *Quod Deterius Postiori Insidiari Soleat* 117); (ii) divine wisdom, like the 'living water', is a *gift* of God (John 4.10; Ecclesiastes 2.26; Prov. 2.6; 1 Kings 3.12; James 1.5). Notwithstanding these striking connections, this position is not without problems. The adjective 'living' qualifying the 'water' makes the connection of the gift solely with revelatory wisdom a shaky one. This is because in the Old Testament or Jewish writings, when water is used as a symbol of divine wisdom, the water or fountain is not qualified with 'living' (ζῶν). The designation of the gift as 'living water' (ὕδωρ ζῶν) (cf. Jer. 2.13; 17.13; Zech. 14.8; Ps. 36.9) makes it a unique entity.

It is very hard to prove with certainty that the living water is the Spirit in its totality as the giving of the Spirit awaits the cross (7.39). The same could be conjectured about the 'revelatory wisdom' referent, as the qualification ζῶν, makes such identification a slippery one. The most probable solution to this theological conundrum, which will account for 7.39 and the adjective 'living' (ζῶν), would be that the phrase encompasses a referent to both revelation and Spirit (cf. Brown, 1966a:180; Turner, 1996:62; Bennema, 2002:185; Lee, 2004:278; Hatina, 1993:209). John 1.33, 6.63 and 3.34 reveal an ontological and functional unity between Jesus' revelatory words and the Spirit. The outpouring of Jesus' revelatory teachings was at the same time the outpouring of the Spirit. In keeping with this notion, the 'living water' which Jesus offered was his revelatory teachings which were innately enlivened by the Spirit. It was not just 'water', but 'living water'. It was not just revelatory wisdom, but 'Spirit quickened' revelatory wisdom. The work of the Spirit is experienced here prior to the cross (7.39) because Jesus, the true *logos* (1.14), has been endowed with the Spirit without measure (1.33, 3.34). The Samaritans were saved prior to the giving of the Spirit promised in 7.39 because the Spirit was at work in

Jesus' teachings. Jesus' teachings were the words of God, mediated and enlivened by the Spirit, and hence had purificatory (8.33; 15.3; 17.17) and transformative efficacy (3.15, 36; 4.14, 41-42; 5.24; 6.35; 11.25). The term 'living water' could be finally construed as a soteriological phrase, pointing to the Spirit enlivened revelatory teachings of God's words through Jesus.

The latter part of the Samaritan discourse is also fraught with exegetical ambiguities with respect to the expression 'God is a Spirit' and worship 'in Spirit and truth' (vv. 23-24). On the clause 'God is a Spirit' Ridderbos (1997:164) stresses it does not express anything more than God as the foundation and giver of true life (14.16). This observation is reasonable, as the Spirit is associated with life in the Fourth Gospel (3.5; 6.63; 7.37-39; 19.34; 20.22). Lindars (1972:190) posits that the term is more of a description of God's character than of his metaphysical nature, finding support from 1 John 1.5 and 4.8, texts which depict God as light and love respectively (cf. Burge, 1987:192; Sanders, 1968:147). This conjecture is equally probable as the Fourth Gospel attests, in diverse manner, to God's Spiritual mode of operations (John 3.5-6; 4.14; 5.24-30; 6.33; 7.37-39; 8.28; 10.1-38; 11.25; 12.23-26, 46; 13.10; 15.1-5; 20.22; 21.18). A similar view is held by Hamilton (2006:61) who suggest that the intent of the term is not to refute the corporeality of God, but to stress that God is of the sphere of the Spirit. Again, as just shown, such a view is not inimical to the understanding of God in the Fourth Gospel. The most probable meaning is that the term gives emphasis to the non-human and non-material nature (pure Spirit) of God (cf. Keener, 2003a:618; Morris, 1971:271; Calvin, 1959:101; Bultmann, 1971:191; Liroy, 2007:101; Swete, 1909:139; Bruce, 1983:111). The whole discourse revolves around Spiritual/physical oppositions: gift of God vs. gift of Jacob; Jesus vs. Jacob; Spiritual/living water vs. natural water; physical place of worship vs. Spiritual place of worship. It follows from this observation that 'our fathers' in verse 20 is contrasted with 'the Father' in verse 23. Here it is possible that the human nature of 'the fathers' of the Samaritans is contrasted with the non-human or spiritual nature of 'the Father'. The whole point would be that 'the fathers' are human and the religious worship they handed down was cultic and earthly. On the other hand, God is Spirit (non-human) and the religious worship he prescribes is in Spirit and truth.

The expression 'worship in Spirit and truth' has not received scholarly consensus as to its meaning. Ridderbos (1997:164) argues that the expression refers to fellowship with God in which the Spirit mediates life-creating and life-giving power to the believer. For Keener (2003a:618), it points to the worship in which the Spirit inspires and illumines by pointing back to Jesus, who is the truth (14.17; 15.26; 16.1: cf. Bennema, 2002:188; Montague, 1976:347; Jones, 1997:104). Burge (1987:195) argues that the expression denotes a worship in which the Spirit brings the revelation of God, Jesus, who is himself the truth, to the believer. For Dodd (1953:314), the expression should be taken as a single concept pointing to a worship centred on that which is ultimately real and characterised with perennial blessings of spiritual life from God (John 3.5). While these interpretations make sense of the meaning of the expression, a similar proposal is worth considering.

The possible background to the understanding of the expression is the eschatological promise in Jeremiah 31.33-34 (cf. Hebrews 8.10-12). This passage anticipates an era when God himself will teach, guide and imprint his will on the hearts of his covenant people, possibly via the agency of the Spirit (Ezek. 36.27-28). The function of the Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel dovetails well with the fulfilment of this eschatological promise. The Spirit as the Spirit of truth (John 14.17; 15.26; 16.13) will reveal, guide, illuminate and mediate to God's people the truth about Jesus' teachings and the mystery of the cross. Consequently, the people of God will know and walk in the truth, and will not need anyone to teach them. This will result in new creation, cleansing, and a new spiritual status (John 3.5-6). Worship 'in Spirit and truth' therefore becomes a worship where the Spirit provides both the context and the content of the worship. By the expression 'worship in Spirit and Truth' Jesus announces the dawn of the eschatological promise in Jeremiah 31.33-34. He announces the advent of an era where the people of God relate with him, not via the medium of sacrificial rituals, but via the medium of the Spirit. This observation, coupled with the work of the Spirit noted in 4.14, reveals two soteriological functions of the Spirit: the Spirit is both the creative and the sustaining agent of salvation (4.14 and 4.24).

#### 4.3.4 The Bread of Life Discourse (John 6.27-59)

The discourse on the bread of life has spawned exegetical difficulties to Johannine scholars in regard to its thematic thrust. This difficulty has divided scholars into five main camps. First, scholars like Lightfoot (1956:150-170) and others (Howard, 1931:210-214; Forestell, 1974:113-122; Strachan, 1941:178-198; Sanders, 1968:185-196; Lindars, 1972:250-270; Talbert, 1992:131-138) posit that the first part of the discourse (6.27-50) is christological, while the second part (6.51-58) is sacramental. In this camp, the terms 'bread', 'flesh' and 'blood' refer to the eucharistic elements. The second is similar to the first, yet different in the sense that this christological-sacramental divide is understood as a result of the hand of a redactor (cf. Bultmann, 1971:227-235; Schnackenburg, 1993:265-270; Kysar, 1975:249-254; von Wahlde, 1983:542-549). Third, Ridderbos (1997:223-244), Morris (1987:234-242) and others (Dunn, 1977:168-173; Koester, 2003:99-103; Bruce, 1983:149-162; Borgen, 1997:100-111; Bennema, 2005:75-86; Menken, 1993:1-26) argue that both sections of the discourse (6.27-50 and 51-58) constitute a logical christological whole penned by a single hand. The terms 'bread', 'flesh' and 'blood' represent in metaphorical categories, Jesus and the revelation of the cross. To 'eat' and 'drink' then becomes a metaphorical diction for believing and coming to Jesus. Fourth, Köstenberger (2004:206-217), Carson (1991:288-299), Beasley-Murray (1991:96-97) and Brown (1996:272-280), while sympathising with the preceding position; add that the tenor of the second section of the discourse is secondarily eucharistic. Fifth, for scholars like Hoskyns (1947:304-307) and Brennan (1961:647-661), the two sections are a unity, serving Eucharistic purposes, with the flesh and blood of Jesus having a literal reference to the body and blood of Jesus present in the Eucharist.

This christological-sacramental debate has been so hot that the pneumatological significance of the discourse has escaped scholarly attention. While this section does not contribute to this christological-sacramental debate, attention to its pneumatic soteriological elements will inevitably throw light on the debate.

To begin with, three enigmatic expressions in the discourse need examination: the meaning of Jesus as 'bread'; the meaning of his 'flesh and blood' and the meaning of 'eat'-'drink.'

The understanding of bread as a metaphor for divine wisdom was a prevailing concept in the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism (Bennema, 2002:198; Burge, 1987:105; Dodd, 1953:336; Witherington, 1995:149-150; Koester, 2003:101). In Sirach 15.3 (cf. 24.23) divine wisdom is conceived as bread and water, granting understanding and knowledge respectively, to all who receive her. Philo also understands divine wisdom as bread from heaven (*De Mutatione Nominum* 258-60; *Quod Deterius Pottiori Insidiari Soleat* 115-118; *De Congressu Quaerendae Eruditionis Gratia* 173-174; *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres* 191). On the allegorical interpretation of Exodus 16.4, he identifies divine wisdom with bread from heaven, which guides according to God's law (*Legum Allegoriae, III* 162). Jewish interpreters associate bread with divine wisdom (*Mekilta on Exodus* 13.17; *Exodus Rabba* 25.7; *Genesis Rabba* 70.5; Bennema, 2002:198). In the OT wisdom tradition, divine wisdom is understood as bread, giving understanding to all who eat and drink of her (Prov. 9.1-5; cf. Amos 8.11; Deut. 8.3 LXX). Set against this background, Jesus' identification of himself as the bread from heaven in the discourse is a possible allusion to the concept of 'bread from heaven' in the OT and the Second Temple literature. Thus, by the expression, 'I am the bread from heaven' (6.33), Jesus claims to be the embodiment of divine wisdom (cf. Witherington, 1995:158; Turner, 1996:64-65; Bennema, 2007:198), that is, the words of God (3.34; cf. 1.14) revealed in his teachings: on his identity (2.11; 3.11-15, 31-32; 4.25-26; 6.14, 35; 7.31; 8.12, 23; 9.35-38; 10.9, 11; 11.25; 12.32; 14.6, 11; 15.1, 13; 16.28; 20.27-28); on his relation with the Father (1.18; 3.35; 5.20; 8.26, 28; 10.38; 14.11; 15.9, 15; 17.6-8); on the revelation of the Father (1.18; 3.16; 5.19; 8.19; 9.3-4; 12.45; 14.7, 9; 17.6, 26); and on eternal life (3.15, 16, 36; 4.14, 36; 5.24, 39; 6.27, 40, 54, 68; 10.28; 12.25, 50).

The 'flesh' and 'blood' of Jesus possibly refer to his sacrificial death on the cross in that (1) the terms recall the suffering of the Isaianic servant (Isa. 53.10-12; cf. Zach. 12.10b; Matt. 26.28, 38, 39, 42; Mark 14.24; Luke 22.37; 23.32; Phil. 2.9; Col. 1.20); (2) 'blood' in the Old Testament can refer to violent death (Gen. 4.10); (3) flesh and blood were manifestations of the cross, as the piercing of Jesus' flesh with the spear produced blood (19.34); (4) at the beginning of the discourse, it is affirmed that the bread of God is he who comes down from heaven and gives life to the world (6.33). Elsewhere in the Gospel,

this life-giving efficacy of the bread from heaven finds its ultimate fulfilment in the cross event (3.14-16). It is therefore of little doubt that 'flesh' and 'blood' in the discourse refer to Jesus' sacrificial death on the cross (cf. Keener, 2003:690; Bennema, 2005:81; Painter, 1997:88; Menken, 1993:16; Ashby, 2002:59-61; Morris, 1987:239; Lioy, 2007:133; Barrett, 1962:853).

The use of 'eat-drink' or 'feed' as metaphors for 'believe in,' or 'come to believe in,' in the Fourth Gospel finds its antecedent in Second Temple texts and in the OT. In *Sirach* 24.19-21 (cf. *Sir.* 15.3), 'come to me,' 'desire in me,' 'possess me,' 'obey me,' are equivalent phrases to 'feed on me,' 'drink from me,' 'eat of me.' Isaiah 55.1-3 (cf. Isaiah 49. 9-10) evinces similar connections. The prophetic invitation to 'eat' true bread is couched in phrases like 'give ear to,' 'come to,' 'hear (believe).' In Proverbs 9.1-5, to 'walk in' divine wisdom is equivalent to 'eating' it as food. The conclusion that can be drawn from this observation is that, in the OT and Second Temple thought to 'eat/drink' or 'feed' could be a metaphor for 'coming to,' 'believing in' or 'walking in.' Understood against this backdrop, to 'eat' Jesus' flesh and 'drink' his blood is, *contra* Schnackenburg (1993:268; cf. Lightfoot, 1956:150-170; Howard, 1931:210-214; Forestell, 1974:113-122; Strachan, 1941:178-198; Sanders, 1968:185-196; Lindars, 1990:79; Talbert, 1992:131-138), a metaphorical phraseology for 'believing in' the salvific efficacy of the revelation of his sacrificial death (cf. Jer. 15.16; Ezek. 2.8-3.3; Rev. 10.9ff; Calvin, 1959:167, 170, 171; also Ridderbos, 1997:240; Koester, 2003: 99-103; Carson, 1991:297; Köstenberger, 2004:216; Menken, 1993:16; Lioy, 2007:132; Witherington, 1995:159; Daise, 2003:696).

Such a reading is supported by the following parallel observations. First, belief in Jesus for eternal life looms large in the discourse (6.29, 40, 47, 65); hence interpreting 'eat my flesh and drink my blood' as a metaphor for belief in Jesus is contextually benign. Second, in the discourse, believe in Jesus procures eternal life (6.47). The same is said regarding eating his flesh and drinking his blood (6. 52-54, 57-58). Third, he that eats Jesus' flesh and drinks his blood is raised up at the last day (6.54). The same is said of those who belief in Jesus (6.39, 44). Fourth, eating Jesus' flesh and drinking his blood is equated with mutual indwelling of Jesus and the believer (6.56). The same equation is made elsewhere in the Gospel with believing in Jesus (15.1-17). These parallels

strongly suggest that 'eat/drink' is a metaphor for belief in Jesus. This evidence is too striking to be ignored in favour of a sacramental reading of the expression.

Having examined the possible meanings of Jesus as 'bread', his 'flesh and blood' and what it means to 'eat'/'drink' of his flesh and blood, it is now apropos to examine the salvific role of the Spirit in the discourse.

The distinction placed between the bread of the Exodus and the bread which Jesus promised to give in the discourse is very crucial to the understanding of the soteriological role of the Spirit in the discourse. While both kinds of bread originate from heaven and are both given by the Father (6.31, 32, 33, 42, 50), they are distinct from each other on two main grounds: (1) the Exodus bread did not give life (6.49), but the bread which Jesus gives is life-giving or life quickening (6. 33, 35, 47, 50, 57, 58); (2) the Exodus bread was manna (6.31), but the bread which Jesus gives is (1) himself (as revelatory wisdom, 6.48, 51) and his flesh and blood (the revelation of the cross, 6.53-56). The question now left to be investigated is how the bread that Jesus gives (his revelatory wisdom teachings and the revelation of the cross) is life-giving.

During the baptism of Jesus, the Fourth Gospel announces the continuous bond between Jesus and the Spirit by stressing that the Spirit remained upon Jesus (1.32; cf. 6.27), and by implication, connects his teachings with the Spirit (1.33; 3.34; cf. Montague 1970:346). If the Spirit remained upon Jesus, and if Jesus is the bread, then it follows logically that the bread is Spirit imbued. Moreover, if this Spirit gives life (3.5; 6.63; 20.22), then it is not hard to see that the life-giving efficacy of the bread is due to the presence of the Spirit. Beasley-Murray (1991:98) is right when he notes that if the words of Jesus are Spirit and life (6.63), then those who receive Jesus' words in the discourse receive the Spirit and life of which he speaks (cf. Barrett, 1962:853; Schnackenburg, 1993:252; Turner, 1996:72; Bennema, 2002:204; Hatina, 1993:212). The life-giving efficacy of the Spirit in this bond is further given expression in the Samaritan discourse (4.14) and elsewhere (6.63; 8.32; 15.3; 17.17). It follows from this construct that the teaching of Jesus is Spirit-imbued, and its life-giving/life quickening power is derived from the work of the Spirit. When this conclusion is brought to bear on the entire bread discourse, the understanding which

emerges is that the life-giving power of the bread which Jesus promised to give (6.27, 33, 35, 47-48, 50) is derived from the Spirit. This reading is in keeping with the life-giving power of the Spirit attested in the OT (Gen. 1.2; 2.7; Ezek. 37.1-14).

The life-giving efficacy of Jesus' flesh and blood (the revelation of the cross; cf. 1.29; 7.37-39; 10.11, 15; 15.13; 16.5-12; 17.1-5) is also down to the work of the Spirit. John 6.63 stresses that it is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh profits nothing. This text draws attention to the fact that the flesh, which has been shown to be the revelation of the cross in this discussion, in itself does not give life, but the Spirit. This understanding is further symbolised by the giving up of the Spirit on the cross (19.30). The death of Jesus as a result of the giving up of the Spirit reveals that the flesh of Jesus profits nothing without the life-giving presence of the Spirit. The revelation of the cross is meaningless to the receiver until the Spirit quickens a belief response in them and further teaches them all the truth about such revelation (14.26; cf. Montague, 1970:346). The ultimate result of this spiritual engagement is divine rebirth or new creation (3.5-5). The belief in the cross is life giving, simply because the Spirit, who is received as a result (7.37-39), has a life-giving power (cf. Carson, 1991:302; Turner, 1996:75; Bennema, 2002:204).

Calvin (1959: 174-175) and others (Keener, 2003:694, Ridderbos, 1997:246; Morris, 1987:246; Lindars, 1972:273; Odeberg, 1968:269) take a literal approach to the meaning of the 'flesh' in 6.63 by taking its referent as human flesh or human intellect. The precariousness of such a reading is seen in the following observations: (1) the uses of 'flesh' in 6.51-56 do not suggest the anthropological sense; (2) 6.62-63 is Jesus' response to the disposition of his disciples concerning the 'eating' and 'drinking' of his 'flesh and blood' for eternal life (6.51-61). It is therefore quite artificial for the symbolic meaning of the 'flesh' in the preceding passage (6.51-61) to take on a literal twist of meaning in verse 63 without any signal. Accordingly, any literal anthropological interpretation of the 'flesh' in 6.63 meddles with the conceptual flow of the entire discourse (see also Carson 1991:301). Brown (1966:292) and others (Sanders, 1968:197; Howard, 1931:213; Swete, 1909:142) understand the 'flesh' as a reference to the life of Jesus in the food of the Eucharist. This reading is suspect as the New

Testament eucharistic term is body (*soma*), not flesh (*sarx*) (Mark 14.22; 1 Cor. 11.24; cf. Köstenberger, 2004:215; Carson, 1991:295; Ridderbos, 1997:240).

The life-giving role of the Spirit in Jesus' flesh and blood' is further given emphasis, albeit in implicit manner, in the mutual indwelling passage: *He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him* (v. 56). Here, eating Jesus' flesh and drinking his blood is the means by which the believer abides in Jesus, and vice versa. In the discourse on the promise of the Paraclete (14.15-24), the means by which this mutual indwelling becomes possible is the reception of the Spirit-Paraclete, which is contingent upon the keeping of Jesus' words. If eating Jesus' flesh and drinking his blood are metaphors for believing in Jesus and his life changing words, and if such belief, by extension, results in the reception of the Spirit-Paraclete (14.15-16), and if the reception of the Spirit-Paraclete is the means by which the mutual indwelling of Jesus and the believer is made possible (14. 20), then it is exegetically plausible to argue that the 'co-inherence' as a result of eating Jesus flesh and drinking his blood in v. 56 is made possible by the work of the Spirit. To abide in Jesus' words is to be indwelt by the life-giving Spirit. Dunn (2010:185) is right when he observed that v. 56 is not a reference to sacramental categories, but the union of Jesus with believers through the Spirit (cf. Carson, 1991:298).

Another passage which is equally significant for the soteriological role of the Spirit in the discourse is the eschatological promise in 6.54 (cf. v. 39). According to this promise, those who come to Jesus not only gain eternal life, but they will be raised at the last day. In the Old Testament (Ezek. 37.9-10; Ps. 104.30) and Second Temple texts (2 Macc. 14.43-46; 1 Enoch 62.13-15; *Sibylline Oracles* 4.179-192; *mSot.* 9.15) resurrection from the dead is understood as a function of the Spirit. Viewed against this backdrop, it is not hard to deduce that the Spirit who indwells the believer, who believes in Jesus, is the same one who quickens the believer from death into life at the last day (cf. Rom. 8.11; Rev. 11.11). Jesus is able to promise resurrection to those who believe in him because to believe in him is to receive the life-quickening Spirit, the agent of the resurrection of believers. It could be argued that the Spirit is revealed as a life-quickening agent in verse 54, albeit in shroud terms.

Jesus' revelatory wisdom teachings and the revelation of the cross (cf. 1.29; 7.37-39; 10.11, 15; 15.13; 16.5-12; 17.1-5) are both life-giving bread (6.33, 47-48, 50, 51, 53, 54) because the life-giving Spirit operates through them. Burge (1987:180) and (Dunn, 2010:184) observe the striking link between the spring of living water in 4.14 and the food that endures to eternal life in 6.27, and concludes that the food that will endure to eternal life will be the Spirit. While this conclusion overstretches the evidence, as the food is not understood solely as the Spirit in the discourse, it rightfully attests to the salvific role of the Spirit in the food offered by Jesus. Swete (1909:142) observes that it is the Spirit in the humanity of Jesus as food which is life-giving, and which is mediated to the believer for eternal life either via the Eucharist or otherwise. While Swete's association of the food with the eucharist is questionable, his observation rightly acknowledges the life-giving role of the Spirit in the bread from heaven. For Dodd (1953:341), although Spirit is not mentioned, the use of the term 'true' sufficiently indicates that the food of eternal life belongs to the order of truth and therefore of Spirit. All these perspectives point to the fact that in the bread of life discourse, the Spirit is the life-giving agent in the bread from heaven. As the nutrients in earthly food sustain earthly transient life, so the Spirit in the bread from heaven gives and sustains eternal life.

So far, the following threads could be drawn from the above discussion to throw light on the christological-sacramental debate spinning around the discourse. (1) The terms 'bread', 'flesh' and 'blood' do not refer to the eucharistic elements, at least in the primary sense, rather they are metaphorical equivalents of Jesus and the revelation of the cross. (2) 'Eating-drinking' is symbolic of believing and coming to Jesus. (3) The salvific role of the Spirit that runs through both sections of the discourse strongly suggests their unity, and thus their provenance from a single pen.

#### 4.3.5 Living Water (John 7.37-39)

Although scholars have rightly interpreted Jesus' prophetic call to his audience to drink living water (7.37) against the backdrop of the significance of the water-drawing of the Tabernacle Feast (Keener, 2003a:724-728; Ridderbos, 1997:272; Carson, 1991:322; Morris, 1971:421; Lindars, 1972:298; Dodd, 1953:348, 349; Grigsby, 1986:102-106; Selwyn, 1912:226), two other biblical

themes serve as luminary to the understanding of this prophetic call. Regarding the Tabernacle Feast, it is noted that during the water-drawing ceremony, a golden flask, holding three logs in volume, is filled with water from Siloam. When they get to the Water Gate, a sustained blast of the *shofar* is heard, as the priest goes up on the ramp at the south. The priest pours out the water as the water libation all the eight days, and as he pours out the libation, the people say, 'Lift up your hand so that we can see the water pouring out' (*Sukkah* 4.9). The water drawing was associated with the blessed rain in the coming season for fruitfulness (*Tosefta Sukkah* 3.18; *Babylonian Talmud Ta'anit* 25b; cf. Zech. 14.17; cf. Davies, 1977:102-103). Ulfgard (1998:248) notes that the water-drawing and ensuing libation at *Sukkot* was popularly understood as a kind of rain-charm (cf. Selwyn, 1912:226). The water dripping from the flask is given eschatological import when R. Eliezer says of it thus: 'The waters are dripping, intimating that water oozing out and rising, as from this flask, will in future days come forth from under the threshold of the Temple' (*Tosefta Sukkah* 3.18; cf. Ezek. 47. 1-10; Zech. 13.1; 14.8-9; Joel 3.18; Isa. 12.3). This eschatological Temple water pouring is associated with living water (*Tosefta Sukkah* 3.8; cf. Zech. 14.8; and probably Rev. 22.1, 17); it has cleansing and life-saving efficacy (*Tosefta Sukkah* 3.9; cf. Zech. 13.1; Ezek. 47.8-9); it has creative and fruit-bearing effect (*Tosefta Sukkah*; cf. Ezek. 47.12 ). Moreover, rabbinic expositions (e.g., *Ruth Rabbah* 4.8; also *Jerusalem Talmud Sukkah* 5.1 cf. Isa. 44.3; Ezek. 36.25-27; Joel 2.28) identify the water libation at the feast of Tabernacles with the Spirit or the inspiration of the Spirit (see also: Keener, 2003a:724; Lightfoot, 1956:184; G. Brown, 2003:153; Selwyn, 1912:226; Burge, 1987:92). What all these mean for the understanding of Jesus' cry on the last day of the Feast is that, by the promise of 'rivers of living water' Jesus depicts himself as the true eschatological Temple (John 2.19-22) out of which the true living water of the Spirit will flow with a creative, life-giving and cleansing efficacy (cf. Ridderbos, 1997:272; Keener, 2003a:730; G. Brown, 2003:160; Burge, 2014:108).

The first theme which serves as possible luminary to John 7.37-39 is the rock miracle of the Exodus (Exodus 17.6; cf. Numb. 20.2-11; Isa. 48.21). Here, the striking of the rock by Moses led to the gushing of water, which gave physical life to the children of Israel. As Jesus identified himself as the true manna of the

Exodus (6.33, 35, 48-50), so in 7.37-39 he most likely identifies himself as the true rock of the Exodus, out of which flows living water of the Spirit, this time not to quench physical thirst but spiritual (see also Hoskyns, 1947:322; Menken, 1996:168; Grigsby, 1986:107; Burge, 1987:91; G. Brown, 2003:162; Hatina, 1993:212-3; Brown, 1966a:322). This reading is supported by the following observations: (1) Deuteronomy 8.15-16 (cf. Ps. 78.20; 105:40-41) conflates the manna miracle with the rock miracle in demonstrating God's sufficiency. It is possible that John also employs the theme of the manna miracle in chapter 6 and that of the rock miracle in the chapter that follows as an ideological parallel, demonstrating the sufficiency of God in providing life for the salvation of the world (for similar perspective see also Carson, 1991:327-8; Hoskyns, 1947:321; Burge, 1987:91; Brown, 1966a:322). (2) Targumic translation of Psalm 78.16 interprets the water from the rock as 'rivers of living water'. This association makes it possible for Jesus' offer of living water in 7.37-39 to evoke the water from the rock, and thus to depict him as the true rock out of which the living water of the Spirit flows. (3) The rock was seen in the early church as a type of Christ (1 Cor. 5.4), making the identification of the rock with Jesus a plausible one.

The second theme that possibly sheds light on 7.37-39 is the miracle of Siloam in John 9.1-7. The theatrical nature of the healing of the blind man is significant for the understanding of Jesus' prophetic call. Its symbolic thrust is striking and revealing. In both the Old and New Testaments, blindness is often used as a symbol of sin expressed as both the rejection and ignorance of the truth (Exod. 23.8; Deut. 16.19; 28.28-29; Isa. 6.9-10; 43.8; 44.9-10; 56.10; Matt. 13.17; 15.14; 23.16-17, 19, 24, 26; Jn. 9.39; 12.40; Rom. 2.19; 11.7-10; 2 Cor. 4.4; 2 Pet. 1.9; 1 Jn. 2.11; Rev. 3.17). The moral filth characteristic of the man's blindness is highlighted symbolically by the attachment of saliva and clay paste to his eyes in 9.6 (bodily discharge, including saliva, was classified as unclean according to Old Testament cultic prescriptions, Lev. 15; Num. 12.14). The command to wash in Siloam (Jn. 9.7) attests to the cleansing significance attached to the pool. Brown (1977:237) alludes to this cleansing significance when he notes that the healing drama is a symbolic pointer to the cleansing effect of baptism. The restoration of the sight of the man born blind after the Siloam experience further reveals three conceptions about Siloam. (1) It has a

restorative and life-transforming effect (Jn. 9.7, 11). (2) It has the ability to evoke a faith response in those who experience its effect based on Jesus' words (Jn. 9.17); this is supported by the fact that in the Fourth Gospel healing is often conceived as signs conveying people to faith in Jesus (4.54; 5.15). (3) On the basis of Jesus' command, it has the ability to bring people to the saving grace of Jesus, as the transformation of darkness to light is a salvific construct in the Fourth Gospel (3.19; 8.12; 12.35-36, 46; cf. Grigsby, 1985:232).

The implication of the above deductions about Siloam for our understanding of Jesus' prophetic call in 7.37-39 can now be coherently constructed thus: by his invitation to drink living water on the last day of the feast, Jesus identifies himself as the source of the eschatological spiritual Siloam (Spirit) (cf. Ervin, 1968:215). This eschatological gift will have a cleansing, faith-evoking, life-giving and life-transforming effect on those who believe in Jesus (7.38; cf. Ezek. 36.25-29; Zech. 13.1; 14.8). It is significant to emphasise in conclusion that in John 7.37-39 Jesus declares himself, albeit in symbolic categories, as the source of the life-giving eschatological gift of the Spirit.

John 7.38 is one of the problematic passages in the Fourth Gospel that has posed interpretational hurdles to exegetes. This is simply because it is not clear from the text who the source of the living water is. This has split exegetes into two main schools. The first is the traditional view or the Eastern interpretation, favoured by Calvin (1959:198) and others (Carson, 1991:324; Barrett, 1962:854; Morris, 1971:424-5; Köstenberger, 2004:240; Ridderbos, 1997:274; Witherington, 1995:174; Liroy, 2007:145). This position identifies the believer as the subject of the citation, and consequently the source of the living water. The common scriptural evidence often adduced in support of this position is John 4.14 (cf. Isa. 5.11; 58.11; Zech. 14.8; Prov. 4.23; 5.15; also *Sir.* 24.30-33; 1QH 8.16).

The second is the Christological view or Western interpretation, favoured by Bultmann (1971:303) and others (Keener, 2003:729; Dodd, 1953:349; Brown, 1966a:323; Lindars, 1972:300; Beasley-Murray, 1991:68-9; Burge, 1987:89-93; G. Brown, 2003:157; Schnackenburg, 1993:291, 293). This position identifies Jesus as the subject of the citation, and consequently the source of the living

water. The common scriptural evidence often adduced in support of this position is John 19.34 (cf. Ps. 78.15-16; Isa. 43.20-21; 44.3; Zach. 14.8; Rev. 22.1, 17).

While both positions are plausible in their own rights (cf. Levison, 2009:374), the following theological considerations tend to swing the pendulum in favour of the Christological view. First, the fact that the believer is the supposed receiver (v. 39) means that Jesus is the giver, and thus the source. Second, since the gift awaits Jesus' glorification, Jesus will be the source of the living water. Third, John 19.30, 34 present two expressions of symbolic giving of the Spirit on the cross: the giving up of the Spirit and the water from Jesus' side. This is a possible attestation to Jesus as the source of the living water (cf. 20.22). Fourth, in view of Jesus' anointing at Jordan (1:32), his possession of the Spirit without measure (3:34), his giving of the Spirit to the disciples (20:22); and the provenance of the Paraclete from Jesus (16:7), it is most likely that the 'streams of water' will flow from Jesus rather than the believer. Fifth, living water is mostly depicted in scripture as flowing from God/Jesus (Deut. 8.11-12; Jer. 2.13; Isa. 43.20; 44.3; Ezek. 36.25-27; Joel 3.18; Zech. 13.1; 14.8; Rev. 22.1-2, 17; symbolically Jn. 19.34; prototypically Ps. 78.15-16). Finally, as Dodd observes, it is difficult to find a New Testament antecedent to the idea of the believer as the source of living water (cf. Burge, 1987:90; Bultmann, 1953:303 n.2).

It is important to note that whether the living water flows from Jesus' belly or that of the believer is less significant for the understanding of the soteriological significance the passage accords the Spirit. If Jesus is the source then he is the one from which the believer receives the life-quickening, life-transforming, and life-purifying Spirit. If the believer is the source, then not only will he/she receive life from the Spirit but they will in turn become agents of this life-transforming impact of the Spirit. In both positions, the Spirit still remains soteriologically significant.

#### 4.3.6 The Vine Metaphor (John 15.1-8)

The vine was commonly used as a symbolic representation of Israel in the Old Testament, mostly depicted in unfaithful or unfruitful terms (Ps. 80.14-17; Jer. 2.21; 5.10; 6.9; Isa. 5.1-7; Ezek. 15.1-6; 17.1-10; 19.10-14). In the vine

discourse, the vine is not a representation of Israel, but Jesus. The emphasis, 'true' (*alēthinē*) vine (15.1) suggests a contrast between Israel, the untrue or unfaithful vine in the Old Testament, and Jesus, the true and faithful vine of God in the New Testament (cf. Köstenberger, 2004:450; Ridderbos, 1997:515; Morris, 1971:668-69; Schweizer, 1959: 234; Westcott, 1894:216-7; Talbert, 1992:212; Barrett, 1962:861). This Old Testament/New Testament untrue-true, real-unreal contrast is common to Johannine literary style. For example, (1) in the Samaritan discourse, the Old Testament worship on the Temple Mount is compared with the worship in Spirit and Truth which Jesus brings (4.21-24); (2) in the bread of life discourse the manna of the Exodus is compared with the bread that Jesus brings (6.48-50); and (3) the Law from Moses is compared with grace and truth from Jesus (1.17). Jesus as the 'true' vine is depicted in the discourse as the tree of life, giving life to all those who remain attached to him (15.5-6: cf. Rev. 22.1-2).

The branch who remains attached to Jesus is pruned so he/she can bear much fruit (v. 2). The word (*katharizein*) used for 'prune' in this context, also carries the idea of 'cleansing' (cf. Koester, 2003:273; Bennema, 2005: 164; Lindars, 1972:488; Westcott, 1894:217). Viewed in this context, pruning the branches is most likely a metaphorical way of expressing the moral cleansing of the branches (disciples) by the Father (cf. *Sir.* 38.10; *Psalms of Solomon* 17.30), so they can bear much fruit (for pruning as moral cleansing see Koester, 2003:273; Keener, 2003:996-7; Ridderbos, 1997:516-7; Carson, 1991:514). Moreover, the branches are said to have attained purity already by the words of the vine (v. 3), thus stressing a double cleansing (cf. 13.10). The words of Jesus carry a cleansing/purifying effect, simply because they are Spirit-imbued (3.34; 6.63). It is the Spirit who, through the words of Jesus as living water, cleanses the heart and transforms God's people (cf. Ezek. 36.25-29; Calvin, 1961:94). For Bultmann (1971:533 n.4), the pruning does not refer to moral or cultic purity, but God making sure the believer does not give him/herself over to rest, placing demands on them, and giving them continuous strength. The problem with this interpretation is that it is quite alien to the possible meanings of the verb *katharizein* (to make clean, to purify, to purge), and thus does not dovetail well with the context.

The concept of mutual indwelling stressed in v. 5 (cf. v. 7) is given expression in the Spirit of truth passage in 14.17-20. There the Spirit, as the means by which the Father indwells the Son and the Son the Father, is paradigmatic for the mutual indwelling of the Son and the disciples. Accordingly, the vine (Jesus) remains in the branches (disciples) and the branches remain in the vine by virtue of the Spirit (cf. 1 Jn. 3.24; 4.13). This concept of mutual indwelling by the Spirit reverberates Paul's 'in Christ'/'in the body' salvific metaphor. In John, as in Paul, the Spirit is the means by which the believer participates and functions in the body (1 Cor. 12.1-14). Köstenberger (2004:451) identifies the role of the Spirit in the organic union of the vine and the branches when he notes that continuous connection of believers with their exalted Lord is contingent upon the presence of the Spirit in them. Keener (2003:999) makes a similar observation when he stresses that this intimate union of Jesus with his disciples is achieved through the Spirit (cf. Ridderbos, 1997:516; Bennema, 2002:225). In the vine metaphor, the Spirit is soteriologically significant in that he is the unifying agent in the 'co-inherence' of the believer and Jesus.

Brown (1966b:672) proposes that the vine metaphor is a possible symbol of eucharistic union and eucharistic life-giving in the light of the 'fruit of the vine' image in the last supper (Mark 14.25; Matt. 26.29). What problematizes this symbolic association, at least theologically, is the fact that *contra* Schnackenburg (1993:268) (so Lindars, 1972:268; Swete, 1909:142), ascribing life-giving (salvific) efficacy to the Eucharist is quite artificial as it is difficult to find support in the Fourth Gospel (see also Köstenberger, 2004:84, n.80; Carson 1991:299; Koester, 2003:303-4). Moreover, the dissimilarities between the Eucharist and the vine metaphor are weightier than the similarity observed by Brown. Sequestration from the vine results in divine judgement (15.6), while in the Eucharist, it is unworthy participation that results in judgement (1Cor. 11.29-34); remaining in the vine result in cleansing and fruit-bearing (15.2-5). The same is not evident in the Eucharist participation; remaining in the vine results in mutual indwelling of Jesus with believers (15. 4-5). Such a concept is missing in the Eucharist participation; remaining in the vine is a sign of true discipleship (15.8). The participation in the Eucharist is not associated with true discipleship. The above observations make Brown's construct tenuous and his conclusion unlikely. The eucharistic union of believer and Jesus is not

equivalent to the vine metaphor, and hence incomparable to its life-giving (salvific) emphasis.

To remain in the vine is to keep the Spirit-imbued words of Jesus (v. 7, 10, 14), which in turn leads to the bearing of fruits (v. 2, 4, 5, 7). For Keener (2003:997), the fruit-bearing that results from remaining in Jesus, has a moral denotation, alluding to other New Testament moral imperatives (Matt. 3.8, 10; 7.16-20; 12.33; Luke 3.8-9; 6.43-44; 13.6-9). Morris (1971:670) stresses Christian character as the fruit. Brown (1966b:676) understands the fruit as the possession of divine life. For Dodd (1953:412), it is the reproduction of the love of the Father (cf. Talbert, 1992:212; Smith, 1995:147). Hoskyns (1947:476) understands it in missiological terms (cf. Lindars, 1972:489; Witherington, 1995:257; Draper, 1991:22). For Barrett (1962:861), true discipleship is in view. While the above propositions make sense of the meaning of the fruit-bearing in the discourse, none of them on their own exhausts the meaning of the term. As Carson (1991:517; cf. Köstenberger, 2004:454) notes, limiting the term to a single referent is reductionism. This is because there are clues in the passage (15.1-17) which suggest more than one referent. For example, the cleansing emphasis in vv. 2 and 3 suggests moral character, v. 8 suggests faithful discipleship, vv. 12 and 17 suggest love, v. 16 suggests mission, etc.

The role of the Spirit in the vine metaphor should provide the best clue to the understanding of the meaning of the fruit-bearing. It is noted in the discourse that the 'co-inherence' of the believer and Jesus (15.4-5), which is shown elsewhere as facilitated and sustained by the Spirit advocate (14.15-21), is the basis for this fruit-bearing. This suggests that the believer who remains in Jesus cannot bear fruit apart from the Spirit. Viewed in this light, the meaning of the fruit-bearing should be understood within the frame work of the enabling work of the Spirit advocate. First, the believer bears the fruit of love because the Spirit of truth will enable him/her to walk in the commands of Jesus, and thus remain in his love (14.17-21; cf. 15. 9-13). Second, the Spirit will remind the believer about Jesus' teachings (14.26-27) so that he/she will uphold them and bear the fruit of faithful discipleship (cf. 15.8). Third, the Spirit will testify about Jesus to the believer and equip him/her to bear the fruit of mission (15.26-27; cf. 15.16). Fourth, the Spirit as the Spirit of truth will teach the believer, leading him/her

into all truth (16.12-15, 17). This means that the believer bears the fruit of obedience by walking in the truth (4.23-24). In sum, fruit-bearing as a consequence of remaining in the vine encompasses all the aspects of the believer's relationship with Jesus facilitated by the Spirit (cf. Köstenberger, 2004:454; Carson, 1991:517; Westcott, 1894:218; Sanders, 1968:337). By this, believers give glory to the Father and are seen as true disciples (15.8). True discipleship, for John, is to remain in the vine and bear much fruit by the enabling power of the Spirit. The Spirit then becomes both the purifying (15.2-3) and sustaining/facilitating agent (15.4-8) in the Johannine concept of discipleship.

Refusal to remain in the vine means sequestration from the cleansing and fruit-bearing effects of the Spirit. The consequence is casting out, withering, and consumption by fire (15.6; cf. Ezek. 15; 19.12), Judas being the prime example. In the Old Testament and Second Temple writings, destruction by fire is a common image for divine judgement as a result of unfaithfulness to the divine will (Isa. 30.27; 31.9; Amos 7.4; Malachi 4.1; *Jub.* 9.15; 36.10; 1 *Enoch* 10.6; 54.6; 90.24-27; 4 *Ezra* 7.36-44; cf. Matt. 3.12; 5.22; 18.8; 25.41; Luke 12.49; 2 Peter 3.10; Rev. 20.14; see also Köstenberger, 2004:454; Carson, 1991:517; Dunn, 1970:12). Detachment from the vine is an attachment to divine judgement. On the other hand, attachment to the vine is a detachment from divine judgement. In this light, to remain in the vine is depicted as a soteriological category. Accordingly, if the Spirit is the means by which the branches remain in the vine, and vice versa, then the Spirit is construed as a soteriological necessity in the vine discourse.

#### 4.3.7 The giving up of the Spirit / blood and water symbol (John 19.30, 34)

On the death of Jesus on the cross, the Fourth Gospel reports that Jesus gave up the Spirit (v. 30) (10.17-18). Although Calvin (1961:184; cf. Talbert, 1992:244) may be right in arguing that *pneuma* here refers specifically to Jesus' human spirit, on the grounds that Jesus elsewhere stresses his ability to lay down his life (10.11, 15, 17-18, 15.13), which might be a possible allusion to 19.30. The fact that the Spirit took permanent residence upon Jesus (1.33), who also received the Spirit without measure for the purpose of his earthly ministry (3.34), suggests that the giving up of his life on the cross was at the same time

a reversal of the Jordan anointing, that is, the giving 'back to the Father the Spirit that had not only empowered his ministry but also sustained his physical life' (Bennema, 2012:92). This is further supported by Jesus' declaration, 'It is finished'. Thus, now that his ministry has been accomplished on the cross, he can give back the gift of the Spirit to the giver. Most significant is the observation that Jesus' breath is elsewhere identified with the Spirit (20.22; cf. Johnston, 1970:11), implying that the release of his final breath on the cross was, by identification, a relinquishing of the Spirit. This means that the Spirit has now been made available for believers.

Hoskyns (1947:532) argues that 19.28-30 records the fulfilment of 7.37-39, hence the handing over of the Spirit in verse 30 was a true giving of the Spirit to the faithful believers who stood below the cross (cf. Jones, 1997:206; Pryor, 1992:82). To begin with, the position that John 19.30 constitutes the fulfilment of 7.37-39, and thus the actual giving of the Spirit, is fraught with exegetical difficulties. First, the availability of the Spirit expressed in 7.37-39 is contingent on Jesus' glorification. This glorification encompasses the cross, resurrection and ascension (12.16; 13.31-33; 16.7; 17.5; cf. Turner, 1996:93-4; Bennema, 2005:217; Koester, 2003:201; Carson 1991:653). This observation problematizes any association of the giving up of the *pneuma* in 19.30 with the fulfilment of 7.37-39.

Second, there is no receiving object (disciples/believers) in this context, as in 20.22, to suggest an actual giving of the Spirit (cf. Keener, 2003b:1149; Lindars, 1972:582-3; Carson, 1991:621). The most plausible reading that would circumvent the condition of 7.39 and which would make sense of the context is that the giving up of the Spirit in 19.30 presents a proleptic fulfilment of 7.39, which is further given emphasis with the water image in 19.34 (Keener, 2003b:1149; Bennema, 2012:93; Ashton, 1991:425; Brown, 1966b:931). This giving of the Spirit on the cross to the Father explains the double provenance of the Spirit in the farewell discourse: from the Father (14.16, 26; 15.26) and from Jesus (16.7). Jesus gives the Spirit because it was he who released the Spirit on the cross. The Father gives the Spirit because it was he who received the Spirit from the Son on the cross.

While agreeing with Hoskyns, Swetnam (1993:565, 569, 572) argues further that there is a two-fold bestowal of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel: 19.30 and 20.22. In the former, the Spirit is given as an agent of discernment and functions as Jesus' successor (14.17, 26; 15.26; 16.3), while in the latter, the Spirit is given as an agent of empowerment for mission and constitutes Jesus' presence. The tenuous nature of this position is highlighted by the following observations:

First, as argued above, the association of 19.30 with an actual giving of the Spirit is problematic (cf. Burge, 1987:134). This means that the two-fold bestowal of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel proposed by Swetnam is suspect.

Second, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to see an association of the Spirit in 19.30 with discernment in the text or cotext. Swetnam's exegesis suggests that he identifies the Spirit in 19.30 with the Spirit-Paraclete and his revelatory teaching functions (14.26; 15.26; 16.13), as well as his replacement functions (14.16) (p. 568, 569). Such a conjecture falters at two levels. (1) The Spirit-Paraclete is said to proceed from the Father to the disciples (14.16, 26; 15.26). In 19.30, the originator is not the Father and the fact that the receiving objects are the disciples is not clear in the text. (2) The coming of the Spirit-Paraclete is preceded by Jesus' physical removal from earth (16.7). Since the giving of the Spirit still leaves Jesus' body on earth, it is hard to identify the Spirit in 19.30 with the promised Paraclete.

Third, it is difficult, if not impossible, to see the Spirit in 19.30 mediating revelation and teaching wisdom to believers in the Fourth Gospel, as Swetnam maintains. This suggests that the theological dichotomy he places between the work of the Spirit in 19.30 and that in 20.22 is an artificial one.

Moving on to 19.34, it is not far-fetched to posit that in view of John's strong anti-docetic views expressed elsewhere (1 John 4.2-3), it is possible that here he takes advantage of the cross event to emphasise, in narrative terms Jesus' humanity (flesh, blood and water), which is a strong anti-docetic claim (cf. Talbert, 1992:244; Lindars, 1972:586; Dunn, 2010:187). As symbols, the blood and water that came out of Jesus' side are significant for John's pneumatic soteriology for the following reasons. (1) The verse demonstrates a link

between the revelation of the cross (cf. 6.51-69) and the life-giving water in the Fourth Gospel (3.5; 4.14; 7.37-38). Jesus' 'flesh and blood' is life-giving bread (6.51-69) because out of it flows the Spirit, the fountain of living water. This symbolic portrait evokes the 'water from the rock image' of the Exodus. As the rock was struck to produce a fountain of water for the physical sustenance of Israel's life in the old covenant, so in 19.34 Jesus, the eschatological true rock, is struck and pierced to produce the fountain of water for the spiritual sustenance of the life of the people of God in the new covenant (cf. Carson, 1991:624; Köstenberger, 2004:552; Keener, 2003b:1153). (2) It serves as a symbolic fulfilment of Jesus' prophetic call in 7.37-38. Jesus stood at the Temple and invited his hearers to come and drink living water. In 19.34, this living water of the Spirit symbolically flows from Jesus' body, the eschatological Temple (cf. 2.19-22; Ezek. 47.1-10; Zech. 13.1; 14.8-9) (cf. Hatina, 1993:214). (3) It shows a link between the living water of the Spirit and the 'Lamb of God' imagery in 1.29. The sacrificial death of Jesus, the Lamb of God, here depicted by the blood takes away sin in that the living water of the Spirit that flows with it is that which interiorises the significance of the cross event in believers, deepens their faith in the cross, and guides them into all truth (14.26; 15.26-27; 16.13-14). The result is new-creation, forgiveness, purification, and coherence between Jesus and the believer (cf. 1.33; 3.5-6; 15.3, 4; 14.16-20; 20.22-23). Jesus, the Lamb of God, takes away the sin of the world because in his death the living water of forgiveness is made available.

Calvin (1961:186), Bultmann (1971:678) and others (Schnackenburg, 1977:249; Barrett, 1962:866; Westcott, 1894:279; Hoskyns, 1947:533; Servotte, 1994:79) admit sacramental overtones in the blood and water, noting that the blood points to the Eucharist, while the water points to baptism. According to this view, the death of Jesus validates these rites in the church. At a *prima facie* level, such a reading looks attractive, especially granting the observation that blood and water are sacramental images in the New Testament (Acts 8.36-39; 10.47; 22.16; Matt. 3.11; 26.27-28; Mark 14.23-24; 16.16; Luke 22.20; 1 Cor. 11.25). What makes such a reading doubtful is the fact that, as Carson (1991:624) notes, 'blood' by itself does not mean Holy Communion in the New Testament. Moreover, John, in the Fourth Gospel, tenuously associates the sacraments (baptism and Eucharist) with his soteriology. This means that it is

very unlikely for him to either tie the sacraments to the cross, the main substance of his soteriology (3.14-16) or enforce the practise of the sacraments in the church by the cross. (For similar opposing views see Witherington, 1995:311; Beasley-Murray, 1991:92; Lindars, 1972:587; Kysar, 1975:257).

What is most significant for the understanding of the salvific role of the Spirit in this section is that, in 19.30 and 19.34, the Fourth Gospel condenses its pneumatic soteriology in symbolic categories, using the cross event as a substrate. This condensation emphasises the necessity of the Spirit to salvation in the Fourth Gospel by the double effusion of the Spirit (19.30, 34).

#### 4.3.8 The paschal insufflation gift (John 20.22)

On the resurrection evening, the Fourth Gospel reports that the disciples had shut themselves up in a room, for fear of the Jewish leaders, when Jesus appeared in their midst and breathed upon them and said, 'Receive the Holy Spirit'. The functional nature of this gift, and its implication for the pneumatic soteriology of the Fourth Gospel, have not received scholarly consensus. Calvin (1961:205) proposes that the giving of the Spirit to the apostles at this stage constitutes a sprinkling of divine grace and not a saturation of full power, furnishing them with unique apostolic authority. For him, this giving anticipates the full giving of the Spirit in the future. The strength of this position hinges on two points. First, it distinguishes this giving of the Spirit from that of Pentecost, and expects the latter afterwards. Second, it identifies an implicit conferment of apostolic authority by the gift. This is plausible, as the giving is followed by a unique authority to forgive sins (20.23), a prerogative reserved for God (Num. 14.19-20; Isa. 1.18; 43.25; Dan. 9.9; Micah 7.18-19; Ps. 103.12; Matt. 6.12; 9.1-6; Luke 7.48-50; Acts 3.19; Heb. 8.12; 10.17; 1 John 1.9; 2.1). Its problem lies in the fact that it is difficult to find signals in the text or cotext which would allow the receiving of the gift of the Spirit to be seen as an inadequate experience, yet to be topped up. Such a reading questions the efficacy of Spirit experience in the New Testament. An observation of most, if not all, Spirit reception texts shows that any Spirit experience was adequate to fulfil its intended purpose (Acts 2; 4.23-31; 8.14-17; 9.17-19; 10.44-48; 19.1-7).

For Carson (1991:652-654) and Köstenberger (2004:574-575), the insufflation is symbolic of the Pentecost gift (see also Witherington, 1995:341 Parker, 2005:74). For Carson, the verb *emphysaō* has no direct object, hence the action should be interpreted as 'exhalation', that is, Jesus' expelled air, as 'wind', 'breath' and 'air' could all be denoted by the same word. Although, the verb has no direct object, the flow of the narrative from verse 19 strongly suggests that the object is the disciples. This means that the 'breathing' was not just 'exhalation' of air or wind, but an act purposefully directed towards a specific object, in this case, the 'breathing' out of the Holy Spirit to the disciples. It is not symbolic of the enduement that is still to come, but an actual giving of the Spirit chronologically different from the expected enduement.

Bultmann (1971:692), Burge (1987:123-131) and others (Lightfoot, 1956:331; Dunn, 200:176; Beasley-Murray, 1991:80; Dodd, 1953:430; Ashton, 1991:425) postulate that this is a record of the full giving of the Spirit and a fulfilment of the promise of the farewell discourse, given as empowerment for mission. Thus Easter and Pentecost here fall together. Burge (1987:125-127) puts forward several arguments in support of this position, which are worth engaging with there.

- *In the light of 7.39, the process of glorification is complete in 20.22 by the giving of the Spirit.* In 7.39, it is the glorification that determines the giving of the Spirit, not vice versa. The giving of the Spirit according to 7.39 must be subsequent to Jesus' glorification, but this entails his death, resurrection and ascension (12.16; 13.31-33; 16.7; 17.5; cf. Turner, 1996:93-4; Bennema, 2005:217; Koester, 2003:201; Carson 1991:653). It is very controversial to assert with certainty that by 20.22 Jesus had already ascended to the Father for the glorification process to be completed. The absence of Thomas casts doubts on the 20.22 event as a post-glorification giving of the Spirit parallel with Pentecost. Moreover, the coming of the Spirit, like Pentecost, is subsequent to Jesus' physical removal from earth (16.7). More significant is the observation that the expressions used regarding the coming of the Paraclete suggest a special separation between Jesus and his disciples upon the arrival of the Spirit: 'I will not leave you orphans, I will come to

you' (14.18); 'whom the Father will send in my name' (14.26); 'whom I shall send from the Father' (15.26). The presence of Jesus with the disciples during this giving questions the taking of this event as a fulfilment of the Paraclete sayings.

- *The use of 'to breathe' evokes Genesis 2.7 (cf. Ezek. 37.9), making Jesus the source of the life-giving Spirit. Both Luke and John understand the life-giving result of Spirit reception (Acts 2.4) and its origin in Jesus (Acts 2.33). Although both Luke and John trace the origin of the life-giving Spirit to Jesus, the fact that Luke records the giving in Jesus' absence and John records the giving in Jesus' presence weakens the strength of the parallel that Burge claims between Pentecost and the insufflation experience.*
- *The absence of the definite article in 20.22 ('Receive Holy Spirit) parallels the usage in the Baptist's prophecy (1.33), connecting 20.22 as a fulfilment of 1.33, and hence a reference to Pentecost. 20.22 is one of two or more events fulfilling the Baptist prophecy, and not the ultimate fulfilment of 1.33. As shown earlier in this chapter, Spirit baptism for John (1.33), entails the soteriological and empowering work of the Spirit in the life of the believer. The fact that the nature of the gift in 20.22 performs soteriological and empowering functions for the believer in the narrative is not clear. This means that it is difficult to maintain that 20.22 is the fulfilment of 1.33.*
- *The use of the verb 'receive' in conjunction with the 'Holy Spirit' is common to the New Testament (John 7.39; 14.7; 20.22; Rom. 8.15; 1 Cor. 2.12; 2 Cor. 11.4; Gal. 3.2, 14; Acts 1.8; 2.38; 8.15, 17, 19; 10.47; 19.2). In 20.22 the gift given is the Holy Spirit, as Burge argues. However, this does not mean that the experience is the Johannine counterpart to the Lukan Pentecost.*
- *One of the most important themes in the Paraclete sayings is the disciple's sorrow as a result of Jesus' departure, which the Paraclete will restore (14.27; 16.33; 16.20, 21, 22). Jesus' threefold blessing of peace (20.19, 21, 26) points to an eschatological fulfilment of the Paraclete expectations. This claim falters at several levels. First, the peace pronounced to the disciples is from Jesus, not from the Spirit-Paraclete.*

This means that the threefold blessings do not point to the fulfilment of the Paraclete expectation. Second, as Burge himself admits, the full catalogue of the functions ascribed to the Paraclete is not evident in the narrative after 20.22. Third, after 20.22, the disciples went back to fishing (21.1-14). This suggests that they have not yet received the Spirit-Paraclete, because when the Paraclete comes he will testify of Jesus and will bear witness through the disciples (15.25-26; 16.8). Fourth, the fact that the disciples could not recognise Jesus on shore suggests that they lacked the role of the Paraclete in their lives as one who will guide them into all truth, tell them things to come, and declare to them what belongs to Jesus (16.13-14).

- *The Fourth Gospel expects one anointing which will climax Jesus' relations with his disciples.* Yes, the Fourth Gospel might expect one anointing of the Spirit, but that does not mean that the one gift of the Spirit cannot be given in two chronological stages. That is, in 20.22 and then later as Paraclete.
- *There are striking parallels between John 20 and Acts 2: (1) both happened in Jerusalem behind closed doors; (2) both are characterised by commissioning; (3) both are characterised by the ministry of forgiveness; (4) both are characterised by the traditional image of breath/wind for the Spirit (1 Kgs. 19.11; Ezek. 19 and 20; Ezek. 37.8-10; Gen. 2.7).* While this observation is striking, the difference between the two events is equally striking, if not weightier: (1) In Acts 2, the disciples were ALL gathered in the room, while in John 20, Thomas was missing. (2) In Acts 2, the experience was characterised by tongues of fire that gave them the utterance of different tongues, while in John 20, the experience was without such charismatic rigour. (3) In Acts 2, the experience was preceded by prophecy and the exegetical preaching of the Old Testament, while in John 20, no such demonstration was evident. (4) In Acts 2, the Spirit was given when Jesus was physically removed from earth, while in John 20, it was Jesus who literally gave the Spirit.

On the basis of the above engagement, to posit that the 20.22 event is the Johannine counterpart to the Lukan Pentecost is a shaky claim. In his critique of

the 'Johannine Pentecost' supposition that 20.22 is coequal with Pentecost, Hatina (1993:205, 216-218) argues that 20.22 is a separate enduement from Acts 2.1-4, and should be understood, not in terms of re-creation or regeneration, but as the Paraclete who will impart Jesus' words and understanding of eternal life to the disciples for effective mission. While Hatina's critique is soundly based on the above observations, his taking of 20.22 as the giving of the Paraclete is equally subject to the weaknesses observed in such a reading above.

Turner (1996:96-97), Bennema (2012:95), Atkinson (2011:111), and Ervin (1984:136, 137) posit that the nature of the giving is for the recreation of the apostles. However, they differ in some respects. Turner (1996:98-100) conceives the process of the giving of the Spirit as one theological gift consisting of two chronological stages: in 20.22 and then as Paraclete after Jesus' removal from earth. This two-stage experience is not normative for the church today. Bennema (2012:102-103) conceives the giving of the Spirit as one theological gift consisting of three stages: the symbolic giving on the cross (19.30), the giving as life-saving (20.22), and an anticipation of a third stage giving of the Spirit as Paraclete. Atkinson (2011:113) and Ervin (1984:139) conceive the process of the giving of the Spirit as two theologically distinct gifts in two chronological stages, the first as regeneration in 20.22 and the second at Pentecost as empowerment for mission. This two-stage giving of the Spirit is normative for the church today.

Before the above positions are given attention, the following discussion is crucial, as the conclusion will serve as a lens through which these positions are examined. The identification of the giving of the Spirit with re-creation is a plausible one in that the 'breathing' evokes God's creative work in Genesis 2.7 and Ezekiel 37.9 (cf. Wis. 15.11; *4 Ezra* 3.5-7; *De Opificio Mundi* 139). By breathing the creative Spirit on his disciples, Jesus imparts new life into them (cf. Brown, 1966b:1037)

Forestell, 1974:100; Pryor, 1992:89; Levison, 2009:371; Thiselton, 2013:144). Such a reading spawns the following question: Does this mean that Jesus' disciples were not re-created (born anew) prior to 20.22? The answer is a No. The disciples were born anew prior to 20.22 by virtue of their walk and belief in

Jesus and his teachings (4.10, 13, 14, 23; 6.63; 8.32; 13.10; 15.3). Their experience in 20.22 should be seen as a graphic depiction of the new creation that had already taken place by their relationship with Jesus. The new birth of 'water and Spirit' spoken of in 3.5, is here given a concrete or theatrical depiction. This depiction is to show that to be born anew is to experience the life-creating and life-transforming Spirit/breath of God (cf. Ezek. 36.25-27; 37.9).

The authority to forgive and retain sins given to the disciples in 20.23 finds its legitimacy in 20.22. The 20.22 event recalls the successor motif in the Exodus, where Moses legitimated Joshua as his successor by granting him authority of leadership over Israel through Spirit impartation (Num. 27.18-20). Here also, the prophet-like-Moses legitimates the disciples as his successors to perpetuate his salvific ministry on earth while he is away by granting them the unique and exclusive authority to forgive and retain sins through the impartation of the Spirit. The forgiveness and retention of sin in this context should be seen in the universal salvific context, contingent upon the acceptance or refusal of Jesus. That is, the acceptance of Jesus results in forgiveness of sins, whilst refusal results in the retention of sin (cf. Witherington, 1995:343; G. Brown, 2003:112; Ridderbos, 1997:645). Köstenberger (2004:575) notes that the authority to forgive and retain sins is reminiscent of the 'keys' concept in Matthew 16.19, and both probably recall the reference to the giving of the 'key of the house of David' in Isaiah 22.22. If so, then the idea is the authority to grant or deny access into God's kingdom. The authority to forgive and retain sins, which is tantamount to the authority to grant or deny access into the kingdom, is a divine prerogative (Ps. 51.1-19; 103.12; Isa. 1.18; 43.25-26; Micah 7.18-19; Dan. 9.9; Matt. 9.6; Jn. 1.29; Acts 2.38; 3.19; Heb. 8.12; 10.17; 1 Jn. 1.9), and the disciples are able to share in this prerogative simply because they have been authorised as such by virtue of the Spirit impartation, making such privilege specific to the apostolic circle, as opposed to believers in general (*contra* Bultmann, 1971:693; Brown 1966b:1044; G. Brown, 2003:112).

From what has been gathered so far, John associates the giving of the Spirit in 20.22 with the re-creation and mission of the disciples (Barrett, 1962:867; Brown, 1996:1036-1039; Lindars, 1972:611; Keener, 2003b:1204-05; Ridderbos, 1997:643-44). Moreover, by associating the gift of the Spirit with the

authority to forgive sins, John emphasises the purificatory significance of the Spirit (cf. 1.33-36; 3.5; 19.30, 34). In a nut shell, the giving of the Spirit in 20.22 puts the Spirit at the centre of the divine salvific act of new birth.

Since the taking of 20.22 as the Johannine Pentecost has been shown to be an unhelpful reading, one is on solid ground to suggest that the Fourth Gospel still expects the coming of the Spirit as Paraclete at Pentecost in fulfilment of earlier expectations (7.39; 14.16; 15.2; 16.7, 13) (cf. Ridderbos, 1997:643; Morris, 1971:846 n. 53; Hoskyns, 1947:547; Westcott, 1894:295). This means that the Fourth Gospel knows of two givings of the Spirit (20.22 and a future giving as Paraclete) expressed in four stages: the first is symbolic, 19.30; the second is also symbolic, 19.34; the third is unique and exclusive to the apostolic circle, 20.22; lastly, the fourth is a future expectation of the Spirit as Paraclete for all believers. As the next discussion on the Paraclete will reveal, the expected Spirit-Paraclete will perform both soteriological and prophetic functions in the life of the believer. If the Spirit received in 20.22 is also soteriologically and prophetically significant, then both givings are theologically one, but chronologically distinct. In the light of the above deductions, Turner, Bennema, Atkinson, and Ervin are right when they attached re-creative significance to the Spirit in 20.22. However, the position of Turner and Bennema, that both givings are theologically one yet chronologically distinct, is more convincing as compared to that proposed by Ervin and Atkinson. Also, the proposal of Ervin and Atkinson that the two-stage giving of the Spirit is normative for the church today is improbable. Turner's two-stage giving, however plausible, fails to accommodate the symbolic giving in 19.30 and 19.34 as part of the stages of the giving. Bennema's three-stage proposal moves a step ahead of Turner, yet it also fails to consider 19.34 as a composite of the stages of the giving of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel. Notwithstanding the differences, these scholars rightly attest to the salvific significance of the Spirit in 20.22. Such understanding presents a significant contribution to the central theoretical emphasis of this: that the Spirit is indispensable to salvation in the Fourth Gospel.

#### 4.3.9 Summary

The soteriological significance of the Spirit is evident in relation to both Jesus and the disciples/believers. In relation to Jesus, the Spirit was the power behind his revelatory teachings and the instrument of his baptising mission, which initiates, purifies, and re-creates the receiver. In relation to believers/disciples, the Spirit is the source of cleansing and new birth (3.5; cf. 20.22), the faith-quickening and life-giving agent in the divine gift (3.16; 6.63), the power within and behind believers' worship (4.24), the life-giving agent in the bread from heaven (6.27-59), the life-sustaining power in Jesus' revelatory teachings (7.38), and the means through which the mutual indwelling between Jesus and the believer is actualised. The Spirit is conceived as the fulcrum of Jesus' salvific mission in the Fourth Gospel.

Having examined the salvific import of the Holy Spirit in the pneumatic passage, this study moves to examine the soteriological significance of the Spirit understood as Paraclete in the farewell discourse. In all of the pneumatic passages examined thus far, the Spirit has been shown to be soteriologically significant. As to whether a similar claim can be made with respect to the Spirit-Paraclete is the concern of the following segment of the discussion.

#### **4.4 The Spirit-Paraclete and Salvation**

The salvific significance of the Spirit-Paraclete in the farewell discourse has not received scholarly consensus as opposed to the role of the Spirit in John 3-7. Windisch (1968:2, 3) argues that the disciples received all they needed spiritually with respect to Jesus' departure; the Spirit-Paraclete is expected as a *donum superadditum*, an additional gift. Arguing along a similar trajectory, Menzies (2004:50) argues that the Spirit comes as a source of regeneration in John 3-7, while in 14-16 the Spirit-Paraclete comes as a source of the disciple's mission. Brown (1966b:1140) also notes that the Spirit-Paraclete is portrayed in a distinct manner from the Holy Spirit in that soteriological functions such as regeneration, re-creation and forgiveness of sins are never associated with the Paraclete. Turner (1996:85, 88) and Bennema (2002:222), on the other hand, argue that the Spirit-Paraclete has both prophetic and soteriological significance. Scholars like Calvin (1961:82), Bultmann (1971:560, 574) and

others (Witherington, 1995:252; Beasley-Murray, 1991:73, 76; Hoskyns, 1947:481; Breck, 1991:163; Smalley, 1978:232; Draper, 1992:23) in various ways attest to the soteriological significance of the Spirit-Paraclete. Before the Paraclete sayings are examined in order to address this issue, an investigation into the meaning of the term παράκλητος (*paraklētos*) as employed by the Fourth Gospel is a necessary step forward.

The term *paraklētos* has evoked divergent interpretations within Johannine studies for centuries. Calvin (1961:82) advances that *paraklētos* designates the office of a patron, one who comforts, exhorts and guards by his patronage. Bruce (1983:302) views the term as denoting 'one called alongside as a helper/defender'. Lightfoot (1956:258) advances 'helper'. Barrett (1962:861) and Lindars (1972:478) suggest 'counsellor'. Hamilton (2006:73) claims 'comforter'. Sanders (1968:330) postulates an 'intermediary'. These positions present unsatisfactory understandings of the term, as they all fail to capture the meaning of the term as employed in the five sayings of the discourse.

By observing a body of opinion in Mandaean writings and the *Odes of Solomon* analogous to the concept of ἄλλος παράκλητος (another *Paraklētos*) in the Fourth Gospel, Bultmann (1971:566-572) identifies the figure of the παράκλητος with the Gnostic figure of the Jawar-Helper. This figure is a revealer, helper/sustainer, guide and leader, who establishes dwellings for the righteous and because of whom the righteous are persecuted. While Bultmann's analogy is striking, it is very difficult to prove in the Fourth Gospel John's dependence on or influence by Gnostic concepts. More significant is the observation that the role of the Paraclete to the world expressed in 16.8 is unparalleled with the helping role of the Gnostic figure. Also, the ontological, functional, and spatial relationship between Jesus and the Paraclete (14.16, 18, 21b, 26; 15.26; 16.16) is not evident in the relationship between the Gnostic figure and the divinity. This makes such identification tenuous (see also, Strecker, 2000:506; Johnston, 1970:88-91; Ridderbos, 1997:504; Turner, 1996:78; Burge, 1987:11-12; Dodd, 1953:98).

For Windisch (1968:20), while the Spirit is conceived as an influencing power, the Paraclete is an angel in human form or a prophet sent from God (3.2),

subordinated to the incarnate Logos, yet comparable to him. This proposal is thrown into question by the observation that Jesus promises his indwelling-presence in the believer by the Paraclete when he is away (14.17, 20). This concept of indwelling betrays the lack of conviction in any reading that considers the Paraclete as a human or angelic figure (cf. Johnson, 1970:81, 87).

Drawing from the brokerage model in ancient Mediterranean culture, G. Brown (2003:186-234) postulates that, like others in his culture, the Evangelist conceives of the Spirit-Paraclete as one who brokers or mediates access to Jesus and continues his work and presence after he has departed. For G. Brown, if there be any forensic significance to the meaning of the Paraclete, especially based on 16.8-11, that meaning is not primary. He argues further that the ἐλέγχειν (to convict, refute, confute, convince) function of the Paraclete is towards the disciples, not the world, and that the world is here identified with the synagogue Israelites. While this social scientific consideration of the Paraclete offers an insightful perspective on the subject, it is not without hurdles. First, it emphasises the mediatory/brokerage aspect of the Paraclete to the disregard or denial of its forensic significance expressed in 16.8-11. Second, G. Brown skews the evidence to his favour when he argues that the ἐλέγχειν function of the Paraclete is directed towards the disciples. The ἐλέγχειν function of the Paraclete is directed at the world, not the disciples, as emphasised in the passage (16.8). Third, it is quite improbable that the 'world' in this context is limited to the synagogue Israelite, and not a cosmic emphasis, especially granting its broad usage elsewhere (1.9; 3.16; 4.42; 6.33; 8.23; 12.31; 12.47; 17.6, 18, 21-25).

Brown (1966b:1137-1139) discovers four possible elements of background to the understanding of the Spirit-Paraclete in John. First, the tandem relationship in the Old Testament in which a successor takes over from a predecessor, continues his work and interprets his message, for example Moses/Joshua. Second, the Spirit of God in the Old Testament comes upon chosen men with divine revelation and gives them the power to proclaim it. Third, personal angelic spirits in the Old Testament who teach and guide men into truth, as well as defending them against evil (Job 1.6-12; 16.19; 19.25-27; 33.23; Zech. 3.1-5;

Dan. 10.13). Fourth, divine Wisdom dwells with the people of God, teaches and illuminates their minds into God's truth (Sir. 24.12, 26-27, 33; Enoch 14.17; 42.2). For him, the roles of the figures in all four backgrounds - witnessing, teaching, guiding, and accusing - are reminiscent of the functions of the Johannine Paraclete. Brown's proposal is brittle in the sense that (1) the teaching and guiding attributes of the angelic spirit are not clear in the passages Brown adduces in support of his position above and (2) the convergence of all four concepts into one conceptual understanding of the Spirit as Paraclete in John is a slippery position to maintain. This is because such framework paints the Paraclete with four faces: as successor, divine empowering presence, divine wisdom, and angelic spirit. The association of the last face with the Paraclete in the farewell discourse is uncertain.

Observing the Johannine community through the lens of the sociological theories of *world view reconstruction*, *intensive interaction*, and *boundary maintenance*, Draper (1992:20-23) argues that the use of the Paraclete sayings in the farewell discourse confirms the function of the Paraclete as boundary maintenance in an introversionist sect. For him, the exclusive claim to salvation by the Johannine sect based on their possession of the Truth, which is a hallmark of an introversionist sect and a technique of boundary maintenance, is specifically linked to the Paraclete sayings (14.17; 16.7; 17:13, 26). He argues further that within the framework of boundary maintenance, the Paraclete functions to maintain and strengthen the community by defending them against the hostile world (16.7-11). Draper's sociological insight on the subject contributes to the understanding of the Paraclete as a salvific figure who communicates salvific truth to believers, characterises them as a divine community, and strengthens them against the world. Nonetheless, it fails to capture the full essence of the role of the Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel, especially the portrait of the Paraclete as the abiding presence of Jesus after Jesus' departure and its prophetic significance (14.17, 20; 16.13c).

For Johnston (1970:119-126), the identification of angels, especially Michael, with the true Spirit of God, who guides and guards the church, was a prevailing concept (Gal. 1.8; 3.19; Col. 2.18ff; Heb. 1.4ff), which had posed a threat to the Christological orthodoxy of the church. In view of this, the author of the Fourth

Gospel combined 'Spirit of Truth' with 'Paraclete' as a deliberate denial of such ideology. The Spirit of Jesus Christ as Paraclete, he argues further, is representative of Jesus and not the presence of Jesus when he is away. While the Spirit-angelic polemic might be a component of John's purpose, the postulation that the Spirit-Paraclete is a representative of Jesus, and not his presence, disregards the concept of co-inherence of Jesus and believers advanced in the discourse (14.8, 20, 23; cf. 15.1-8). Turner (1996:80, 81) makes a cogent observation when he notes that the Paraclete comes to the disciples not merely as Jesus' replacement, but as his personal presence with them when he is away (cf. Keener, 2003b:968; Bennema, 2002:220; Koester, 2008:147; Pryor, 1992:146).

Harvey (1976:103-122) sees the use of the term from the Jewish legal background and argues that the term *paraklētos* means advocate, not in the sense of a lawyer, but as one who lends his prestigious position to the case of his friend in court, convincing the judge of the friend's honesty, so as to procure a suitable verdict (see also; Dodd, 1953:414; Koester, 2008:147; Witherington, 1995:252; Thompson, 1992:382; Morris, 1971:666; Westcott, 1894:213). Seen in this light, the Spirit-Paraclete is an advocate on earth, providing the advocacy of (1) giving evidence about Jesus in the earthly court, (2) accusing the world of their disbelief in Jesus, (3) accusing the world of their misinterpretation of Jesus' death, and (4) accusing the world with regard to their wrong judgement of Jesus. While such observation proves helpful in understanding the forensic significance of the term, it is an inadequate reading as it fails to equally accommodate the other non-forensic dimension of the term within the discourse (14.18-19; 26-27).

Talbert (1992:207) compares the Paraclete functions in the Fourth Gospel with early Christian understanding of the Spirit as the Spirit of prophecy and concludes that Paraclete means the verbal manifestation of the Spirit, hence the Spirit of prophecy (cf. Stefan, 2005:277; Forestell, 1974:138). The Paraclete is called the Holy Spirit (14.26), and by implication, the Spirit of prophecy. However, the Paraclete is associated with forensic functions (16.8-11) not certain with the concept of the Spirit as the Spirit of Prophecy. This makes Talbert's conclusion problematic.

Köstenberger (2004:436 n.70) claims that 'helping presence' is the most appropriate label (see also Talbert, 1992:207), as its holistic flavour carries the full import of the functions laid out in chapters 14 to 16 for the Paraclete. Turner (1996:79-88) claims that the Spirit-Paraclete is an advocate after the pattern of Jesus, the first Paraclete, one who is to take over Jesus' Paraclete functions as teacher and revealer, one who bears witness and convicts or convinces the world. Bennema (2002:219) argues along similar lines when he notes that the understanding of the Paraclete concept must be fixed within the purview of John's own portrait in the discourse (cf. Ridderbos, 1997:503; Smalley, 1978:229; Bellington, 1995:95), in which the functional link between the Paraclete and Jesus is crucial. These perspectives are the most plausible and convincing positions, as not only do they seek to understand the meaning of the term within its Johannine context, but they consider all the functional import of the term as expressed in the discourse. Another plausible alternative interpretation of the term is offered by this study in the following paragraphs.

In view of the Exodus themes identified in the Fourth Gospel, it is a sound exegetical observation to note that the farewell-successor theme in the Exodus possibly lurks underneath the Paraclete promise in the farewell discourse. These themes include divine habitation among his people (1.14 / Exod. 29.46); Mosaic mediation of the law (1.17-18; 7.19 / Exodus 20; 34.1); the lamb imagery (1.29, 36 / Exod. 29.38-41); the 'lifting up' salvific metaphor (3.14-15 / Num. 21.4-9); the bread/manna reference (6.35, 41, 48, 51 / Exod. 16.4, 15); the light symbol as divine presence (1.4-5; 8.12 / Exod. 13.21-22); the living water motif (7.37-38 / Exod. 17.6; cf. Ps. 114.8); the I AM formula (8.58; cf. 6.35; 8.12; 10.9; 11; 11.25; 14.6; 15.1 / Exod. 3.14); the shepherd metaphor (10.1-30 / Num. 27.15-17; and see also Kysar, 1975:137-144; Pryor, 1992:117-142; Lioy, 2007). It is worth stressing that this does not mean there is a direct correspondence or parallel between John and the Exodus texts, but rather, that John's concept of the Paraclete's being with the disciples after Jesus' departure suggests that some basic elements in the farewell-successor motif of the Exodus story contributed to his thought. Moses' successor Joshua was to continue Moses' salvific ministry of leadership/guide, teacher/mediator of divine salvific revelation, intercessor, and defender of the community against the outside world. This means that the farewell-successor theme in the Exodus

story speaks of a functional soteriological task. The successor takes up and continues the salvific role of the predecessor and by so doing compensates for his absence. The parallel between the roles of Joshua, the successor, and Moses, the predecessor, could be outlined as follows:

<b>Moses</b>		<b>Joshua</b>
Exod. 3.10	charismatic leader	Josh. 1.1-9
Exod. 19-26; 31-35; 40	teacher/mediator of divine revelation	Josh. 4; 8.30-35; 24
Exod. 32.30-33; Deut. 9.13-14	intercessor	Josh. 7.10-26
Exod. 17.8-16; 21; Num. 15.45; 21.1-3	defender against the outside world	Josh. 6; 10; 11; 12.7-24
Exod. 3.1-5	theophanic missiological encounter	Josh. 5.13-15
Exod. 14.21	the parting of water	Josh. 3; cf. 14.21

This functional successor-predecessor parallel between Moses and Joshua is also evident between Jesus and the Paraclete. Such a parallel has also been noted by Brown (1966b: 1140-1141), Bultmann (1971:566, 567) and others (Turner, 1996:79, 80; Burge, 1987:141; Keener, 2003:965; Lampe, 1977:92; Thiselton, 2013:141):

<i>Jesus</i>		<i>Spirit-Paraclete</i>
14.16	Paraclete	14.16
3.16	gift from the Father	14.16
7.14; 8.20	teacher	14.26
5.31; 8.13-14	gives testimony	15.26
3.19-21; 15.22	convicts the world	16.8
1.18	revealer	16.13
6.69	called Holy	14.26
14.6	associated with Truth	14.17; 15.26; 16.13
17.4	glorifies	16.14

As Joshua succeeded Moses and compensated for his absence by taking over his salvific task, so here also, the Paraclete, as a Joshua-like successor is promised to compensate for the absence of Jesus, the prophet like Moses, by taking over his salvific tasks (see also Windisch, 1968:17; Brown, 1966b:1138). Viewed in this light, the term Paraclete finds meaning and expression within the matrix of the discourse (14.16-18, 26; 15.26-27; 16.8; 13-15). The Spirit is another Paraclete in that he takes up and continues the salvific role of Jesus, who is the first Paraclete. This suggests that the Spirit as another Paraclete is conceived as another soteriological figure in God's salvation history. An investigation into this assertion via the examination of the Paraclete texts is significant at the moment, but prior to that, understanding the phrase 'Spirit of truth' will be a helpful step forward, not least because the Paraclete is often called the 'Spirit of truth' (14.17; 15.26; 16.13).

#### 4.4.1 The Paraclete as Spirit of Truth

In 14.17, 15.26 and 16.13, John calls the Paraclete the Spirit of truth. A good starting point to unravelling the meaning of this label is to delve into the meaning of 'truth' as understood in the Fourth Gospel, as that will help construct a clearer formulation of the salvific role of the Spirit-Paraclete as the Spirit of

truth. This examination will consider the concept of 'truth' in the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism to see whether John shares similar thought.

The concept of truth in the Old Testament entails several aspects. Truth is qualified as righteousness (Ps. 15.2; 85.11; 111.8; Prov. 8.7; 12.17; Jer. 5.1; Isa. 48.1; 59.14-15; Zech. 8.3, 16); truth as God's gracious disposition towards humanity (Deut. 32.4; Exod. 34.6; Ps. 31.5; 40.10-11; 45.4; 98.2-3; Isa. 25.1; 65.16); truth identified with divine mercies, kindness, and peace (Gen. 24.27; 32.10; 2 Sam. 2.6; 15.20; Ps. 57.10; 61.7; 85.10; 86.15; 89.14; 108.4; 115.1; 117.2; 138.2; Prov. 14.22; 16.6; 20.28; 1 Sam. 16.5; Jer. 33.6; Mic. 7.20; Zech. 8.19); truth as the right mode of worship (Josh. 24.14; 1 Sam. 12.24; 1 Kgs. 2.4; 3.6; 2 Kgs. 20.3; Jer. 7.28; Ps. 145.18; Isa. 10.20; 38.3; Dan. 8.12); truth as salvific path/guide (Ps. 25.5; 43.3; 69.13; 86.11; Isa. 38.17-19); truth as divine justice (Ps. 54.5; 146.6; Isa. 42.3; 59.14-15; 61.8; Zech. 8.16b); truth as opposed to lies (Gen. 42.16; Exod. 18.21; 2 Chr. 18.15; Jer. 9.1-3); and truth as Torah and divine revelatory wisdom/precepts (1 Kgs 17.24; Ps. 26.3; 51.6; 119.30, 43, 142, 151; Prov. 22.21; Dan. 9.13; 10.21; 11.2; Hos. 4.1; Mal. 2.6). In summary, 'truth' in the Old Testament could be construed as a composition of God's salvific intents and tendencies towards his people.

In *Testament of Judah* 20.1-5, truth is construed as right standing with God, while error is a wrong standing with God. The Spirit of truth testifies to both positions and accuses of sin. To be a son of truth is to walk in the decrees of God (*Test. Judah* 24.3-4). In *Testament of Levi* 18.8, it means to receive the majesty of the Lord, interpreted as power over wickedness (v.12) and being clothed in righteousness (v.14). Doing the 'truth' in the *Testaments* has several features. It includes: to act in piety before God and man (*Test. Iss.* 7.1-7); to abstain from all evil (*Test. Dan.* 6.8-10; cf. *Test. Ash.* 5.3); to exude love for one's neighbour (*Test. Rub.* 6.9), and to understand and live Torah (*Test. Rub.* 3.8; cf. *Test. Ash.* 6.1; *Test. Ben.* 10.1-3).

In 1 QS 3.13-4.26 truth is associated with moral rectitude, ethical propriety, righteousness, revelatory knowledge and wisdom, goodness, eternal life, and moral purification. God's works, laws and counsel are qualified as 'truth' (1 QS 1.16; 10.17; 1 QH 13.26; cf. 1 QH 4.21-22). To practise 'truth' is to abstain from evil and to cleave to justice, righteousness, Torah, love of community members,

and righteous counsel (1 QS 1.5-15; cf. 8.1-4). The *Yahad* community is 'truth' in that they are God's salvific society who embrace the laws of righteousness and upright living before God. The one who rejects these values is not worthy of the *Yahad* membership (1 QS 2.24-26; cf. 5.5-7). Viewed in this light, 'truth', as the *Yahad* community label, is understood as an embodiment of God's salvific ethical imperatives. The soteriological import of 'truth' is given significant attention in 1 QS 4.6-8. Here, 'truth' is defined as an embodiment of the mysteries of divine knowledge, and those who yearn for it through their walk in the Spirit of Truth receive blessings and everlasting life. The Spirit of Truth mediates God's saving truth (hidden knowledge) to the community and those who walk in it are promised the blessing of life eternal. 'Truth' in Qumran and the *Testaments* is a soteriological component: God's revelatory wisdom and ethical purifier.

In the Fourth Gospel, truth takes on the following features: truth as God's gracious disposition towards mankind (1.14; 17); truth as opposed to falsehood (5.33; 8.44, 45) (cf. Lioy, 2008:90); truth as revelatory wisdom and its ethical purifying and liberating/salvific efficacy revealed in Jesus (8.31-32, 40; 17.17, 19; 18.37) (cf. Bennema, 2002:227; Olsson, 1999:158; Dodd, 1953:177; Lioy, 2008:90); truth as salvific path (14.6); truth as belief in the only begotten Son of God (3.18-21); truth as the right mode of worship (4.23-24; cf. Koester, 2008:148). Thus for the Fourth Gospel, truth is a soteriological/ethical register (cf. Bennema, 2002:225; Vink, 1960:486). Understood against this backdrop, John calls the Paraclete the Spirit of truth in that (1) he mediates Jesus, the embodiment of God's grace to believers; (2) whatever he testifies about Jesus is the truth as opposed to falsehood (cf. Carson, 1991:500; Calvin, 1961:82; Hamilton, 2006:77; Beasley-Murray, 1991:72; Brown, 1966b:639); (3) he mediates divine revelatory wisdom with a purifying/salvific effect to believers; (4) he reveals Jesus as the true path to eternal life/salvation to believers (cf. Brown, 1988:76-77); (5) he quickens believers' understanding and a consequent belief response to Jesus' teachings; and (6) he provides both the context and content of worship for believers (cf. Köstenberger, 2004:438; Smalley, 1978:232). Crump (1992:861) arrives at a similar conclusion. He notes that the idea of the Spirit as the Spirit of truth in John hinges on three basic things: the Spirit is sent from the Father who is truth; He continues the ministry of Jesus who is truth;

and He leads the disciples into all truth. All these observations evoke the understanding that in the Fourth Gospel, the Spirit identified as the Spirit of the truth is presented as a dynamic salvific agent (cf. Breck, 1991:163).

In the light of the above examination, it emerges that John shares his concept of truth with the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism (cf. Lioy, 2008:90). On this note, Lioy (2008:71) is probably right in his criticism of Dodd (1953:177) for determining the meaning of John's concept of truth within the crucible of Hellenistic usage. For John, as for the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism, truth embodies elements of God's salvific disposition towards man (see also; Brown, 1977:84). It is imperative to note that such a conclusion does not imply that the 'Spirit of truth' concept in John parallels that in the *Testaments* and Qumran (see Morris, 1971:649 n. 45; Hamilton, 2006:77; Beasley-Murray, 1991:72; Bauckham, 2007:135).

With the above understanding of 'truth' and 'Spirit of truth' as luminating background, the salvific significance of the abiding and indwelling promise of the Spirit of truth with the disciples (v.17) is not difficult to determine. As Spirit of truth, the Paraclete will continue to mediate Jesus, the gracious gift of God to the disciples when he is away; he will continue to testify about Jesus to the disciples; he will continue to mediate revelatory wisdom with a continuous purifying effect to the disciples; he will continue to reveal Jesus as the only true path to eternal life; he will continue to maintain and sustain faith in Jesus in the hearts of the disciples; and he will continue to provide both the context and content of worship for the disciples. The promise of the Spirit of truth - to be in and with the disciples - is not a passive one, but active: to continue and sustain the revelatory, sanctifying and salvific work of Jesus while he is away from earth.

#### 4.4.2 The Paraclete as indwelling and abiding presence (John 14.15-21)

The Holy Spirit is not only promised to abide with the disciples as Jesus' representative (v. 17) or surrogate, as Witherington (1995:252) terms it, but more crucially, he is the very presence of Jesus while he is away (v. 18) (cf. Calvin, 1961:83; Brown, 1979:139; Keener, 2003b:973; Dodd, 1953:415; Malatesta, 1973:548; Sanders, 1968:330; Turner, 1996:80, n.17). Lampe

(1977:92) argues similarly when he refers to the Spirit in this sense as *alter Christus* (cf. Ashton, 1991:467; Dunn, 1998:339). Hoskyns (1947:459) and others (Ridderbos, 1997:505; Morris, 1971:651; Carson, 1991:501), on the contrary, argue that 'I will come to you' refers to the resurrection appearance and not to the coming of the Spirit. The improbability of such a claim is confirmed by two observations. (1) The assurance of the coming in verse 18 is a component of, and forms a conceptual unity with, the discourse of the promise of the Spirit that precedes it (vv. 16-17). This implies that 'the coming' in this context is none other than the 'coming' in the person of the Paraclete. (2) The notion of not leaving the disciples as orphans suggests a permanent separation which needs a permanent accompaniment. This makes this type of coming incomparable to the resurrection appearance, but to the continuous abiding of the Spirit with them (cf. v. 16).

The presence of the Paraclete with the disciples when Jesus is away is again couched in the phrase, 'a little while longer and the world will see me no more, but you will see me' (v. 19, KJV). For Morris (1971:652), this interval points to that between crucifixion and resurrection (cf. Lindars, 1972:480; Ridderbos, 1997:505; Carson, 1991:501; Köstenberger, 2004:439; Ashton, 1991:464). This reading is unlikely for at least two reasons. First, the subject of the discourse is on the coming of the Spirit and his salvific role of companionship with the disciples. As such, it seems quite unnatural, as far as the conceptual flow of the narrative is concerned, for a sudden twist of subject matter from the coming of the Spirit to the coming to Jesus' physical appearance(s) without a clear signal in the text. Second, the statement, 'the world will not see me no more, but you will see me' suggests that Jesus' appearance will not be physically manifested conspicuously to the gaze of the world, but disguisedly in the person of the Spirit, experienced exclusively by believers (cf. v. 17). In a little while the disciples will not see Jesus anymore because he goes to the Father, but in a little while they will see him in another mode, thus through the abiding and indwelling presence of the Spirit (cf. Calvin, 1961:123; Vawter, 1968:453; Swete, 1909:152). The world will not see him, as they cannot comprehend and accommodate this mode of his presence (v. 17). For Brown (1966b:640), it is the interval between ascension and the *parousia*. The issue with this perspective is that the fact that the world will not see Jesus in this coming,

suggests that it cannot refer to the *parousia*. This is because John, together with the New Testament writers, understand the *parousia* to include the revelation of Jesus to all, not to a selected community (1 Jn. 2.28; 3.2-3; Col. 3.4; 1 Thess. 4.16-18; 2 Thess. 1.6-7; Titus 2.12-14; Heb. 9.28; 1 Pet. 1.13; 4.13; 5.4; Rev. 1.7-8).

Verse 19b presents a salvific propositional logic where the validity of the second statement is contingent on the first. That is, the disciples will live because Jesus lives. The life that the disciples will receive because of Jesus' life is not physical existence, but eternal (see also Brown, 1966b:646; Carson, 1991:502; Lindars, 1972:481; Morris, 1971:652; Dodd, 1953:405; Barrett, 1962:861; Sanders, 1968:331), for why should they be promised physical existence when they are already living? This eternal life is made possible in the lives of the disciples because Jesus' own life will be mediated to them through the coming of the Spirit to be in and with them (cf. 14.16-19). Accordingly, the abiding and indwelling function of the Spirit-Paraclete to the disciples is revealed to be soteriologically significant. This notion is further given emphasis in verse 20. In this text, the co-inherence between Jesus and the Father, as well as between Jesus and the disciples, will be fulfilled 'in that day' by means of the abiding and indwelling presence of the Spirit (14.16-19; cf. 1 Jn. 3.24; 4.13). 'In that day' recalls eschatological formulae evident elsewhere (Matt. 7.22-23; Mark 13.19-32; Jn. 6.40; 11.24; 12.48; Acts 2.19-20; Rom. 2.5, 16; 1 Cor. 1.8; Phil. 1.6; 2 Tim. 1.12; 4.8; Isa. 2.12-17; 5.29-30; 11.11; 13.4-11; 24.21-22; 27.1, 12-13; 26.1; Jer. 30.7-8; 46.10; Ezek. 30.3-4; Joel 2.1-10; 3.12-14; Amos 5.18-20; 9.11; Mic. 4.6-7; Zeph. 3.11-20; Rev. 6.15-17) (cf. Lindars, 1972:481; Carson, 1991:502; Köstenberger, 2004:439; Lightfoot, 1956:276; Keener, 2003b:974), and by such reference the Fourth Gospel actualises the second coming of Christ in the coming of the Spirit. The Spirit is the eschatological unifying agent between Jesus and the disciples for a soteriological purpose (see also; Bennema, 2002:225; Lightfoot, 1956:276; Westcott, 1894:2006; Swete, 1909:152).

The disciple who loves Jesus and obeys his commandments experiences two salvific elements. First, Jesus will manifest/reveal himself to him via the agency of the Spirit (v.21; cf. vv. 15-16) (cf. Keener, 2003b:975). This revelation should

be best understood as the continuous revelation of the Father, as Jesus is the embodiment of such revelation. If revelation of the Father and Son in the Fourth Gospel is salvific (17.3), then accordingly, by the role of the Spirit as the revealer of Jesus, the embodiment of divine salvific truth, the Paraclete is here conceived as a conveying envoy of salvation. Second, the Father and Son will come and make their abode with him via the presence of the Spirit (cf. Ridderbos, 1997:508; Köstenberger, 2004:440, 441; Carson, 1991:504). In the Old Testament to reside in God's dwelling or abode is a salvific construct, at least within the purview of Jewish eschatology (Exod. 15.13, 17; 25.8; 29.45-46; Lev. 26.11-12; Deut. 33.26-29; Ps. 90.1; 91.1-16; Isa. 56.7; Ezek. 37.26-28; Zech. 2.10-13; cf. *Jub.* 1.17; *Test. Zeb.* 8.2; *Test. Dan.* 5.1; *Test. Josh.* 10.2-3; *Test. Ben.* 6.4). If the Spirit-Paraclete is the medium by which the believer enters into this divine communal fellowship, then the Spirit-Paraclete is conceived as a soteriological *mishkan* (dwelling place) for the believer. Moreover, and equally revealing is the observation that in the Old Testament and Second Temple texts the concept of the divine Spirit in an individual/community (Gen. 2.7; Ezek. 36.26-27; Ps. 51.12; Isa. 63.11-14; *Jub.* 1.23) has a soteriological force. Understood against this backdrop, it is not farfetched to posit that the Paraclete as the indwelling presence of the Father and the Son in the believer has a salvific purpose (cf. Rom. 8.9, 11; Gal. 4.6). This salvific cohabitation is a mystical pneumatization of 1.1 and 14, and a means by which believers participate in the life of the God head. Lindars (1972:482-483) claims that the coming of the Father and the Son to make their home with the believer is akin to the Pauline concept of being 'in Christ' and entails the interior apprehension of Jesus and the Father via 'imagination' and 'will'. Lindars' identification of the cohabitation of the Father and the Son with the Pauline 'in Christ' mysticism is a reasonable observation; however, it is very difficult and unnatural to maintain that the revelation of Jesus and the Father is mediated to the believer through imagination and will in the Fourth Gospel. Such a claim is a usurpation of Johannine pneumatic revelatory soteriology which attributes the mediation of the truth/revelation of Jesus and the Father to the agency of the Spirit (15.26; 16.13-15; cf. 1 Jn. 3.24; 4.2, 12-16) (see also Bennema, 2002:129; Bultmann, 1971:572-576; Ridderbos, 1997:536; Köstenberger, 2004:473; Carson, 1991:541-542). Although Ashton (1991:466)

denies the mission of the Paraclete in this context, he fails to provide an alternative construction for his readers. Hoskyns, (1947:460) conjectures that this cohabitation of Father and Son with the believer is a fulfilment of the Old Testament prediction, 'Let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them (Exod. 25.8). Not only is the link between John 14.23 and Exodus 25.8 tenuous, but more importantly, Hoskyns fails to show how this dwelling is actualised in the life of the believer.

The understanding of the Spirit as another Paraclete is a soteriological one. John, the Old Testament, and Second Temple Judaism understand truth as a soteriological concept. Accordingly, the title 'Spirit of truth' is a salvific embodied label. The Paraclete is the means by which Jesus and the Father abide with, and indwells the believer.

#### 4.4.3 The teaching and anamnestic task of the Paraclete (John 14.26-27)

The Paraclete is here identified with the Holy Spirit. This identification is probably to make clear the teaching and anamnestic task of the Paraclete in terms of the teaching/revelatory quality of the Holy Spirit understood as the 'Spirit of prophecy' in the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism. In the Old Testament (Gen. 41.38-39; Exod. 31.1-5; 35.30-35; Num. 11.17-29) and Second Temple texts (*Wis. Sol.* 7.22-24; 9.17; *Sir.* 39.6, 8; 1 QH 9.32; 1 QH 12.11-13; 1 QH 13.18-19; 1 QH 14.12-13; *4 Ezra* 14.22; Philo *De Vita Moses, II.* 365; *Josephus Ant.* 10.239), the Spirit of prophecy affords revelatory wisdom to individuals and as a result they are able to comprehend divine truth or are able to accomplish certain unnatural tasks. The teaching task of the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit should be understood as affording revelatory wisdom to the disciples so they will be able to understand all things. 'All things' here is synonymous with 'all truth' in 16.13. The disciples will comprehend 'all truth'; simply because they possess divine revelatory wisdom by the inspiration of the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 2.14; Eph. 1.17; Col. 1.9-11). Moreover, the anamnestic function of the Paraclete, the Spirit of prophecy, should not be seen as providing a mere recollection of what Jesus has said and done in the past, but the revelatory interpretation of that past as relevant to the present and future of the church (cf. Gen. 41.25-39). Ridderbos (1997:511) conjectures a similar thought. For him, the anamnesis does not just relate to the disciples' ability to recollect, but to the understanding

of the hidden treasures in Jesus (see also: Burge, 1987:213; Bennema, 2002:228-229). As teacher and interpreter of both the hidden and revealed divine salvific 'truth', the Paraclete is revealed in 14.26 as the sustaining organ of the on-going salvation of the believing community.

The teaching and anamnestic function of the Paraclete is immediately followed by a farewell peace benediction in verse 27. Understood contextually, this benediction of peace serves as a product of these two functions of the Paraclete (cf. Morris, 1971:657; Carson, 1991:506; Brown, 1988:78). It is less likely, *contra* Westcott (1894:209; cf. Calvin, 1961:88-89), that the peace here is a mere Semitic salutation as evident elsewhere (Philemon 1.3; Titus 1.4; 1 Tim. 1.2; 2 Tim. 1.2; 1 Pet. 1.2; 2 Jn. 1.3; 3 Jn. 1.14). The juxtaposition or contrast made between the peace Jesus is giving via the Paraclete and that which the world gives is revealing. The peace the world gives is mostly social, economic and political stability. That which Jesus gives is from above and has its origin in Jesus himself, consisting in itself mostly associated with God's salvific truth (cf. Luke 1.79; Acts 10.36; Rom. 10.15; Eph. 2.17; 6.15; Phil. 4.7) (cf. Carson, 1991:506). The association of the Paraclete with this unique peace stresses, albeit in a covert manner, the salvific significance of the teaching and anamnestic function of the Paraclete.

#### 4.4.4 The Paraclete as one who testifies (John 15.26-27)

In this passage, the Paraclete as the Spirit of truth performs two basic functions: he will testify of Jesus to the disciples; and he will bear witness through the disciples. On the first aspect, the witnessing task of the Paraclete concerning Jesus should be understood within the matrix of the vine discourse (15.1-17) that precedes it. The exhortation in the discourse is reminiscent of farewell exhortational discourses in Second Temple Judaism (1 *Enoch* 94.1-5; *Jubilees* 20; 21; 36; *Test. Zeb.* 8), where the father/leader exhorts his sons/followers on a specific way of life consonant with their relationship after his departure. Unlike farewell discourses of Second Temple Judaism, the promise of the Spirit of truth in 15.26-27 provides an enabling/empowering presence for the fulfilment of the expectations in 15.1-25. In his testimony about Jesus, the Spirit of truth mediates a deeper understanding of the truth about Jesus and his teachings to

his disciples, which in turn facilitates obedience of Jesus' words (commands). The results of this understanding and obedience are five-fold.

(1) There is steadfastness in the vine and its consequent pruning and fruit bearing effect (vv. 1-5). A deeper understanding of the 'truth' results in a deeper anchorage in the 'truth', and a deeper anchorage in the truth is salvific in itself (8.31-32; 14.6).

(2) Communicational relationship with the Father (v. 7). This relationship implies cleansing/forgiveness of sins, as sin is the element which ruins it (cf. Ps. 34.15-18; Isa. 50.1-4; 59.1-2). Cleansing/forgiveness of sins is a salvific divine disposition in the Fourth Gospel (1.29; 3.5; 8.34-36; 15.3; cf. Acts 3.9; Eph. 1.7; Col. 1.13-14; 2 Cor. 5.21; 1Jn. 1.9; symbolically 13.5).

(3) Discipleship (v. 8). To be a disciple of Jesus entails coming to him and believing in him (1.35-51; 2.11; 4.1; 6.65-70), remaining in him and his word (6.56-60; 8.31; 13.34-35); and testifying about him (15.27; 21.24). Believing in Jesus and remaining in him and his words is a salvific act, as that leads to eternal life in the Fourth Gospel (3.15-16, 18, 36; 5.24; 6.35, 40, 47; 7.38; 8.24; 12.44-50; 14.1-4; 17.20-21; 20.31).

(4) Abiding in the love of the Father (vv. 9-13). The love of the Father is expressed principally in the giving of the son (3.15-16). To abide in the love of the Father is therefore to believe in and remain in the object of this love, Jesus. As the preceding point has shown, to believe in this object of divine love is salvific.

(5) Divine friendship (v. 14). To be a friend of the Father and the Son is identified with divine election (15.15-16; 3.28-29; 11.11; cf. 2 Chr. 20.7; Isa. 41.8; Jas. 2.23) (cf. Köstenberger, 2004:459). In the Fourth Gospel and also in the Old Testament, to be chosen by God is a salvific status (6.70; 15.19; cf. Deut. 7.6; 10.15; 14.2; Ps. 33.12; 132.13; 135.4; Isa. 41.8-9; 48.10; Ezek. 20.5; Zech. 3.2). This suggests that friendship with Father and Son is a salvific relationship (see also Bennema, 2002:224-225).

The results of the testifying role of the Spirit of truth about Jesus to the disciples within the framework of the vine discourse (steadfastness in the vine and its consequent pruning and fruit-bearing effect; communicational relationship with

the Father; discipleship; abiding in the Father's love; and divine friendship) have been shown to have salvific relevance. It is through the testifying work of the Spirit of truth that the disciples gain a deeper understanding of the truth, so they can remain in the truth for a salvific benefit.

On the second aspect, the Spirit of truth bears witness about Jesus through the disciples to the world. He is both the power behind and the quickening agent within the proclamation of the apostles (cf. Calvin, 1961:110; Sanders, 1968:346; Morris, 1971:684; Hamilton, 2006:86. As the Spirit of truth in the testimony of the disciples, the Paraclete mediates Jesus, the embodiment of God's grace to the world; he convinces them that the disciples' witness about Jesus is the truth, as opposed to falsehood; he leads them into a deeper understanding of this divine revelatory wisdom in Jesus; he reveals Jesus as the true path to eternal life/salvation to them; he quickens in them a belief response to the witness of the apostles with a purifying/salvific effect to believers. The testimony of the Spirit of truth both to the disciples and through them is soteriologically significant.

#### 4.4.5 The Paraclete as one who convinces the world (John 16.8-11)

The role of the Paraclete when he finally comes is shown in this passage to have three features: he will convince ἐλέγξει the world of sin, because they do not believe in Jesus; of righteousness because Jesus goes to the Father; and of judgement because the prince of this world is judged. There are divergent opinions among scholars on the meaning of the term ἐλέγξει. Calvin (1961:116) proposes 'convict' (cf. Schnackenburg, 1977:255; Keener, 2003b:1034; Morris, 1971:697; Carson, 1991:534; Barret, 1962:862; Hamilton, 2006:86; Köstenberger, 2004:471; Dodd, 1953:414). For Ridderbos (1997:531) the context suggests 'to prove wrong' (cf. Brown, 1966b:711; Witherington, 1995:264). Bultmann (1971:561) claims 'to uncover/expose' (cf. Beasley-Murray, 1991:76; Turner, 1996:86). The problem with these interpretations is that 'convict', 'to prove wrong', and 'to expose/uncover' does not dovetail well with the genitive 'of righteousness'. The most appropriate meaning of the term which fits all three genitive cases: of sin; of righteousness, and of judgement, is probably 'to convince' (cf. Barret, 1962:862; Bennema, 2002:238). When the

Spirit comes he will convince the world of sin. That is, the Paraclete as both the propelling power behind and the animating power within the witness of the disciples will convince the world of its sin and the need to accept the truth about Jesus for the forgiveness of sins and eternal life (cf. Acts 2.36-38; 1 Cor. 14.24-25) (see also Calvin, 1961:117; Morris, 1971:698). This sin is primarily understood as unbelief in Jesus in the Fourth Gospel (3.18; 12.48; 15.21-25; cf. Bultmann, 1971:563; Ridderbos, 1997:531; Morris, 1971:698; Sanders, 1968:351; Carson, 1991:537). He will convince the world of righteousness, that is, the righteousness that will be made available in the Spirit after Jesus' ascension to the Father to those who accept the truth about Jesus (7.39; cf. 3.5-7). He will convince the world of judgement. This feature has two elements. (1) The Paraclete will convince the world about the judgement that awaits those who reject the truth about Jesus (1.11; 3.18-21, 36; 5.27-29; 12.48). The reality of this judgement is confirmed by the fact that the prince of this world has been judged in his rejection of and opposition to the truth (cf. 12.31; 14.30; 1 John 3.8; Heb. 2.14) (cf. Sanders, 1968:352). (2) The Paraclete will convince the Jews (the world) that the accusations levelled against Jesus (5.1-16; 7.7; 6.41-59; 8.13-59; 9.7, 14; 10.33, 36; 15.23) and the judgement passed against him (11.45-57; 18.28-40; 19.1-16) are false (cf. Bennema 2002:239; Carson, 535).

As the empowering presence behind the witness of the apostles, and the convincing power within, which draws the world to Jesus, the Paraclete is here depicted as both a prophetic and a salvific agent.

#### 4.4.6 The Paraclete as guide into all truth and revealer of things to come (John 16.12-16)

When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide the disciples into all truth. The 'all truth' in this passage should be understood within the context of all the facets of 'truth' in the Fourth Gospel earlier examined: truth as God's gracious disposition towards mankind (1.14, 17); truth as opposed to falsehood (5.33; 8.44, 45); truth as revelatory wisdom and its ethical purifying and liberating/salvific efficacy revealed in Jesus (8.31-32, 40; 17.17, 19; 18.37); truth as salvific path (14.6); truth as belief in the only-begotten Son of God (3.18-21); and truth as the right mode of worship (4.23-24). The Spirit is the Spirit of truth because he will guide the disciples into all these facets of truth. This revelatory truth consists in the

deepening and continuation of what Jesus had made known, as well as an augmentation of that truth received from the exalted Christ (vv. 12-14) (cf. Burge, 1987:215; Lightfoot, 1956:287). If Jesus' revelatory teachings are salvific then *mutatis mutandis* the continuation, deepening and augmentation of such revelation by the Spirit of truth is also salvifically oriented. In that sense, the Spirit-Paraclete as a guide into 'all truth' is construed as a salvific envoy/ambassador of the exalted Christ.

The phrase 'things to come' which the Spirit will disclose to the disciples has equally posed exegetical difficulty to scholars. For Calvin (1961:120), 'things to come' points to the post-resurrection life of the church (the spiritual kingdom) (cf. Morris, 1971:701; Köstenberger, 1997:536; Bultmann, 1971:575; Westcott, 1894:231). The observation that 'things to come' pertains to the spiritual post-resurrection life of the church makes sense of the phrase, especially within the context of 'he will guide you into all truth'. In the light of the 'all truth', 'things to come' include, but may not be limited to, a deeper illumination and understanding of the revelation of the Father in Jesus; the ministry and teachings of Jesus; the death, resurrection and exaltation, as well as their significance to the on-going life of the church and her mission in and to the world (cf. Carson 1991:540; Hoskyns, 1947:487; Packer, 2005:56; Levison, 2009:402). Barrett (1962:862) stresses predictive prophecy (eschatological future) (see also Beasley-Murray, 1991:78-79). Such a reading is improbable, as there is no hint or allusion in the text that suggests that futuristic eschatological discourse is in view. For Köstenberger (2004:473-474), the emphasis is not so much on predictive prophecy or the passion event, but more probably a deeper understanding of revelation of God and the application of such revelation to the community. Brown (1966b:716) claims that this consists in the interpretation of the contemporary significance of Jesus' revelatory works and teachings. Since the revelation of God in Jesus and his teachings are components of the 'all truth' in the text, the views of Köstenberger and Barrett are not far from the mark.

Stefan (2005:286) views 'things to come' as relating to predictive prophecy (ecclesiastical future) (cf. Hill, 1989:186; Johnston, 1970:139). This position is equally valid on the basis of the following observations. (1) In the Old

Testament (Num. 11.24-30; 23.7-10; Ezek. 2.1-10) the LXX (Exod. 31.1-4; 1 Sam. 10.10; 19.20-21; Prov. 1.23; Isa. 11.2; 61.1; Ezek. 3.24-27; Joel 2.28) and Second Temple Judaism (4 *Ezra* 14.22; 1 *Enoch* 71.11; Sir. 48.24; *Jub.* 25.14; 31.12; 40.5; Wis. Sol. 1.4-7; 1.17; 1 QH 14.12-13), the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of prophecy was the source of prophetic utterances, revelatory wisdom, and inspired interpretation of scripture (cf. Turner, 1992:342; Menzies, 1991:50-102). This suggests that the identification of the Paraclete with the Holy Spirit (14.26) makes predictive prophecy a natural component of the 'things to come' which the Spirit of truth will disclose to the disciples. (2) The phrase, 'whatever he hears he will speak' is reminiscent of the nature of ancient Israelite and early Christian prophecy, which entails the receipt/hearing of divine revelation and the proclamation of such revelation (Ezek. 3.17; Acts 21.11) (cf. Grudem, 1988:135-140; Gentry, 2011:14; Hill, 1989:73, 77; Yocum, 1976:49). Understood in this vein, it is not too much a claim to posit that 'things to come', as a possible component of whatever the Spirit hears and speaks has the undertone of predictive prophecy. (3) The phrase, 'he will take what is mine and declare to you' recalls one of the characteristics of ancient Israelite prophecy: the claim to divine authority, mostly expressed in the formula, 'thus says the Lord' or 'the word of the Lord came to me' (Jer. 1.11-12; Ezek. 37.15; Amos 1.3, 6, 9, 11, 13; Zach. 6.9) (cf. Aune, 1983:89; Gentry, 1989:4; Grudem, 2011:18). By this statement, Jesus emphasises that what the Spirit discloses possesses divine authority, as it originates from the Father through the Son. If 'things to come' is part of what the Spirit receives and discloses, then there can be little doubt that 'things to come' has the relevance of predictive prophecy.

Putting the threads together, the phrase, 'things to come' should be understood as having a dual feature: (1) the significance of Jesus' revelatory ministry and his glorification (death, resurrection and exaltation) to the on-going life of the church, as well as her mission in the world; and (2) predictive prophecy, that is, the continuous revelation of the love of the Father through the Son to the church via the instrumentality of the Spirit (see also, Turner, 1996:84; Sanders, 1968:355; Keener, 2003b:1041; Lindars, 1972:505).

The 'little while' in verses 16 and 19 is a reiteration of the 'little while' in 14.19. It could possibly be an *inclusio* literary technique to emphasise the fact that,

*contra* Keener (2003a:1042) and others (Lindars, 1972:506; Carson, 1991:543; Morris, 1971:702; Ridderbos, 1997:538; Ashton, 1991:464), the Spirit will represent Jesus to the disciples when he goes to the Father (cf. Westcott, 1894:232; Calvin, 1961:123).

By his role as the revealing, guiding and abiding instrument of God's salvific truth embodied in the life, death and exaltation of Jesus to the church, the Spirit as the Spirit of truth, is here accorded an indispensable soteriological status in God's salvation history in the Fourth Gospel.

#### 4.4.7 Summary

The soteriological significance of the Spirit-Paraclete as examined in this part of the study consists of the following features. The term, 'another Paraclete' is *prima facie* evidence of the salvific mission of the Paraclete. The Paraclete as the Spirit of truth leads people into salvific truth (cf. 16.12-16). He sustains the salvation of the believer by providing an indwelling and abiding presence of the exalted Christ to the believer (14.15-21); he mediates salvific revelatory wisdom to the believer/disciple to understand the truth (14.26-27), he is the mediator of deeper understanding of the truth, he is both the power behind, and the faith-quickening agent in, the testimony of the truth (15.26-27; 16.8-11).

In the light of this conclusion, the claim of Turner, Bennema and others about the soteriological significance of the Spirit-Paraclete is valid. The denial of the salvific function of the Spirit-Paraclete by Windisch, Menzies and Brown is a biased consideration of the evidence of the farewell discourse. The Spirit-Paraclete, in view of the findings of this section, has both missiological and salvific relevance.

#### **4.5 Conclusion**

The investigation into the soteriological significance of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel has shown that, according to this Gospel, the Holy Spirit is indispensable to salvation. This observation is based on the following findings.

The Spirit was the baptising instrument of Jesus' ministry (1.33), affording cleansing and new-creation life-transforming benefit to the recipients (3.5; 7.38; 20.22). The Spirit is the agent and the *sine qua non* of the new birth into God's

kingdom (3.5; cf. 20.22). To believe in Jesus is to have a life-giving encounter with the Spirit, the ultimate gift of the Father. To have a disbelief in this gift is to be alienated from the life-giving Spirit, and the consequence is eternal condemnation (3.16-21). Again, to believe in Jesus is to possess the gift of 'living water', the Spirit, which leads to eternal life/salvation (4.14; 7.38; cf. 19.34). The Spirit is the power behind and within the worship of the believing community (4.24). Belief in the 'bread from heaven' is to encounter the life-giving, life-quickening and life-sustaining efficacy of the Spirit (6.27-59). The Spirit is the bond of continuous fellowship between Jesus and the believer, expressed in the vine metaphor (15.1-7). Here, the Spirit is the means through which the branches (believers) remain in the vine (salvation). He is both the constitutive and providential agent of the salvific bond between the branches and vine.

The Spirit-Paraclete provides a continuous indwelling and abiding presence of the exalted Christ and the Father to the believing community. He is teacher, guide, reminder and revealer of divine salvific truth, as well as the enabling power behind and the faith-quickening instrument within the testimony of this truth.

The 'new-creation' and 'revelatory knowledge' interpretation proposed by this study regarding the 'Dove symbol' is not only compelling, but reinforces the tandem work of the Spirit and revelation within the soteriology of the Fourth Gospel. Also, the meaning given to the phrase, baptism with 'Spirit and fire' in the Fourth Gospel by this study is convincing. This is because it draws the background of the phrase from Old Testament and Second Temple Jewish understanding, as opposed to gnostic and other alien background.

The interpretation by Köstenberger and others about the meaning of the expression 'born of water and Spirit' is a significant contribution to the understanding of the expression, not least because it draws on Old Testament and Second Temple understanding. The meaning of the term, 'water' in the expression offered by this study is an impressive appendage to the position of Köstenberger and others. It also helps bring to light, the dual effect of this Spiritual rebirth: purification and transformation.

The pneumatic import of the gift of the Father, bread of life discourse, and the Vine discourse has been convincingly demonstrated. It has also been proposed that the Paschal insufflation was dramatic and stood for the new creation and the mission of the disciples. The position of Turner and Bennema that 20.22 and the Pentecost gift of the Spirit are theologically one, but chronologically distinct, is compelling and helps maintain complementarity between the soteriological outlook of the Fourth Gospel and that of Luke.

The meaning of the term Paraclete proposed by this study has been shown to be more compelling as compared to the alternatives proposed by scholars like Bultmann and G. Brown, who view the backdrop of the term aside its Jewish and Old Testament context.

In sum, the presence of the triune God, whether understood in the Fourth Gospel as Holy Spirit, Spirit of truth, or Spirit-Paraclete, is not only a soteriological necessity, but more revealingly, the *sine qua non* of salvation. In the next chapter, this understanding will be compared with the rest of the New Testament, specifically the writings of Paul and Luke (Luke-Acts), to see how they compare with each other.

## **CHAPTER 5:**

### **COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SOTERIOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE REST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO LUKE-ACTS AND THE PAULINE CORPUS.**

#### ***5.1 Introduction***

This chapter is aimed at delving into the question: How does the teaching in the Fourth Gospel about the Holy Spirit's soteriological role compare to and contrast with the rest of the teachings in the New Testament, with specific reference to Paul and Luke? It attempts this question from five angles: (1) A brief thematic investigation into how the Spirit is soteriologically significant in Paul. This will be concerned strictly with the exegesis of the pneumatic soteriological texts in Paul. (2) A brief thematic investigation into how the Spirit is soteriologically significant in Luke. Again, this will be concerned with the exegesis of the pneumatic soteriological texts in Luke-Acts. (3) A comparative analysis of the soteriological role of the Spirit in John and Paul. (4) A comparative analysis of the soteriological role of the Spirit in John and Luke. (5) An attempt to formulate a New Testament pneumatic soteriology.

#### ***5.2 The Pneumatic Soteriology of Paul***

There is almost a consensus among scholars as to the soteriological significance of the Spirit in Paul, and much research has been conducted in that respect. What concerns this section is a brief examination of the salvific import of the Spirit in the thoughts of Paul. This will provide a snapshot that will serve as a solid base to compare with that of John.

##### **5.2.1 Born of Water and Spirit**

In Titus 3.3-6, Paul emphasised that the salvation of the believing community was wrought through the washing and regenerative work of the Spirit (cf. Dunn, 2010: 166, 168; Fee, 1994:780; Knight, 1989:1117; Wall, 2012:206). Schnackenburg (1964:11) claims that the washing of regeneration in this context is an allusion to baptism (cf. Bultmann, 1952:138; Ridderbos, 1975:398; Beasley-Murray, 1993:63; Denzer, 1968:361; Montague, 1970:157,

231; Wild, 1990:895; Rowland, 1985:223; Mollat, 1964:69-70). Guthrie (1997:1306) embraces both positions when he notes that the washing and regeneration could be either an allusion to baptism or a metaphorical description of the cleansing work of the Spirit. It is significant to note that, like John, Paul understands the cleansing/purifying, life-giving and life-transforming work of the Spirit as indispensable to eternal life/salvation. In John, 'born of water and Spirit' points to the cleansing and life-renewing work of the Spirit in the process of rebirth (John 3.3-5: cf. Isa. 32.15-17; 44:3-5; 55.1-5; Ezek. 36.25-27; 37.1-14; 39.29; 47:9; Jer. 17:13; Zech. 14:8; Joel 2.28; cf. 1QS 4:20-22; *Jub.* 1.23; *T.Jud.* 24.3). In Titus 3.3-6 Paul presents a similar concept. Rebirth is wrought by 'water and Spirit: the cleansing/purifying and new-creation work of the Spirit. Thus both authors associate cleansing and new creation work with the Spirit at rebirth. To be saved, according to Paul, is to be transformed from the realm of the flesh (v. 3) to the realm of the Spirit (vv. 5-6) through the cleansing and renewing work of the Holy Spirit. This spiritual dynamism is achieved through belief in the truth about Jesus (2 Thess. 2.13-14). Here also, Paul, like John, emphasises the soteriological correspondence between belief in the truth (the gospel about Jesus) and the salvation/eternal life actualised by the Spirit. 1 Corinthians 6.11 is a parallel text to Titus 3.3-6 on this issue. There also, the new-creation or rebirth is achieved through a transformation from the flesh (vv. 9-10) to the realm of Christ (v. 11) by the washing and justifying work of the Spirit. Although ἐδικαιώθητε (justify) is used in this context vis-à-vis ἀνακαινώσεως (renew) in Titus, the concept is the same. It is by the sanctifying and renewing work of the Spirit that the one who believes is justified or rendered righteous before God (cf. Rom. 15.16) (cf. Dunn, 2010:167). The justifying work of the Spirit here becomes synonymous with the renewing work of the Spirit.

### 5.2.2 Baptism in/by the Spirit

In 1 Corinthians 12.13 entrance and incorporation into the body is by the work of the Spirit. Although the preposition ἐν in the expression, 'for we were all baptised *in* one Spirit', can mean in, on, at, with, by, among, the context suggests either 'by' or 'in'. If 'in' is preferred, as in Dunn (2010:127) and others

(Fee, 1994:179, 181; Ridderbos, 1975:398; Pett, 1998:68; Grosheide, 1953:293) the Spirit becomes the medium of the baptism into the one body: 'for we were all baptised *in* one Spirit into one body' (cf. Matt. 3.11; Mark 1.8; Luke 3.16; John 1.33; Acts 1.5; 11.16). Such a reading implies that the baptism *in* the Spirit is, according to Paul, a baptism into the body, which is 'in-Christ' (cf. Rom. 12.5; Eph. 4.15-16; Phil. 1.1; 4.21; 1 Thess. 2.14) (cf. Ridderbos, 1975:221; Fee, 1994:182). This identification is given amplification by the concluding phrase, 'and have been made to drink of one Spirit'. To drink of one Spirit is equivalent to baptism in the Spirit and into the body. This conceptual interchange squares with Paul's 'in Christ'/ 'in the Spirit' equivalent elsewhere (Rom. 8.1-11) (for Paul's 'in Christ' - 'in the Spirit' close identification see also Ridderbos, 1975:220; E. Sanders, 1991:73, 74, 75; Du Toit, 2000:293; Dunn, 1998:408; 414; Zielsler, 1983:48, 63; Gunkel, 2008:113; Lampe, 1977:79, 80; Berkhof, 1964:25). Ervin (1984:101) disagrees with this harmonisation and argues that 'we were baptised into one body' is initiatory, while 'we were made to drink of one Spirit' is a metaphor for fullness of the Spirit for mission. Thus, the former is conversion-initiation, while the latter is empowerment for mission. Such theological distinction is not clear in the passage. In the Old Testament, the pouring out of the Spirit like water/drink is associated with two functions: recreation (Isa. 32.15; 44.3; Ezek. 39.29; Zech. 12.10/13.1) and prophetic empowerment (Joel 2.28). If such Old Testament understanding lies behind Paul's Spirit-drink metaphor, then the phrase 'and we were all given one Spirit to drink' should be seen as explicatory of 'the baptism in the Spirit into the body. That is, it is a mystical metaphor showing the re-creative and empowering effect of the baptism of incorporation into the body by the Spirit in the one conversion experience. Giblet (1964:179, 181) views the baptism in this context as water baptism, claiming that it is through the baptism of water that the drinking/infilling of the Spirit is actualised. This is a very slippery position, as 'the Spirit' in the passage can either possess instrumental or locative force depending on the meaning ascribed to the *év* preposition.

It is imperative to note that Paul views his 'in Christ' metaphor as the *domesticus* (domicile) of his soteriology (Rom. 3.24; 6.11, 23; 8.1-2; 1 Cor. 1.2, 30; 4.15; 15.22; 2 Cor. 3.14; 5.19; Gal. 2.4; 3.14, 26-29; 5.6; 6.15; Phil. 2.1; 3.9; 1 Thess. 4.16; 5.18). For him, 'in Christ' is a sphere where the Spirit-

baptised person: (1) overcomes sin, becomes alive to God, and receives eternal life (Rom. 6.11, 23; 1 Cor. 15.22); (2) escapes eternal condemnation and is guided by the Spirit of life (Rom. 8.1-2); (3) experiences the sanctifying redemptive work of God, leading to the imputation of the righteousness of God (1 Cor. 1.2, 30; Phil. 3.9; cf. 2 Cor. 5.21; Rom. 3.22; 5.17; Eph. 1.7); (4) receives divine son-ship (1 Cor. 4.15; cf. Rom. 8.15; Gal. 4.6); (5) is purged of the veil of cognitive blindness and transformed into the image of Christ (2 Cor. 3.14-18; cf. Col. 3.10); (6) receives divine forgiveness and enjoys reconciliatory peace with God (2 Cor. 5.19); (7) is granted liberty from the estrangement of the law of sin and death (Gal. 2.4); (8) puts on Christ's image and becomes legitimate seed of Abraham and heir according to the promise (Gal. 3.14, 26-28); (9) experiences rebirth/new creation (Gal. 5.6; 6.15); (10) receives all spiritual blessings from God (Eph. 1.3); (11) enjoys a foretaste of the future life and reign with the Son (Eph. 2.6); (12) enjoys divine consolation, comfort of love, fellowship and mercy (Phil. 2.1); (13) is granted eschatological hope of future resurrection (1 Thess. 4.16); and (14) locates the divine will (1Thess. 5.18). (For similar perspectives on Paul's 'in Christ' soteriological metaphor, see also Diessmann, 1926:201-221; Morris, 1986:51-55; Ridderbos, 1975:60-61; Du Toit, 2000:294; Seifrid, 1993:436; Witherington, 1993:99; Ziesler, 1983:49-57; Dunn, 1998:396-401; Cranfield, 1985:174; Bultmann, 1955:177; Gunkel, 1998:112). This implies that the baptism in the Spirit, which is also a baptism into the body, is a baptism into a salvific sphere.

On the other hand, if 'by' is preferred, as in Schnackenburg (1964:28-29) the Spirit becomes the instrument, while water baptism becomes the medium (cf. Ervin, 1984:99; Montague, 1970:157). Schnackenburg (pp. 27, 28, 29) argues further that although water baptism is in view, the Spirit is emphasised as both the principle of unity and the life principle of the body (cf. Morris, 1986:81). For Atkinson (2011:98), God is the baptising agent and the Spirit is the immersing instrument. Thus, the Corinthians were baptised in one Spirit by God.

It is imperative to note here that whichever preposition is preferred, the Spirit is soteriologically significant in this incorporation experience. For Paul, Spirit baptism initiates believers into the body, a mystical sphere ('in Christ') where all their soteriological needs receive fulfilment. In view of this observation,

Dunn (2010:129) might be right when he concludes on this passage that, 'there is no alternative to the conclusion that the baptism in the Spirit is what made the Corinthians members of the Body of Christ, that is, Christians.'

### 5.2.3 The Spirit as Ethical Guide

The ethical/soteriological significance of the Spirit looms quite large in Paul's writings compared to those of John and Luke. Galatians 5.16-26 is probably the most popular passage on Paul's pneumatological ethics. Here, Paul exhorts the Galatian community that the key to overcoming the lust of the flesh is to follow the guidance of the Spirit (v. 17) (cf. Ridderbos, 1975:282). Parker (2005:97) overstates the evidence when he claims that the ethical guidance of the Spirit should be understood as an impelling of our will towards the practice of righteousness. On the contrary, the guidance should rather be understood in a didactic sense as the teaching/revelatory role of the indwelling Spirit (cf. Jer. 31.33-34 / 2 Cor. 3.3) which leads to life (cf. Rom. 8.5-6). Bultmann (1952:336) succinctly sums up the idea thus: 'Led by the Spirit does not mean to be dragged along willy-nilly but directly presupposes decisions in the alternative: flesh or Spirit' (cf. Otoo, 2014:2001). Living and walking according to the Spirit gives rise to the mortification of the flesh and the production of the fruit of the Spirit (vv. 19-25). Otoo (2014:144) makes a cogent observation when he notes that by the expression 'fruit of the Spirit' Paul is not alluding to natural qualities or qualities emanating from the natural self, but rather qualities produced as a result of the Spirit's presence in the community/individual (cf. Fee, 1994:444). On this note, Morris (1986:76) may be right to posit that it is ethical conduct, not ecstatic behaviour, which is the true index of Spirit reception. Being attuned with the Spirit guarantees ethical victory, while the opposite means being caught at the nexus of fleshly desires (cf. 8.9-11), which constitutes death.

The Spirit is the Spirit of holiness (Rom. 1.4), that is, he enables the fulfilment of the righteous requirement of the law (cf. Rom. 8.3-4, 12-13; 14.16-18). The Spirit is the sanctifying agent and the ethical guide to believers (1 Thess. 4.3-8; cf. Rabens, 2014:203). He bears witness to the truth in Christ, and corrects in love and gentleness (1 Cor. 4.21). The Spirit empowers the conscience of the believer towards the truth (Rom. 9.1). It is in the Spirit that the conscience of the believer is attuned to the truth. The human mind is prone to error and

falsehood without the Spirit (see further Keener, 2016:127, 128,134). Thus for believers, the Spirit is indispensable to their ethical rectitude and propriety. In the light of the role of the Spirit expressed in Romans 9.1, Paul's exhortations to walk in the Spirit, live according to the Spirit, mind the Spirit, etc., receive cognitive significance. Believers who walk in the Spirit or are led by the Spirit have their conscience directed away from falsehood to the truth. For Paul, the Spirit not only re-creates and initiates the believer into the salvific body of Christ, but continues to ethically transform the initiate towards the goal of Christlikeness or divine character. He is the ethical transformer in Paul's soteriological thinking (cf. Montague, 1970:199, 201).

#### 5.2.4 The Spirit as the Convicting and Faith-Quickening Power within the Gospel Proclamation

In Paul, the Spirit is revealed as the power within the gospel proclamation quickening a faith response or having a conversional impact on recipients of the gospel. In 1 Corinthians 2.4-5 Paul challenges the Corinthians that their faith or conviction in Christ was as a result 'of the Spirit and power' (πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως) inherent in the gospel (cf. 2 Cor. 4.13; 1 Cor. 12.1-3). Keener (2016:133) rightly understands the Spirit in this context as indispensable to the communication and understanding of the gospel message (cf. Pinnock & Callen, 2009:201). The 'Spirit and power' here should be understood, not as two distinct realities, but as two words expressing a single reality (hendiadys). In this case, the 'power' expresses the dynamic efficacy of the Spirit's work in the proclamation and reception of the gospel (cf. Fee, 1994:92; Dunn, 1988:420; Murphy-O'Connor, 1990:801; Montague, 1970:135). If the phrase is viewed in this way, Paul attests to the conversional power characteristic of his gospel by virtue of the Spirit's presence (cf. Rom. 15.18-19). This is of course, not to dismiss the miraculous dimension of the Spirit's power in this context (cf. Gal. 3.5; Acts 10.38).

A similar emphasis is evident in 1 Thessalonians 1.5-6. Here, Paul stresses three elements constitutive of the gospel: δυνάμις (power), πνεύμα ἅγιον (Holy Spirit), and πληροφορία (assurance/conviction). The Holy Spirit is here sandwiched between the 'power' and the 'assurance' probably, to stress the

two as significant operations of the Spirit. If this is the case, then Paul wishes to emphasise that in the preaching of the gospel the Holy Spirit is both the conversational δύναμις and the guarantor of eschatological salvific πληροφορία in the life of believers. Rabens (2014:200) makes a similar observation. He notes that the Thessalonians accepted Paul's gospel simply because the accompanying power of the Holy Spirit persuaded them (cf. Marshall, 1997:1279). This Spirit imbued gospel is capable of making disciples amidst afflictions, not least because of the joy it affords (1 Thess. 5.6). It is through the strengthening work of the Spirit within believers that faith is provoked in them as Christ indwells their hearts (Eph. 3.16-17). The convicting/faith provoking power of the Holy Spirit is the basis for Christian discipleship and existential joy (cf. Rom. 15.13). It can be concluded that, for Paul, the Spirit is both the miraculous and convicting power of the gospel message (Levison, 2009:280).

#### 5.2.5 The Life-Giving Spirit

Romans 8 may be seen as the *locus classicus* of Paul's pneumatic soteriology. This is because the ethical and life-giving function of the Spirit is given ample attention, as compared to the rest of the chapters within the *corpus Paulinum*. The first verse opens with a declaration which affirms that to walk after the Spirit is a true mark of being 'in Christ' and being part of the redeemed eschatological community of God who have escaped eternal condemnation. The Spirit is accorded the title 'Spirit of life' whose law sets free from the law of sin and death. The 'law' in the expression νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος (the law of the Spirit) should be best understood, not as Torah, but as the life-transforming teaching/guidance of the Spirit in the hearts of believers 'in Christ' under the new covenant (cf. Jer. 31.31-34), or, in agreement with Thayer (1981:427) as 'the impulse of right action emanating from the Spirit'. This life-giving teaching/guidance of the Spirit in the hearts of believers is understood to have liberating force, that is, it empowers and guides them to fulfil the righteous requirement of Torah (v. 4), and thereby to escape the sin and death as a result of one's inability to fulfil Torah (cf. Gal. 3.10, 12).

The Spirit is the guarantor of life and peace (v. 6). Of life because those who walk after his guidance escape the death and condemnation associated with carnal mindedness. Of peace because those who walk in his guidance are subject to the law of God and thus are pleased with God (vv. 7-8). The Spirit as the Spirit of Christ indwelling the believer is an indicator of divine ownership (v. 9). To possess the Spirit of Christ is to be possessed by Christ (cf. Dunn, 1998:423; Fee, 1994:548), or better still, to be indwelt by the Spirit is to be indwelt by Christ (v. 10). Here, Christology coalesces with pneumatology.

The indwelling of Christ by the Spirit in the believer produces two contrasting soteriological effects. First, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν (the body is dead because of sin). Bultmann (1952:208) argues that the expression should be understood thus: 'If Christ is in you, although the body is dead because of sin, your *spirits* are alive because of righteousness' (cf. Fee, 1994:550, 551). The theological problem associated with this interpretation is two-fold. (1) It circumvents the transformative efficacy of what it means to be indwelt by Christ – for how can the body still remain dead when the second Adam, the life-giving Spirit, indwells it? It should be borne in mind that because of Christ in the believer, the 'now' σῶμα experiences a foretaste of the 'not yet' eschatological transformation, as the body of sin is destroyed (Rom. 6.6; 7.4-5; Gal. 2.20; 5.24). This 'now' transformation of the σῶμα receives completion at the *eschaton* (Rom. 8.23; 1 Cor. 15.50-53). (2) It robs the eschatological transformation of the body of its beginning in time, thereby denying its salvific continuum.

Paul's new creation circumcision metaphor is probably the appropriate grid for the understanding of this hermeneutically challenging phrase. Circumcision in Paul's soteriological language is most appropriately understood as the removal of the contagion of sin by the Spirit through dying and resurrection with Christ, as a means into the new covenant economy (Col. 2.11-13; Gal. 6.5; Rom. 6.5). When this insight is brought to bear on the phrase, its meaning becomes less difficult to grasp. Because of the contagion of sin the body needs to die (or be sanctified) through circumcision. That is, the putting off of the contagion of sin by the Spirit through identification with the death and resurrection of Christ. Romans 8.13 is revealing. There, the Spirit is emphasised as the instrument for

this spiritual circumcision. The 'death of the body because of sin' then becomes a phraseological metaphor alluding to the sanctifying work of the Spirit in the process of re-creation. Keener (2016:106) expresses a similar thought when he claims that although immortality of the body is expected at the resurrection, it is given life in the present by the Spirit by being rendered an instrument for good rather than evil. Bultmann (1952:348) elsewhere alludes to the fact that by its crucifixion with Christ, the σῶμα of sin of the believer is destroyed; the believer dies to the world but lives to God in Christ as a result (Rom. 6.11, 13). This is the most appropriate theological context within which the expression should be best understood. This understanding not only appreciates the transformative efficacy of the inherence of Christ in the believer, but acknowledges the link between the 'now' and the 'not yet' work of the Spirit in the σῶμα.

On the second soteriological effect: τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην (but the spirit is life because of righteousness), three words control the understanding of this expression. That is, πνεῦμα, ζωὴ and δικαιοσύνην. In the New Testament, πνεῦμα can mean air/wind (e.g. Jn. 3.8; Heb. 1.7), the anthropological spirit (e.g. Luke 8.55; 23.46; Acts 7.59), spirit as opposed to matter (e.g. Luke 24.37; Acts 23.8), and the divine Spirit (e.g. Matt. 1.18; 20; Eph. 1.13) (cf. Taylor, 1981:520, 521). Fee (1994:551; cf. Bultmann, 1952:208; Dunn, 1998:432) argues that πνεῦμα in this context is the divine Spirit. Contrary to this position, the anthropological sense is rather the case (cf. Gruenler, 1989:940; Fitzmyer, 1990:853). This is because the whole concept is about the soteriological effect of Christ's presence in the believer via the Spirit (the transformation of the believer's body and spirit). Hence, the most appropriate pair to the σῶμα is the human spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 7.34). The word ζωὴ can mean normal earthly life (e.g. 1 Pet. 3.10; Luke 12.15; Acts 8.33) or life as the exclusive essence of God (e.g. Jn 1.4; 3.36). The meaning which does most justice to the context is 'divine life'. Also, δικαιοσύνη, more generally, is understood as the righteousness which God gives. However, in this context it points to Christ, expressed as the embodiment of God's life-giving grace which makes the sinner acceptable to God upon possession. In

the light of the understanding dredged from these three dictions, the meaning of the expression becomes apparent. Thus, the spirit (πνεῦμα) of the believer is identified with divine life (ζωή) because Christ, the embodiment of God's life-giving grace (δικαιοσύνη) indwells the believer through his Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 15.45). The indwelling presence of Christ in the believer by the Spirit is the life-giving power in the believer and the means by which the spiritual circumcision of the believer is actualised.

In verse 11 the Spirit is presented as the life-quickening agent of both the body in time and the eschatological resurrected body. This now-and-not-yet life-quickening work of the Spirit is predicated on the power that raised Jesus from death. Although it is not clear in the text whether this power is the Spirit or God himself, the association of the Spirit with resurrection/new-creation in Ezekiel 37.8, and probably 1 Corinthians 6.14 and Romans 1.4 (cf. 2 Macc. 14.43-6; *Sibylline Oracles* 4.179-92; *mSot.* 9.15) tends to tip the balance in favour of the Spirit (see also; Gunkel, 2008:83; Wright, 2003:193, 203; 256, 257; Burke, 2014:133; Thiselton, 2013:72; Dunn, 1998:262; Scott, 1993:15; Fitzmyer, 1990:853).

Sowing to the flesh leads to death, while sowing to the Spirit leads to eternal life (Gal. 6.7-9). 'To sow' here is metaphorical. It points to the fulfilment of the promptings of either the flesh (cf. Gal. 5.19-22) or the Spirit (cf. Gal. 5.22-24). Sowing to the Spirit falls within the locution of Paul's *paraenetic* expressions: walk in the Spirit (Gal. 5.16; 25); be led by the Spirit (Gal. 5.18; Rom. 8.14); live in the Spirit (Gal. 5.25); walk according to the Spirit (Rom. 8.4); and live according to the Spirit (Rom. 8.5) (cf. Fee, 1994:465). Bultmann (1952:337) insightfully observes that these expressions are locutions describing the Spirit as the source, power and norm of present conduct. Morris (1986:77) has a similar thought. For him, these expressions point to the fact that the presence of the Spirit is the dominating component of the Christian life (cf. Ridderbos, 1975:222). Sowing to the Spirit is equivalent to living or walking according to the promptings of the Spirit (see also Swete, 1909:211). Paul's use of these expressions probably finds its background in the Old Testament, where to walk in God's ways/commandments is to live by them with a consequent soteriological reward (Lev. 18.4-5; Ezek. 18.9; cf. Deut. 28.9; 1 Kings 3.14;

8.23; 11.38; Ps. 119.1; 128.1-6). To walk away from God's ways or commands is disobedience, and the consequence is death (Lev. 26.27-33; 2 Kgs 21.22-23; Jer. 44.10, 11, 23; Ezek. 5.6-17; 20.16). In a similar vein, walking according to the Spirit leads to life, while the opposite leads to death (Rom. 8.5-6, 13; Gal. 6.8).

In summary, walking/living according to the Spirit, is for Paul, a road map to attaining eternal life and a true sign of one's incorporation into Christ. The guidance of the Spirit is a means by which the believer fulfils the righteous requirement of the Law and escapes eternal condemnation associated with Torah. To be indwelt by the Spirit is to be owned by Christ. This indwelling means victory over sin and attainment of eternal life.

5.2.6 The Spirit as both the power within and behind the worship of the believing community.

Like John, Paul also views the Spirit as the power both within and behind the worship of the believing community. The Spirit is understood as the unifying bond of fellowship among the believing community (2 Cor. 13.13-14; Eph. 4.1-6; Phil. 2.1). In 1 Corinthians 12 and 14 we read that the communal worship of the believing community in Corinth was enlivened by the functional gifts of the Spirit (cf. Phil. 3.3). On this note, Dunn (1998:421) observes that the Spirit was at the heart of the worship of the Corinthian church. The Spirit is the author of praise and thanksgiving worship within the body (Eph. 5.18-21), as well as the empowering presence behind the church's prayer life (Rom. 8.15; 15.30-32; 1 Cor. 14.14-18; Gal. 4.6; 26-27; Eph. 6.18). The Spirit is a preserving power behind the worship of the believing community in that he is the divine presence within the body (1 Cor. 3.16; 6.19), inducing its ethics and promoting its spiritual οἰκοδομή (edification) (1 Cor. 14.1-5, 26). The Spirit is the author of believers' community fellowship (κοινωνία) (2 Cor. 13.13; cf. Hubbard, 2014:173), that bond of Spiritual life-giving fellowship among believers in relation to God and Christ (cf. Montague, 1970:191; Berkhof, 1964:57-65). He is also the source of the church's joy (1 Thess. 1.6). In short, Paul understands the Spirit as the empowering; unifying, enlivening, and preserving presence of

the body in the church's on-going salvific relationship with God in worship (see also Paige, 1993:411-412).

#### 5.2.7 The Spirit as the fulfilling instrument of the promised new covenant

Jeremiah 31.31-34 (cf. 24.7; Ezek. 11.8, 19; 36.26-27) promised a future where God would make a new covenant, as opposed to the old covenant, with the house of Israel. In this covenant, God himself would imprint his laws in the minds and hearts of his people, resulting in the forgiveness of sins, the independent knowledge of God, and divine ownership. In 2 Corinthians 3.3 (cf. vv. 6-8) Paul reveals the Spirit as the instrument of fulfilment of this new covenant promise: the Spirit is the means by which God imprints his ἐπιστολή (letters of commandments) upon the hearts of his people, resulting in regeneration and new covenant relationship. The γράμμα (the written Mosaic Law) of the old covenant is killing, whereas the πνεῦμα (Spirit) of the new covenant is life-giving (v.6).

In verses 14 to 16, the old covenant κάλυμμα (veil) which once blinded the minds of God's people, preventing them from comprehending the revelation of God in the γράμμα, has in the new covenant been removed in Christ as one turns to the Lord. The 'Lord' in verse 16 is closely identified with the Spirit in verse 17 (cf. Ziesler, 1983:46), meaning that to turn to the Lord and to turn to the Spirit are two ways of saying the same thing: conversional reception of the Spirit (cf. Dunn, 1998:422). If turning to the Lord means conversional Spirit reception, which in turn leads to the removal of the old covenant veil of blindness, then there can be little doubt that Paul understands the Spirit as instrumental to new covenant soteriology (cf. Turner, 1998:115; Hubbard, 2014:165; Dunn, 2010:135). Such conjecture is validated by the fact that this unveiling is understood as a transformation into the image of Christ wrought by the Spirit (v. 18; cf. Ridderbos, 1975:220; Lampe, 1977:84; Swete, 1909:195-195).

In Genesis 22.18 (cf. 12.3; 18.18) God proclaims that the blessings of all nations under the new covenant will be located in the seed of Abraham. In Galatians 3.14 Christ is identified with this promised seed of Abraham in whom

the blessing of Abraham, identified as the Spirit, is located. Possession of the Spirit in the new covenant is possession of the promised Abrahamic seed and blessing, who is construed as the genesis of the Christian life, inseparably attached, and consequent to faith in Christ (Gal. 3.2-3). Dunn (2010:108) is right when he notes that the promise to Abraham has a dual fulfilment: in Christ as the promised seed, and in the reception of the Spirit. The observation of Gunkel (2008:81-82) on this subject is revealing. He notes a conceptual link between Galatians 3.14 and 3.18, 29 and argues that for Paul, possession of the Abrahamic promise is tantamount to possession of the kingdom. The validity of such a conclusion rests on the deduction that the noun κληρονομία used in this context for 'inheritance' denotes 'the eternal blessedness in the consummated kingdom of God which is to be expected after the visible return of Christ' (Thayer, 1981:349). This future inheritance is equated with the promised Spirit in Galatians 3.14. Also, possession of the Spirit legitimates heirship of this inheritance in Galatians 3.29. Tying these knots together, possession of the Spirit becomes a present realisation or foretaste of the future possession of the kingdom. Fee (1994:394) differs from Gunkel in his understanding of the meaning of 'inheritance' in this context. For him, it is 'being Abraham's true children'. Although such perspective is not alien to the context, it is a bit too narrow, especially granting the use of the term elsewhere in Paul (Col. 3.24; Eph. 1.13-14; Rom. 8.15; cf. Matt. 21.38; Mark 7.7; Lk. 20.14). In these passages, 'inheritance' is connected to the glorious future kingdom and all its blessedness (cf. Ridderbos, 1975:203), suggesting that the future kingdom is most likely in view in this context.

In Romans 8 the Spirit is construed as the operational power of the new covenant. Under the new covenant, the Spirit is the instrument that liberates people from under the old covenant (8.1); the Spirit gives life (8.2; cf. 1 Cor. 15.45; 2 Cor. 3.6; 4 Ezra 3.5; *Judith* 16.14; *Syb. Or.* 4.46) (cf. Gunkel, 2008:84; Bultmann, 1952:336; Fee, 1994:525); the Spirit is an ethical guide into the fulfilment of the righteous requirement of the law (8.4; cf. Fee, 1994:536; Montague, 1970:207), leading to life and peace (8.6); the Spirit is the guarantor of divine ownership (8.9; cf. Fee, 1994:548); the Spirit is a life-quickenning agent of the eschatological dead σῶμα (8.11; cf. Fee, 1994:552, 553; Gunkel,

1998:83; Lampe, 1977:80; Dunn, 1998:262); the Spirit is the instrument that brings liberation from the entrapment of the flesh (8.12-13); the Spirit is the agent of divine adoption/sonship (8.14-15; cf. Gal. 4.6) (cf. Fee, 1994:566; Montague, 1970:09; Dunn, 1998:435; Manson, 1959:163; Kruse, 1993:17). In a nutshell, for Paul, the Spirit is the enlivening power of the new covenant.

Thus far the Spirit as the fulfilling instrument of the promised new covenant is the means by which the ἐπιστολή of Christ is imprinted upon the hearts of believers. He is the remover of the old covenant κάλυμμα; he is the object of the promised Abrahamic blessing; and he is the enlivening and operational power of the new covenant.

#### 5.2.8 The Spirit and sonship/adoption

The indwelling Spirit (1 Cor. 3.16; 6.19), who guides the believer (Rom. 8.14; Gal. 5.18, 25) is for Paul, the harbinger of divine sonship/adoption. To be a child of God is to be led by the Spirit (Rom. 8.14). Spirit reception does not only bequeath divine life to the believer (8.2; cf. 1 Cor. 15.45; 2 Cor. 3.6), but also grants divine sonship. This soteriological consequence of Spirit reception is given amplification in Romans 8.15. Here, the spirit of bondage, a probable metaphor for the law under the old covenant, is put in antithesis with the Spirit of adoption. This contrast recalls the symbolic antithesis of Hagar and Sarah, bondage and freedom, old covenant and new covenant, birth according to the flesh and birth according to the promise (Spirit) elsewhere (Gal. 4.22-31). The bearing this has on the interpretation of Romans 8.15 is that to receive the Spirit of adoption is to possess the Abrahamic promises: faith in Christ (Gal. 3.2, 14; 5.5-6); birth according to the Spirit (Gal. 4.28-31), and freedom from the bondage of the Law of the old covenant (Gal. 3.13-14; 4.31; 5.1).

Adoption by the Spirit is most likely the eschatological redefinition of the concept of Israel as Gods son in the Old Testament (Exod. 4.22-23; Jer. 3.19; Ps. 2.7; 82.6; Hos. 11.1; Isa. 1.2; 63:16). Israel's unique status as God's children meant that they have been sanctified and separated from the Gentile nations unto God by the covenant of circumcision, with the implication of living faithful unto God and walking in his ways (Gen. 17.10; cf. Exod. 19.5; Deut. 5.29; Jer. 7.23; Ps. 78.10-11; cf. Cullmann, 1959:273). As the covenant of

circumcision was the true mark of inclusion or membership of God's family in the Old Testament (cf. von Rad, 1961:196; Williamson, 2003:123), so Paul, in Romans 8.15, sees the Spirit of the new covenant as the defining mark of membership of God's family or the agent through whom believers become God's children (cf. Coetzer, 1981:184; Fee, 1994:565; Fitzmyer, 1990:853). Thus the Spirit replaces circumcision as the defining emblem of God's children.

The understanding of the Spirit as a marker of divine sonship is given theological emphasis when Paul stresses that by the Spirit, believers cry out  $\text{Αββα ὁ πατήρ}$  (Abba Father). In its Aramaic setting,  $\text{Αββα}$  is a register of intimacy and endearment (cf. Fee, 1994:411; *contra* Gunkel, 2008:80; Lampe, 1977:88, 88; Manson, 1962:946, who view the term as glossolalic ecstatic manifestation inspired by the Spirit). Jesus' usage (Mark 14.36) in prayer points to his unique filial position of love, oneness and intimacy with the Father. For Paul, the oneness of believers with the Son (1 Cor. 6.17; Gal. 3.27) gives them the right to share this unique position of sonship with him, hence the believers' cry, 'Abba Father' (cf. Dunn, 1992:619; Cranfield, 1985:188-189). This 'Abba' cry establishes three things. (1) Through that, the Spirit both affirms and attests to the adopted status of believers (cf. Gunkel, 2008:79; Dunn, 1998:437; Lampe, 1977:88; Fee, 1994:564; Fitzmyer, 1990:854), their recreation into God's family, as well as their heirship with the Son. (2) Through that, the Spirit affirms and attests to the intimate relationship of believers with the Father, as the veil has now been removed in Christ (cf. 2 Cor. 3.14- 4.6). (3) Through that, the Spirit affirms and attests to the endearing status of believers to the Father (cf. Rom. 5.5, 8; 8.37; Eph. 2.4-5). Verse 16 links Spirit reception to the inheritance of the kingdom. It is by the reception of the Spirit that believers become children of God and hence, joint heirs with Christ in relation to the future kingdom.

Galatians 4.6 is a co-text with Romans 8.15. In this passage, Paul reminds the believers in Galatia that because they are sons God has sent forth the Spirit of his son into their hearts. Spirit reception here should not be understood as posterior to sonship, thereby suggesting alienation from it, rather the theological trust of the passage should be seen as a reiteration of the role of the Spirit as witness in Romans 8.16. The passage asserts that because

believers are sons God has sent forth his Spirit into their hearts as a witness or confirming agent to this new status (cf. Rom. 8.16). Quoting Galatians 4.6 and Romans 8.16, Ridderbos (1975:201) alludes to this understanding when he observes that the sending of the Spirit into the hearts of God's children is to witness with their Spirit. For Paul, the Spirit is not only the author of divine sonship, but its witness.

In Romans 8.23 Paul attaches the eschatological dimension to the adoption by the Spirit. Here again, as in 8.15, the Spirit, through glossolalic prayer, affirms the adoption of the saints, albeit in eschatological categories. More important is the observation that Paul attests to another aspect of the adoption by the Spirit: τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος (the redemption of the body). According to Paul, Spirit reception grants present membership into God's family (Rom. 8.15), however, this membership comes to complete fulfilment when the body is ἀπολύτρωσιν (fully redeemed or delivered by the full payment of the ransom; cf. 1 Cor. 15.50-58). Adoption is here conjoined and equated with resurrection (cf. Cranfield, 1985:200; Moo, 1997:1141), with the Spirit identified as the common perfecting agent. Thus adoption in Paul has both 'a now' and 'a not yet' significance (cf. Ridderbos, 1975:200; Davis 1984:13; Scott, 1993:17; Manson, 1962:946; Fee, 1994:574; Cranfield, 1985:199-200).

Believers eagerly await the fullness of their adoption because they possess the 'firstfruits' (ἀπαρχή) of the Spirit. 'Firstfruits' appears in the Septuagint version of Exodus 23.16, 19, Numbers 18.12, 13 and Deuteronomy 18.4. There, the produce as 'firstfruits' carries the idea of initial evidence and guarantee of future harvest. Christ as the 'firstfruits' of those who are fallen asleep carries a similar thought: his resurrection is the initial evidence and guarantee of the future resurrection of believers. In Romans 8, the idea is that believers' possession of the 'firstfruits' of the Spirit means that the life-giving work of the Spirit in their lives at this present aeon is an initial evidence and guarantee of their possession of the fullness of this life in the future. Here, the genitive, 'of the Spirit', is taken as a genitive of apposition, indicating the 'firstfruits' as the life-giving work of the Spirit, and not the Spirit himself (cf. Cranfield, 1985:199), or as Berkhof (1964:106) terms it, it is a genitive of explication, pointing to the Spirit's present agency: conversion, forgiveness, communion with God, joy,

etc., as the foretaste of the coming kingdom. Although Fee (1994:573) defends the 'apportion' view, he differs in his claim that the 'firstfruits' points to the 'Spirit' himself (cf. Bultmann, 1952:158; Dunn, 1998:470). The problem with such a claim is that it makes the reception of the Spirit in this context a down payment of that for which believers eagerly await. Although such understanding is not alien to Paul's pneumatic eschatology, it does not fit the 'firstfruits' imagery, which evokes the meaning of a pledge, foretaste or guarantee (cf. Fitzmyer, 1990:854; Montague, 1970:186). As Thiselton (2013:73) puts it, 'it is a pledge of more of the same quality or kind to come', and not a down payment as Fee's claim suggests. Gunkel (2008:82) views the genitive, 'of the Spirit' as a 'partitive' genitive, indicating the 'firstfruits' as the partial conferral of the Spirit, with a future expectation of full bestowal. This position is frail in the sense that it is difficult to trace a present partial reception of the Spirit by believers in Paul (1 Cor. 12.13; Eph. 5.18; Titus 3.5; Eph. 1.13). What is discernible in Paul is a partial experience or foretaste of the soteriological works of the Spirit, with a future hope of complete fulfilment (Rom. 8.14-30; Eph. 1.13-14; 2 Cor. 1.20-22; 5.5; Gal. 4.6-7). This makes such a 'partial view' an alien construct to Paul's theology (cf. Fee, 1994:573, n. 297).

What could be said about the Spirit thus far in this section is that, for Paul, the Spirit is the Spirit of sonship/adoption (cf. Bultmann, 1952:335; Moo, 1997:1140; Fee, 1994:562; Dunn, 2010:149). The soteriological significance of this assertion is that, in Paul adoption means eschatological redemption (Rom. 8.23), divine sonship and heirship (Rom. 8.14-17; Gal. 4.4-7), salvific freedom (Rom. 8.15, 21; Gal. 4.28-31), predestination, divine selection or ownership (Eph. 1.5, 11; Rom. 8.14). Accordingly, if the Spirit is understood as the harbinger of adoption, then the Spirit is for Paul, a soteriological agent.

### 5.2.9 The Spirit and Eschatology

In Ephesians 1.13-14 (cf. 2 Cor. 1.22; 5.5), Paul alludes to the eschatological dimension of the soteriological work of the Spirit. The Spirit is understood as the seal (σφραγίς) of believers' eschatological promise of redemption. Σφραγίς could mean authentication, security, or mark of ownership. All these

shades of meaning are implied in this context. Thus, the Spirit as God's σφραγίς on believers marks them as God's possession/adopted children and authentic heirs of the inheritance in Christ, and secures them until the final redemption (see also Morris, 1986:80; Parker, 2005:61; Ridderbos, 1975:400; Fee, 1994:669). For Bultmann (1952:137-138), the term σφραγίς in this context is an allusion to baptism. Thus through baptism the baptised person is sealed, that is, placed under the protection, security and ownership of the Name of the κύριος. On the contrary, the sealing is more likely an activity of the Spirit than a reference to baptism (cf. Ridderbos, 1975:400; Dunn, 2010:160). Schnackenburg (1962:88) expresses his reservations on this baptism referent position when he observes that, if there be any allusion to baptism, that connection is only a figurative pointer to the reality of the Spirit. More significant is the observation that the Spirit in Ephesians 1.13 is depicted as the instrument of the sealing, thus emphasising the soteriological function of the Spirit as the marker or stamp of (1) those predestined to adoption as sons (v.5); those redeemed through the blood of Jesus (v. 7); those who are members of the eschatological ingathering in Christ (v. 10); and those who are heirs of the 'now' and the 'not yet' inheritance (v. 11). The view of σφραγίς as an allusion to baptism robs the Spirit of these soteriological functional features.

In Genesis 38.18, the signet-ring (*hôtām*) is mostly translated in the Septuagint as σφραγίς (cf. Levison, 2009:256-260). There, the seal (*hôtām*), as a pledge to Tamar was significant in three aspects. First, it was for her, a down payment of the full settlement in the future (vv. 17-18). Second, it signified for Tamar an evidence of her possession of Judah's σπέρμα (seed) (v. 18). Third, it was a testimonial mark of her future redemption (vv. 24-26). If Paul had Genesis 38 in mind when he termed the Spirit as the seal of believers, then there can be little doubt that he had all three aspects in mind. That is, the Spirit as seal in Paul's thought is for believers, (1) the down payment of their future redemption (cf. Rom. 8.23; 2 Cor. 1.22; 5.5), (2) an evidence of their possession of Christ, the promised σπέρμα (cf. Gal. 3.14-16), and (3) a testimonial mark of their future redemption (cf. Eph. 4.30). Knitting both the lexical and historical perspectives on the term σφραγίς together, the shape which emerges for the understanding

of the seal in Ephesians 1.13-14 is that the Holy Spirit as the seal of the believers' promise has the following features: He marks believers as God's possession/adopted children and authentic heirs of the inheritance in Christ; he is the security, true mark and down payment of the future redemption of believers; and he is the evidence of believers' possession of the promised σπέρμα.

The Spirit is further construed as the guarantee (ἀρραβών) of believers' inheritance in Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 1.22; 5.5) until the redemption of the purchased possession. The term ἀρραβών means a pledge, that is, 'money which in purchases is given as a pledge that the full amount will subsequently be paid' (Thayer, 1981:75; cf. Berkhof, 1964:106; Schnackenburg, 1964:87; Pett, 1998:115). Understood thus, the Spirit as ἀρραβών of believers' inheritance means that possession of the Spirit is for them, the present assurance, down payment, and foretaste of their future promise (cf. Dunn, 2010:159).

#### 5.2.10 The Spirit and Divine Revelation

Paul understands the Spirit as the author of prophetic revelation (1 Cor. 12.8; 1 Cor. 14.26-40; 1 Thess. 5.19-20; 1 Tim. 4.1; cf. 2 Sam. 23.2-3; Zech. 7.8-12). The Spirit is the Spirit of wisdom and revelation (Eph. 1.17-21; cf. 1 Cor. 12.7-8; 14.2; Eph. 3.1-5; cf. Isa. 11.1-2; *1 Enoch* 49.2-3; 61.11-12). Here also, the terms 'wisdom' and 'revelation' should be taken as a hendiadys, stressing the fact that the Spirit is the revealer or mediator of divine revelatory wisdom (cf. Gen. 41.38-39; Ezek. 11. 24-25). This revelatory wisdom leads to the knowledge of God, divine illumination, and belief/faith. Paul admits that the deep mysteries characteristic of his gospel proclamation were given by the revelation of the Spirit (Eph. 3.3-7). The Spirit is conceived as a teacher, revealer, discernor and excavator of divine hidden wisdom (1 Cor. 2.9-14; cf. Gunkel, 2008:78; Levison, 2009:280; Fee, 1994:96-107; Lampey, 1977:81-82; Montague, 1970:136). The Spirit is the Spirit of God, who possesses exclusive knowledge of the mind of God, and reveals God's mind concerning his people (vv. 11-12). Atkinson (2014:149, 152) rightly calls the Spirit, God's mind reader, in this context. Accordingly, to possess the Spirit is to possess the mind of God concerning his children (cf. Lampe, 1977:81). Without the revelatory and

discerning power of the Spirit, it is impossible for the natural man (ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος), that is, man as a living being in his natural existence without the experience of the Spirit's rebirth (see also Fee, 1994:105; Montague, 1970:137; Swete, 19909:179), to comprehend God (v. 14). This suggests that for Paul, the Spirit is indispensable to the acquisition of divine revelation, and thus the knowledge of God. Turner (1996:110) views the work of the Spirit here as the enabler of authentic Christian faith. This is sound because without the Spirit the ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος not only lacks the content of authentic Christian faith (divine revelation and knowledge), but more importantly, lacks the illuminating agent (the Spirit) to this content, which leads to authentic faith.

#### 5.2.11 The Spirit as Christ's indwelling presence

For Paul, The Spirit is both the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of God (cf. Ziesler, 1983:4; Lampe, 1977:79), and the means through which the Old Testament salvific concept of God dwelling amongst his people (Ezek. 43.9) is actualised in the new covenant (Rom. 8.9-11; cf. Gal. 4.6; Phil. 1.19; 1 Cor. 3.16; 1 Cor. 6.19-20; Eph. 2.19-22). To have the Spirit is to be indwelt by Christ and thus to possess the righteousness of God (Rom. 8.9-11). Such Spirit-Christ identification here, and elsewhere (1 Cor. 15.45; 6.17; 2 Cor. 3.17; Rom. 8.9; 15.18-19; 1 Cor. 12.3) has led Gunkel (2008:113) to argue that for Paul, Christ is himself the Spirit (so Deissmann, 1926:171, 175; Lampe, 1977:79). Ziesler fairly warns against such a conclusion (cf. Turner, 1996:131; Fee, 1994:267, 311 n. 91; Cranfield, 1985:182) and argues that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ because he communicates Christ to the believer. For Turner (1996:131), it is because the Spirit is 'Christ's executive power, and self-revealing presence'. Arguing along similar lines Ridderbos (1975:88) claims that the reason for such identification is that it is in the revelation and work of Christ that the manifestation and work of the Spirit is experienced. For Berkhof (1964:26), the exalted Christ, is the Spirit, not in complete identity, but to emphasise that the Spirit is Christ in action. Dunn (1998:264) claims that the relationship between Christ and the Spirit is a close identification, but not a complete one, and that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ because the character of Jesus' ministry has become the character of the Spirit. The validity of all these perspectives, contra Gunkel and the others, is that they observe the Christ-Spirit identification

through the prism of function, not ontology. Christ is not the Spirit and the Spirit is not Christ in the ontological sense. The Spirit is the Spirit of Christ (Rom. 8.9; 2 Cor. 3.17; Gal. 4.6; Phil. 1.19) because he is the soteriological functional regent of the exalted Christ on earth: he is the means through whom the exalted Christ indwells the believer (Rom. 8.9-11); he is the means through whom Christ gives life to the believer (Rom. 8.2, 9-10; 1 Cor. 15.45; 2 Cor. 3.17); he is the revealer of the mysteries of Christ (2 Cor. 3.18; Eph. 3.1-5); he is the bonding agent in the believer's mystical union with Christ (1 Cor. 6.17; 12.13; Eph. 4.4; cf. Col. 2.12; 3.27; Rom. 6.4-5; 1 Cor. 12.27; Rom. 12.4-5; Eph. 4.15-16; 5.23); he is a mark of ownership for Christ (Rom. 8.9); he is the operational power of the exalted Christ (Rom. 15.18-19; Gal. 3.5; 2 Cor. 3.17); he is the builder and strengthener of Christ's body (1 Cor. 14.1-5; 2 Cor. 13.13; Eph. 4.1-6; Phil. 2.1; 3.3); and he is the convicting power behind the proclamation of the gospel of Christ (1 Cor. 2.4-5; 12.1-3; 2 Cor. 4.13).

Two problem texts (1 Corinthians 15.45 and 2 Corinthians 3.17) tend to tip the balance in favour of Gunkel at face value. In 1 Corinthians 15.45 we read that Christ, the second Adam, became a life-giving Spirit. Understanding the text as a complete identification of Christ with the Spirit, as a cursory look at the text might suggest, is to overlook the theological emphasis of the passage. The meaning of the text should be best examined from the juxtaposition of the 'first Adam' with the 'second Adam'. The first man Adam became ψυχὴν ζῶσαν a (living soul) because through him humanity inherited the natural body (cf. v. 44), understood as the sinful body, the old man or the old nature (Rom. 5. 12-15; 6.6-7; Eph. 4.17-24; Col. 2.11; 3.5-11). On the other hand, Christ became πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν a (life-giving Spirit) because through him believers received/inherited the Spirit who gives life (Rom. 7.4-6; 8.9-10; 1 Cor. 6.17; Gal. 3.14; 4.6-7).

In 2 Corinthians 3.17 the Spirit is closely identified with Christ thus: 'now the Lord is the Spirit.' The meaning of this phrase should be examined, not in isolation, but in relation to its context. In verse 14, Christ is the locus of the taking away of the veil, which is synonymous with regeneration. Verse 16 is explicatory of verse 14, emphasising that this regeneration in Christ is possible only when one turns or converts to the Lord. Thus conversion or turning to the

Lord yields regeneration or the lifting up of the veil. The Lord here then is not simply Christ, but God's salvific disposition towards the convert in Christ. Understood thus, the 'Lord is Spirit' in this context is not a complete identification of the Spirit with Christ, rather it is to emphasise that this salvific disposition towards the convert in Christ is the work of the Spirit. It is the Spirit in Christ, who removes the veil and sets the convert free, transforming him into the image and glory of Christ (vv. 17b; 18). Paul calls this the ministry of the Spirit, as opposed to the ministry of death (vv. 7-8).

#### 5.2.12 Summary

This brief survey of Paul's pneumatic soteriology has shown that he associates the washing/cleansing, life-giving and life-transforming agency with the Spirit. The Spirit is the means by which believers are bonded with, and incorporated into, Christ's body. The Spirit for Paul is the power behind the ethical living of believers: to be led by the Spirit is to fulfil the righteous requirement of the law, which leads to life. The Spirit is conceived as the power behind the gospel proclamation and its convicting, faith-provoking power. He is the life-giving fulfilling agent of the new covenant promise. Through his ministry (1) the people of the new covenant interiorise the life-saving law of God in their hearts, (2) the veil of ignorance which once prevented access to the glory of God is removed, so believers can experience a life-transforming encounter with God, and (3) the Abrahamic new covenant promises become a reality in the life of the believer.

The Spirit is the means by which Christ and his righteousness indwell believers, which for them is a mark and a seal of their ownership by Christ. The Spirit is the Spirit of sonship. To have the Spirit is to be a true son of God, delivered from under the bondage of the old covenant Law. Thus for Paul, the Spirit is the defining index of God's children (cf. Keener, 2016:132; Fee, 1994:107; Dunn, 1998:427 n77). He is the Spirit of Christ, closely, but not completely identified with him. To possess the Spirit is to receive a present assurance, guarantee and down-payment of a future redemption/resurrection. The Spirit is the mediator and illuminator of divine revelation in Christ. He is conceived as the author, bond, and the very life of believers' fellowship.

It could be argued, based on the above examination, that the Spirit is the very nucleus of Pauline Christianity. Thus for Paul, as for John, the Spirit is the *sine quo non* of salvation. Such a conclusion begs the question: could the same assertion be made with respect to the pneumatic soteriology of Luke? Does Luke also see the Spirit as soteriologically significant? Or to what extent is Luke's pneumatology soteriologically significant? An investigation into questions like these will help capture Luke's pneumatic soteriology, so that a comprehensive comparative analysis with that of John outlined in the third chapter, could be readily embarked upon. To this venture, the study now turns.

### **5.3 The Pneumatic Soteriology of Luke (Luke-Acts)**

Unlike John and Paul, the soteriological significance of the Spirit in Luke (Luke-Acts) has not received a settled agreement among scholars. For Turner (1996:436-437) the gift of the Spirit in Luke-Acts is soteriologically necessary, both transforming and shaping the life of the Christian community and empowering her witness. While admitting that the Spirit indirectly influences the ethical life of the Christian community, Menzies (2000:89) disagrees with Turner and maintains that the Spirit in Luke-Acts is never presented as a soteriological necessity; rather, it is a *donum superadditum*. Atkinson (2011:88-91) argues that the Spirit was soteriologically involved prior to Pentecost, but the Pentecostal reception of the Spirit was non-soteriological. Hence, for him, Turner is correct in his view that the Spirit performs salvific functions in the life of the Christian, but is wrong to tie these functions to the gift of Pentecost and beyond. Arguing along similar lines, Stronstad (1984:62) argues that the Pentecostal gift of the Spirit is not for salvation, but for witness and service (so Petts, 1998:66). According to Schweizer (1980:59, 77) Luke dissociated faith and the working of miracles from the work of the Spirit. For Dunn (2010:52, 53) the Pentecost gift of the Spirit is that which makes one a Christian.

The above positions will be evaluated in the light of the insight drawn from the subsequent discussions, which will centre on the investigation into Luke's pneumatic soteriology. The discussion is divided into two main sections for clarity. The first section delves into Luke's understanding of the soteriological significance of the Spirit in relation to Jesus. The second segment will be in relation to the believer.

### 5.3.1 The Spirit and Jesus

#### 5.3.1.1 *The Spirit and New Creation (Luke 1.31-35)*

Luke's association of the Spirit with new creation is evident in the discourse between Mary and the angel concerning the birth of Jesus (cf. Warrington, 2014:97). The angel prophesied Mary's conception of Jesus. Mary's response to this prophetic pronouncement was revealing: 'How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?' This response questions the means of the conception. The angel's reply to Mary delineates the means by which the conception will be accomplished: 'The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. So the holy one to be born will be called the Son of God' (v. 35). According to this angelic reply, there can be little doubt that Luke conceives the Spirit as the principal agent of this miraculous conception (cf. Turner, 1996:156-162; Stronstad, 1984:37; Morris, 1986:192; Montague, 1970:266; Swete, 1909:25; Petts, 1998:29). Thus, as the Spirit brooded over the primeval waters in creation, so here also the Spirit broods over Mary in the creation of the foetus (cf. Schweizer, 1980:53). It is also crucial to note that the association of the Spirit with creation/new creation is not foreign to Luke's Old Testament and Second Temple Jewish background (Isa. 32.15; 44.3-4; Ezek. 11.19; 36.26; 37.5-6, 14; *Jos. Asen.* 8.9; *Jub.* 1.20-25).

#### 5.3.1.2 *The Baptist's Prophecy (Luke 3.16-17)*

In the Baptist's prophecy, Luke understands the Spirit as performing purgative/cleansing functions. The baptism of the coming mightier one is a baptism of the Holy Spirit and fire, normally understood as a baptism of the Spirit having a cleansing effect on the repentant and a judgemental effect on the unrepentant (cf. Turner, 1996:183-184; Dunn, 2010:13; Wenk, 2000:187-188; Lampe, 1957:162; Morris, 1986:192 n. 2; Warrington, 2014:95). This understanding is further supported by the employment of the winnowing metaphor (v. 17). The baptism of the mightier one is identified with the winnowing fan by which he will perfectly clean out his threshing floor and gather the wheat into his barn, while the chaff is burnt with unquenchable fire. Thus the baptism of the mightier one with the Spirit is here expected to involve cleansing for the righteous (the wheat) and judgement for the unrighteous

(chaff). Viewed in this light, Luke here associates ethical/soteriological significance to the work of the Spirit. Quoting Targum Isaiah 4.3-4 as a supportive text, Menzies (1991:126-128) on the contrary, argues that the baptism of the mightier one does not refer to the cleansing or moral transformation of the individual, rather it refers to the cleansing of Zion through the removal of the wicked. It is probable, based on the text Menzies cites and other texts (*Psalms of Solomon* 17.26-37; *1 Enoch* 62.2) that the Spirit baptism of the mightier one includes the removal of the wicked from Zion. It is also sound to maintain, in view of Ezekiel 36.25-33 that this baptism involves individual cleansing/purification.

### *5.3.1.3 The Temptation Account (Luke 4.1-16)*

Luke links Jesus' baptism with his temptation experience when he tells his readers that being filled with the Spirit, Jesus returned from the Jordan and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil, after which he came out in the power of the Spirit. Although the Spirit is not mentioned during the temptation experience itself, there is no doubt that Luke wanted his readers to understand the Spirit as the influencing agent in Jesus' obedience and interpretation of scripture during his encounter with the devil. Understood thus, the Spirit is here seen as an ethical necessity. This is because Luke alone sandwiches the temptation experience (4.1-13) between two significant encounters with the Spirit, the infilling of the Spirit (4.1) and the empowerment of the Spirit (4.14), thus calling attention to the incubating role of the Spirit in this experience. Such understanding does not only allude to the involvement or assistance of the Spirit in the temptation drama, but his sovereignty over it. Moreover, the fact that Jesus was led by the Spirit into the temptation (4.1) and was led out of the temptation by the Spirit (4. 14-15) suggests that his actions in the temptation were also led by the Spirit (4.1-13). Lampe (1957:170) makes a similar observation when he notes that Jesus' struggle with the devil and his victory was within the scope of the Spirit's operation (cf. Swete, 1909:54; Wenk, 2000:194; Thiselton, 2013:36; Turner, 1996:209).

#### 5.3.1.4 The Nazareth Manifesto (Luke 4.18-19)

In this text, Jesus identifies himself with the suffering Messianic servant of Isaiah (61.1-2; 58.6; cf. 11.1-2; 42.1-4) who is to effect the deliverance and salvation of oppressed Israel. His declaration in the synagogue marks the announcement and advent of this eschatological redemption: ‘*Today this scripture is fulfilled in your ears*’ (v. 21). The proclamation of ἄφεσις to the captives and ‘the year of the Lord’s favour’ evoke the Jubiliary motif of redemption/release of slaves, debtors and lands (cf. Lev. 25; Deut. 15). The term ἄφεσις could mean release or liberation from bondage or imprisonment (cf. Thayer, 1981:88; Sloan, 1992:397; Turner, 1996:223). Jesus metaphorized this understanding of the term in his dealings with those in Israel who had been imprisoned or bound (placed at the margins of society) by the socio-religious structures of his day (5.27-32; 6.20; 7.36-39; 12.33; 14.13; 18.22; 19.1-7; 21.1-4), as well as those held captive by demons (Luke 4.31-35), death (Luke 7.14-15), and illness (Luke 5.24-25; 17.11-14). His Spirit-anointed mission proclaimed, albeit in Jubilee categories, the in-breaking of the reign of God, which releases the lame, the blind, the leper, the deaf, the dead, and the poor from captivity (Luke 7.22; cf. Acts 10.38). The Spirit upon Jesus was the instrument by which this eschatological in-breaking of Yahweh’s reign was experienced (cf. Sloan, 1992:397; Ringe, 1985:66; Schnackenburg, 1993:138; Morris, 1986:193; *contra* Menzies, 1991:149). The Spirit is the Spirit of the eschatological kingdom.

The term ἄφεσις could also have the meaning of ‘forgiveness’ of sins in the New Testament (Matt. 26.28; Mark 1.4; Luke 1.77; 3.3; 24.47; Acts 2.38; 4.31; 5.43; 8.38; 24.18; Col. 1.14) (cf. Harris, 1996:37). It is possible, *contra* Turner (1996:224), that forgiveness of sins is also implied in Jesus’ use of ἄφεσις in 4.18 (cf. Prior, 1995:139). This is not a farfetched conjecture, as Luke understands forgiveness of sins to be integral to the mission of Jesus (5.20-23; 7.40-50; 19.1-10) and the Baptiser (1.77; 3.3). In Luke’s understanding, forgiveness is a salvific construct (1.77; 3.3; 24.47), and if the Spirit upon Jesus is the anointing behind his ministry of ἄφεσις, then there can be little doubt that Luke understands the Spirit to be soteriologically relevant.

### 5.3.1.5 *The Beelzebub Controversy (Luke 11.20)*

In Luke 11 Jesus' exorcism ministry attracted a sharp controversy from the Pharisees. He was accused of casting out demons by Beelzebub, the ruler of the demons. Jesus' response to this accusation attaches soteriological significance to the work of the Spirit: *But if I cast out demons with the finger of God, surely the kingdom of God has come upon you* (11.20). Here Luke changes 'Spirit of God' in the synoptic tradition to 'finger of God', probably because he understands Jesus' ministry in terms of new Exodus liberation (cf. 4.18/Isa. 61.1-2), hence, he does not have difficulty employing the Exodus imagery of finger/arm/hand of God (Exod. 8.19; 31.18; Deut. 9.10) to depict the liberating power of the Spirit of God in this context (for 'finger of God' as 'Spirit of God', see also Turner, 1996:259; Schnackenburg, 1993:137; Swete, 1909:58-59; Lampe, 1957:172; Trocmé, 2003:47). Understood in this vein, Luke views the liberating power of the Spirit in Jesus' ministry as a present taste of the future kingdom and the doorway into it. For John, to enter the kingdom is to be born of the Spirit, while for Luke; it is to experience the liberation ministry of the Spirit.

Menzies (1991:163, 167) denies the above deduction and argues that Luke's alteration of 'Spirit of God' to 'finger of God' was fuelled by his distinctive prophetic pneumatology and that he was reluctant to associate exorcism or miraculous manifestations directly with the Spirit (cf. Schweizer, 1980:59). Three problems are discernible in this line of deduction. First, on the basis of the examination of Luke's pneumatic soteriology in this chapter thus far, it is precarious to establish that Luke's pneumatology is distinctively prophetic (see also Turner, 1996:254). Second, Jesus' programmatic sermon in 4.18 strongly links the Spirit upon him with his ministry, of which exorcism is a composite part (7.21-22; 13.10-17; Acts 10.38) (cf. Schnackenburg, 1993:137; Woods, 2001:246-247). If so, the assertion that Luke was reluctant to associate exorcism or works of miracles with the Spirit is suspect (cf. Woods, 2001:252). Third, elsewhere Luke uses the hand/finger of God as a functional metaphor for the Spirit (Acts 4.28-30; 7.35; 13.11; cf. Exod. 23.19; 31.18; Deut. 9.10; Ps. 8.3; 33.6). This makes it likely that by 'finger of God' Luke intends the Spirit of God.

Although Wood (2001:253) was careful not to identify the term 'finger of God' with the Spirit, his exegesis does not deny the role of the Spirit in the definition of the term. For him, the term stands for God at work in Jesus through his Spirit empowered word of command. While Wood's observation is equally sound, it is worth asserting that whether the term stands for the Spirit or Jesus' Spirit inspired proclamation, the Spirit is involved in the defeat of Satan and the resultant experience of the salvific Kingdom.

### 5.3.2 The Spirit and Believers/Disciples

#### 5.3.2.1 *The Forerunner (Luke 1.15-17)*

In 1.15, Luke emphasises for the attention of his readers that John the Baptist was filled with the Spirit from the womb. This early encounter with the Spirit suggests that the Spirit is significant for the sustenance of the life of the baby in the womb, for why would the Spirit be experienced at that stage if he is not consequential to the perfection of the developmental process? Accordingly, it is not far from the mark to propose that the Spirit is here construed as a life-sustaining agent. Moreover, it suggests that the Spirit is fundamentally crucial to the identity of the baby. It comes with no surprise that the anointing of the unborn child by the Spirit is immediately ensued by what the baby is destined to fulfil in the narrative (vv. 15-17). This might be a literary technique employed by Luke to convey the significance of the Spirit in both the life and ministry of the Baptist.

In verse 16, the baby is destined to turn many of the children of Israel to the Lord their God. In 3.1-20, the manifestation of this prophecy is evident. The Spirit empowered preaching of the one anointed from the womb convicted his audience and provoked a response from his audience in the form of the question, 'What shall we do?' (3.10). Such inquisitive response is reminiscent of that from Peter's audience after their encounter with Peter's Spirit empowered message (Acts 2.37). In both passages, the preaching events are preceded by a unique experience of the Spirit by the preachers in the narratives (Luke 1.15 for John and Acts 2.1-4 for Peter). Luke, by narrating these, brings to the attention of his readers that the Spirit is both the empowering presence behind the testimony of these preachers and the

conviction-provoking agent within. Understood in this light, the soteriological mission of John the Baptist, to turn the hearts of the children of Israel to their God owes its fulfilment to his Spirit-anointing in the womb.

Verse 17 is revealing on this point. The ministry of John the Baptist to 'turn the hearts of the fathers to the children' is construed as a Spirit-led task. The salvific resonance of this ministry comes to the fore when it is observed that in the Old Testament, the preservation, perpetuity and sustenance of Yahweh's covenant with his people was predicated on the hearts of the fathers towards their children (Exod. 13.8-16; Deut. 4.9-10; 6.6-7; 11.18-21; 32.46-47; Josh. 4.6-7, 21-24; cf. Ps. 71.18; 78.3-8; Isa. 38.19), that is, the fathers' diligence in teaching/communicating Yahweh's gracious and merciful acts to their children. Such a father-child relationship is to ensure the continuous flow of God's salvific intention across generations. If it is by virtue of the Spirit in the life of John by which he will accomplish this mission, then there can be little doubt that Luke here understands the Spirit, *contra* Menzies (1991:108), to be soteriologically relevant (see also Wenk, 2000:155-161).

#### 5.3.2.2 *The Spirit of the New Covenant (Acts 2)*

The Pentecost outpouring of the Spirit in Acts 2 is interpreted by Peter as the fulfilment of Joel's prophecy concerning the eschatological experience of the Spirit (Acts 2.16-21; cf. Joel 2.28-29). Such textual evidence has led scholars like Menzies (1991:186-188; cf. Stronstad, 1984:51-52; Atkinson, 2011:90-91) to posit that the Pentecost gift of the Spirit is exclusively prophetic. Such a proposition overstretches the evidence in the light of the ensuing consideration. Although Peter stresses that the events of Pentecost are a fulfilment of Joel 2, it is a biased observation to argue that Acts 2 is not equally a fulfilment of Ezekiel 36.25-29 (cf. Wenk, 2000:253; Robson, 2014:69, 70), as there is no scriptural evidence to suggest that the latter was fulfilled outside the manifestation of the former in the life of the church. Moreover, if Acts 2 fulfils Luke 1.35, and if the baptism of the mightier one is understood to have cleansing/purgative effects on the recipients, then it follows that the function of the Pentecost gift of the Spirit has a soteriological dimension. The Pentecost outpouring, seen as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Ezekiel (36.25-29), reveals the Spirit as the Spirit of the new covenant renewal, possessing salvific

attributes (see also Turner, 1996:51-56; Strauss, 2012:270; Thiselton, 2013:51). More striking is the observation that the clause 'the promise is to you and to your children' in Acts 2.39 brings to mind the Abrahamic covenantal promise construed as the Spirit by Paul (Gen. 12.3c/ Gal. 3.14). This link suggests that Luke sees the Pentecost Spirit as the new covenant fulfilment of the Old covenant promise of the Spirit (cf. Dunn, 2010:47).

While Dunn (2010:47, 48) is correct to see the Pentecost gift as the agent of the new covenant, his view that it was only by the reception of the Spirit at Pentecost that the disciples became Christians is problematic (2010:44, 52). This is because prior to the Pentecost outpouring (Acts 1.2, 25, 26) the disciples hold the office of the ἀποστολή (apostleship). In the New Testament apostles were called, separated, mandated and privileged to receive and proclaim God's salvific plan for humanity by the revelatory and empowering work of the Spirit (cf. Eph. 3.1-5). In that sense, 'apostleship' is a salvific label in New Testament understanding (cf. Acts 4.33; Rom. 1.1; 1 Cor. 1.1; 1 Pet. 1.1-2; 2 Pet. 1.1; 2 Cor. 1.1; Eph. 1.1; Col. 1.1; Titus 1.1; Heb. 3.1). It follows from this understanding that the apostles were saved (that is, had become 'Christians') prior to Pentecost (see also Turner, 1996:333-341, 353). The Pentecost event for the apostles might then be understood as a decisive moment, a sustaining, enabling and empowering salvific event in God's new covenant relationship with them, and hence, a composite element in God's eschatological dealings with his people.

The new covenant character of the Pentecost gift of the Spirit could also be inferred from the possible allusions the event itself bears with the giving of the law at Sinai or its traditions (*Dec.* 32-36, 44-49; *Leg.* 2.188-89; *Targ. Ps. – J* on Exod. 20.2) (see also Montague, 1970:274-288; Turner, 1996:279-289; Keener, 1997:193; Wenk, 2014:119).

- The Pentecost event took place in the morning (the third hour of the day, Acts 2.15). The Sinai event took place in the morning (Exod. 19.16).
- The Pentecost event is characterised by 'fire' as the symbol of divine presence (Acts 2.3; cf. Exod. 3.2; Isa. 4.4; 66.15; Ps. 50.3; 4 *Esdras*

13.10). The Sinai event depicts a similar association (Exod. 19.18) (cf. Levison, 2009:325).

- Acts 2.33 recalls Psalms 68.18 (cf. Eph. 4.8). The thematic and ideological parallels between both texts (both figures are divine envoys; both figures ascended on high; both received gift from the Father to the people) suggest that Luke views the Pentecost gifts of the Spirit as the new covenant counterpart of the old covenant gift of the Law. Such a conjecture is further supported by the fact that Luke elsewhere identifies Jesus as a prophet-like-Moses (Acts 7:37-38).
- Pentecost was later celebrated by Jews as the anniversary of the giving of the Law (Edersheim, 1997:171; cf. Montague, 1970:275; Swete, 1909:68)

The Sinai-Pentecost similarities noted above are striking enough to suggest that Luke sees the Pentecost event as an eschatological Sinai-like event where the promised covenant of the Spirit was given (cf. Turner, 1996:288-289; Montague, 1970:282).

Menzies (1991:189-201) decries the above deduction and conclusion. For him, the parallels between Pentecost and the Sinai traditions do not suggest influence but a shared milieu. He argues further that the absence of any reference to Moses, the Law/covenant, and 'gifts' in Acts 2:33 makes the link between Acts 2:33 and Psalm 68:18 unlikely. While Menzies' first point might be probable, his second point is not compelling. Although Acts 2.33 does not mention 'gift', it is not difficult to understand, based on the following texts, that Luke views the Spirit as the gift of the Father: Luke 11.13; Acts 2.38; 8.20; 10.45; 11.17. Also, although Law/covenant is not mentioned in the Acts account, what is striking is the fact that the leaders receive gift(s) for the people. Moreover, when Acts 2.33 is interpreted as a fulfilment of new covenant promises of the Spirit in the Old Testament (Joel 2.28; Ezek. 36.25-27), there can be little doubt that Luke understands the Spirit in 2.33 as the Spirit of the new covenant, irrespective of the absence of 'Moses' in the text.

The allusion to Joel's prophecy, most especially in 2.21, intimates that Luke understands the Spirit in salvific terms. If the 'everyone' in 2.21 refers to the 'servants', 'men', and 'women' in verse 18, then it follows that the Spirit is

conceived as the influencing power behind the proclamation of the name of the Lord (v. 21). And since that proclamation leads to salvation, the Spirit, in Luke's understanding, has a salvific influence.

### *5.3.2.3 The Spirit as the Source of Revelatory Wisdom and as a Convicting Agent*

The hermeneutical prowess demonstrated by Peter in his Spirit-inspired preaching marks the Spirit as the source of divine revelatory wisdom (Acts 2.22-36). The Spirit not only mediated scriptural revelation to Peter, but afforded him the ability to understand the revelation and to proclaim it (see also Levison, 2009:347-362). The result of this dynamic exposition was 'conviction', the pricking of the hearts of the audience (Acts 2.37). It is natural to understand that the Spirit that afforded revelation and utterance to Peter was the same that provoked the conviction in the hearts of his audience (cf. Petts, 1998:53). The Spirit is the agent of both revelation and conviction. The convicting agency of the Spirit involves interpretation and understanding, for how could Peter's audience understand his revelatory message if the Spirit did not interpret, and how could they be convicted if the Spirit did not afford understanding?

### *5.3.2.4 The Spirit and Conversion*

For Luke, the Spirit is received when one believes and is baptised in the name of Jesus (Acts 2.38; cf. 8.14-17; 19.1-8) (cf. Atkinson, 2011:68; Lampe, 1956:198; Turner, 1996:358; Schweizer, 1980:63; Montague, 1970:295; Schnackenburg, 1993:162). However, in some cases, the Spirit reception may precede the baptism (Acts 10.44-48). The purpose of the gift of the Spirit in conversion-initiation is to sustain and deepen the salvation of the individual and the corporate church. After the Pentecost event, it is not difficult to understand in the narrative, *contra* Gunkel (2008:16) and Menzies (2000:96), that the Spirit was the unifying bond behind the *koinonia* relationship of the believers (Acts 2.1-4 and 42-47) (cf. Thiselton, 2013:51). The Spirit afforded ethical, moral and religious guidance to the community (Acts 5.1-11; 6.1-7; 15.27-29; 20.23; 21.11; Luke 2.25) (see also Wenk, 2000:268-270; Turner, 1996:413-418). Moreover, in the comfort of the Spirit, the believers walked in the fear of the

Lord and were edified (Acts 9.33). The Spirit was the sustaining instrument of the church's inner life.

Having briefly surveyed Luke's pneumatic soteriological understanding thus far, the scholarly positions presented above can now be evaluated. Beginning with Turner, his observation that the gift of the Spirit in Luke is soteriologically necessary is a valid conclusion. Menzies position that in Luke the Spirit is portrayed as a *donum superadditum* is an inadequate consideration of Luke's understanding of the Spirit's work in the light of the findings of this study. The view of Atkinson that the Spirit was soteriologically involved prior to Pentecost is a sound observation. However, his admission that the Pentecost reception of the Spirit was non-soteriological is a shaky conclusion in view of what this study has shown so far. Schweizer might be right in observing that Luke dissociates faith from the work of the Spirit. However, his conclusion that Luke separates the working of miracles from the work of the Spirit is problematic. Although the Spirit is not directly or specifically connected with miracles, it is unfair and unnatural to disconnect Jesus' anointing by the Spirit from his miraculous ministry, most especially in the light of Luke 4.18. Dunn over-amplifies the evidence and overstates the case when he posits that the Pentecost gift of the Spirit is that which makes one a Christian. As shown in this study, the Pentecost gift is given to those who believed and are baptised (Acts 2.38).

### 5.3.3 Summary

Luke associates the Spirit with new-creation, cleansing and ethical guidance. The Spirit is the Spirit of the kingdom, the instrument by which the manifestation of the eschatological kingdom is experienced in the present. The Spirit is the convicting presence within the proclamation of the gospel. He is both the source and interpreter of divine revelatory wisdom. He is the Spirit of the new covenant, sustaining and deepening the on-going salvation of the church.

Having understood the pneumatic soteriology of the Fourth Gospel in the previous chapter, as well as that of Paul and Luke in this chapter, it is now appropriate to move a step further to compare the soteriological role of the

Spirit in John with that of Paul and Luke. With no particular order, the study begins with John and Paul.

#### ***5.4 The Fourth Gospel, Luke and Paul Compared***

The insight gathered from the discussion of the previous chapter and the current chapter shows that both the Fourth Gospel (1.33; 3.3-5) and Paul (Titus 3.3-5; 1 Cor. 12.13) directly link the Spirit with conversion-initiation and regeneration. For Luke (Acts 2.38; 8.14-17; 19.1-8), the Spirit is given to the converted and baptised, to sustain and deepen their on-going salvation. The ethical significance of the Spirit is more developed in Paul as compared to John and Luke. For Paul, the sum total of the believer's ethical conduct is contingent on the guidance of the Spirit of holiness (Rom. 1.4; 8; Gal. 5.16-26; 1 Thess. 4.3-8). The understanding of the Fourth Gospel on the ethical relevance of the Spirit hinges on the view of the Spirit as the Spirit of Truth, who teaches the way of Truth (14.17; 15.26; 16.13). For Luke, the Spirit affords ethical guidance to the individual and the community as a whole (Acts 5.1-11; 6.1-7; 15.27-29; Luke 2.25). In the Fourth Gospel (14.17; 15.26; 16.13), as in Paul (1 Cor. 2.4-5; 12.1-3; 2 Cor. 4.13; 1 Thess. 1.5-6) and Luke (Acts 2.37), the Spirit is the agent of conviction within the gospel proclamation. For the Fourth Gospel (14.26; 15.26-27; 16.7-15), as for Paul (1 Cor. 2.9-14; 12.7-8; 14.2; Eph. 1.17-21; 3.1-5) and Luke (Acts 2.22-36), the Spirit is the source and revealer/teacher of divine revelatory wisdom. The Fourth Gospel (4.23-24), Paul (Rom. 8.15; 1 Cor. 14; 2 Cor. 13.13-14; Eph. 4.1-6; 5.18-21; 6.18; Phil. 2.1; Gal. 4.6, 26-27; 1 Thess. 1.6), and Luke (Acts 5.1-11; 6.1-7; 15.27-29) all view the Spirit as the enlivening power within the worship and life of the believing community. The Fourth Gospel (4.14; 6.63; 7.37-39; 20.22), Paul (Rom. 8.6, 11, 13; 1 Cor. 6.14; 15.45; Gal. 6.7-9) and Luke (Luke 1.35) all view the Spirit as giver of life.

Unlike John, Paul (2 Cor. 3.3, 6-8; Gal. 3.14 / Jer. 31.31-34; 24.7; Ezek. 11.8, 19; 36.26-27; Gen. 22.18; 12.3; 18.18) and Luke (Acts 2.39 / Gen. 12.3c; cf. Gal. 3.14) understand the Spirit as the Spirit of the new covenant. John and Luke connect the Spirit in different ways with the kingdom. For the Fourth Gospel, to enter the kingdom is to be born of the Spirit (3.3); while for Luke to enter the kingdom is to experience the liberating power of the Spirit (Luke

11.20). Unlike Luke, the Fourth Gospel (14.15-21) and Paul (Rom. 8.9-11) recognise the Spirit as the means by which the exalted Christ indwells the believer. They both view the Spirit as the agent of divine sonship (John 3.5-6; Gal. 8.14-15).

While Paul is unique in his view of the Spirit as the seal and down payment of believers' eschatological redemption (Eph. 1.13-14; 2 Cor. 1.22; 5.5), the Fourth Gospel is unique in several aspects. The Spirit, for the Fourth Gospel, is strongly connected with the Word, so much so that, to receive the Word or the eternal incarnate *Logos* is to experience the life-giving ministry of the Spirit (3.16, 34; 6.63, 27, 33, 40, 47-51, 53-58; 15.1-14). The Fourth Gospel alone understands the Spirit as evoking *anamnesis* (14.26-27) and links the Spirit closely to the cross (19.30; 34).

### **5.5 Conclusion**

In the Fourth Gospel, John comes close to Paul in his view of the role of the Spirit in conversion-initiation, in his view of the Spirit as the means by which Christ indwells the believer, and his view of the Spirit as the author of divine sonship. With Luke, John comes close in his association of the Spirit with the kingdom. All three authors associate the Spirit with conviction, divine revelatory wisdom and life. While Paul stands out in his ethical religious view of the Spirit and his understanding of the Spirit as seal and down payment, John stands out in his view of the Spirit as promoting *anamnesis*, and his view of the tandem relationship between the Spirit and the Word. In conclusion, it is imperative to understand that the pneumatic soteriological difference evident in all three authors is harmonious and complementary. In their own rights, they all contribute to the understanding of a holistic perspective of New Testament pneumatic soteriology.

## **CHAPTER 6:**

### **THE SOTERIOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE CONTEMPORARY EVANGELISTIC MISSION OF THE CHURCH**

#### ***6.1 Introduction***

This chapter will examine the following subsidiary question: 'What is the relevance of the Spirit's involvement in the process of salvation, as revealed in the Fourth Gospel, for the contemporary evangelistic mission of the church'? This task is intended to be undertaken by means of the hermeneutical method of contextualisation. This is that process of interpretation which brings out the significance of a religious or cultural document, written in a distant historical milieu, for contemporary application (Osborn, 1991:318). In the light of this method, the following rules will be deployed: (i) Whenever our contemporary situation is the same as that of the first century hearers, our application of God's word will be a direct application (Fee & Stuart, 2003:75). (ii) Whenever we have a situation that is incomparable with that of the text we must seek the internal principle embedded in the text (Osborn, 1991:335). In addressing the subsidiary question, the discussion will be centred on the following five units: Jesus' pneumatic anointing and the contemporary mission of the church; the gift of the Father and the contemporary mission of the church; remaining in the Son and the contemporary mission of the church; the paschal insufflation and the contemporary mission of the church; and the Spirit-Paraclete and the contemporary mission of the church. The examination of these units will help tease out the relevance of the Spirit's involvement in the process of salvation, as revealed in the Fourth Gospel, for the contemporary evangelistic mission of the church.

#### ***6.2 Jesus' pneumatic anointing and the church***

Although John did not account for the baptism of Jesus as in the Synoptic Gospel (Matt. 3.13-17; Mark 1.9-11; Luke 3.21-22), his narrative implicitly links baptism with Spirit anointing (1.33). The relevance of this for the church is that believers receive the promised Spirit (John 16.7) in baptism. It should be emphasised here that believers' experience of the Spirit in baptism is not in the form of a dove, as in the case of Jesus. This is because the situation of the

church is not comparable to that of the text. Jesus' experience of the Spirit in the form of a dove was to mark him as one who, by the anointing of the Spirit, carried divine revelatory knowledge and new-creative power. This makes his experience unique and inapplicable. The only way the text could be relevant to the church today is to apply the internal principle embedded therein. In the fourth chapter it was examined that the dove symbolises divine revelatory wisdom and new-creation. This insight is a possible internal principle that could be dredged out of the text. The implication of this for the contemporary church is that the Spirit received in baptism is the source of the church's continuous revelation of the Father and Son, and its new-creation.

### ***6.3 The Gift of the Father and the church***

In the fourth chapter it was discovered that to believe in the gift of the father is a pneumatic locution. That is, to believe in Jesus is to come into intimate life-transforming contact with his Spirit (3.16). It is salient to stress that the 'whosoever' in the text accentuates the timeless quality of the message. This means that the situation of the church is the same as that of the first century hearers; hence, the life-transforming power of the divine gift is directly applicable to the church and its mission. The implication of this for the contemporary church is that in the preaching of the gospel to the world, 'belief in Jesus', the ultimate gift of the Father, should form the bedrock of that witness. This is because it is through the belief in Jesus that believers (1) experience the cleansing/purifying and life-transforming/indwelling work of the Spirit (born of water and Spirit, 3.5); (2) receive the water of life that springs to eternal life (4.14); (3) receive rivers of living water from Jesus (7.37-37); (4) receive the bread of everlasting life and are raised up at the last day (6. 30-59). It is through believe in Jesus that the life-giving/life-transforming work of the Spirit as Paraclete is appropriated in the life of the believer. Belief is therefore indispensable to the new-creation experience of the Spirit. The church has been born of the Spirit and is in possession of the Spirit because it first believed in Jesus.

#### ***6.4 Remaining in the Son and the Church***

This discourse in John 15 is centred on the branches of the vine (Jesus). The situation of the first-century hearers is the same as the church today, since believers also stand as branches of Jesus. This implies that the exhortation in the discourse is directly applicable to the church. Within the purview of the discourse, the church is enjoined to abide in the love and commandment of Jesus, the true vine. The significance of this paraenesis is that by the work of the Spirit in the vine (1) the church is cleansed continually; (2) Jesus continues to indwell the church; (3) the church bears much fruit and becomes a gathering of true disciple; and (4) the church does not face eternal punishment.

From the above examination it is not difficult to see that the Fourth Gospel contributes to the understanding of the contemporary church that the Spirit received as Paraclete is responsible for the recreation of the believer, the sustenance of the salvation of the church, and the understanding, proclamation, and conviction of the church's message of Jesus. The Spirit received during conversion is the Spirit-Paraclete, who is soteriologically and missiologically relevant to the church's life and mission to the world.

#### ***6.5 The Paschal Insufflation and the Church***

It has been established in the fourth chapter that the meaning of the insufflation gift for the disciples (20.22) was a theatrical depiction of their new creation, as a result of their encounter with Jesus and his revelatory teachings. It is significant to note that the situation of the text is incomparable to that of the church; hence direct application is hermeneutically inappropriate. The disciples walked with Jesus and had life (cf. 8.12). The 20.22 experience was a graphic depiction of this new creation experience. The situation of the church is different. Believers are not recreated through a physically encounter with Jesus; hence, the gift of 20.22 is not applicable. Believers encounter the Spirit once as the promised Paraclete who recreates, sustains, empowers and nurtures the Christian life.

The possibility of making the gift of 20.22 relevant for the church is to apply the internal principle approach. The embedded principle discernible in the text is that the gift alludes to the work of the Spirit in Ezekiel 36.25-27; 37.9, pointing to

its life-creating and life-transforming quality. The conclusion that could be drawn based on this principle is that the Spirit received in baptism has a life-creating and life-transforming quality.

### **6.6 The Spirit-Paraclete and the Church**

In keeping with the first rule of contextualisation noted in section 6.1 above: 'When the particulars of our present situation are the same as that of the text, our application of God's word will be a direct application,' the Paraclete sayings in the Fourth Gospel should be understood as paradigmatic for the church's understanding of its anointing by the Spirit for ministry. This is because the Spirit-Paraclete was promised to be with believers till the return of Jesus, and since believers are still awaiting the *parousia*, the Paraclete promise is still valid for the church today. This means that the role of the Spirit-Paraclete promised to the disciples in the Paraclete sayings is valid for the contemporary church. Understood thus, the following deductions are crucial as far as the church's anointing by the Spirit for ministry is concerned:

First, the Fourth Gospel designates the promised Spirit as the 'Spirit of Truth' (cf. 14.17; 15.26; 16.13). As shown in the fourth chapter, the Spirit is designated as such because (1) he mediates Jesus, the embodiment of God's grace to believers; (2) whatever he testifies about Jesus is the truth as opposed to falsehood; (3) he mediates divine revelatory wisdom with a purifying/salvific effect to believers; (4) he reveals Jesus as the true path to eternal life/salvation to believers; (5) he quickens believers' understanding and a consequent belief response to Jesus' teachings; and (6) he provides both the context and content of worship for believers. The implication of all this for the life of the church is that the Spirit provides both the content and context of the church's religious life.

Second, the Paraclete is understood as the indwelling and abiding presence of Jesus and the Father with the disciples (John 14.15-23). The implication of this is threefold. (1) The concept of God among his people was understood as the basis for the religious life and ethical purity of the Old Testament church (Exod. 29.42-46; Num. 5.1-3; 35.33-34; 1 Kings 6.12-13; Ezek. 37.27-28; 43.7-9). In

the light of this insight, John, by revealing that the Holy Spirit is the indwelling and abiding presence of Jesus and the Father with the disciples, would want the church to understand that the received Spirit is the basis for their religious life and ethical purity. The ethical and religious life of the church must conform to Jesus, the ultimate divine truth, simply because God tabernacles among them. (2) The concept of God dwelling among his people was understood as the basis for the divine possession of the Old Testament church, characterised as 'My people' (Exod. 29.45; 1 Kings 6.13; Ezek. 37.27). It is therefore not difficult to deduce that by understanding the Spirit as God's presence with the disciples, John would like the church to understand that the received Spirit is the basis for their divine possession. The indwelling and abiding presence of Jesus and the Father with believers is a sign that the church owes its subsistence to God. (3) The dwelling of God with his people was understood as a means of divine covering and protection (Gen. 28.15; Exod. 33.14; Ps. 23.4; 31.20; 91.1; Isa. 41.10). This level of meaning was possibly present in John's understanding of the Spirit as God's presence with his people. The contemporary implication of such awareness for the life of the church is that the Spirit, for the believer, is God's protective presence with his people, granting both outer and inner peace, joy and refuge.

Third, the Spirit-Paraclete is revealed as one who will teach and remind them of 'all things' (14.26). As examined in the fourth chapter, 'all things' in the Fourth Gospel is synonymous with 'all truth', which has the following elements: God's gracious disposition towards mankind (1.14, 17); truth as opposed to falsehood (5.33; 8.44, 45); divine revelatory wisdom and its ethical purifying and liberating/salvific efficacy revealed in Jesus (8.31-32, 40; 17.17, 19; 18.37); the divine salvific path (14.6); belief in the only-begotten Son of God (3.18-21); and right mode of worship (4.23-24). Understood thus, the teaching role of the Spirit to the church encompasses these elements enshrined in scripture. It is by the teaching and reminding role of the Spirit that the church is brought to the comprehension and application of God's revelatory truth in scripture, as well as its proclamation to the world. This claim does not rule out human agency in the teaching process. As Klein *et al.* (1993:84) have rightly observed, the 'illuminating work of the Spirit does not circumvent nor allow us to dispense with the principles of hermeneutics and the techniques of exegesis.' In the teaching

or interpretation of God's word, either by self-meditation or pedagogy, the role of the Spirit is illumination. Erickson (1983:251) advocates a similar view. For him, 'the objective Word, the written Scripture, together with the subjective word, the inner illumination and conviction of the Holy Spirit, constitute authority for the Christian' (see also Pinnock & Callen, 2009:236; Montague, 1976:291; Klein *et al.*, 1993:85; Swartley, 1983:224). The inspired written word of God is made relevant to the contemporary believer through the illuminating work of the Spirit. The contemporary meaning of God's word results from the interplay between inspiration and illumination. The inspired written word of God must intersect with the illuminative power of the Spirit in the believer to bring about scriptural relevance.

Fourth, the Spirit is both the mediator and the proclaiming voice of the church's message of witness (15.26-27). The church is able to proclaim Jesus, the ultimate embodiment of divine truth, because the Paraclete as revealer and teacher speaks through them.

Fifth, in 16.8-13 the Spirit is not only the convicting/convincing power behind the gospel proclamation of the church, but also the guide into 'things to come'. As shown in the fourth chapter, 'things to come' has a prophetic dimension. Thus, by the reception of the Spirit the church gains prophetic knowledge and insight into the future. This observation affirms the validity of the prophetic ministry in the church today, *contra* Gentry (2011:28, 53-60), who defends the cessation of prophecy today. He argues that (1) the prophets, together with the apostles, were considered as the foundation of the New Testament church (Eph. 2.19-22), and a foundation, by the very nature of the case, is laid but once. The foundation analogy made by Gentry in defence of his case rather argues against his position. Although a foundation is built but once, once it is built it remains supportive as long as the structure remains. This means that prophecy as a foundation remains as long as the church continues to exist. (2) Gentry also argues that since the 'partial' in 1 Corinthians 13.9 refers to prophecy and other modes of revelation, and the 'perfect' points to the final New Testament scripture (James 1.22), now that the 'perfect' has come the 'partial' has certainly been done away with. This second argument is weak because the 'perfect' in this context is hardly a reference to the final New Testament canon, since there

is no clue in the Pauline corpus suggesting that Paul expected the formation of the New Testament canon somewhere in the future after his death. The future expectation of the 'perfect' is most likely the *parousia* (cf. Turner, 1996:286; Grudem, 1988:230-233; Fee, 1994:208). Such a conjecture dovetails well with Paul's eschatological views expressed elsewhere (1 Thess. 3.13; 4.13-18; 5.2, 23; 2 Thess. 2.1-6; Titus 2.13; Col. 3.4). If the 'perfect' points to the *parousia*, then the 'partial' (prophecy and other modes of revelation) is still relevant for today (see also Yocum, 1976:133-139; Turner, 1996:288; Grudem, 1988:243; Fee, 1994:209).

In sum the Spirit as Paraclete is the source of the church's religious life, the basis of its purity, divine possession, and protection. It is by the illuminating role of the Spirit that scriptural meaning becomes relevant to the contemporary life and mission of the church. The church is able to proclaim Jesus to the world because the Paraclete testifies through them. Through the prophetic ministry of the Paraclete, Jesus continues to speak and reveal himself to the church today

### **6.7 Conclusion**

The Spirit received has a life-creating and life-transforming quality. He is the source of the church's continuous revelation of the Father and the Son. The Spirit is the one who affords a new and creative river of life to the one who believes the church's witness of Christ. The church is able to remain and bear fruit in the vine by virtue of its possession of the Spirit.

The Spirit as Paraclete is the source of the content and context of the church's religious life. His presence with the church is the basis for its ethical and religious purity. The possession of the Spirit by the church means that the church is owned, protected and secured by God.

It is through the illuminating work of the Spirit that the church understands the relevance of God's revelation in history, encased in scripture. The Spirit is the mediating, convincing, and proclaiming voice of the church's message of witness to the world. He is the means by which the exalted Christ speaks prophetically to the church.

## **CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION**

Thus far the primary focus of this study was to examine the question, 'in what way is the Holy Spirit soteriologically significant to the process of salvation revealed in the Fourth Gospel?' Out of this primary concern emerged the following subsidiary questions that the study aimed to examine. First, what is the relevant state of scholarship up to present on the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel? Second, what is the theological influence of the Old Testament and the writings of Second Temple Judaism on the understanding of the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel? Third, what does the Fourth Gospel reveal about the Holy Spirit's involvement in the process of salvation? Fourth, how does the teaching in the Fourth Gospel about the Holy Spirit's soteriological role compare to and contrast with the rest of the teachings in the New Testament, with specific reference to Paul and Luke? Lastly, what is the relevance of the Spirit's soteriological role, as revealed in the Fourth Gospel, for the contemporary evangelistic mission of the church? The following sections show how this study has helped address these questions. The primary research question is addressed last because of its summative character.

### ***7.1 What is the relevant state of scholarship up to present on the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel?***

It has been shown that although scholars are divided as to the soteriological significance of the Spirit on some passages, there is some form of agreement on the salvific role of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel. Based on texts examined like 3.5, 7.37-39, 6.63 and 20.22, it is fair and sound to argue that the Fourth Gospel understands the Spirit in salvific categories. Also, it was revealed that there is no scholarly consensus regarding the meaning of the phrase, born 'of water and Spirit' in the Fourth Gospel (3.5). The proposal of Ridderbos and others, which identifies the water in the phrase with baptism, has been shown to be unattractive. That of Odeberg and Witherington, which associates the water with natural birth is unsatisfactory. The proposal by Calvin and Keener, which reduces the term (water and Spirit) as pointing to the Spirit is inadequate. The study has helped address this issue by proposing, in the light of insights from the Old Testament and Second Temple texts, that the water in the phrase

functions as an intensifying metaphor, emphasising the purificatory aspect of the Spirit's work in the entire process of rebirth. The meaning of the phrase then should be understood as a description of the cleansing/purifying (represented by the water) and life transforming/indwelling work of the Spirit (represented by the Spirit) in the new birth (cf. Ezek. 36.25-27). This finding supports the observations made by Turner, Bennema and Carson on the subject. Moreover, two opposing views revolve around the role of the Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel: those who argue for, and those who argue against, the soteriological significance of the Spirit-Paraclete. Here also, the study has helped settled the case by examining the evidence and bringing out new arguments in support of the position that the Spirit-Paraclete is soteriologically significant in the Fourth Gospel. The designation of the Spirit as another Paraclete who takes up Jesus' salvific roles when he is away argues against any position that denies him of his salvific agency. In the light of the Old Testament and Second Temple understanding of the concept of truth, the title of the Paraclete as the Spirit of truth confers salvific qualities on him. In addition, it was revealed that there is no scholarly agreement on the nature of the Pascal insufflation gift. The position of Burge and others that the event stands as a Johannine version to the Lukan Pentecost has been shown to be unsatisfactory. The symbolic view advocated by Carson and Köstenberger was not helpful. The study has helped tackled this issue by observing that the experience in 20.22 should be seen as a graphic depiction of the new creation that had already taken place in the life of the disciples by their relationship with Jesus. 20.22 is a concrete or theatrical depiction of the new birth of 'water and Spirit' spoken of in 3.5. This means the Fourth Gospel knows of four types of giving. The first and second are symbolic (19.30 and 19.34), the second is a dramatic depiction of what it means to be born of the Spirit (20.22) and the fourth is the expectation of the actual giving of the Spirit as Paraclete (cf. Acts 2).

***7.2 What is the theological influence of the Old Testament and the writings of Second Temple Judaism on the understanding of the soteriological role of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel?***

It was discovered that in the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism the Spirit was understood in various ways as having a life-giving and a life-sustaining function. With John's familiarity with the Old Testament and Second Temple texts, it comes as no surprise that in his understanding of the work of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel, John attributes soteriological significance to the Spirit. His understanding of the Paraclete as Jesus' successor when he is away intimates that the farewell-successor motif of the Exodus story contributed to his thought. In addition, it was examined that John shares his concept of truth with the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism. In the Old Testament and Second Temple texts 'truth' was understood as a soteriological language, hence, John's understanding of the Paraclete as the Spirit of truth carries a soteriological force.

### ***7.3 What does the Fourth Gospel reveal about the Holy Spirit's involvement in the process of salvation?***

In the Fourth Gospel the Spirit was the power behind Jesus' life-giving and life-sustaining ministry. The Spirit was the instrument by which Jesus baptised believers (1.33), as well as the source of his life-changing revelatory wisdom teachings. Through the work of the Spirit, belief in Jesus and his teachings results in (1) new birth/new creation and access into God's kingdom (3.5; 20.22); (2) the possession of everlasting life (3.16; 6.40); (3) the experience of living water (4.14; 7.37-39); and (4) mutual coherence, bearing of fruit and true discipleship (15.1-8).

The Spirit-Paraclete as the Spirit of truth is the mediator, illuminator, teacher, and convincer of divine life-giving revelatory wisdom. The Paraclete is the medium by which believers enter into communal fellowship with the Father and the Son and participate with the life in the Godhead. The Spirit is both the power behind, and the faith-quickenning agent within the disciples' witness.

### ***7.4 How does the teaching in the Fourth Gospel about the Holy Spirit's soteriological role compare to and contrast with the rest of the teachings in the New Testament, with specific reference to Paul and Luke?***

John, Luke and Paul have common and distinct perspectives as far as the pneumatic soteriology of the Spirit is concerned. However, those distinctions

should be understood as complementary and harmonious, as well as a means of helping us grasp a holistic view of the pneumatic soteriology of the New Testament canon.

***7.5 What is the relevance of the Spirit's soteriological role, as revealed in the Fourth Gospel, for the contemporary evangelistic mission of the church?***

The Spirit received during conversion is the Spirit-Paraclete, who is soteriologically and missiologically relevant to the church's life and mission to the world. He is the one responsible for the recreation of believers, the sustenance of the salvation of the church, and the understanding, proclamation, and the conviction of the church's message of Jesus to the world.

***7.6 In what way is the Holy Spirit soteriologically significant to the process of salvation revealed in the Fourth Gospel?***

The Fourth Gospel reveals that the Spirit is he who initiates the new life of the believer. He is the Spirit of life (6.63). He sustains this new life by (1) the continuous mediation, illumination and teaching of God's truth to the believer; (2) maintaining a bond of fellowship between the believer and the exalted Christ; and (3) serving as a medium for the coherence between the believer and Christ. The Spirit is both life-giving and life-sustaining. There is no new birth, Christian life, eternal life, and true Christian discipleship without the involvement of the Spirit. For the Fourth Gospel, the Spirit is soteriologically significant and indispensable to the process of salvation.

***7.7 Gaps in the area of Johannine pneumatic soteriology filled by the study***

The following gaps in Johannine pneumatic studies were filled in the study:

(1) *The salvific role of the Spirit in the giving of the Son (3.16).* It was discovered that 'belief' in the Fourth Gospel is both a pneumatic and soteriological diction. To believe in the Son of the Father is to experience the creative work of the Spirit. This is because the Son is the baptiser of the Spirit (1.33); he is given the Spirit without measure (3.34); his words are Spirit-imbued (6.63); he is the giver of the Spirit as living water (7.39; cf. 4.14); and he is the

source of the Spirit/breath of life (20.22). The gift of the Father is a pneumatic soteriological one.

(2) *The salvific role of the Spirit in the bread of life discourse (6.22-59)*. It was revealed that to 'eat' and 'drink' is a metaphorical diction for believing and coming to Jesus. By the phrase, 'I am the bread of life', Jesus claimed to be the embodiment of divine wisdom. The life-giving power of this bread which Jesus promised to give is derived from the Spirit. The bread that Jesus promised is life not only because it originated from heaven, but more significantly, because it was enlivened by the Spirit.

(3) *The salvific role of the Spirit in the vine discourse (15.1-8)*. It was deduced that the vine remains in the branches and the branches remain in the vine by virtue of the Spirit. The fruit-bearing of the branches is predicated on the enabling work of the Spirit. The Spirit is both the purifying and sustaining agent in the Johannine concept of discipleship. The branches cannot live on their own and become productive without enhancement by the Spirit.

(4) *The salvific role of the Spirit-Paraclete (14.16-17, 25-26; 15.26-27; 16.7-11, 12-15)*. The finding of the study has shown that the Spirit-Paraclete, *contra* Windisch and others, is soteriologically significant. The Paraclete is the one who continues and sustains Jesus' life-giving vocation while Jesus is away. He is the indwelling and abiding presence of the Godhead with the disciples, and the source of their joy. He is the teacher/revealer of divine salvific wisdom and mediator of the 'truth'. He is the convincer of the world's guilt and acts as a faith provoking agent.

It is imperative to emphasise in conclusion that for the Fourth Gospel, the Spirit is an indispensable agent to the process of salvation. The creative power of the Spirit is experienced by the one who believes in the gift of the Father. The Spirit is the purifying water and the regenerative agent in the phrase, 'born of water and Spirit'. He is the life-giving power behind the revelation of the cross expressed, albeit in symbolic categories, in the bread of life discourse. The Spirit is understood as the means through which believers continue to live and bear fruits in Jesus. This truth is couched in the vine metaphor. The Spirit is the agent of new-creation, demonstrated to the disciples, by the act of the paschal

insufflation. The Spirit-Paraclete is the mediator, illuminator, teacher, revealer and convincer of Jesus' life-saving teachings. He is the power behind and the faith-provoking agent to the witness of the disciples. He is the medium of fellowship between Jesus and his disciples, as well as the means by which the Father and Son tabernacle with believers.

While the findings of the research have helped in the filling of these gaps, the following two areas were not addressed and are therefore recommended for further research:

- *The Johannine Concept of the Spirit as the Spirit of the New Covenant.* In the sixth chapter, Paul's and Luke's view of the Spirit as the Spirit of the New Covenant was explored. John's view in the Fourth Gospel was not given attention when his pneumatic soteriology was explored in the fourth chapter. John's view of the Spirit as the Spirit of the New Covenant in the Fourth Gospel still remains an unexcavated area within Johannine pneumatic studies. Hence, a proposal for further research in that area is in order.
- *Johannine Pneumatic Ethics.* It was revealed in this study that John's views of the Spirit-Paraclete as the Spirit of truth entails an ethical dimension. Also, the work of the Spirit in the vine discourse was shown to include cleansing and the bearing of fruits. However, these ethical features were not given in depth attention. How the Spirit is ethically involved in the soteriology of the Fourth Gospel deserves in-depth attention in Johannine pneumatic studies.

## Bibliography

- Ashby, G. W. 2002. Body and Blood in John 6.41-65. *Neotestamentica*, 36(1/2): 57-61.
- Ashton, J. 1991. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Atkinson, P. W. 2011. *Baptism in the Spirit: Luke-Acts and the Dunn Debate*. Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications.
- . 2014. 1 Corinthians. (In Burke, T. J. & Warrington, K. eds. *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*. London: SPCK. p. 146-159).
- Aune, D. E. 1983. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Bamberger, B. J. 1939. *Proselytism in the Talmudic period*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press.
- Barrett, C. K. 1947. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. Edinburgh: T & A Constable Ltd.
- . 1950. The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel. *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 1(1):1-15.
- . 1962. John (In Black, M. & Rowley, H. H. eds. *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*. Middlesex: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd. p. 844-869).
- . 1975. *The Gospel of John & Judaism*. London: SPCK.
- Baskin, J. R. 2001. Women and Ritual Immersion in Medieval Ashkenaz: The Sexual Politics of Piety. (In Fine, L. ed. *Judaism in Practice*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. p. 131-142).
- Bauckham, R. 2007. *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. 1991. *Gospel of Life: Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- . 1993. Baptism. (In Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P. & Reid, D. G. eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 60-66).
- Bennema, C. 2002. *The Power of Saving Wisdom*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock.
- . 2003. Spirit Baptism in the Fourth Gospel: A Messianic Reading of John 1.33. *Biblica*, 84(1):35-60.
- . 2005. *Excavating John's Gospel*. Delhi: ISPCK.
- . 2012. The Giving of the Spirit in John 19-20. (In Marshall, I. H., Rabens, V. & Bennema, C. eds. *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. p. 86-104).
- Berkhof, H. 1964. *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit: The Annie Kinkead Lectures, 1963-1964*. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press.

- Billington, A. 1995. The Paraclete and Mission in the Fourth Gospel. (*In* Billington, A., Lane, T. & Turner, M. eds. *Mission and Meaning: Essays Presented to Peter Cotterell*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press. p. 90-115).
- Bloomberg, L. D, & Maria, V. 2012. *Completing your Qualitative Dissertation*. 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- Borgen, P. 1997. John 6: Tradition, Interpretation and Composition (*In* Culpepper, R. A. ed. *Critical Readings of John 6*. Atlanta: SLB. p. 95-114).
- Breck, J. 1991. *Spirit of Truth: The Origins of Johannine Pneumatology*. Crestwood- New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.
- Brennan, J. 1961. The Living Bread. *The Furrow*, 12(11):647-661.
- Brenton, L. 1851. *LXX Septuagint*. Marson Gate, Winchester: Amazon UK.
- Brown, R. 1966a. *The Gospel According to John i-xii*. Vol 1. London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- . 1966b. *The Gospel According to John*. Vol. 2. London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- . 1977. The Qumran Scrolls and John: A Companion in Thought and Expression. (*In* Taylor, M. J. ed. *A Companion to John: Readings in Johannine Theology*. New York: Alba House. p. 69-90).
- . 1979. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*. New York: Paulist Press.
- . 1988. *The Gospel and Epistles of John*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.
- Brown, T. G. 2003. *Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-Scientific Perspective*. London: T&T Clark.
- Bruce, F. F. 1983. *The Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Bruner, F. D. 1970. *A Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Büchsel, F. 1926. *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament*. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann.
- Bultmann, R. 1952. *Theology of the New Testament*. Vol. I. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. London: SCM Press.
- Bultmann, R. 1955. *Theology of the New Testament*. Vol. II. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. London: SCM Press.
- Bultmann, R. 1971. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated from the German by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Westminster Press.
- Burge, G. 1987. *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- . 2014. The Gospel of John. (*In* Burke, T. J. & Warrington, K. eds. *A Biblical Theology of the Spirit*. London: SPCK. p. 104-115).

- Burke, T. J. 2014. Romans. (In Burke, T. J., & Warrington, K., eds. *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*. London: SPCK. p. 129-145).
- Calvin, J. 1959. *The Gospel According to St. John 1-10*. Translated by T. H. L. Parker. Edinburg: The Saint Andrew Press.
- . 1961. *The Gospel According to St. John 11-21*. Translated by T. H. L. Parker. Edinburg: The Saint Andrew Press.
- Carson, D. A. 1991. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Charlesworth, J. H. 1983a. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 1. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC.
- . 1983b. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 2. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC.
- Christiansen, E. J. 1995. *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries and Identity*. Lieden: Brill.
- Coetzer, W. C. 1981. The Holy Spirit and the Eschatological View in Romans 8. *Neotestamentica*, 15:180-198.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. 1985. *Romans*. Edinburgh: T&T. Clark.
- Crossan, J. D. 1991. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.
- Crump, D. M. 1992. Truth. (In Green, J. B. & McKnight, S. ed. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 859-862).
- Cullmann, O. 1959. *The Christology of the New Testament*. London: SCM Press.
- Daise, M. A. 2003. "If anyone Thirst, Let that One come to Me and Drink": The Literary Texture of John 7.37b-38a. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 122(4):687-699.
- Dauids, P. H. 1984. Adoption. (In Elwell, W. A., ed. *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House Company. p. 13).
- Davies, W. D. 1977. The Johannine 'Signs' of Jesus. (In Taylor, M. J. ed. *A Companion to John: Readings in Johannine Theology*. New York: Alba House. p. 91-115).
- De Boer, M. C. 1988. Jesus the Baptiser: 1 John 5.5-8 and the Gospel of John. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 107(1):87-106.
- De Lacey, D. R. 1993. Gentiles. (In Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P. & Reid, D. G. eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 335-339).
- Delorme, J. 1964. The Practise of Baptism in Judaism at the Beginning of the Christian Era. (In George, A., Delorme, J., Mollat, D., Gullet, J., Boismard, M. E., Duplacy, J. Giblet, J. & Tremel, Y. B. *Baptism in the New Testament*. London: Geoffrey Chapman. p. 25-83).
- Denzer, G. A. 1968. The Pastoral Letters. (In Brown, R. E., Fitzmyer, J. A. & Murphy, R. E. eds. *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Vol. 2. London: Geoffrey Chapman p. 350-361).

- Diessmann, A. 1926. *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*. Translated by William E. Wilson. New York: George H. Doran Company.
- Dockery, D. S. 1992. John the Baptist. (In Green, J. B, McKnight, S. & Marshall, I. H, eds. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 55-58).
- Dodd, C. H. 1953. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Douglas, J.D. 1990. *New Commentary on the Whole Bible: Old Testament Volume*. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc.
- Draper, J. A. 1992. The Sociological Function of the Spirit/Paraclete in the Farewell Discourses in the Fourth Gospel. *Neotestamentica*, 26(1):13-29.
- Du Toit, A. "In Christ", "In the Christ" and Related Prepositional Phrases: Their Relevance for a Discussion on Pauline Mysticism. *Neotestamentica*, 34(2):287-298.
- Dunn, J. D. 1970. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. London: SCM Press.
- . 1977. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*. London: SCM Press Ltd.
- . 1998. *The Christ and the Spirit*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- . 2012. The Lord, the Giver of Life: The Gift of the Spirit as Both Life-giving and Empowering. (In Marshall, I. H., Rabens, V. & Bennema, C. eds. *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. p. 1-17).
- . 1992. Prayer. (In Green, J. B. & McKnight, S. eds. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 617-625).
- . 1993. Letter to the Romans. (In Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P. & Reid, D. G. eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 838-850).
- . 1998. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. London: T&T Clark.
- Edersheim, A. 1997. *The Temple*. London: Angus Hudson.
- Erickson, M. J. 1983. *Christian Theology 1*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Ervin, H. M. 1968. *These are not Drunken as you Suppose*. New Jersey: Plainfield.
- . 1984. *Conversion-Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- Esler, P. F. 1994. *The First Christians in their Social World*. London: Routledge.
- Fee, G. D & Stuart, D. 2003. *How to Read the Bible for all its Worth*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Fee, G. D. 1991. *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.

- . 1994. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Filson, F. V. 1962. The Gospel of Life: A Study of the Gospel of John. (In Klassen, W. & Synder, G. F. eds. *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*. London: SCM Press Ltd. p. 111-123).
- Fitzmyer, J. A. 1990. The Letter to the Romans. (In Brown, R., Fitzmyer, S. J. & Murphy, R. E. eds. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. p. 830-868).
- Forestell, J. T. 1974. *The Word of the Cross*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Fortna, R. T. 1988. *The Fourth Gospel and its Predecessor: From Narrative source to present Gospel*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Gentry, K. L. 2011. *The Charismatic Spirit of Prophecy: A Reformed Response to Wayne Grudem*. South Carolina: Victorious Hope Publishing.
- Gero, S. 1976. The Spirit as a Dove at the Baptism of Jesus. *Novum Testamentum*, 18(1):17-35.
- Giblet, J. 1964. Baptism – The Sacrament of Incorporation into the Church, according to St Paul. (In George, A., Delorme, J., Mollat, D., Gullet, J., Boismard, M. E., Duplacy, J. Giblet, J. & Tremel, Y. B. *Baptism in the New Testament*. London: Geoffrey Chapman. p. 161-186).
- Goring, P., Hawthorn, J. & Mitchell, D. 2001. *Studying Literature: The Essential Companion*. London: Arnold.
- Grigsby, B. H. 1986. "If Any Man Thirsts...": Observations on the Rabbinic Background of John 7.37-39. *Biblica*, 67(1):101-108.
- . 1985. Washing in the Pool of Siloam: A Thematic Anticipation of the Johannine Cross. *Novum Testamentum*, 27(3):227-235.
- Grosheide, F. W. 1953. *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.
- Grudem, W. 1988. *The Gift of Prophecy in the New Testament Today*. Suffolk: Kingsway Publication Ltd.
- . 1994. *Systematic Theology*. Nottingham: InterVarsity Press.
- Gruenler, R. G. 1989. Romans. (In Elwell, W. A. ed. *The Marshall Pickering Commentary on the NIV*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker book House. p. 923-957).
- Gullet, S. J. 1964. Baptism and the Spirit. (In George, A., Delorme, J., Mollat, D., Gullet, J., Boismard, M. E., Duplacy, J. Giblet, J. & Tremel, Y. B. *Baptism in the New Testament*. London: Geoffrey Chapman. p. 87-104).
- Gunkel, H. 2008. *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*. Translated by Roy A. Harrisville & Philip A. Quanbeck II. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Guthrie, D. 1997. The Pastoral Letters. (In Carson, D. A., France, R. T., Motyer, J. A. & Wenham, G. J. eds. *New Bible Commentary*. Leicester: InterVarsity Press. p. 1292-1315).
- Guthrie, J. T. 1980. Metaphor. *Journal of Reading*, 23(7):640-641.

- Hamilton Jr., J. M. 2006. *God's Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old and New Testament*. Nashville, Tennessee: B&H Academic.
- Hammersley, M. 1993. What is social Research? (In Hammersley, M. ed. *Principles of Social Research and Education*. Milton Keynes: The Open University).
- Harris, M. 1996. *Proclaim Jubilee*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Harvey, A. E. 1975. *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel*. London: SPCK.
- Hatina, R. T. 1993. John 20.22 in its Eschatological context: Promise or Fulfilment? *Biblica*, 74(2):196-219.
- Hayes, J. H & Holladay, C. R. 1982. *Biblical Exegesis: A Beginner's Handbook*. Atlanta: SCM Press Ltd.
- Henn, M. et al. 2009. *A Critical Introduction to Social Science Research*. 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- Hill, C. 1989. *Prophecy Past and Present*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Servant Publication.
- Hoskyns, E. 1947. *The Fourth Gospel*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Howard, W. F. 1931. *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*. London: The Epworth Press.
- Hubbard, M. 2014. 2 Corinthians. (In Burke, T. J. & Warrington, K. eds. *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*. London: SPCK. p. 160-174).
- Hughes, J. H. 1972. John the Baptist: The Forerunner of God Himself. *Novum Testamentum*, 14(3):191-218.
- Hunter, A. M. 1950. *The Work and Words of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Jesson, J.K. et al. 2011. *Doing your Literature Research*. London: Sage.
- Johnston, G. 1970. *The Spirit Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, L. P. 1997. *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kaiser, W. C. 2014. The Pentateuch. (In Burke, T. J. & Warrington, K. eds. *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*. London: SPCK. p. 1-11).
- Keener, C. S. 1997. *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- . 2003a. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- . 2003b. *The Gospel According to John*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- . 2016. *The Mind of the Spirit*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Klein, W.W et al. 1993. *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. London: Word Publishing.

- Knight III, G. W. 1989. 1-2 Timothy/Titus. (In Elwell, W. A. ed. *The Marshall Pickering Commentary on the NIV*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker book House. p. 1098-1118).
- Koester C. R. 2003. *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery and Community*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- . 2008. *The Word of Life: A Theology of John's Gospel*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publication Company.
- Köstenberger, A. J. 2004. *John*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Kysar, Robert. 1975. *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House.
- Lampe, G. W. H. 1957. The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke. (In Nineham, D. E. ed. *Studies in the Gospels*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. p. 159-200).
- Lampe, G. W. H. 1976. *God as Spirit: The Bampton Lectures*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lane, W. L. 1974. *The Gospel of Mark*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Lauren, R. B. 1984. John the Baptist. ( In Elwell, W. A. ed. *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House Company. p. 587-588).
- Lee, D. 2004. In the Spirit of Truth: Worship and Prayer in the Gospel of John and the Early Fathers. *Vigiliae Christianae*, 58(3):277-297.
- Levison, R. J. 2009. *Filled with the Spirit*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Lightfoot, R. H. 1956. *St. John's Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lindars, B. 1972. *The Gospel of John*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott
- . 1990. *John*. Sheffield-England: Sheffield Academic.
- Lioy, D. 2007. *Jesus as Torah in John 1-12*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock.
- . 2008. The Biblical Concept of Truth in the Fourth Gospel. *The Journal of the South African Theological Seminary*, 6:67-95.
- Malatesta, E. 1973. The Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel. *Biblica*, 54(4):539-550.
- Manson, W. 1959. Notes on the Argument of Romans (Chapters 1-8). (In Higgins, A. J. B. ed. *New Testament Essays*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. p. 150-164).
- Marshall, I. H. 1997. 1 & 2 Thessalonians. (In Carson, D. A., France, R. T., Motyer, J. A., & Wenham, G. J. eds. *New Bible Commentary*. Leicester: InterVarsity Press. p. 1277-1291).
- Marshall, I. H. 2004. *New Testament Theology*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- McDonnell, K & Montague, G. T. 1991. *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.

- McKnight, S. 2000. Proselytism and God Fearers. (In Evans, C. A. & Porter, S. E. eds. *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter Varsity Press. p. 835-847).
- Menken, M. J. 1993. John 6.51c-58: Eucharist or Christology? *Biblica*, 74(1):1-26.
- . 1996. The Origin of the Old Testament Quotation in John 7.38. *Novum Testamentum*, 38(2):160-175.
- Menzies, R. P. 1991. *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- . 2004. John's Place in the Development of Early Christian Pneumatology. (In Ma, W. & Menzies, R. P. eds. *The Spirit and Spirituality*. London: T&T Clark International. p. 41-52).
- . 2000. Exegesis: A Reply to James Dunn. (In Menzies, W. W. & Menzies, R. P. *Spirit and Power*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan. p. 69-86).
- Michael, W., Martin, A. Jr. & Edward, C. 1996. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Midrash Rabbah. 1951. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 10 Vols. Translated by H. Freedman & M. Simon. London: Soncino.
- Mollat, D. 1964. Baptismal Symbolism in St. Paul. (In George, A., Delorme, J., Mollat, D., Gullet, J., Boismard, M. E., Duplacy, J. Giblet, J. & Tremel, Y. B. eds. *Baptism in the New Testament*. London: Geoffrey Chapman. p. 63-83).
- Montague, G. T. 1970. *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Moo, D. J. 1997. Romans. (In Carson, D. A., France, R. T., Motyer, J. A. & Wenham, G. J. eds. *New Bible Commentary*. Leicester: InterVarsity Press. p. 1115-1160).
- Morris, L. 1971. *The Gospel According to John*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.
- . 1987. *Reflections on the Gospel of John: The Bread of Life*. Vol 2. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- . 1986. *New Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 1990. The First Letter to the Corinthians. (In Brown, R., Fitzmyer, S. J. & Murphy, R. E., eds. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. p. 798-815).
- Neusner, J. 1988. *The Mishna: A New Translation*. New Heaven: Yale University Press.
- Nielsen, H. K. 1999. John's Understanding of the Death of Jesus. (In Nissen, J. & Pedersen, S. eds. *New Readings in John*. London: T&T Clark International. p. 232-254).
- Oderberg, H. T. 1968. *The Fourth Gospel*. Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner.

- Olsson, B. 1999. *Deus Semper Marior? On God in the Johannine Writings.* (In Nissen, J. & Pedersen, S. eds. *New Readings in John.* London: T&T Clark International. p. 143-171).
- Osborn, G.R. 1991. *The Hermeneutical Spiral.* Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Otoo, K. 2014. *Walking in the Spirit: A Study of Paul's teachings on the Spirit and Ethics in Galatians 5.13-6.10.* Bangor: Bangor University. (Thesis – PhD).
- Packer, J. I. 2005. *Keep in Step with the Spirit.* Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Paige, T. 1993. Holy Spirit. (In Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P. & Reid, D. G. eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters.* Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 404-413).
- Painter, J. 1997. Jesus and the Quest for Eternal Life (In Culpepper, R. A. ed. *Critical Readings of John 6.* Atlanta: SLB. p. 61-94).
- Pamment, M. 1983. John 3.5. *Novum Testamentum*, 25(2):189-190.
- Perkins, P. 1990. The Gospel According to John. (In Brown, R., Fitzmyer, S. J. & Murphy, R. E. eds. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall. p. 942-985).
- Petts, D. 1998. *The Holy Spirit.* Mattersey: Mattersey Hall.
- Philo. 1993. Translated by Yonge C.D. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Pinnock, C. H. & Callen, B. L. 2009. *The Scripture Principle.* Lexington, Kentucky: Emeth Press.
- Prior, M. 1995. *Jesus the Liberator: Nazareth Liberation Theology.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Pryor, J. W. 1992. *John: Evangelist of the Covenant People.* Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Pusey, K. 1993. *Jewish Proselyte Baptism.* London: Phoenix Press.
- Rabens, V. 2014. 1 Thessalonians. (In Burke, T. J. & Warrington, K., eds. *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit.* London: SPCK. p. 198-212).
- Ricks, S. D. 1996. Miqvaot: Ritual Immersion Baths in Second Temple (Intertestamental) Jewish History. *Brigham Young University Studies*, 36(3):277-86.
- Ridderbos, H. 1975. *Paul.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company
- .1997. *The Gospel According to John.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Ringe, S. H. 1985. *Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee.* Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock.
- Robinson, J. A. T. 1957. The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community: Testing a Hypothesis. *The Harvard Theological Review*, 50(3):175-191.
- Robson, J. 2014. Ezekiel. (In Burke, T. J. & Warrington, K., eds. *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit.* London: SPCK. p. 57-70).

- Rowland, C. 1985. *Christian Origins*. London: SPCK.
- Rowley, H. H. 1959. The Baptism of John and the Qumran Sect. (In Higgins, A. J. B. eds. *New Testament Essays*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. p. 218-229).
- Ryken, L, Wilhoit, J. C. & Longman III, T. eds. 1998. *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Sanders, E. P. 1991. *Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sanders, J. N. 1968. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. London: Adam & Charles Black.
- Schnackenburg, R. 1964. *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul*. Translated by Beasley-Murray, G. R. New York: Herder and Herder.
- . 1977. Is There a Johannine Ecclesiology? (In Taylor, M. J. ed. *A Companion to John: Readings in Johannine Theology*. New York: Alba House. p. 247-256).
- . 1993. *Jesus in the Gospels: A Biblical Christology*. Translated from the German by O. C. Dean, Jr. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Schweizer, E. 1959. The Concept of the Church in the Gospel and Epistles of St. John. (In Higgins, A. J. B. ed. *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson (1893-1958)*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. p. 230-245).
- . 1980. *The Holy Spirit*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Scott, J. M. 1993. Adoption, Sonship. (In Hawthorne, G. F. & Martin, R. P. eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 15-18).
- Seifrid, M. A. 1993. In Christ. (In Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P. & Reid, D. G., eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 433-436).
- Selwyn, E. C. 1912. The Feast of Tabernacles, Epiphany, and Baptism. *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 13(50):225-249.
- Servotte, H. 1994. *According to John: A Literary Reading of the Fourth Gospel*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd.
- Simon, U. E. 1957. Eternal Life in the Fourth Gospel. (In Cross, F. L., ed. *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd. p. 97-109).
- Simpson, C. A & Bowie, W. R. 1952. Genesis. (In Buttrick, G. A, ed. *The Interpreters' Bible*. Vol.1. New York: Abingdon Press. p. 439-829).
- Slee, M. 2003. *The Church in Antioch in the First Century C.E*. London: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Sloan, R. B. 1992. Jubilee. (In Green, J. B. & McKnight, S. eds. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 396-397).
- Smalley, S. 1978. *John: Evangelist and Interpreter*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press.

- Smith, D. M. 1995. *New Testament Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stefan, C. 2005. The Paraclete and Prophecy in the Johannine Community. *The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies*, 27(2):273-296.
- Strachan, R. H. 1941. *The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: Student Christian Movement Press.
- Strauss, M. L. 2012. Jesus and the Spirit in Biblical and Theological Perspective: Messianic Empowering, Saving Wisdom, and the Limits of Biblical Theology. (In Marshall, I. H., Rabens, V. & Bennema, C. eds. *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. p. 266-284).
- Strecker, G. 2000. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Boring, M. E. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Stronstad, R. 1984. *The Charismatic Theology of Luke*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Swartley, W. 1983. *Slavery, Sabbath, War, and Women*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.
- Swete, H. B. 1909. *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited.
- Swetnam, J. 1993. Bestowal of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel. *Biblica*, 74(4):556-576.
- Talbert, C. H. 1992. *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistle*. London: SPCK.
- Taylor, J. E. 1997. *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Thayer, J. H. 1981. *The New Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Lafayette, Indiana: Apqa.
- The Babylonian Talmud. 2008. Vol. 4. Translated by Rodkinson, M. L. Charleston, South Carolina: Forgotten Books.
- The Dead Sea Scrolls. 1987. Translated by G. Vermes. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: Penguin Books.
- The Dead Sea Scrolls. 1996. Translated by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, JR., & Edward Cook. New York: HarperSanFrancisco.
- The Jerusalem Talmud (Studia Judaica), Second Order: MO' ED. 2010. Translated by Guggenheimer, H. W. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- The Joint Committee on the New Translation of the Bible. 1970. *The New English Bible Apocrypha*. Cambridge: The University Printing House.
- The Tosefta. 2014. Translated by Neusner, J. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- Thiselton, A. C. 2013. *The Holy Spirit in Biblical Tradition*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

- Thompson, M. M. 1992. Gospel of John. (In Green, J. B. & McKnight, S. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 368-383).
- Trocmé, A. 2003. *Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution*. New York: Orbit Books.
- Turner, M. M. B. 1992. Holy Spirit. (In Green, J. B. & McKnight, S. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 341-351).
- . 1996. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- . 1996. *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, Inc.
- Ulfgard, Hakan. 1998. *The Story of Sukkot*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Vawter, B. 1968. The Gospel According to John. (In Brown, R. E., Fitzmyer, J. A. & Murphy, R. E. eds. *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Vol. 2. London: Geoffrey Chapman. p. 414-466).
- Vink, J. 1960. Truth in the Gospel of John. *Life of the Spirit* (1946-1964), 14(167):484-489.
- Von Rad, G. 1961. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Translated by Marks J. H. Norwich: SCM Press.
- Von Wahlde, U. C. 1983. Wiederaufnahme as Marker of Redaction in John 6.51-58. *Biblica*, 64(4):542-549.
- Wall, R. W. 2012. Salvation's Bath by the Spirit: A Study of Titus 3:5b-6 in Its Canonical Setting. (In Marshall, I. H., Rabens, V. & Bennema, C. eds. *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. p. 198-212).
- Warrington, K. 2014. The Synoptic Gospels. (In Burke, T. J. & Warrington, K. eds. *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*. London: SPCK. p. 84-103)
- Webb, R. L. 1991. *John the Baptist and Prophet*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Welker, M. 2006. *The Work of the Spirit*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Wenk, M. 2000. *Community Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*. London: T&T Clark International.
- . 2014. Acts. (In Burke, T. J. & Warrington, K. eds. *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*. London: SPCK. p. 116-128).
- Westcott, B. F. 1894. *The Gospel According to St. John*. London: John Murray.
- Wild, R. A. 1990. The Pastoral Letters (In Brown, R., Fitzmyer, S. J. & Murphy, R. E. eds. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. p. 891-902).
- Williamson, P. R. 2003. Circumcision. (In Alexander, T. D. & Baker, D. W. eds. *Dictionary of the Old Testament Pentateuch*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 122-125).

- Windisch, H. 1968. *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Witherington III, B. 1992. John the Baptist. (In Green, J. B, McKnight, S. & Marshall, I. H. eds. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 383-391).
- . 1995. *John's Wisdom*. Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press.
- . 1993. Christ. (In Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P. & Reid, D. G. eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press. p. 95-100).
- Woods, E. D. 2001. *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Yocum, B. 1976. *Prophecy: Exercising the Prophetic Gifts of the Spirit in the Church today*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Servant Books.
- Ziesler, J. 1983. *Pauline Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.