

NAC STUDIES IN BIBLE & THEOLOGY

GOD'S  
INDWELLING  
PRESENCE

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE  
OLD & NEW TESTAMENTS



JAMES M. HAMILTON, JR.

SERIES EDITOR: RAY CLENDENEN









for my sweet Jill

Soli Deo Gloria

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

[List of Tables](#)

[List of Abbreviations](#)

[Series Preface](#)

[Author's Preface](#)

[1. The Holy Spirit and the Old Covenant  
Remnant](#)

[2. A Survey of the Spectrum of Opinion](#)

[3. Not in but with in the Old Testament](#)

[4. The Spirit in John](#)

[5. The Spirit was not yet Given](#)

6. Regeneration and Indwelling in John

7. Results and Relevance for Today

Appendices:

1. The Use of emphusaō in John 20:22

2. "He is with you, and He is in you?" The text of John 14:17c

3. Rushing wind and organ music: toward Luke's theology of the spirit in Acts

Bibliography

# **LIST OF TABLES**

[1. Positions on the Holy Spirit and Old Covenant Believers](#)

[2. Actions of God in John](#)

[3. External Evidence for the Text of John 14:17c](#)

[4. Diagram of the Points of Overlap](#)

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABD Anchor Bible Dictionary

ANF The Ante-Nicene Fathers

ASR Austin Seminary Review

BA Biblical Archeologist

BBR Bulletin for Biblical Research

BDAG Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich.

Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early

Christian Literature. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.

BDB Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. A Hebrew and

English Lexicon of the Old Testament

Bib Biblica

BJRL Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library

BSac Bibliotheca Sacra

BTB Biblical Theology Bulletin

CBQ Catholic Biblical Quarterly

CBQMS Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series

CRINT Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum

CTM Concordia Theological Monthly

CTR Criswell Theological Review

DBI Dictionary of Biblical Imagery

DJG Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels

DOTP Dictionary of the Old Testament Pentateuch

DPL Dictionary of Paul and His Letters

EBC The Expositor's Bible Commentary

Eng. English Translation

EvQ Evangelical Quarterly

ExAud Ex auditu

ExpTim Expository Times

GBH P. Joüon, A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, 2 vols, trans,  
and

rev. T. Muraoka

GKC Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Edited by E. Kautzsch.

Translated by A. E. Cowley

HALOT L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, The  
Hebrew

and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, trans. M. E. J.

Richardson

Hb. Hebrew

Hey] Heythrop Journal

HTR Harvard Theological Review

ICC International Critical Commentary

ISBE International Standard Bible Encyclopedia

IVPNTC IVP New Testament Commentary Series

JETS Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society

JSNT Journal for the Study of the New Testament

JSNTSup Journal for the Study of the New Testament:  
Supplement

Series

JSS Journal of Semitic Studies

JTS Journal of Theological Studies

LCL Loeb Classical Library

LSJ H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. S. Jones, A Greek-English  
Lexicon.

9<sup>th</sup> ed. with revised supplement

MM Moulton, J. H., and G. Milligan. The Vocabulary of the  
Greek

Testament

MT Masoretic Text

NA<sup>27</sup> Novum Testamentum Graece, Nestle-Aland, 27<sup>th</sup> ed.

NAC New American Commentary

NDBT New Dictionary of Biblical Theology

Neot Neotestamentica

NICNT New International Commentary on the New Testament

NIDNTT New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology

NIDOTTE New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and

Exegesis

NIGTC New International Greek Testament Commentary

NIVAC NIV Application Commentary

NovT Novum Testamentum

NovTSup Supplements to Novum Testamentum

NPNF<sup>1</sup> A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of

the Christian Church, Series 1

NPNF<sup>2</sup> A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of

the Christian Church, Series 2

NTApoc New Testament Apocrypha

NTS New Testament Studies

OTL Old Testament Library

OTP Old Testament Pseudepigrapha

PNTC Pillar New Testament Commentaries

RefR Reformed Review

RevQ Revue de Qumran

RTR Reformed Theological Review

SBJT The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology

SBLDS Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series

SBET Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology

SBT<sup>2</sup> Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series

SBTS Sources for Biblical and Theological Study

SJT Scottish Journal of Theology

SNTA Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia

SNTSMS Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series

SP Sacra Pagina

SwJT Southwestern Journal of Theology

TDNJ Theological Dictionary of the New Testament

TDOT Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament

Them Themelios

TJ Trinity Journal

TJT Toronto Journal of Theology

TOTC Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries

TynBul Tyndale Bulletin

UBS<sup>4</sup> The Greek New Testament, United Bible Societies,  
4<sup>th</sup> ed.

VE Vox evangelica

WBC Word Biblical Commentary

WUNT Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen  
Testament

ZAW Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft  
und die

Kunde der älteren Kirche

ZTK Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

# **SERIES PREFACE**

We live in an exciting era of evangelical scholarship. Many fine educational institutions committed to the inerrancy of Scripture are training men and women to serve Christ in the church and to advance the gospel in the world. Many church leaders and professors are skillfully and fearlessly applying God's Word to critical issues, asking new questions and developing new tools to answer those questions from Scripture. They are producing valuable new resources to thoroughly equip current and future generations of Christ's servants.

The Bible is an amazing source of truth and an amazing tool when wielded by God's Spirit for God's glory and our good. It is a bottomless well of living water, a treasure house of endless proportions. Like an ancient tell, exciting discoveries can be made on the surface, but even more exciting are those to be found by digging. The books in this series, *NAC Studies in Bible and Theology*, often take a biblical difficulty as their point of entry, remembering B. F. Westcott's point that "unless all past experience is worthless, the difficulties of the Bible are the most fruitful guides to its divine depths."

This new series is to be a medium through which the work of evangelical scholars can effectively reach the church. It will include detailed exegetical-theological

studies of key pericopes such as the Sermon on the Mount and also fresh examinations of topics in biblical theology and systematic theology. It is intended to supplement the *New American Commentary*, whose exegetical and theological discussions so many have found helpful. These resources are aimed primarily at church leaders and those who are preparing for such leadership. We trust that individual Christians will find them to be an encouragement to greater progress and joy in the faith. More important, our prayer is that they will help the church proclaim Christ more accurately and effectively and that they will bring praise and glory to our great God.

It is a tremendous privilege to be partners in God's grace with the fine scholars writing for this new series as well as with those who will be helped by it. When Christ returns, may He find us "standing firm in one spirit, with one mind, working side by side for the faith of the gospel" (Phil 1:27, HCSB).

E. Ray Clendenen  
B&H Publishing Group

# AUTHOR PREFACE

This book originated as a dissertation done at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary under the direction of Dr. Thomas R. Schreiner, whose influence on me extends well beyond the parameters of this project. He knows the depth of my gratitude, but I gladly express it again here. I am also grateful for the other members of the committee, Drs. Robert H. Stein and William F. Cook. I count it a privilege to have been one of the last students to write under Dr. Stein.

I praise God, too, for the churches whom I now serve and who sustain institutions such as Southern Seminary. Southern is blessed to be led by its president, R. Albert Mohler Jr., who has fostered a fertile place to study in Louisville. We owe thanks for Dr. Mohler and to the leadership of men such as Paul Pressler and Paige Patterson, who is now the president of Southwestern Seminary. I am grateful also for Southwestern Seminary, where I now serve under the leadership of Dr. Patterson thanks to our Provost, Dr. Craig Blaising. The churches of the Southern Baptist Convention have given a sacred trust to the faculties and students of the SBC seminaries, a trust undergirded by not a few mites given by not a few widows. I hope that this book will be both faithful and profitable. May it honor the Lord and benefit his church.

The research for this book was completed in the spring of 2003. No one has read it more carefully than Dr. E. Ray Clendenen and I am extremely grateful for his editorial labors. I thank Ray and B & H Publishing Group for accepting this project into the NAC Studies in Bible and Theology. We have worked back over the manuscript to transform it from a dissertation into a book that we hope will benefit students, pastors, and interested laypeople, but other projects kept me from incorporating scholarship published since 2003. Thanks go to Jesse McMillan for his work on the subject index, and to my colleague, Miles Mullin, for proofing the manuscript under a tight deadline. So, for instance, while I have profited from many of Andreas Köstenberger's writings, his BECNT commentary appeared too late to be consulted in the writing of this project, and the same holds for Craig Keener's two-volume commentary on John. Similarly, I think that many of my conclusions agree with the findings of Greg Beale's excellent book, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, but my research was done before his book became available.

Unless otherwise noted, all translations of biblical texts are my own. These are often intentionally very literal because I am seeking to make the force of the original available to the reader.

My sweet wife Jill made this project possible in more ways than I can enumerate. Her parents also supported us

in many ways, and I wish to thank my mom for instilling in me a love for reading and my dad for teaching me how to focus and work.

“May the favor of the Lord our God be upon us. And the work of our hands, may he confirm for us; and the work of our hands, may he confirm it!” (Psalm 90:17).

Jim Hamilton  
Christmas, 2005  
Houston, Texas, USA

# **Chapter 1**

## **THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE OLD COVENANT REMNANT**

# Introduction

The Bible was written in three different languages, on three different continents, over a period of fifteen hundred years, by some forty different authors. The progressive nature of God's self-revelation given through the human authors during the unfolding of salvation history creates many interpretive challenges. Nevertheless, a Christian worldview entails the understanding that if God has spoken, and if the Bible is His word, then the Bible is not only entirely true in every respect since God is faithful and true in every sense, but it also exhibits a coherent system of thought because God is coherent.<sup>1</sup> We can expect to find in the Bible a unified, non-contradictory theology.<sup>2</sup>

To claim that the Bible possesses a coherent theology raises a host of questions. This investigation hopes to answer one of those questions, namely, were individual believers under the old covenant continually indwelt by the Holy Spirit? Certain statements in the Gospel of John suggest that believers would not be indwelt by the Spirit until Jesus was glorified (see 7:39; 14:16–17; and 16:7).<sup>3</sup> Other statements in John's Gospel indicate that apart from the Spirit's activity human beings are unable to become (John 1:13; 3:3,5–8; 6:63) and remain (3:20–21; 8:34; 16:8) children of God. These two observations—that John portrays the reception of the indwelling Spirit as beginning only after the glorification of Jesus, and that apart from

the Spirit humanity is of the Devil (8:44)—prompt us to ask how believers who lived prior to Jesus' glorification became and remained faithful to God.

While the Gospel of John nowhere addresses the question of how Old Testament saints became and remained faithful, the question is implicit in the Gospel itself. If the Spirit is not received until Jesus is exalted (7:39), what did Jesus mean when He told Nicodemus that he must be born of "water and spirit" (3:5)?<sup>4</sup> When we examine the biblical material that reflects what comes before and after the events recorded in the Fourth Gospel, this question becomes yet more vivid. The Old Testament does say that some have the Spirit (see e.g., Num 27:18), but it is by no means clear that this is the experience of every member of the old covenant remnant. The New Testament, on the other hand, indicates that the Spirit regenerates and indwells all believers (see Rom 8:9–11).

At the appropriate point in this study I will seek to elucidate the distinctions between regeneration and indwelling seen in John's Gospel (see chap. six). Based on the conclusions reached there, I will use the word regeneration to refer to God's work of granting to humans the ability to hear, understand, believe, obey, and enter the kingdom. The New Testament's metaphor of "new birth" matches the Old Testament's metaphor of "heart circumcision." That is, I take circumcision of the heart to be the same experience as regeneration (Rom 2:29; Col

2:11–13). Apart from the enablement God gives in regeneration, men remain slaves of sin (John 8:34) and of the Devil (8:44), or as Paul puts it, dead in trespasses and sins (Eph 2:1; Col 2:13). I will use indwelling, on the other hand, to refer to God's abiding, positive, covenant presence in believers through the Spirit. This book seeks to understand and articulate the role of the Holy Spirit in the faithfulness of believers who live both before and after the exaltation of Jesus. This exercise in biblical theology will focus largely on the Gospel of John because it has so much to say on this question.<sup>5</sup>

John's Gospel, I believe, teaches that the continual indwelling of the Holy Spirit began to take place only after Jesus completed the work that the Father gave Him to do (17:4). When I first began to pursue this question, because of the Bible's clear teaching on mankind's sinful state (e.g., Gen 6:5; Jer 17:9; John 8:34; Rom 3:10–18), I was convinced that saving faith requires both regeneration and indwelling by the Holy Spirit. I have concluded, however, that in the absence of a clear affirmation in the Old Testament that the Spirit continually dwelt in the hearts of believers, passages such as John 7:39; 14:17; and 16:7 will not permit us to say that the Holy Spirit dwelt in ordinary members of the old covenant remnant on an individual basis.

What does the Bible say about how the Spirit relates to believers before and after the glorification of Jesus? I

believe this question is answered by Jesus' statement in John 14:17: "He is with you, and he will be in you."<sup>6</sup> Here Jesus encapsulates the Bible's teaching on God's dwelling in relation to believers in the old and new covenants. In the old covenant God faithfully remained with His people, accompanying them in a pillar of fire and cloud, then dwelling among them in the tabernacle and the temple. Under the new covenant, the only temple is the believing community itself, and God dwells not only among the community corporately (Matt 18:20; 1 Cor 3:16; 2 Cor 6:16), but also in each member individually (John 14:17; Rom 8:9–11; 1 Cor 6:19). This is the overarching thesis this book seeks to establish.

The assertion that old covenant believers were not indwelt raises the additional question of how they became and remained faithful. Previous arguments that old covenant believers were not indwelt have largely failed to address this critical issue. In seeking to explain how old covenant believers were empowered to live by faith (see Heb 11), I will argue that indwelling is not to be equated with regeneration. This distinction opens the possibility that old covenant believers experienced regeneration by the Spirit, even though the Spirit did not then take up residence within them. Some scholars hesitate to use the term "regenerate" in reference to old covenant believers because the Old Testament does not use the "new-birth" and "made-alive" language found in the New Testament.

As noted above, the Old Testament metaphor for this is "circumcision of the heart." Since both regeneration and heart circumcision refer to God enabling people who are dead in sin to believe and obey (see Jer 6:10; Rom 2:25–29), I will regard the two expressions as functionally equivalent. Thus old covenant believers may be described as regenerate though not indwelt. They became believers when the Spirit of God enabled them to believe, and they were maintained in faith by God's covenant presence with the nation as He dwelt in the temple.

In support of this thesis, both Testaments speak of the word of God creating spiritual life.<sup>7</sup> Further, we have evidence that before and after Jesus God's word is made effective by God's Spirit.<sup>8</sup> Thus it seems that in both old and new covenants regeneration occurs when God's Spirit creates the ability to believe the proclamation of God's word (see Rom 4:16–18; 10:17).

It will be argued here that prior to Jesus' glorification God sanctified believers by His presence with them rather than in them. Often the Old Testament describes God as with select persons.<sup>9</sup> God declared to His old covenant people, "I am Yahweh, who sanctifies you" (Lev 20:8; 21:8,15,23; 22:9,16,32). God made His people holy as He indwelt the tabernacle and later the temple (Exod 25:8; 40:34–38; 1 Kgs 8:11,57–58), and thereby He remained near His people on an individual and corporate level (Deut

31:6; 1 Kgs 8:11; 2 Kgs 13:23; Hag 1:13; 2:5). After Jesus' glorification, in keeping with the coming of "that day" (John 14:20), God brought about new birth and obedience by regenerating individuals and indwelling them by His Spirit (John 3:3–6; 6:63; 7:37–39; 14:17; 20:22). So regeneration and indwelling remain distinct works of the Spirit, but they are simultaneously received by all who believe.

With Jesus' completion of the work the Father sent Him to do, a major salvation-historical shift took place. The Spirit takes up residence in a new temple. He dwells in those who believe, and He will do so until the end of the age (John 14:16–17). This is best seen when compared with the Spirit's work in the old covenant. Prior to the completion of Jesus' work, God dwelt in the temple.<sup>10</sup> In the Old Testament, God is described as with and near His chosen nation and only in certain persons for extraordinary tasks. Jesus' proclamation of the new covenant ministry of the Spirit (John 14–16), and the disciples' reception of the Spirit (20:22), anticipate subsequent references to believers and the church as a temple built of living stones (1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; Eph 2:21–22; 1 Pet 2:5). The indwelling of the Spirit is connected to the reality that Jesus has replaced the temple (John 2:13–22), with the result that worship is no longer centered at specific locations (cp. John 4:21 with Deut 12:5). A temple is no longer necessary because those who believe are "in" Jesus (14:20). Through His death on the cross, Jesus put an end

to sacrifice (Heb 10:10–18; cp. John 19:30). The triune God no longer dwells in the temple in Jerusalem, but in believers who live all over the world (see John 14:23).

# The Method of This Study

We will approach relevant texts with a particular question: what is the relationship between the Holy Spirit and believers before and after the glorification of Jesus? Through exegesis and synthesis of these texts, we will seek to trace the structure of thought that produces the statements found in the Bible. As Schlatter described the task,

The significance of New Testament theology today rests on the fact that it is not content simply to gather material like a statistician. It sees its main task in raising the question how the convictions found here in the New Testament arose. It is concerned not only to perceive but to explain... The enquiry concerns what gave rise to the ideas of the New Testament.<sup>11</sup>

The approach taken here will seek to follow Peter Stuhlmacher: "A Biblical Theology of the New Testament which deserves this name must suit the biblical texts hermeneutically, i.e. it must attempt to interpret the Old and New Testament tradition as it wants to be interpreted."<sup>12</sup> Thus Stuhlmacher urges that if we are to understand the text correctly, we must read it sympathetically.<sup>13</sup>

Stuhlmacher's insight is similar to the principle articulated by Michael Horton, who advocates "an exercise in theology in which theological method is determined by the content of the system."<sup>14</sup> We must, as it were, take the text on its own terms and let it speak for itself. In N. T. Wright's words, we must employ a "hermeneutic of love."<sup>15</sup> This study seeks to understand the teaching of the Fourth Gospel as it now stands<sup>16</sup> on the role of the Spirit in the lives of believers before and after the glorification of Jesus. That will be best accomplished by reading the Gospel of John "as it wants to be interpreted."<sup>17</sup>

# A Preview of What Follows

Chapter two surveys the ways that scholars have sought to answer the question posed by this study<sup>18</sup> These observations on what has been said and how the texts have been treated provide important clarity as we seek to untangle this particular knot.

Chapter three seeks to show that the Old Testament does not explicitly claim that each member of the old covenant remnant was indwelt for the duration of his or her earthly sojourn. References to the Spirit being upon or in Israel's leaders are examined, then God's presence with the nation in the tabernacle and temple. The chapter concludes by discussing two new covenant passages, Jeremiah 31 and Ezekiel 36.

Chapter four surveys statements regarding the Holy Spirit in John 1–12 and then examines the Paraclete passages in more detail. The goal of this chapter is to establish exegetically this Gospel's teaching concerning the Spirit. This exegetical work is foundational for the biblical-theological conclusions of chapters five and six. Chapter four is the most technical section of this study, and I hope the reader will not get bogged down in it. The non-technical reader should feel free to move quickly through, i.e. skim, or even skip parts of this chapter rather than put the book down altogether. The last section of chapter four

along with the final three chapters are the most important part of the study.

Chapter five argues that the evangelist's comment in John 7:39 means that old covenant believers had not received the indwelling Spirit. The aim here is to show that the Old Testament prophets described a Spiritanointed Messiah and a future day when the Spirit would be poured out on the people of God. The Gospel of John describes Jesus as the fulfillment and fulfiller of these prophecies. According to John, only after the cross would God dwell in all believers (see John 4:21–24; 7:39; 14:17, 23; 20:22). Chapter five concludes by comparing John's teaching with statements about the Spirit's indwelling in the rest of the New Testament.

Chapter six argues that from what John says about regeneration and indwelling, these two ministries of the Spirit can be distinguished. Having argued that regeneration is not to be equated with indwelling in the Gospel of John, I contend that John presents Jesus as the replacement of the temple. Jesus then confers upon His disciples the authority to administer the blessings of the temple when He gives them the indwelling Spirit. Thus, when Jesus goes away, the disciples replace Him as the replacement of the temple. The indwelling of the Spirit is to be understood in terms of believers replacing the temple, God's new dwelling place.

After summarizing the book in Chapter seven, its conclusions are applied to the life of the church today with respect to church discipline and the priesthood of all believers.

If the assertions made in this introduction can be verified, it will also be indirectly shown that despite the diversity reflected in the Old and New Testaments, the Bible presents a coherent view of the Spirit's role in the life of the believer before and after Jesus' glorification. If this study is successful, we will be closer to understanding the Bible's theology of the Spirit.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a philosophical defense of the Christian worldview, see A. Plantinga, *Warranted Christian Belief* (New York: Oxford, 2000), on this point see esp. chap. 12, “Two (or More) Kinds of Scripture Scholarship,” 374–421.

<sup>2</sup> This paragraph applies to the whole Bible what Adolf Schlatter applied to the New Testament when he referred to “the theology expressed by the New Testament itself” (*The History of the Christ*, trans. A. Köstenberger [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997], 18). For a large-scale exposition of the coherent theology to be found in the Bible, as well as a convincing argument that biblical theology is to be based on the 66 canonical books of the Bible, see C. H. H. Scobie, *The Ways of Our God: An Approach to Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003). On a smaller scale, and with the added benefit that he argues for a “center” of biblical theology, see G. Goldsworthy *According to Plan* (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity, 2002).

<sup>3</sup> My colleague at Southwestern Seminary, John Taylor, points out that calling adherents to the Christian faith “believers” is a linguistic phenomenon that was new with Christianity (“Paul’s Understanding of Faith” [Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University, 2004]). Nevertheless, as a shorthand, and for lack of a better term, I will refer to members of the old covenant remnant as “believers.” Note that in Gal 3:9 Paul refers to Abraham as “the believer” (NASU, NET). I will take the liberty of referring to old covenant faithful as believers since Paul does so.

<sup>4</sup> This consideration is often raised by those who think that old covenant saints were indwelt. See for example D. I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel*, vol. 2, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 360–61, and J. B. Payne, *The Theology of the Older Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962), 241. See my discussion of this verse in chap. four.

<sup>5</sup> J. Barr writes, “Selection among the facts, data, interpretations and interests is unavoidable, and is a perfectly correct academic procedure” (*The Concept of Biblical Theology* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999], 341).

<sup>6</sup> For discussion of the text-critical problem in John 14:17c, see Appendix 2, "He Is with You and He Is in You? The Text of John 14:17c."

<sup>7</sup> See Ps 119:25; Isa 53:3; John 5:24; 6:63; 1 Pet 1:23.

<sup>8</sup> See Neh 9:20,30; John 6:63.

<sup>9</sup> Enoch walked with God (Gen 3:22,24). Noah walked with God (Gen 6:9). Abraham walked before God, and God was with him (Gen 17:1; 21:22; 24:40). God was with Isaac (Gen 26:3), Jacob (Gen 28:15; 31:5), Joseph (Gen 39:2-3,21,23), Moses (Exod 3:12), Joshua (Josh 1:5,9), Gideon (Judg 6:12), David (1 Sam 18:12,14), and Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:7). See my articles, "God with Men in the Torah," WTJ 65 (2003): 113-33, and "God with Men in the Prophets and the Writings," SBET 23 (2005): 166-93.

<sup>10</sup> Note that when Jesus cleansed the temple, He referred to it as "My father's house" (John 2:16, HCSB).

<sup>11</sup> A. Schlatter, "The Theology of the New Testament and Dogmatics," in *The Nature of New Testament Theology*, ed. and trans. R. Morgan, SBT<sup>2</sup> 25 (Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1973), 136.

<sup>12</sup> P. Stuhlmacher, *How To Do Biblical Theology*, trans. J. M. Whitlock, Princeton Theological Monographs 38 (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick, 1995), 1.

<sup>13</sup> Unfortunately, Stuhlmacher violates his own principle by giving the synoptic tradition priority over the Johannine, since in his view the Fourth Gospel's "language and contents bear a stamp which they received only after Easter in the Johannine school." There is strong evidence against this conclusion. The Gospel of John purports to be an account of the things Jesus said and did, and, according to Stuhlmacher's principle, it should be interpreted as such. The Gospel alerts its audience when post-resurrection insights are given (e.g., 2:22; 12:16; 20:9), but aside from these places John's Gospel presents itself as an account of things Jesus said and did. The contents have been selectively chosen (see 20:30; 21:25), but John claims that the testimony is true (21:24).

<sup>14</sup> M. Horton, *Covenant and Eschatology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 1.

<sup>15</sup> N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, *Christian Origins and the Question of God 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 64.

<sup>16</sup> See the comments of U. Schnelle, "Johannes als Geisttheologe,"

NovT 40 (1998): 17.

<sup>17</sup> This study does not set out to prove the reliability of John. I am building on the “spate of recent, article-length studies and fully fledged commentaries on John [that] have appeared, all defending a substantial amount of historicity in the Fourth Gospel” (C. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001], 21; Blomberg cites 24 studies published between 1981 and 1999). After entering the standard discussions and examining the historicity of every relevant passage in John, Blomberg concludes, “One may affirm with considerable confidence that John's Gospel is true—not merely theologically (as, e.g. for Barrett and Lindars) but also historically” (*ibid.*, 294).

<sup>18</sup> Summarizing my article, “Old Covenant Believers and the Indwelling Spirit: A Survey of the Spectrum of Opinion,” *TJ* 24 (2003): 37–54.

# **Chapter 2**

**SURVEY OF THE SPECTRUM OF  
OPINION**

# Introduction

We can distinguish six positions on the question of whether or not the old covenant remnant was individually indwelt.<sup>1</sup> Although I am aware of no one who actually espouses position five, I include it because some have been accused of holding it. Voices from all sides of the question, however, are committed to understanding the Bible—both Testaments—and seek to grapple with the difficult issues the text presents while being faithful to its teaching.<sup>2</sup>

This discussion will be structured by the six positions represented or discussed in the literature. The question of indwelling was rarely addressed by earlier church fathers. In the early church the proper articulation of the doctrine of the Trinity dominated the discussion. Affirmations of the Spirit's existence and activity prior to the incarnation are common, but the question of indwelling is seldom raised.<sup>3</sup> Some church fathers see a measure of discontinuity, but the discussion seems to be a modern one with roots in Luther and Calvin.

Dispensationalists today resemble Luther in emphasizing distinctions between the covenants. Contemporary covenantal theologians show Calvin's influence in their understanding of the continuity of the covenant of grace inaugurated in the garden and continuing to the present.

Only a brief survey can be given here, although this treatment seeks to be representative and fair. The categories are nuanced,<sup>4</sup> and inferences have been avoided as much as possible.

The six positions are (1) complete continuity; (2) more continuity than discontinuity; (3) some continuity, some discontinuity; (4) more discontinuity than continuity; (5) complete discontinuity; (6) vague discontinuity. Positions one and five represent opposite ends of the spectrum. I have been unable to find an author who affirms position five as it is defined here. This material is summarized on the table, "Positions on the Holy Spirit and old covenant Believers."

# (1) Complete Continuity

This position represents those who see basic continuity in the activity of the Spirit within the old and new covenants and affirm that old covenant believers were both regenerated and indwelt by the Holy Spirit.

In the period of the Reformation the view that the Spirit indwelt old covenant believers probably arose from soteriological questions regarding human ability. The controversy between Augustine and Pelagius resulted in a more precise understanding of human ability and inability. The strong influence of Augustine on both Luther and Calvin caused them and their followers to see the necessity of the Spirit's enablement for salvation even in the Old Testament. Thomas Goodwin and John Owen are the best representatives of position one from a reformation perspective.<sup>5</sup> (Augustine and Calvin are best understood as representatives of position two.)

John Owen's voluminous literary output is still widely read more than three centuries later, and some view his work on the Holy Spirit as unsurpassed.<sup>6</sup> As Owen deals with the perseverance of believers in the faith, he writes concerning the Spirit's indwelling,

Positive affirmations that he doth so dwell in and

remain with the saints are the second ground of the truth we assert. I shall name one or two testimonies of that kind: Ps. Li. 11, saith David, 'Take not thy Holy Spirit from me.' It is the Spirit, and his presence as unto sanctification, not in respect of prophecy or any other gift whatever, that he is treating of with God.<sup>7</sup>

The italicized words indicate that on the one hand Owen sees indwelling in the Old Testament, not only for the king, but for the saints in general.

In more recent discussion, it is widely acknowledged that the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is an eschatological blessing. Sinclair Ferguson is no exception in this regard, and his treatment of the Spirit is helpful.<sup>8</sup> Though Ferguson emphasizes the "new" nature of things that results from Christ's completed work, he maintains that the continual indwelling of old covenant believers is not negated by John 14:17. This results in a confusing interpretation of the verse:

What is in view is not so much a distinction between the Spirit being only 'with' believers in the old covenant, while he dwells 'in' them in the new covenant, although that view has widespread support ... He who was 'with' them in Christ's presence would then be 'in' them as the Spirit of the incarnate and exalted Christ. The contrast is located not in the manner of his dwelling so much as in the capacity in

which he indwells.<sup>9</sup>

It appears that this interpretation of John 14:17 allows Ferguson to leave the door open to affirm that old covenant saints were indwelt. He almost affirms a distinction between with and in, but immediately negates it by claiming the distinction Jesus intends regards "capacity" rather than "manner." Since Ferguson does not elaborate on his understanding of the change in the "capacity" in which the Spirit indwells people, his explanation is less than satisfying.

John 7:39 also causes problems for those who affirm continuity between the Spirit's action before and after Jesus. Daniel Fuller seeks to reconcile the words of John 7:39 with his position by explaining,

The only way depraved people can acquire a heart attitude and behavior pleasing to God is to be indwelt by the Holy Spirit (that is, regenerated) ... But the biggest objection to saying that Old Testament saints were born again comes from John 7:39, 'Up to that time the Holy Spirit [was not yet] [sic], since Jesus had not yet been glorified.' Many have concluded from this verse that no one was indwelt by the Holy Spirit and regenerated until after Christ came. But since there is so much evidence in the Old Testament to the contrary, we understand John's 'not yet' to refer to a time when the Holy Spirit, who had been at work in

people's hearts from Adam onward, was to have the additional function of glorifying Jesus.<sup>10</sup>

Fuller clearly equates regeneration and indwelling, but his reading of John 7:39 is not persuasive (see below).

Other authors who could be cited as affirming complete continuity include J. A. Motyer, J. B. Payne, B. B. Warfield, and L. Wood.<sup>11</sup> By way of summary, these authors either appeal to Psalm 51:11, which does not clearly indicate that ordinary old covenant saints had the Spirit (see [chap. 3](#)), or they cite Old Testament texts that speak of God's Spirit with the congregation of Israel. Leon Wood acknowledges that his position is a theological inference when he says, "Since [God] keeps the New Testament saint by indwelling ... it seems reasonable to believe that He kept the Old Testament saint in the same way."<sup>12</sup>

## **(2) More Continuity than Discontinuity**

Those who espouse this view hold that there is no fundamental difference between the activity of the Spirit in the old versus the new covenant, though they may use different language to describe that activity. In various ways these authors affirm that old covenant believers were indwelt by the Spirit, but they qualify their affirmations in an effort to conform their theology to the words of Scripture.

Augustine's thoughts on this issue well illustrate the distinction between positions one and two. In a sermon on John 14:15–17, Augustine stated, "Already, therefore, had the disciples that Holy Spirit whom the Lord promised, for without Him they could not call Him Lord; but they had Him not as yet in the way promised by the Lord.... they had Him not as yet to the same extent as He was afterwards to be possessed."<sup>13</sup> The qualification of the "extent" of the possession of the Spirit made by Augustine is the kind of thing that prompts the creation of category two. This qualification does not have to do with the scope of the Spirit's activity among the people of God,<sup>14</sup> but with the quality of the disciples' experience of the Spirit.

John Calvin also fits in this category. One might expect

that Calvin would hold to complete continuity, for he wrote, "The covenant made with all the patriarchs is so much like ours in substance and reality that the two are actually one and the same."<sup>15</sup> As Calvin continued, however, into his discussion of five ways in which the Old Testament differs from the New, he argued,

But suppose our opponents object that, among the Israelites, the holy patriarchs were an exception: since they were obviously endowed with the same Spirit of faith as we, it follows that they shared the same freedom and joy... We shall deny that they were so endowed with the spirit of freedom and assurance as not in some degree to experience the fear and bondage arising from the law.... they are rightly said, in contrast to us, to have been under the testament of bondage and fear, when we consider that common dispensation by which the Lord at that time dealt with the Israelites.<sup>16</sup>

While these comments show that Calvin saw some discontinuity between old and new covenant believers, his comments on John 7:39 show that he certainly thought they possessed the Spirit prior to the glorification of Jesus. He explained,

At that very time, the disciples had undoubtedly received the first-fruits of the Spirit; for whence

comes faith but from the Spirit? The Evangelist, therefore, does not absolutely affirm that the grace of the Spirit was not offered and given to believers before the death of Christ, but that it was not yet so bright and illustrious as it would afterwards become.<sup>17</sup>

Although Calvin did not explicitly say here that Old Testament saints were indwelt, he maintained they had “undoubtedly received the first-fruits of the Spirit” (even though the verse says they were about to receive the Spirit). We may infer from this his understanding that a qualified indwelling would be followed by a greater experience of the Spirit after Jesus was glorified.<sup>18</sup> As with Augustine, the issue for Calvin is not the scope of the Spirit's ministry among the covenant community but the quality of the experience of the Spirit.

The most prominent adherents of position two today are D. I. Block,<sup>19</sup> G. E. Ladd,<sup>20</sup> and W. Grudem. Grudem's discussion is representative and worth quoting at length.

We should note that it sometimes is said that there was no work of the Holy Spirit within people in the Old Testament. This idea has mainly been inferred from Jesus' words to the disciples in John 14:17, “He dwells with you, and will be in you.” But we should not conclude from this verse that there was no work of the Holy Spirit within people before Pentecost. Although the Old Testament does not frequently speak

of people who had the Holy Spirit in them or who were filled with the Holy Spirit, there are a few examples: Joshua is said to have the Holy Spirit within him (Num. 27:18; Deut. 34:9), as are Ezekiel (Ezek. 2:2; 3:24), Daniel (Dan. 4:8–9, 18; 5:11), and Micah (Mic. 3:8). This means that when Jesus says to his disciples that the Holy Spirit “dwells with you and will be in you” (John 14:17), he cannot mean that there was an absolute “within/without” difference between the old and new covenant work of the Holy Spirit. Nor can John 7:39 (“as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified”) mean that there was no activity of the Holy Spirit in people’s lives before Pentecost. Both of these passages must be different ways of saying that the more powerful, fuller work of the Holy Spirit that is characteristic of life after Pentecost had not yet begun in the lives of the disciples.<sup>21</sup>

Grudem is correct to point out that some Old Testament saints are spoken of as having the Spirit in them. Each example he gives, however, is a person who is either a national leader, a prophet, or otherwise extraordinary. Even classical dispensational writers such as J. F. Walvoord and C. C. Ryrie acknowledge this aspect of the Spirit’s indwelling ministry, but they insist that the indwelling of the Spirit found in the Old Testament is selective as to persons and temporary as to duration.<sup>22</sup> By contrast, Jesus promised the disciples that the Spirit would

be with them forever (John 14:16). Although Grudem appears to be responding to the view "that there was no work of the Holy Spirit within people in the Old Testament,"<sup>23</sup> I have found no one who holds this view.<sup>24</sup>

Many affirm that old covenant believers were not continually indwelt by the Spirit in the way that new covenant believers are. But as I will show, regeneration by the Spirit does not necessarily entail continual indwelling by the Spirit (Ps 119:25; Isa 53:3). Denial of continual indwelling does not necessarily require denial of any interior ministry by the Spirit. Some dispensationalists seem to affirm that old covenant believers were regenerate. Grudem is correct that the greater "power" and "fullness" of the new covenant ministry of the Spirit is in view. He does not affirm a universal, continual indwelling ministry of the Spirit in the lives of old covenant believers.

In articulating his position this way, just as Block is closer to position one than to position three, Grudem is closer to position three than he is to position one. This spectrum of opinion is not uncommon in discussions of this nature. Nevertheless, all the authors in positions one and two agree that old covenant believers were indwelt by the Holy Spirit. It remains to be seen, however, whether they have dealt successfully with John 7:39, 14:17, and 16:7.<sup>25</sup> Part of the reason for the affirmation that old covenant believers were indwelt is that many of these authors

collapse the distinction between regeneration and indwelling. They then rightly reason that without regeneration all are dead in trespasses and sins (Eph 2:1), and they conclude that all who were regenerated were also indwelt. Perhaps these concerns can be addressed without denuding John's teaching on the New Covenant ministry of the Spirit. We will return to this issue in chapter six.

## **(3) Some Continuity, Some Discontinuity**

This position is the mid-point of the possible views. Representatives of this position affirm that while old covenant believers were regenerated by the Spirit, they were not indwelt by the Spirit.

Millard Erickson, J. I. Packer, Bruce Ware, and Willem VanGemeran fit in this category.<sup>26</sup> Because VanGemeran goes into more detail regarding the manner of the Spirit's work in the Old Testament, I will cite his position here. In two pregnant paragraphs VanGemeran suggests a biblical trajectory of the Spirit's work that is worth pursuing.

To Israel God revealed his glorious presence. He had kept people away from his presence after Adam's expulsion from Eden and dramatically symbolized the impossibility of reentrance by stationing the cherubim at the entrance of Eden (Gen. 3:24). When Yahweh came to dwell in Israel, however, he had Israel make gold cherubim and place them over the ark of the covenant in order to symbolize his presence 'in the tents of Shem' and the possibility of access to his glory through the ministry of the high priest.

The presence of God was more fully manifest in the incarnate Christ, who now dwells in each believer with his Spirit of glory. The Holy Spirit witnesses in our hearts to the great glory awaiting all the children of God in the new heaven and earth; the New Jerusalem [sic]. Then the triune God will dwell among the renewed humanity

(Rev. 21:3).<sup>27</sup>

What VanGemerer hints at here is attractive. He briefly traces the trajectory of the nature of God's presence with his people across salvation history: beginning with full access in Eden, moving to God's presence in the Temple, which some authors<sup>28</sup> see as an attempt to recapture what was lost in Eden, then to Christ tabernacled among his people, then to the indwelling of believers, and finally to the renewed full access to God when He dwells with His people in the new heavens and new earth. Because of the scope of his book (From Creation to the New Jerusalem in 500 pages), VanGemerer does not go into detail as to how this understanding relates to the Spirit's ministry to believers before and after Jesus.

## **( 4 ) More Discontinuity than Continuity**

These scholars are very close to those in category three. They agree that Yahweh ministered to old covenant believers and infer that this was by the Spirit. Nevertheless, they generally stop short of saying that old covenant believers were regenerated by the Spirit, and they deny that the Spirit indwelt old covenant believers.

An early church father, Novatian (AD 210–280), seems to have held this view. Novatian was just as concerned with the deity of the Holy Spirit as his contemporaries, but he articulated clear discontinuity regarding indwelling in his treatment of the Holy Spirit,

In the former not as being always in them, in the latter as abiding always in them; and in the former distributed with reserve, in the latter all poured out; in the former given sparingly, in the latter liberally bestowed; not yet manifested before the Lord's resurrection, but conferred after the resurrection.<sup>[29](#)</sup>

Martin Luther also articulated the measure of discontinuity here under discussion. Commenting on John 2:21–22, where Jesus spoke of the temple of His body, Luther says, "Until now God had restricted His presence to

the temple in Jerusalem; that was to terminate now.”<sup>30</sup> Luther continues to expound the discontinuity he perceives when he comes to John 7:39.

One must not fall prey to the foolish notion that the Holy Spirit was not created until Christ had risen from the dead. No, this text states that the Spirit had not yet been given; that is, He was not yet fulfilling His office. The old message and Law were still in effect. For this reason we often say and teach that one must distinguish between the Law and the Gospel.... But how one might be able to keep the Law, or how they could be saved who had not observed its precepts and could boast of no good works—that no one knew. For the Holy Spirit had not yet been given, and Christ was not yet glorified.<sup>31</sup>

Luther confesses ignorance as to how old covenant believers were able to keep the law. One might think it better to place him in the category of “Vague Discontinuity.” But that category is reserved for those who do not raise the question of the faithfulness of Old Testament saints. Luther raises the question, but is clearly confounded. Just as his well-known dilemma regarding James and Paul can be resolved, however, a resolution for this question can be found in the Scriptures. Moreover, an answer can be given that allows the full force of John 7:39 to stand (see [chapter five](#)).

Prominent recent adherents of this position include L. S. Chafer,<sup>32</sup> C. Blaising and D. Bock,<sup>33</sup> D. Bloesch,<sup>34</sup> and M. Green.<sup>35</sup> D. A. Carson is something of an exception among commentators on John. Whereas space and time limitations keep many from considering the broader theological implications of John 7:39 or 14:17, Carson observes

One of the most remarkable aspects of Jesus' teaching in this passage, however, is that it is the triune God who takes up his dwelling in the disciples of Jesus. This truth is unavoidable: 'I will ask the Father and he will give you another Counselor to be with you forever—the Spirit of truth.... The Old Testament writers were concerned that God should live with men [citing 1 Kings 8:27; Ezek 37:27; Zech 2:10]. ... John insists that this occurred historically in the incarnation: 'The Word became flesh and lived for a while among us' (1:14). But now we are brought a stage further: this God reveals himself to the individual believer and takes up residence within him [citing 2 Cor 6:16; Lev 26:12; Jer 32:38; Ezek 37:27; Eph 3:16,17a; Rev 3:14–21].<sup>36</sup>

These considerations cannot be minimized as we seek to answer the question of what role the Holy Spirit played in the lives of old covenant believers. The Old Testament provides an explanation for how its saints became

believers and remained faithful, and the new covenant reality of the Spirit's continually dwelling in believers is not to be read back into the Old Testament. John 7:39, 14:17, and 16:7 stand in the way of that interpretation. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the Spirit was not involved at all in the lives of Old Testament saints. That would be full discontinuity, the position next to be considered.

## (5) Complete Discontinuity

This position holds that the Spirit of God had nothing to do with the faithfulness of those who lived under the old covenant. Although certain authors, particularly dispensationalists, have failed to address these issues and thereby have invited misunderstanding, I have been unable to locate a single affirmation of the position that the Spirit did not operate on the hearts of old covenant believers.<sup>37</sup>

For example, in his discussion of "The Holy Spirit in Relation to Man in the Old Testament" Ryrie does not raise the question of the old covenant believer's regeneration or sanctification. Despite one brief paragraph under the heading "Restraint of Sin,"<sup>38</sup> his later discussion of "Regeneration"<sup>39</sup> fails to address the question whether old covenant believers were regenerated. Ryrie affirms that some OT figures were indwelt, but not permanently<sup>40</sup> By what he does not say, he seems to imply that some believing Israelites were not acted on by the Spirit. In personal conversation (June 10, 2002), Dr. Ryrie explained that while he may have to read the New Testament into the Old, he thinks that old covenant saints "show the fruits of what we call regeneration." He cited John 3 as evidence for the regeneration of old covenant believers. Ryrie reasoned just as Block and others have: Jesus seems to have expected Nicodemus to understand. Ryrie felt that he had been silent where the Scriptures were silent.

## **(6) Vague Discontinuity**

Many writers simply affirm that the Holy Spirit operates in new and distinct ways in the new covenant without raising the question of how old covenant believers came to faith and lived obediently. Most commentators on John's Gospel, as well as others who have written on the Spirit in John, fit into this category.<sup>41</sup> When commenting on John 7:39 or 14:17, these authors generally affirm that believers experience the Spirit in new ways after Jesus is glorified. They do not inquire how old covenant believers became and remained faithful.

Table 1, "Positions on the Holy Spirit and Old Covenant Believers," charts these positions and the adherents of each.

# Concluding Observations

Since the Reformation, those who have followed Calvin have affirmed more continuity between the Testaments than those who have followed Luther. As an extension of this, covenant theologians usually affirm that old covenant believers were indwelt, while dispensationalists usually insist that they were not. There are, of course, exceptions. Block and Wood affirm continuity but are not covenant theologians. Novatian and Luther affirmed discontinuity but were not dispensationalists. Nor does it necessarily follow that affirmations of discontinuity go hand in hand with a low view of sin or a high view of human ability (i.e., libertarian freedom). Though that may sometimes be the case, not all who aver that old covenant believers were not indwelt are un-Calvinistic in their understanding of soteriology (e.g., Carson, Ware).

Some affirmations of continuity appear to owe less to covenant theology than to a reaction against dispensationalism. References to those who hold that there was no "inner" work of the Spirit in the old covenant, or that the Spirit was not involved in the regeneration and sanctification of old covenant believers, are probably references to dispensationalists. While commonly emphasizing the new nature of the Spirit's work, prominent dispensationalists, whether progressives such as Blaising, Bock, and Ware, or more classical/ revised

dispensationalists such as Ryrie, Walvoord, and Chafer all indicate that the Spirit, in various degrees, was involved in the faithfulness of old covenant believers. Complete discontinuity appears to be a straw-man.

	Table 1: Positions on the Holy Spirit and Old Covenant Believers					
Position	1. Continuity	2. More Continuity than Discontinuity	3. Some Continuity Some Discontinuity	4. More Discontinuity than Continuity	5. Discontinuity	6. Vague Discontinuity
Definition of Position	Regenerated and Indwelt	Differences acknowledged, but not seen to be fundamental differences	Regenerated, but not Indwelt	Operated upon by God, and by inference his Spirit, but not indwelt	The Spirit had nothing to do with the faithfulness of Old Covenant believers	Indwelling denied, but the question of regeneration is not raised
Proponents		Augustine		Novatian		Origen Irenaeus Tertullian Chrysostom
Early Church						
Reformation	J. Owen T. Goodwin	J. Calvin		M. Luther		
Modern	S. Ferguson G. Fredricks D. P. Fuller W. C. Kaiser J. A. Motyer J. B. Payne B. B. Warfield L. Wood	D. I. Block G. W. Grogan W. Grudem G. E. Ladd	M. Erickson G. F. Oehler J. I. Packer L. D. Pettegrew J. Rea P. Toon W. A. VanGemeren B. A. Ware	L. S. Chafer Blaising and Bock D. A. Carson M. Green		C. K. Barrett R. E. Brown G. M. Burge C. C. Ryrie J. F. Walvoord

Some Old Testament scholars seem eager to affirm that everything found in the New Testament was present in the Old. Kaiser and Block, for example, seem to oppose the possibility that the New Testament might be perceived as “better” than the Old.<sup>42</sup>

I will argue that those who affirm continuity have said too much, while those who affirm discontinuity have said too little. I will seek to demonstrate that the Old Testament has within itself a Godordained, God-inspired means for the regeneration and sanctification of its saints—a means that allows for the operation of the Spirit on old covenant believers while also allowing the full force of John 7:39, 14:16–17, and 16:7 to stand.

---

<sup>1</sup> This chapter is a revised version of my article, "Old Covenant Believers and the Indwelling Spirit: A Survey of the Spectrum of Opinion," TJ 24 (2003): 37–54.

<sup>2</sup> I have found neither the "impatience" with nor the "wanton neglect" of the OT's teaching on the Spirit alleged by D. I. Block, "The Prophet of the Spirit: The Use of RWH in the Book of Ezekiel," JETS 32 (1989): 27.

<sup>3</sup> See in this regard, Athanasius [c. 296–373], *Four Discourses Against the Arians*, 1.48 (trans. J. H. Newman, rev. A. Robertson, in *St. Athanasius*, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 4:334); St. Cyril of Jerusalem [318–386], *Catechetical Lectures*, 16.26–27 (trans. J. H. Newman, rev. E. H. Gifford, in *S. Cyril of Jerusalem*. S. Gregory Nazianzen. NPNF<sup>2</sup> 7:122); Ambrose [340–397], *On the Holy Spirit*, 2.1 (trans. H. De Romestin, in *St. Ambrose*, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 10:115).

<sup>4</sup> G. Fredricks oversimplifies the contours of the landscape when he claims that there are only two answers to the question: indwelt or not indwelt ("Rethinking the Role of the Holy Spirit in the Lives of Old Testament Believers," TJ [1988]: 81). This is an oversimplification because while Fredricks equates regeneration and indwelling (85–87), as will be seen below, not all have made this move.

<sup>5</sup> For space considerations, only Owen will be cited in this discussion. For an instance in Goodwin's writings [1600–1679] where OT saints are said to be indwelt, see *The Work of the Holy Spirit in Our Salvation*, vol. 6 of *The Works of Thomas Goodwin* (n.p.: James Nichol, 1863; reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1979), 8. Jonathan Edwards might be placed here by inference from his theological position, but while he affirms that sanctification is always by the Spirit, he does not use the word indwelling or related terms. See his *Treatise on Grace*, ed. Paul Helm (Cambridge: James Clark & Co. Ltd., 1971), 55–56. In *A History of the Work of Redemption*, Edwards highlights the "remarkable pourings out of the Spirit of God" seen in the Scriptures (vol. 9 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. J. F. Wilson [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989], 142,

192, 233).

<sup>6</sup> See C. C. Ryrie's comments to this effect in his book, *The Holy Spirit* (Chicago: Moody, 1965), 118.

<sup>7</sup> John Owen, *The Doctrine of the Saints Perseverance Explained and Confirmed* [1654], vol. 11 of *The Works of John Owen*, ed. W. G. Gould (London: Johnstone & Hunter, 1850–53; reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1965), 331 (emphasis added).

<sup>8</sup> See the lucid discussion of regeneration in S. Ferguson, *The Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1996), 116–30. See esp. his discussion of the "New Creation," 118–19.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 68.

<sup>10</sup> D. P. Fuller, *The Unity of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 229–30. Apparently we are to understand Fuller's bracketed "was not yet" as his literal rendering of what the NIV has as "had not been given." Some might suppose he is supplying something missing from the Greek text, but there are two "not yet's" (the adverbs *oupō* and *oudepō*) in the verse. What had not yet occurred was the reception of the Spirit by believers. Note the HCSB, "for the Spirit had not yet been received." This idea is implicit from the preceding phrase: "this he spoke of the Spirit, whom those who had believed in him were about to receive [*lambanein*]." The phrase "for the Spirit was not yet" (*oupō gar ēn pneuma*) explains why Jesus could speak of receiving the Spirit as a future event.

<sup>11</sup> J. A. Motyer, *Isaiah, TOTC* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 103 n. 1); J. B. Payne, *The Theology of the Older Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962), 174–75, 241; B. B. Warfield, "The Spirit of God in the Old Testament," in *Biblical Doctrines* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1929; reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1988), esp. 121–28; L. J. Wood, *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 70, 85–86.

<sup>12</sup> Wood, *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament*, 70. Can this inference be made when the NT denies that the reception of the Spirit was experienced prior to the glorification of Jesus (John 7:39)? With this question we may add the question that will be taken up in the next chapter: does the OT claim that the faithful were continually indwelt by the Spirit? If a person who had read the OT but not the NT were asked where God dwells, would that person not respond that God dwells in the temple?

This impression is so strong that many Christians refer to the place where the church meets as “God’s house,” but the NT (except the Gospels, which are set prior to the cross) does not refer to buildings as God’s dwelling places. It seems that the OT’s own understanding of the sanctification of God’s people comes not through his dwelling in them, but through his dwelling in the temple in the midst of (i.e., with) Israel (see 1 Kgs 8:57–58). It might be that in the attempt to see continuity within God’s work in the two testaments, what the OT and NT say about the old covenant has been overlooked.

<sup>13</sup> Augustine, *Homilies on the Gospel of John* [ca. 416], 74.2 (trans. J. Gibb and J. Innes, in *Augustin*, NPNF<sup>1</sup>), 7:334.

<sup>14</sup> As argued by M. Van Pelt, W. C. Kaiser Jr., and D. I. Block, “What is new about [Ezekiel’s] vision is that finally the physical boundaries of the nation of Israel will be coterminous with its spiritual boundaries” (“□□□□” in *NIDOTTE*, 3:1077). When discussing this issue with Scott Hafemann, he too endorsed this view.

<sup>15</sup> John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Batdes, Library of Christian Classics, vols. 20–21 (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960), 429 [2.10.2].

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 458–59 [2.11.9] (emphasis added).

<sup>17</sup> John Calvin, *Commentary on the Gospel according to John* [1553], trans. W. Pringle, in *Calvin’s Commentaries* (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1847; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 17:310 (emphasis added).

<sup>18</sup> In his comments on Rom 8:9–11 Calvin refers to the Spirit as “the Spirit of regeneration,” indicating that he equates indwelling with regeneration (*Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* [1540], trans. J. Owen, in *Calvin’s Commentaries*, 19:291).

<sup>19</sup> See D. I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 2 vols., NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997, 1998), 2:360–61. I place Block here because he indicates that he sees a distinction between “spiritual endowment” and “spiritual infusion” (Ezekiel, 360). He does not elaborate on these terms.

<sup>20</sup> Ladd notes the newness of what Jesus is promising, but thinks that Ps 51:10–11 shows that in a real sense OT saints were indwelt (G. E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993], 325–26).

<sup>21</sup> W. Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 637 (emphasis his). For a similar view, see G. W. Grogan, "The Experience of Salvation in the Old and New Testaments," *VE* 5 (1967): 23.

<sup>22</sup> Ryrie, *The Holy Spirit*, 41–42; J. F. Walvoord, *The Holy Spirit* (Wheaton, IL: Van Kampen, 1954), 71–73.

<sup>23</sup> Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 637 (emphasis his).

<sup>24</sup> In fairness to Grudem, some dispensationalists have left themselves open to being interpreted this way. See below under "Complete Discontinuity."

<sup>25</sup> As noted in the first chapter, when I originally set out to pursue this project I intended to argue that old covenant believers were indwelt by the Holy Spirit. I tried very hard to make John 7:39, 14:17, and 16:7 fit that interpretation, but the evidence compelled me to abandon this position.

<sup>26</sup> M. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 992–95. Among Packer's relevant publications are his book, *Keep in Step with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Revell, 1984), and an article, "The Holy Spirit and His Work," *Crux* 23.2 (1987): 2–17. Fredricks wrongly classes Packer with those who hold that old covenant saints were indwelt ("Rethinking," 82); he seems to make certain assumptions: (1) Packer is a Calvinistic theologian; (2) he affirms that the Spirit played a part in the faithfulness of old covenant believers; (3) he must, therefore, hold that they were indwelt. This is not, however, what Packer himself affirms. For discussion, see J. M. Hamilton Jr., "Old Covenant Believers and the Indwelling Spirit: A Survey of the Spectrum of Opinion," *TJ* 24 (2003): 46–47 n. 26. Ware argued for this position in a paper presented at a national meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society (B. A. Ware, "Rationale for the Distinctiveness of the New Covenant Work of the Holy Spirit," November 1988), 7. Also see G. F. Oehler, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. G. E. Day (Clark's Foreign Theological Library, 1883; reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, n. d.), 141–42; L. D. Pettegrew, *The New Covenant Ministry of the Holy Spirit* (New York: University Press of America, 1993), 13–14; J. Rea, "The Personal Relationship of Old Testament Believers to the Holy Spirit," in *Essays on Apostolic Themes*, ed. P. Elbert (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1985), esp. 94, 96, 102–3; and P. Toon, *Born Again* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 61.

<sup>27</sup> W. A. VanGemeren, *The Progress of Redemption* (Grand Rapids:

Baker, 1988), 81–82. He is clear that old covenant saints were regenerate, saying, “God expected nothing less from his Old Testament people than he does today. The saints were those who were circumcised of heart, or ‘regenerate’” (p. 167). The quotation regarding God’s dwelling indicates that he does not conceive of old covenant saints as indwelt.

<sup>28</sup> E.g., G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, NSBT (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 66–80; R. E. Averbeck, “Tabernacle” in *DOTP*, 815–18.

<sup>29</sup> Novatian, *Treatise Concerning the Trinity* [256], chap. 29 (trans. R. E. Wallis, in *Fathers of the Third Century*, ANF 5:640).

<sup>30</sup> Martin Luther, *Sermons on the Gospel of John*, trans. M. H. Bertram, ed. J. Pelikan, vol. 22 of *Luther’s Works* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1957), 248, see also 249.

<sup>31</sup> Martin Luther, *Sermons on the Gospel of John*, trans. M. H. Bertram, ed. J. Pelikan, vol. 23 of *Luther’s Works* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1959), 278.

<sup>32</sup> A. H. Lewis (“The New Birth under the Old Covenant,” *EvQ* 56 [1984]: 36) and M. Erickson (*Christian Theology*, 992–93) both conclude that Chafer did not think that old covenant believers were regenerated. For the problems with their conclusion, see Hamilton, “Old Covenant Believers and the Indwelling Spirit,” 49–50 n. 35.

<sup>33</sup> Blaising and Bock state, “We should not assume that God had never before conditioned the hearts of His people, that His Spirit had never before indwelt them, or that He had never before forgiven them of their sins. However, the new covenant makes these blessings a constitutive abiding feature of God’s relationship to His people. They will be given to all the people (‘from the least of them to the greatest,’ Jer. 31:34) forever (‘from now and forever,’ Isa. 59:21)” (C. A. Blaising and D. L. Bock, *Progressive Dispensationalism* [Wheaton, IL: Bridgepoint, 1993], 156 [emphasis theirs]).

<sup>34</sup> D. G. Bloesch, *The Holy Spirit*, *Christian Foundations* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), 297.

<sup>35</sup> M. Green, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 25–26.

<sup>36</sup> D. A. Carson, *The Farewell Discourse* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980), 46–47. For other pertinent statements from Carson, see *The Gospel*

According to John, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 195, 329. For an argument that Carson belongs in this category, see Hamilton, "Old Covenant Believers and the Indwelling Spirit," 50–51 n. 39.

<sup>37</sup> See Fredricks, "Rethinking," 87: "We are left with one of two options. The first is that OT believers like Noah, Abraham, Joseph, or Job—about whom nothing is said of their having the Spirit—lived in bondage to sin.... The second option is that these OT saints were enabled to live their lives through the power of the Spirit." Fredricks has assumed that those who think old covenant saints were not indwelt conclude that the Spirit had nothing to do with their faithfulness (if they did not have the Spirit, they "lived in bondage to sin"), a view that no one affirms. Moreover, he has again oversimplified the issue, because a number of authors clearly speak of the Spirit's role in the lives of OT saints, while maintaining that he did not indwell them (cp. the authors in positions three and four). See the discussion of Grudem above, and Block, "The Prophet of the Spirit," 40 n. 38, citing Walvoord.

<sup>38</sup> Ryrie, *The Holy Spirit*, 42.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, chapter 11, 64–66.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 41–42.

<sup>41</sup> Examples are C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978); *id.*, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 1 (1950): 1–15; R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, 2 vols., AB (New York: Doubleday, 1966, 1970); *id.*, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," *NTS* 13 (1967): 113–32; and G. M. Burge, *John*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000); *id.*, *The Anointed Community* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987).

<sup>42</sup> This seems to be argued, however, by the New Testament, e.g., John 1:18, 2 Cor 3–4, and Heb 1:1–2.

# **Chapter 3**

**NOT IN BUT WITH IN THE OLD  
TESTAMENT**

# Introduction

The burden of this chapter is to show that the Old Testament does not indicate that each individual member of the old covenant remnant was indwelt by the Holy Spirit. The Old Testament teaches that God was with His people by dwelling among them in the temple rather than in them as under the new covenant. God (or His "name") is often presented in the Old Testament as dwelling in particular places (see Deut 31:11), such as the tabernacle (e.g., Exod 25:8; 29:42–45; Deut 12:11) and later in Zion (Ps 74:2; Isa 8:18; Joel 3:17,21) or the temple (1 Kgs 8:13), rather than in individuals. The concern in the Old Testament is with God's presence with the nation, not with individual covenant members possessing the Spirit. Interestingly, even after the destruction of the temple we do not find a "theology of indwelling" (until the New Testament), but we do find a "Shekina-Theology."<sup>1</sup>

Thus, one could rightly conclude that throughout the history of Israel the Spirit of God was always with the people of God (see John 14:17).<sup>2</sup> This does not exclude an interior ministry of the Spirit to individuals under the old covenant. Whereas God may not have been continually in His people, He could operate upon their hearts through other means. This chapter will demonstrate that the Spirit exercised an interior ministry under the old covenant in that God's presence with His people had a sanctifying

effect on them. Evidence for a distinction between regeneration and indwelling will be presented in this chapter and in chapter 6.

We first survey passages that speak of the Spirit's extraordinary relationship to certain Old Testament saints. Some have suggested that these passages indicate a general indwelling of old covenant believers. On the contrary, each time the Old Testament describes someone as having the Spirit, it does so precisely to mark that person out from other old covenant believers.<sup>3</sup> The special experience that these persons have with the Spirit empowers them to serve, and the service generally takes the form of national leadership or prophetic office. This extraordinary experience of the Spirit did not grace all who followed in the footsteps of Abraham's faith prior to the cross.

The second section examines Old Testament statements that God was with His people. This divine presence is shown to be distinct from the new covenant experience of indwelling. The Old Testament is explicit that God is with His people by dwelling in certain places or habitations, rather than being in each of them individually. In this section, then, I seek to show that God dwells in the tabernacle/ temple, and that the statements that God was "in the midst of" or "among" the people of Israel (e.g., Hag 2:5, "My Spirit is standing in your midst [bětökkem]") are to be understood in light of God's dwelling in the

tabernacle/temple.<sup>4</sup>

The third section examines the new covenant promised in Jeremiah 31 and Ezekiel 36.<sup>5</sup> Both prophets ministered at a time when the covenant had been broken. Jeremiah faced the destruction of the temple, and Ezekiel saw the glory of God abandon it. Both speak of a time when God will remedy this situation. Jeremiah promises a new medium on which the law will be written; Ezekiel promises a rebuilt temple and a return of God's Spirit. These passages present the indwelling or "pouring out" of the Holy Spirit as an eschatological blessing for each believer.<sup>6</sup> They give no indication that old covenant believers were indwelt, because their intention is to describe what will become a reality under the new covenant. I cannot accept Block's suggestion that, "The problem was not the absence of the [indwelling of the] Holy Spirit to transform lives, but that this was not occurring on a national scale. The issue was one of scope."<sup>7</sup>

# Those Filled by the Spirit under the Old Covenant

In the Old Testament, it was primarily the mediators of God's covenant—political leaders and prophets—who experienced the Spirit on an individual basis.<sup>8</sup> This section will consider the Old Testament figures who were empowered by the Spirit. The thesis of this section is that in every instance the Spirit's presence distinguishes<sup>9</sup> a person from the rest of the nation and thereby qualifies him<sup>10</sup> for his function as an advocate for God's kingdom.<sup>11</sup> We will begin with national leaders before considering the prophets.

## Political Leaders

It is noteworthy that in the approximately 2,000 years of Israelite history described in the Old Testament, relatively few of Israel's leaders are described as endowed with (that is, indwelt by) the Spirit. Beginning with Joseph and continuing through David the Spirit is said to come upon national deliverers. After David, we are not told that the Spirit came on any of Israel's kings—not even Solomon.<sup>12</sup> Although we do not read of Old Testament leaders after David who possessed the Spirit, Israel's prophets (who had the Spirit; see Mic 3:8) assured the people that Yahweh's Spirit had not abandoned the nation (Hag 2:5).

Further, they proclaimed that Yahweh would raise up for them a Messiah whose anointing from the Spirit would be similar to, but also greater than, their leaders of old (Isa 11:2; 42:1; 48:16; 61:1; see further chap. 5).

In Gen 41:38 Pharaoh describes Joseph as “a man in/on whom is the Spirit of God” (‘îš ’āšer rûah ’ēlōhîm bô).<sup>13</sup> Most translations have a lower case “spirit” here (NAS has “a divine spirit”), although the ESV and a few others (KJV, CEV) have “the Spirit of God.” We cannot be sure whether we are to understand this statement as reflecting Pharaoh's polytheistic theology or the monotheistic theology of the divinely inspired author, but it appears similar to language used of the Spirit's being “in” or “on”<sup>14</sup> people elsewhere in the Old Testament. That Joseph can do what no one else can is taken as evidence that he has the Spirit (note Pharaoh's comment in Gen 41:38, “Can we find another like this?”). Joseph's experience of the Spirit, therefore, is hardly presented as normative.

In response to Israel's complaining in the wilderness, Moses cries out to Yahweh that he cannot bear the burden of the nation alone (Num 11:14). In response Yahweh instructs him to gather seventy elders (11:16), and He says, “Then I will come down and speak with you there, and I will take from the Spirit that is upon you and put [the Spirit] upon them. And they shall bear with you the burden of the people so that you will not bear it alone” (11:17).

After these things happen, we are told that “as the Spirit rested upon them [wayhî kěnôah `ălěhem hārûah] they prophesied, but they did not do it again” (11:25). Apparently two of the seventy had stayed in the camp,<sup>15</sup> but the Spirit also came on them with the result that they prophesied (11:26). Commentators generally conclude that the Spirit “rested upon” the seventy elders in order to validate them as leaders of the nation.<sup>16</sup> That this experience is limited to the seventy is apparent in the wish that Moses expresses for the whole congregation to enjoy this experience of the Spirit: “O that all the people of Yahweh were prophets, and that Yahweh would put His Spirit upon them [’ălěhem]” (11:29).<sup>17</sup>

After Yahweh declares to Moses that he will die and not enter the land (Num 27:12–14), Moses asks Yahweh to appoint a man to shepherd the people in his stead (27:15–17). In response, Yahweh instructs Moses to commission Joshua (27:18–19). The description of Joshua in Num 27:18 as “a man in/on whom is the Spirit” (’iš ’ăšer rûah bô) echoes the description of Joseph in Gen 41:38. Once again, this statement is made because the Spirit in/on Joshua is what qualifies him to lead the people.<sup>18</sup> The same point is made after Moses' departure: “Now Joshua the son of Nun was filled with the Spirit of wisdom” (Deut 34:9).<sup>19</sup> Joshua's experience of the Spirit is not portrayed in these texts as a model for Old Testament believers in general.

In the years between Joshua and King Saul, a succession of judges led Israel. Their experience is summarized in Judg 2:18: "And when Yahweh raised up judges for them, Yahweh would be with [im] the judge in order to save them from the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge."<sup>20</sup> With several of these judges, Yahweh being with them takes the form of the Spirit coming on them to empower them. There is some variety in the terminology used, but the different descriptions generally overlap.

We are told in Judg 3:10 regarding Othniel that "The Spirit of Yahweh was upon him" (wattëhî `älāyw rûah yhw), and in 11:29 that "The Spirit of Yahweh was upon [al] Jephthah." Gideon's experience is described similarly through the imagery of clothing, although some uncertainty exists whether the Spirit clothed Gideon or put on Gideon as a garment, that is, entered or filled him: "The Spirit of Yahweh clothed [or "put on"] Gideon" (6:34).<sup>21</sup> Block understands Gideon's experience to be the equivalent of Othniel's and Jephthah's in that the Spirit took possession of them.<sup>22</sup> Different expressions are used with Samson: "The Spirit of Yahweh began to stir him" (13:25), and "The Spirit of Yahweh rushed upon him" (Judg 14:6,19; 15:14; also used of Saul and David).<sup>23</sup> In these accounts, the coming of the Spirit empowers the judge for a particular task,<sup>24</sup> marking him out as distinct.<sup>25</sup> Therefore, these passages do not lend support to the

notion that each individual member of the old covenant remnant was indwelt by the Spirit.

When Samuel anoints Saul king over Israel (1 Sam 10:1), he tells him that, "the Spirit of Yahweh will rush upon you" (10:6, the same expression used of Samson), which is just what happens (10:10). This text does not recount Saul's conversion (even though Samuel tells Saul in v. 6 that he will be "changed to another man").<sup>26</sup> The Old Testament speaks of the Spirit "rushing upon" someone not to describe a conversion experience (e.g., the expression is not used of Abraham or Rahab), but rather the Spirit's empowering leaders who will deliver the nation. In view of the context, where Samuel has just anointed Saul as king, and Saul promptly delivers the nation (1 Sam 11:1–11), it seems clear that here Saul is being marked out by the Spirit to lead the nation. The expression occurs again in 11:6, suggesting that Saul's earlier experience of the Spirit ceased when he finished prophesying (see 10:13). When Saul needs to be empowered anew, the Spirit rushed on him anew (11:6). This may indicate that the Spirit did not continually indwell Saul, but that Saul was periodically empowered by the Spirit. The Spirit comes on Saul just as He came on Samson. Further, just as the seventy elders prophesied, Saul also prophesied (10:10–13).

Saul's experience of an evil spirit from God furnishes additional evidence that the Spirit's "rushing upon"

someone was for temporary empowerment. The evil spirit that tormented Saul came and went from him (1 Sam 16:23). At times the same phrase used for the Spirit of Yahweh coming upon people is used of the evil spirit coming on Saul. For instance, in 1 Sam 18:10, "And an evil spirit from God rushed to Saul." This uses the same verb as is used of Samson and Saul, but a different preposition. It is identical, however, to the expression used of the Spirit of Yahweh coming on David in 1 Sam 16:13, "And the Spirit of Yahweh rushed to David from that day forward."

Further, Saul's reception of the Spirit is specifically related to kingship. When Samuel anoints David to be king and the Spirit rushes to him (1 Sam 16:13); we immediately are told, "Now the Spirit of Yahweh had departed from being with [mē'im] Saul" (16:14). Then, when Saul calls Samuel through the witch at Endor, Samuel announces, "Yahweh has departed from upon you [mē'āleykā, see 10:6] ... and Yahweh has torn the kingdom from your hand" (28:16–17). These two passages seem to indicate that the kingdom belongs to the one upon whom the Spirit rests.

When David is anointed king in 1 Sam 16:13, "the Spirit of Yahweh rushed to David."<sup>27</sup> An additional element, however, distinguishes the description of the Spirit coming on David from the description of the Spirit coming on Saul. To the phrase "the Spirit of Yahweh rushed to David" the

words "from that day forward" are added. Since both Samson and Saul are described as experiencing the Spirit "rushing upon" them repeatedly (Judg 14:6,19; 15:14; 1 Sam 10:10; 11:6), it would seem that the experience was ongoing in the sense that David continued to be periodically empowered from the day of his anointing until the end of his life. It does not seem, in other words, that David lived in a continual experience of the Spirit being on him mightily.<sup>28</sup> Yahweh stops being with Saul (1 Sam 16:14); now Yahweh is with David (1 Sam 16:18). The Spirit is no longer rushing on Saul to empower him, because now David is king (16:13).

This would seem to explain David's prayer in Ps 51:11 (Hb. 51:13), "Do not take your Holy Spirit from me." David has witnessed the Spirit and the kingship being taken from Saul when he sinned. He pleads that the same not happen to him.<sup>29</sup>

In these instances, national leaders are empowered by the Spirit for the position to which they are appointed. No indication is given that those not appointed were indwelt by the Spirit. Rather, the Spirit distinguishes these people from the rest of the nation as He empowers them for the task of leadership. These texts do not give evidence that ordinary believers under the old covenant were indwelt by the Holy Spirit.

## **Prophets**

After the seventy elders prophesy in Num 11:25–26, the next time the Spirit of God comes on a person and inspires prophetic activity is in the case of Balaam. According to Num 24:2–3, “the Spirit of God came upon him [watthî`ālāyw],<sup>30</sup> and he lifted up his discourse and said ...” The Spirit came on Balaam with the result that Balaam made true statements. The Spirit apparently did not stay with Balaam indefinitely, nor did the Spirit bring about his conversion since Balaam died making war on the people of God (31:8), and the New Testament condemns him (Jude 11).

The Old Testament frequently asserts that prophets were inspired by the Spirit.<sup>31</sup> The New Testament is aware of this phenomenon, even stating that the prophets had the Spirit of Christ within them (1 Pet 1:11). Ordinary believers, however, who were not prophets, tabernacle craftsmen, kings, or the like, were not continually indwelt by the Holy Spirit as individuals.<sup>32</sup>

Beyond the Spirit's empowering for “the performance of a specific task or the exercise of an office” in the Old Testament, some scholars question whether the “indwelling transforming presence of the Spirit” is only a new covenant believer's experience.<sup>33</sup> The prophet Joel spoke of a future outpouring of the Spirit in terms of a universal gift of prophecy. No longer would the Spirit be reserved for select prophets, but all flesh would experience the Spirit and prophesy: sons, daughters, old

men, young men, male servants, and female servants (Joel 2:28–29 [Hb. 3:1–2]). Joel spoke of an experience that was not true in his day. Commentators understand Joel's prophecy as pointing to the fulfillment of Moses' wish that Yahweh would put His Spirit on all His people (Num 11:29).<sup>34</sup> Joel's words imply that in his day the Spirit's work in individuals was limited.

This survey of passages indicates that even those who were divinely selected and empowered by the Spirit for special tasks or offices were not necessarily indwelt by the Spirit. All the more would individual believers lack this experience.<sup>35</sup> Philo at least represents later Jewish understanding during the Hellenistic period: "It is possible that the spirit of God may remain in the soul, but that it should remain forever is impossible" (Gig., 7 [28]). I am not arguing, however, that the Spirit had no influence on the people of God. In addition to the Spirit's working on the people through the prophets (Neh 9:20,30), the pious also prayed that the Spirit would lead them in righteousness (see Ps 143:10, "Cause your good Spirit to lead me on level ground."). In the next section we consider where the Old Testament indicates that God by His Spirit dwelt under the old covenant.

# The Dwelling of God in Israel

The Old Testament presents God as dwelling in particular locations, not in individual believers. This contrasts with the New Testament teaching that God no longer dwells at particular places and instead dwells in human beings (see John 4:21–24). Whereas old covenant believers were lifted out of deadness in sin by the ministry of the Spirit, the Spirit did not take up residence within them in order to preserve them in faith. Though the Spirit was not in Old Testament saints, He was with them. God was with them by dwelling in the tabernacle and then the temple, which made the place lovely (Ps 84:1 [Hb. 84:2]).

## God's Dwelling Place

The Old Testament conceives of God as being present with His old covenant people by dwelling in the tabernacle and later the temple.<sup>36</sup> Chapter six will show that these concepts are foundational to the New Testament teaching that believers in Jesus are the new temple, which is to say they are indwelt by the Holy Spirit.

**The Tabernacle.** Yahweh declared to Moses, “let them make for Me a sanctuary that I may dwell among them” (Exod 25:8). In this statement God expresses His desire to be sought and found at a particular place, and He commands that His dwelling place be prepared.<sup>37</sup> He will

dwelt in the tent the Israelites make for Him. Prior to this statement about the tabernacle, earlier references to God's house (Gen 28:17; Exod 23:19), mountain (Exod 4:17), or sanctuary (Exod 15:17) indicate that though God cannot be geographically bound,<sup>38</sup> there were certain places where He could be met (see Num 17:4). When the tabernacle was complete and Yahweh's glory filled it (Exod 40:34–38), all these various ways that God's presence was communicated came together.<sup>39</sup> In a real sense, "The purpose for the exodus from Egypt was so God could dwell in the midst of His people. The coming of God's glorious presence into the newly constructed tabernacle forms the climax of the Book of Exodus (40:34)."<sup>40</sup>

Yahweh's residence among His people in the tabernacle not only provided them with access to His presence, it also sanctified them. God's presence among His people necessitates—and creates—clean and holy living, for, as He declares, "I am Yahweh who sanctifies you" (Exod 31:13).<sup>41</sup> As Craig Koester explains, "God's presence in the tabernacle continued to remind Israel of His covenant with them and of the importance of faithful obedience to His commandments (Lev 26:9–13; Num 9:15–23)."<sup>42</sup> The texts would have us conclude that God actually took up residence in the tabernacle (Exod 40:34–35)<sup>43</sup> and continually dwelt there (40:36–38).<sup>44</sup>

**The Temple.** Deuteronomy 12 mandates that Israel was

to have one place of worship.<sup>45</sup> Yahweh later chose the threshing floor of Araunah in Jerusalem as the place where He would place His name (2 Sam 24:16–25).<sup>46</sup> Solomon built the temple (1 Kgs 5–9), the account of which climaxes with Yahweh's glory filling the temple (8:10–11) just as it had filled the tabernacle (Exod 40:34–38). P. W. Comfort correctly notes, "In pre-A.D. 70 Judaism, the Temple represented the one place God had chosen to be uniquely present among his elect people."<sup>47</sup>

In the temple, Yahweh was present with His people. He had promised, "I will dwell among [bĕtōk] the sons of Israel" (1 Kgs 6:13). Just as God's presence in the tabernacle had a sanctifying influence on the people, God's presence in the temple would incline the people toward obedience.<sup>48</sup> At the dedication of the temple Solomon prays, "May Yahweh our God be with us [immānū] as He was with our fathers! May He neither forsake us nor abandon us, that He may incline our hearts to Himself, to walk in all His ways, to keep His commandments and statutes and judgments which He commanded our fathers" (1 Kgs 8:57–58). Solomon petitions Yahweh to incline the hearts of the people to covenant faithfulness by means of His presence with the people. In this context, as Solomon prays at the dedication of the temple, Yahweh's presence with the people takes the form of His condescension to dwell in the temple.<sup>49</sup>

The construction of the temple was the apex of Israel's

national life. From this high point in her national history, however, Israel plummeted into the likeness of her neighbors. After the prominence of the temple in 1 Kings 5–9, its absence from the account from 1 Kgs 15:18 to 2 Kgs 11:3 is striking. The temple is not a part of the story of the nation's decline. For some seventeen chapters there is not one word about the place where Yahweh chose to set His name.

The significance of the temple for Israel was such that the later kings whose reigns are recounted in this “deuteronomistic history” are evaluated partly on the basis of their fidelity to the temple in Jerusalem. Although a king could do what was right in the eyes of Yahweh and be intolerant of idolatry, he could still be criticized if he failed to remove the high places (2 Kgs 12:2–3; 14:3–4; 15:3–4, 34–35). These high places were probably not places where other gods were worshiped, but places other than the temple in Jerusalem where people sought to worship Yahweh.<sup>50</sup> This explains the Rabshekeh's taunt to the people on the wall that Yahweh would not deliver them because Hezekiah had taken away His high places and altars (2 Kgs 18:22). Kings Jehoash and Josiah also are commended for their concern with the condition of the temple (2 Kgs 12:4–16; 22:4–7).<sup>51</sup>

The centrality of the temple is also evident in the Psalms.<sup>52</sup> References to Jerusalem, Mount Zion, and the temple are so prominent in the Psalter that some

recognize a “theology of Jerusalem.”<sup>53</sup> Yahweh dwells in Zion (Ps 9:11 [Hb. 9:12]), He is in His holy temple, and His throne is in heaven (11:4).<sup>54</sup> Help comes from the sanctuary, even from Zion (20:4 [Hb. 20:3]). To enter the sanctuary is to enter God's presence, and doing so has a sanctifying effect on old covenant believers (73:17). Because Yahweh dwells there, one day in the temple courts is better than thousands elsewhere (84:10 [Hb. 84:11]). Yahweh is enthroned upon the praises of Israel (22:3 [Hb. 22:4]) because they praise Him in His sanctuary (150:1). Indeed, the Psalmist considers himself blessed because he will dwell in the house of Yahweh forever (23:6).<sup>55</sup>

Jerusalem was precious to Old Testament believers because the temple was there, and the temple was precious to them because God was there. The association between God and temple was so close that the people had to be reminded that He also dwelt in heaven (1 Kgs 8:27,30). Jeremiah had to rebuke the people for forgetting that they were to trust God rather than the temple, and that it was not a magical charm guaranteeing their protection (Jer 7:4,14–15).<sup>56</sup> Nevertheless, once the temple was completed, Israel was to worship Yahweh in Jerusalem and nowhere else.<sup>57</sup>

## **The Spirit in the Midst of the Nation**

On a few occasions the Old Testament speaks of the Holy Spirit being “in the midst of” or “among” the nation. In view of what was seen in the previous section—that Yahweh dwells among the people in the temple—it would seem that Yahweh's Spirit in the temple is the referent of these statements. Isaiah 63 and Haggai 2 will demonstrate this point sufficiently.

Isaiah 63:11 recalls the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, particularly the parting of the Red Sea: “Then He remembered the days of old, of Moses and His people. Where is the one who brought them up from the sea with the shepherds of His flock? Where is the one who put in the midst of it [bēqirbô]<sup>58</sup> His Holy Spirit?” Isaiah declares that at the time God delivered Israel at the Red Sea He put His Spirit in the midst of the people. What is in view here is not the Spirit taking up residence in individual Israelites. In fact, a case can be made that the Holy Spirit in this text may be the same as the pillar of fire and cloud that led the people to the sea, then stood between the Israelites and the Egyptians (see Exod 14:19–20). Both passages refer to a certain angel. Exodus 14:19 tells us that the “angel of God” (mal’ak hā’ēlōhîm) who had been in front of the camp of Israel “moved and went behind them.” Then using a clause type typically describing a subsequent event, we are told, “Then the pillar of cloud moved from in front of them and stood behind them.” So “the angel of God” and “the pillar of cloud” appear to be distinct entities. Similarly,

Isa 63:9 speaks of “the angel of His presence” (mal’ak pānāyw), who delivered and redeemed Israel and then lifted and carried them. But according to v. 10 Israel “rebelled and grieved His Holy Spirit” (cp. Ps 106:33). It seems that Isaiah is alluding to Exod 14:19, with Isaiah’s “angel of His presence” corresponding to the “angel of God,” and “His Holy Spirit” in Isa 63:10–11 corresponding to the “pillar of cloud” in Exod 14:19.

God’s Spirit was in the midst of the nation because the pillar of fire and cloud was there at the tabernacle (Num 9:15–16). God was with His people, but He was not in them individually.<sup>59</sup> In Exod 29:42–46 Yahweh promises to “dwell among [ “in the midst of”] the sons of Israel” and to “meet” with them at the tent of meeting. As Motyer states, “The reference here is to the indwelling of the Lord himself in the tabernacle.”<sup>60</sup>

Much later, following Israel’s return from Babylonian exile, Haggai’s mission was to stir up the people to finish rebuilding the temple. Although the rebuilt temple seemed “as nothing” in comparison to the first temple (Hag 2:3), Yahweh commanded the leaders to take courage and work (2:4). He would not reject the rebuilt temple, but would fulfill for the people the promises He had made to their ancestors: “I cut a covenant with you when you came out of Egypt, and My Spirit is standing in your midst [wěŕûahî ’ōmedet bětôkēkem]; do not fear!” Yahweh promised to fill the rebuilt temple with glory, even greater glory than that

experienced by the first temple (2:7–9). Even though the temple did not seem as great as the one built by Solomon, Yahweh accepted it and would dwell in it even as He dwelt in Solomon's temple. Furthermore, His Spirit was already “standing” in their midst—not in each of them individually—but just as He had been in their midst when He brought them out of Egypt.<sup>61</sup> Interestingly, the word for “pillar” (ʿammûd) in such texts as Exod 14:19 is from the same root (ʿmd) as the verb (ʿamad) here translated “standing.”

Under the old covenant, God empowered certain mediators of the covenant by His Spirit. Through these leaders of the nation the Spirit ministered to the rest of the people (e.g., Neh 9:30). By His Spirit, God took up residence in the tabernacle and later the temple. God's presence in the temple had a sanctifying, preserving effect on Old Testament saints. The psalmist Asaph in Psalm 73 recounts how he was tempted to envy the wicked. He says he found this wearisome (v. 16) “until I went into the sanctuary of God; then I discerned their end” (v. 17). Entering the temple preserved the psalmist from the sin of betraying God's people by envying the wicked and thinking that righteous living is in vain (vv. 13–15). He was preserved because through the presence of God in the temple (v. 23,28) he was reminded that God will indeed judge the wicked (v. 18). The awareness of God's presence, mediated through the temple, motivated the psalmist to persevere in faith.

Eventually, Yahweh's patience with His covenant-breaking people ran out, and He cast off the city He had chosen and the temple where He placed His name (2 Kgs 23:27). God abandoned His dwelling place in Israel (Jer 12:7), and His glory departed from the temple in Jerusalem (Ezek 8–11).

# The Promises of the New Covenant

Several Old Testament texts speak of a future day when God's people would have a greater experience of His Spirit (Isa 32:15; 44:3; Ezek 36:27; 37:14; 39:29; Joel 2:28–29).<sup>62</sup> Jeremiah 31 does not refer explicitly to the Spirit, but to a new covenant (Jer 31:31–32) that brings a new location for God's law—not stone tablets in the temple, but the hearts of God's people (31:33). Because Ezekiel 36:26 also speaks of a new heart given to God's people, that passage is usually interpreted as conceptually parallel to Jeremiah 31. It has been suggested that when Ezekiel speaks of indwelling, he is not “predicting a phenomenon here of which he had heretofore no personal knowledge or experience.”<sup>63</sup> As a prophet, Ezekiel had an extraordinary relationship with the Spirit (Ezek 2:2; 1 Pet 1:11). But had Ezekiel already experienced what he was here prophesying? Furthermore, had Ezekiel's audience experienced anything like it? These two texts, Jeremiah 31 and Ezekiel 36, rather point to a day after the prophets when God would no longer reside in the temple, but by His Spirit He would dwell in His people.

## Jeremiah 31:31–34

Jeremiah begins his oracle by placing it squarely in the

future, "Behold, days are coming ..." (31:31). With these words Jeremiah alerts his audience that what follows is what will take place, rather than what is taking place. As Moshe Weinfeld states, "The prophecies which use these introductory formulae are mainly associated with the return of the captivity, with the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and with the shoot of David ... as well as with vengeance executed on the enemies of Israel."<sup>64</sup> The remainder of the verse declares that Yahweh will cut with the house of Israel and the house of Judah a new covenant.

This new covenant is then distinguished from the Mosaic covenant: "Not like the covenant which I cut with their fathers in the day I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt" (v. 32).<sup>65</sup> This new covenant is needed because Israel broke the old covenant (v. 32b). Verse 33 first describes the new covenant in terms of what Yahweh will do, while the rest of vv. 33–34 describes the result of the new covenant.

In v. 33a, "This is the covenant which I will cut with the house of Israel after these days,"<sup>66</sup> the futurity of the new covenant is reiterated. Using old covenant imagery to describe the new covenant, Yahweh states, "I will put my Torah in the midst of them." Then He clarifies in the following poetic line, "and upon their hearts I will write it" (v. 33b). The tablets of testimony on which the law was written had been placed in the ark of the covenant, which

was kept in the tabernacle (later the temple), the dwelling place of God (Exod 25:16; cp. 24:12; 40:20; Deut 10:5; 1 Kgs 8:9). The book of the Torah was later placed next to the ark (Deut 31:26). But "Jer 3:16 promises that, in the future, restored city of Jerusalem, the Ark will be obsolete."<sup>67</sup> As Weinfeld explains, "If we deny any need of the ark of the covenant we naturally deny any need of the tables of the covenant."<sup>68</sup>

It appears, then, that the Torah will no longer reside in the ark in the temple. Yahweh promises that the Torah will have a new medium—no longer written on tablets but on hearts, and a new home—no longer residing in the ark in the temple but in God's people (Jer 31:33).<sup>69</sup>

Three results of this new covenant are then stated. First, Yahweh will be their God and they will be His people (Jer 31:33). Second, no longer will instruction in the knowledge of Yahweh be necessary (v. 34a). And third, iniquity will be forgiven and transgression remembered no more (v. 34b). Since the responsibility of the priesthood was to teach Torah,<sup>70</sup> this verse implies that the new covenant will render this function of the priests unnecessary. No longer will the limited availability of copies of the Torah prohibit access to God's word. Furthermore, once sins are dealt with, an ongoing sacrificial cult is no longer necessary (see Heb 9:6–10:18). Dumbrell explains, "Forgiveness is normally granted in the OT through the sacrificial system. ... In the context of Jer

31:34 for God 'not to remember' means that no action will need to be taken in the new age against sin."<sup>71</sup> As Keil put it,

Under the old covenant the knowledge of the Lord was connected with the mediation of priests and prophets. ... Access to the Lord was denied to individuals, and His grace was only obtained by the intervention of human mediators. This state of matters has been abolished under the new covenant, inasmuch as the favoured sinner is placed in immediate relation to God by the Holy Spirit.<sup>72</sup>

Indeed, "When God writes the torah ('law, instruction') on the people's heart, mediators are bypassed and the limitations of written documents are superseded."<sup>73</sup>

Jeremiah 31:31–34 does not explicitly state that the Holy Spirit will indwell believers under the new covenant, but there are hints in that direction. Just as the Torah was formerly housed in the temple, it now will be housed in individuals.<sup>74</sup> Just as the blessings of the knowledge of God and the forgiveness of sins were mediated through the priesthood at the temple, they will be experienced by all believers under the new covenant (see 1 John 2:1–2,20,27). These changes point to the people of God becoming the replacement of the temple. This is the newness of the new covenant, for it is precisely the indwelling of the Spirit that constitutes the people of God

as His temple (see [chapter six](#)).

The charge of speaking against the temple was leveled against Jesus, Stephen, and Paul (Matt 26:61; Acts 6:13; 21:28). Such charges may have arisen from the early church's proclamation that the temple had been replaced and was no longer essential for God's people. Whether or not it was ever stated in precisely those words, the early church did claim that all believers are indwelt by the Spirit (John 14:17,23; Rom 8:9–11; 1 Cor 6:19) and serve as the new temple (e.g., 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19), that Jesus had put an end to ritual sacrifice (e.g., Heb 10:12), and that through Jesus believers have direct access to God through the Spirit (e.g., Heb 4:14–16; 10:22; 12:28; 1 John 3:24; 4:13). Such claims would have been offensive in the first century milieu, particularly to those whose preeminence was derived from their place at the temple.

Under the new covenant, God would not have a tribe of priests ministering to the rest of His people, but His people as a whole would be a kingdom of priests (see Exod 19:6; 1 Pet 2:9; Rev 1:6).<sup>75</sup> In these respects it may be said that there is discontinuity between the old and new covenants. There is continuity, however, in that the Spirit has been active in the lives of believers under both covenants.<sup>76</sup> That there were believers under the old covenant<sup>77</sup> demonstrates that the Spirit had an interior ministry in the Old Testament.<sup>78</sup> Consequently, although not indwelt, old

covenant believers had circumcised hearts (i.e., they were regenerate).

Whereas Jeremiah places the writing of the law on the heart in the future (Jer 31:31,33), he speaks of circumcision of the heart as something some of his contemporaries may have experienced: "Behold, days are coming, declares Yahweh, when I will punish all those who are circumcised in foreskin" (Jer 9:25 [Hb. 9:24]). Here Jeremiah declares that Yahweh intends to punish those of his contemporaries who have been circumcised and yet their foreskin remains. This oxymoron could be rendered "uncircumcised circumcised"<sup>79</sup> and is explained in the following verse to mean "uncircumcised of heart" (cp. Lev 26:41; Deut 10:16; 30:6; Acts 7:51; Rom 2:29).<sup>80</sup> As Woodbridge writes, "The limitations of the mere physical act are underlined in Jeremiah 9:25–26. ... A Jew with an uncircumcised heart is no different from a Gentile whose nation practices circumcision."<sup>81</sup>

In Jer 9:25–26, the "days" that "are coming" does not refer, as in Jer 31:31, to the restoration of the people after judgment, but to the coming judgment itself against Jeremiah's contemporaries. Apparently they considered themselves wise, mighty, and rich, and Jeremiah counters that this is no ground for boasting. Rather, the one who boasts should boast in knowing Yahweh (9:23–24 Hb. 9:22–23). But they have refused to know Yahweh, so Jerusalem will be made a heap of ruins, and Jeremiah will

weep over the slain. Hard on the heels of the reference to knowing Yahweh in 9:24 come the references in 9:25–26 to those whose hearts are uncircumcised. The sacking of Jerusalem would result in exile (9:16). The destruction of the city is a type of the eschatological judgment, but the destruction would come in the near future. If this is correct, the judgment that would take place during Jeremiah's lifetime fell on those who were uncircumcised of heart. If any of Jeremiah's contemporaries were to "circumcise yourselves<sup>82</sup> to Yahweh and remove the foreskins of your hearts" (4:4), that is, respond with faith to Jeremiah's plea, they would constitute a remnant who, though suffering in the judgment, would be saved through it. Such a remnant seems to have survived the destruction of Jerusalem in Jeremiah's day (see 23:3; 31:7; 40:11; 42:2,19). Whereas the writing of the law on the heart replaced the law that was stored at the temple, the spiritualization of circumcision does not hint at the replacement of the temple in any way. But circumcision of the heart does seem to result in the ability to love God and live (Deut 30:6). This spiritual circumcision (circumcised heart and ears) enables people to incline to Yahweh. In Jer 6:10 Yahweh asks, "Who shall I speak to or warn that they might listen? Behold, their ear is uncircumcised, and they are not able to pay attention [wěłō' yûkěłû lěhaqšib]. Behold, the word of Yahweh has become a reproach to them; they do not delight in it." An "uncircumcised ear" indicates an inability to interest oneself in the word of Yahweh. In chapter six, I will argue that the new birth

from above, i.e., regeneration, results in a new ability to hear and believe, just as spiritual circumcision does. If the believing remnant under the old covenant had the ability to hear Yahweh's word and believe it, they had the same ability given to those who are described by the New Testament as having been "born again" or "made alive" (John 3:3–8; Eph 2:5; 1 Pet 2:23). Further, it seems from Jer 9:25 (Hb. 9:24) that those who were circumcised in heart would be saved when the rest of the nation was judged.

Circumcision of the heart appears equivalent to regeneration, while the writing of the law on the heart involves the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, making the recipient into a spiritual temple. Whereas circumcision of the heart was possible for Jeremiah's contemporaries, writing the law on their hearts would await the inauguration of the new covenant. Although the old covenant remnant was not indwelt (God's Spirit, like His Torah, was to reside in the temple), the old covenant remnant was regenerate (they had circumcised hearts). As A. H. Lewis writes, "Therefore, we must conclude that the Word of God used by the Spirit of God brought new life to all who came to personal salvation under the old covenant."<sup>83</sup>

At the very least, the overtones of indwelling in Jer 31:31–34 were set firmly in the future. This text does not indicate that old covenant believers were indwelt.

## **Ezekiel 36:26–27**

This section will focus on three points. First and most important are the eschatological blessings promised in this passage to Israel. Second, we will consider the suggestion that the original audience might have understood Ezekiel to say that Yahweh would put His Spirit back in the temple after it was removed in Ezekiel 8–11. And third, I will argue that v. 26 speaks of regeneration and v. 27 of indwelling. These second and third items are interpretive possibilities that may be helpful, although my thesis does not depend on them. We begin with the indications that the promises here are eschatological.

Ezekiel wrote as one who had been exiled (Ezek 1:1) and granted a vision of the glory of God leaving the temple (Ezek 8–11). Ezekiel 36 looks forward to the time Yahweh brings Israel back from exile: “I will take you from the nations, and I will gather you from all the lands. Then I will bring you to your land” (36:24).

When they return to the land, they will naturally be unclean, not only from their deeds but from having been in Gentile territory. When Yahweh gathers them, however, they will not need to cleanse themselves, for Yahweh himself will do it: “And I will sprinkle clean water on you that you may be clean. From all your uncleanness and from all your idols I will cleanse you” (36:25). Here Ezekiel

is piling up allusions to various cleansing rites in order to describe a divinely accomplished absolute or wholesale cleansing of the people from sin.<sup>84</sup> Verses 28–30 speak of the prosperous life that Yahweh will grant His people in the fruitful land to which He will gather them. The nation will repent (36:31), cities will be rebuilt (36:33), and desolate land cultivated (36:34) like the Garden of Eden (36:35; cp. Isa 51:3).

Ezekiel 36:26–27, then, is set in an eschatological scene. Dumbrell puts it well, “While his emphasis is ... slightly different to that of Jeremiah, the goal of Ezekiel is certainly the same; the experience of new life within the New Creation. This is the direction in which Ezekiel 36 heads, since in vv. 28–38 we have a virtual return to the garden scene of Genesis 2.”<sup>85</sup> The restoration of the nation is in view in this text (see Ezek 37).<sup>86</sup>

When Ezekiel prophesied, the nation was in exile. God had abandoned His dwelling place. But Ezekiel offered hope to the people—their God would gather them back to the land He gave them and put His Spirit back in their midst. It seems possible that Yahweh's promise to put His Spirit “in your [plural] midst” (bēqirbēkem, 36:27) might have been understood against the vision of God's glory leaving the temple in Ezekiel 8–11. Not only does this interpretation fit contextually, it also has grammatical probability on its side. Each time this term, which is the equivalent of “in the midst of you all,” occurs in the Old

Testament, it signifies something that is in the midst of the community collectively rather than something that is in the midst of each individual in the community.<sup>87</sup> It would be remarkable if the uses of the form in Ezek 36:26 and 27 were the lone exceptions to this pattern of usage in the Old Testament.

In this case, the Spirit being put “in the midst” of them again could naturally be understood as Yahweh putting His Spirit back into the temple He had forsaken. As Clements writes, “In exile Ezekiel taught the people that Yahweh had only temporarily withdrawn His presence and that he would return to a new and rebuilt Jerusalem.”<sup>88</sup> This is supported from the near context, where Yahweh promises that He will once again dwell among the nation.

I will cut a covenant of peace for them; it will be an everlasting covenant with them. I will establish and increase them, and I will put my sanctuary in their midst [bētôkām] forever. My dwelling shall be upon them [ʾălêhem]. I shall be their God, and they shall be my people. And the nations will know that I am Yahweh who sanctifies Israel, when My sanctuary is in their midst [bētôkām] forever (37:26–28).

We may add to these statements the vision of a new temple (Ezek 40–48), which the Spirit of God once again inhabits (Ezek 43:1–9).

Understanding the statement in Ezek 36:27, "And my Spirit I will put in your midst," as a statement that God will return to the temple is supported by contrasting it with Ezek 37:1–14. There, as Ezekiel records his vision of the dry bones, he does not say that the Spirit goes "into the midst of" or "among" the bones (with the prepositions *bĕqereb* or *bĕtôk*).<sup>89</sup> Rather, Ezekiel writes that the Spirit goes into the bones. God says in Ezek 37:14, "I will put my Spirit in you" (*bākem*; cp. also "in you," *bākem*, in 37:5–6, and "in them," *bāhem*, in 37:10).<sup>90</sup> The use of the preposition *bĕ* ("in/at/with"), as opposed to the compound prepositions *bĕqereb* or *bĕtôk*, seems to indicate that Ezekiel is depicting the Spirit entering each individual set of bones.

One wonders whether the Spirit being again in the midst of the people would be read as indwelling were it not for the New Testament. With Ezekiel's proclamation that Yahweh will again have a sanctuary among the people (37:26–28), and His concern for a new temple (see Ezek 40–48),<sup>91</sup> it seems more plausible that he envisions God returning to dwell among the people since God had previously abandoned His temple (10:18).<sup>92</sup>

These promises, which Ezekiel declared while Israel was in exile, were for the day when the exile was finally over (36:24). There is a partial fulfillment of the promise of Ezekiel 36:27 in Haggai 2:5, "and my Spirit is standing in your midst."<sup>93</sup> What Ezekiel's audience might have

expected—God dwelling in His temple in the midst of His people—will ultimately be realized in the consummation: “Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell among them. And they will be His people, and God himself, their God, will be with them” (Rev 21:3).<sup>94</sup>

Understanding Ezekiel 36:27 as a promise that God's Spirit will return to dwell in the restored temple rather than a promise that He will indwell each member of the remnant is not essential to the thesis but fits grammatically and contextually and offers intriguing corroboration.

Nowhere in the Old Testament prior to Ezekiel is there an indication that the Spirit's indwelling of each believer was a known or expected phenomenon.<sup>95</sup> Nor is there evidence that any after Ezekiel developed a new idea he introduced.<sup>96</sup> But however Ezek 36:27 is to be applied,<sup>97</sup> the fact remains that these are eschatological promises.<sup>98</sup> Therefore, Ezek 36:26–27 does not indicate that the old covenant remnant was indwelt.

We must also consider the possibility that two works of the Spirit are in view: that Ezek 36:26 speaks of a new heart for God's people (cp. 18:31), whereas the following verse refers to God's indwelling presence (whether in the temple or in individual believers). Thus, in these two verses it is possible to distinguish between regeneration

and indwelling.

Ezekiel is not promising one aspect of this prophecy (36:26) to his contemporaries and locating the other (36:27) in the future; both promises are future. It may be, however, that the believing remnant among Ezekiel's audience had experienced a heart change (circumcision of the heart/regeneration, 36:26) and were rejoicing with the Psalmist that God would dwell in the temple (Ps 132:7; indwelling, Ezek 36:27), even if an experience of individual indwelling was alien to them. These promises concern what God will do for the people when the nation is ultimately restored. My suggestion is that regeneration and indwelling are presented here as separate, though coordinate. Although a tenuous exegetical point, this view is appealing and supports the thesis that old covenant believers were regenerate but not indwelt.

The restoration of the nation will include the transformation of its people. Through Ezekiel Yahweh declares what He will do for the nation when He brings them back:

- 26a) I will give to you a new heart,
- 26b) even a new spirit I will put in your midst.
- 26c) I will remove the heart of stone from your flesh,
- 26d) and I will give to you a heart of flesh.
- 27a) My Spirit I will put in your midst;

27b) and I will cause you to walk in My statutes,  
27c) and you shall keep My judgments and do them  
(Ezek 36:26–27).

Verse 26 seems primarily concerned with the gift of new life to the individual. Verse 26a, “I will give you a new heart,” is elaborated on in v. 26c-d. The gift of the new heart is accomplished through the removal of the old heart of stone and the provision of a heart of flesh. This gift of a new heart seems conceptually parallel to the idea of heart circumcision, but Ezekiel never employs the concept of circumcision of the heart. It is difficult, therefore, to be certain how these two metaphors relate to one another. But Weinfeld states, “While the idea of the circumcision of the heart does not occur explicitly in Ezekiel, it is embodied in verses such as the following: ‘And I will remove the stony heart out of their body, and will give them a heart of flesh.’ (11<sub>19</sub> 36<sub>26</sub>).”<sup>99</sup>

Verse 26b is most likely in the same vein. The “new spirit” referred to there is not necessarily Yahweh’s Spirit (“My Spirit”) referred to in v. 27a, but a new spirit in the sense of a new attitude (see Num 14:24). This point is commonly recognized by translations, which leave the “s” on “spirit” in v. 26 lowercase while capitalizing the “s” in v. 27 (ESV, HCSB, NAS, NIV). As many interpreters agree, the parallelism between “new heart” and “new spirit” in v. 26 is a decisive indicator that the two concepts are synonymous.<sup>100</sup> This parallelism is highlighted by the chiasmic arrangement. The word order in v. 26a-b is verb-

noun, noun-verb (reflected in the literal translation above).<sup>101</sup> Verse 26b, then, can be interpreted in view of v. 26a. The “new spirit” is not Yahweh's Spirit being placed in each individual restored Israelite. Rather, God will grant a new heart and a new attitude to the people.<sup>102</sup> As noted above, we are not far from the circumcision of the heart, which can be likened to regeneration. Weinfeld states, “Ezekiel ... described the process of Israel's regeneration in a distinctly ritualistic manner. God sprinkles clean water on Israel and purifies them before He gives them a new heart.”<sup>103</sup>

Along with the gift of a new heart and a new spirit, Ezek 36:27 describes the gift of Yahweh's presence. Though the temple was abandoned and the nation was exiled, Yahweh here promises that when the nation is restored they will once again experience His Spirit dwelling among them.<sup>104</sup> On this reading of the passage, v. 26 speaks of something like regeneration, while v. 27 speaks of something like indwelling. This observation is born out by the grammar of the two statements. In v. 26, the people receive the action of the verb—they receive a new heart and a new spirit. In v. 27, Yahweh's Spirit receives the action of the verb—He is placed “among” the people. Both of these promises are for the future, but just as Israel experienced God's presence as He indwelt the temple, perhaps they also experienced a heart change akin to, if not the same as, regeneration.

Those who agree that all people are dead in trespasses and sins (Eph 2:1) will agree that anyone who exercises faith in God must have been lifted by God out of that dead and unresponsive condition.<sup>105</sup> The Gospel of John treats this enabling as a new birth from above. I will argue below that this ministry of the Spirit is not limited to the new covenant (see the discussion of John 3 in chapter six). By contrast, John limits the reception of the Spirit to the age after Jesus is glorified (7:39; see [chapter five](#)).

# Conclusion

This chapter has argued that the Old Testament does not present believers as indwelt by the Holy Spirit. Covenant mediators such as national leaders, craftsmen of the tabernacle and temple, and prophets had extraordinary experiences of the Spirit. The Spirit came on such people to differentiate them from the rest of the nation and empower them for their task. The Old Testament presents God dwelling among ancient Israel by His Spirit in the temple.<sup>106</sup> Finally, the promises of a new covenant in Jeremiah 31 and Ezekiel 36 do not indicate that old covenant believers were indwelt by the Spirit.

Since the Old Testament contains no clear statement that all old covenant believers were individually indwelt by the Holy Spirit,<sup>107</sup> the argument that old covenant believers were indwelt by the Spirit must be made from the New Testament.<sup>108</sup> Chapter five of this study will argue that according to John 7:39 believers would not receive the indwelling Spirit until Jesus was glorified.<sup>109</sup> In chapter four we will consider John's teaching on the Spirit more generally.

**Table 2: Actions of God in John**

<b>Actions Common to Father, Son, and Spirit</b>			
<b>Action</b>	<b>Father</b>	<b>Son</b>	<b>Spirit</b>

Give Life	5:21; (6:33); 17:3	5:21,25–26,40; 6:33; 17:3	3:6,8; 6:63
Proclaim Future	1:33	13:19,26,36–38; 14:3,29; 16:1–4,16– 28,32; 20:18	16:13
Indwell Believers	14:23	14:20,23; (15:4–7); 17:23,26	14:17
Teach	6:45; 7:16,17; 8:28	7:14; (8:2); 8:20; 13:13–14	14:26
Testify to Jesus	5:32; 6:27; 8:18	8:12–14,18	15:26
Glorify Jesus	5:22–23; 8:50,54; 13:31– 32; 17:1,22	(1:14); 2:11; 13:31– 32; 17:5,24	16:14

### Actions Common to Father and Son

	Father	Son
Glorify the Father	4:23; 12:28; 13:31–32	(2:16); (9:3–4); 11:40; 12:28; 13:31–32; 14:13; 17:1,4–5
Give the Spirit	3:34; 14:16	(4:10–14); (7:37–39); 20:22
Send the Spirit	14:26	15:26; 16:7

### Actions Common to Son and Spirit

	<b>Son</b>	<b>Spirit</b>
Be Given by the Father	3:16	(4:10–14); 14:16
Be Sent by the Father	3:17; 4:34; 5:23–24,36; 6:29,57; 7:28–29,33; 8:16,26,29,42; 9:4; 10:36; 11:42; 12:44–45; 13:20; 15:21; 17:3,8; 17:18,23,25; 20:21	14:26; 15:26
Speak Not from Himself	(5:19); 5:30; (6:38); 7:16; 12:49–50	16:13
Speah Only What He Hears	3:32; (3:34); (5:30); 8:26,40; 12:50; 15:15	16:13
Convict	3:19–20; 4:16,18; (5:27); (8:7); 8:34,40; 11:40; 12:7–8; 13:8	16:7–11
Be Received	1:12 (cp. 1:10–11)	7:39 (cp. 14:17)
Disclose What Belongs to God	1:18	16:13–14

---

<sup>1</sup> See B. Janowski, "Ich will in eurer Mitte wohnen: Struktur und Genese der exilischen Scheifeina-Theologie," in *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie*, Band 2, *Der eine Gott der beiden Testamente* (Neukirchener: Verlag, 1987), 189.

<sup>2</sup> For "Motifs of Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East," see T. W. Mann, *Divine Presence and Guidance in Israelite Traditions*, Johns Hopkins Near Eastern Studies (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), 27–117. Mann finds the "divine vanguard motif" to be a common way of depicting divine presence in the ancient near eastern material he surveys. This fits with the notion of God being with but not in His people.

<sup>3</sup> H. D. Preuss, *Old Testament Theology*, 2 vols., trans. L. G. Perdue, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995, 1996), 1:160.

<sup>4</sup> G. W. Grogan, "The Experience of Salvation in the Old and New Testaments," *VE* 5 (1967): 14.

<sup>5</sup> Most commentators agree that although Ezekiel does not use the phrase "new covenant" in this passage, it is conceptually parallel with Jer 31 and therefore deals with the new covenant.

<sup>6</sup> W. A. VanGemeren, "The Spirit of Restoration," *WTJ* 50 (1988): 82: "The very mission of the Spirit of God is eschatological." See Isa 32:15; 44:3; Ezek 39:29; Joel 2:28–29; Zech 12:10; Acts 2:17–18,33; 10:45; Rom 5:5; Tit 3:6.

<sup>7</sup> D. I. Block, "The Prophet of the Spirit: The Use of RWH in the Book of Ezekiel," *JETS* 32 (1989): 41. G. Fredricks agrees with Block's view, "Rethinking the Role of the Holy Spirit in the Lives of Old Testament Believers," *TJ* 9 (1988): 103.

<sup>8</sup> In some cases, such as Moses and Samuel, these two roles overlap. Furthermore, we are told twice that the Spirit filled and so enabled the craftsman Bezalel (and Oholiab?) to do his work on the tabernacle (Exod 31:1–5; 35:30–35). When the temple is later constructed, Hiram of Tyre is described as "filled with wisdom and understanding and knowledge to do

all craftsmanship with bronze" (1 Kgs 7:14). The text does not explicitly state that Hiram was filled with the Spirit, but these passages seem to be parallel. So also L. Wood, *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 42. Such descriptions of the Spirit's work of enabling individuals for specific tasks seem to be exceptional rather than normative.

<sup>9</sup> R. S. Cripps, "The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament," *Theology* 24 (1932): 275.

<sup>10</sup> No females are described as having the Spirit in the OT, though in the days of the Judges, Deborah functions as a national leader and prophetess (see Judg 4–5). The author of Judges, however, does not record that the Spirit "came upon" her.

<sup>11</sup> See I. F. Wood, *The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature* (New York: Armstrong, 1904), 25. Similarly W. J. Dumbrell, "Spirit and Kingdom of God in the Old Testament," *RTR* 33 (1974): 1.

<sup>12</sup> This is not to say that Solomon did not have the Spirit, but compare 1 Kgs 1:38–40 with David's anointing in 1 Sam 16:13. If Solomon indeed wrote those portions of the OT that have been traditionally ascribed to him, we can infer that he was specially empowered by the Spirit as an author of Scripture. This is warranted because the NT indicates that authors of Scripture wrote by the Spirit (2 Tim 3:16; 1 Pet 1:11; 2 Pet 1:21). There are also indications in the Intertestamental Jewish literature that its authors understood that no Spirit-inspired prophets qualified for authoritative pronouncements were present at that time (among the verses inserted at Dan 3 in the LXX, see Dan 3:38; also 1 Macc 4:46; 9:27; 14:41).

<sup>13</sup> This could also be translated "a spirit of the gods" (see Dan 4:8).

<sup>14</sup> Among other things, the prefixed preposition *bē* can mean either "in" or "on" (BDB, 88–91; HALOT, 103–05).F

<sup>15</sup> Keil, *Pentateuch*, 698. Against P. J. Budd, *Numbers*, WBC (Waco, TX: Word, 1984), 128, who thinks that Eldad and Medad were not two of the seventy. For the speculative suggestion that "the addition of the anecdote about Eldad and Medad seems aimed against attempts to restrict the working of the spirit to official channels," see G. T. Montague, *The Holy Spirit* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1976), 15; and Budd, *Numbers*, 130.

<sup>16</sup> R. B. Allen, "Numbers," *EBC*, 2:794; Budd, *Numbers*, 128; L. Neve, *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (Tokyo: Seibunsha, 1972), 23; Z.

Weisman, "The Personal Spirit as Imparting Authority," ZAW 93 (1981): 225–34.

<sup>17</sup> I have passed over the description of Caleb in Numbers 14:24, "Now as for my servant Caleb, because there was a different spirit with him [rûaḥ 'aḥeret 'immô] and he followed me fully, I shall bring him to the land." This looks like a reference to Caleb's different attitude, or human spirit, as compared with the attitude of the other spies (save Joshua). The OT often uses rûaḥ in this way (e.g., Exod 35:21; Num 16:22; 27:16; Judg 15:19; 1 Kgs 21:5). Even if this is a reference to the Spirit of God with Caleb, note that the preposition with is employed. Further, if this is the Spirit, and not Caleb's attitude, it marks Caleb as distinct, empowers him to lead, and thus fits with what is being argued here. See D. Rys, *Rûach: Le Souffle dans L'Ancien Testament* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962), 211: "il s'agit de distinguer Caleb des autres Israélites."

<sup>18</sup> R. Koch, *Der Geist Gottes im Alten Testament* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1991), 53–54. Neve suggests that Joshua was one of the seventy elders in Num 11:25 who had received the Spirit (The Spirit of God in the Old Testament, 87).

<sup>19</sup> According to J. H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 338, what is bestowed is "a divine gift of wisdom to govern Israel."

<sup>20</sup> The summarizing nature of this verse can be seen in the frequentative w-qatalti forms continuing the temporal wêhâyâ (GBH § 119u-v; § 166n-o; GKC § 112e; § 164d).

<sup>21</sup> HALOT gives the meaning of לָבַשׁ in the qal as "clothe oneself, put on [a garment]" except here and in 1 Chr 12:19; 2 Chr 24:20 with "material for clothing as subject." Note ESV, NJB "clothed," JPS, NAB "enveloped," and KJV, ASV, NKJV, NASB "came upon." But according to E. Jenni ("לָבַשׁ", TLOT: 2:642–44) the Hebrew verb לָבַשׁ does not change meaning in these passages; rather, they "depict the activity of God's Spirit in a person such that the Spirit resides in the person like the person in the garment ... thus לָבַשׁ here, as elsewhere, means 'to clothe oneself with,' not the trans. 'to clothe someone,' wherein the Spirit would be the garment." BDB similarly renders "the spirit of [Yahweh] clothed itself with Gideon, i.e. took possession of him." Note NLT, NRSV, REB, RSV "took possession of."

<sup>22</sup> D. I. Block, *Judges, Ruth*, NAC (Nashville: Broadman & Holman,

1999), 272.

<sup>23</sup> The Hebrew uses the verb *šālah*, “rush,” plus the preposition ‘al, “upon.”

<sup>24</sup> See Dumbrell, “Spirit and Kingdom of God in the Old Testament,” 4.

<sup>25</sup> So also D. I. Block, “Empowered by the Spirit of God: The Holy Spirit in the Historiographic Writings of the Old Testament,” *SB JT* 1 (1997): 45.

<sup>26</sup> Against J. Rea, “The Personal Relationship of Old Testament Believers to the Holy Spirit,” in *Essays on Apostolic Themes*, ed. P. Elbert (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1985), 93. See Keil, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel, vol. 2 of *Commentary on the Old Testament*, 431; and R. W. Klein, 1 Samuel, WBC (Waco, TX: Word, 1983), 94, who interpret this in terms of Saul being empowered for kingship.

<sup>27</sup> The only significant difference here is that the preposition used with *šālah*, “rush,” is ‘el, “to,” rather than ‘al, “upon.”

<sup>28</sup> Against Block, “Empowered by the Spirit of God,” 52–53. In support of my view is the similarity of the phrases used for the Spirit “rushing upon” Samson, Saul, and David, for when the verb *šālah* is used to describe the coming of the Spirit it seems to have an iterative aspect (see Judg 14:6,19; 15:14; 1 Sam 10:10; 11:6; 18:10; also Amos 5:6, “Seek Yahweh lest He break forth [yīšlah] as a fire”). Similarly M. Dreytza, *Der theologische Gebrauch von RUAH im Alten Testament* (Giessen: Brunnen, 1990), 170.


<sup>29</sup> Dumbrell, “Spirit and Kingdom of God in the Old Testament,” 5. In addition to the superscription, see P. D. Miller, “Trouble and Woe: Interpreting Biblical Laments,” *Interpretation* 37 (1983): 37, for compelling evidence that Psalm 51 is connected to David’s sin with Bathsheba.

<sup>30</sup> The language is identical to Judg 3:10; 11:29; 1 Sam 16:16; 19:20,23; 2 Chr 15:1; 20:14.

<sup>31</sup> David (2 Sam 23:2); Amasai (1 Chr 12:18); Azariah (2 Chr 15:1); Jahaziel (2 Chr 20:14); Zechariah (2 Chr 24:20); Isaiah (Isa 59:21?); Ezekiel (2:2; 3:12, 14, 24; 8:3; 11:1, 5, 24; 37:1; 43:5); Daniel (Dan 4:8,9,18; 5:11,14); and Micah (Mic 3:8). The Spirit even came upon Saul and his men so that they prophesied (1 Sam 19:20–24).

<sup>32</sup> See M. Green, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,

1975), 25; B. Baloiian and J. E. Hartley, "The Spirit of God in the Old Testament," in *The Spirit and the New Age*, ed. R. L. Shelton and A. R. G. Deasley (Anderson, IN: Warner, 1986), 3–32.

<sup>33</sup> M. V. Van Pelt, W. C. Kaiser Jr., and D. I. Block, "  " in NIDOTTE, 3:1076.

<sup>34</sup> J. Barton, Joel and Obadiah, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 93: "This collection of oracles concerns ... the 'age to come.'" Similarly Keil, *The Minor Prophets*, vol. 10 of *Commentary on the Old Testament*, 139.

<sup>35</sup> L. Wood agrees, though he thinks that old covenant believers were indwelt: "every instance where one or more Old Testament persons are said to have experienced the Spirit either come on or leave them ... concerned an aspect of empowerment for a task, with no instances seeming to involve spiritual renewal" (*The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament*, 64). Similarly W. Hildebrandt, *An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 61.

<sup>36</sup> This section summarizes the findings of my articles, "God with Men in the Torah," WTJ 65 (2003): 113–33, and "God with Men in the Prophets and the Writings: An Examination of the Nature of God's Presence," SBET 23.2 (2005): 166–193. See also M. L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001), 31–63; S. Terrien, *The Elusive Presence* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978); R. E. Clements, *God and Temple* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965); and P. Hoskins, "Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple in the Gospel of John" (Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2002), 48–156.

<sup>37</sup> See R. E. Averbeck, "Tabernacle," in DOTP, 807–12.

<sup>38</sup> Yahweh is Lord of all. The creation account shows that He is sovereign over all things (Gen 1–2), and His triumph over Egypt through the plagues (Exod 1–12) demonstrates that He is no tribal deity with authority over a limited land area.

<sup>39</sup> D. Sheriffs, *The Friendship of the Lord* (Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 1996), 67.

<sup>40</sup> B. T. Arnold and B. E. Beyer, *Encountering the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 114. Similarly Averbeck, "Tabernacle," 815.

<sup>41</sup> S. J. Hafemann, *The God of Promise and the Life of Faith* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2001), 192; J. J. Niehaus, "Theophany, Theology of," in

NIDOTTE, 4:1248.

<sup>42</sup> C. R. Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*, CBQMS 22 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989), 8.

<sup>43</sup> Averbeck, "Tabernacle," 815, 825.

<sup>44</sup> See T. N. D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, trans. F. H. Cryer, *Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series* 18 (n.p.: CWK Gleerup, 1982), 89.

<sup>45</sup> Critical scholarship dates Deuteronomy to the time of Josiah because Josiah's reform is thought to have created the demand for centralization. This makes the effect the cause. For discussion, see G. J. Wenham, "Deuteronomy and the Central Sanctuary," in *A Song of Power and the Power of Song*, ed. D. L. Christensen (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1993), 94–108; J. G. McConville, *Grace in the End: A Study of Deuteronomistic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993); S. Westerholm, "Temple," in *ISBE*, 4:759; G. E. Wright, H. H. Nelson, and L. Oppenheim, "The Significance of the Temple in the Ancient Near East," *BA* 7 (1944): 41–88.

<sup>46</sup> Westerholm, "Temple," in *ISBE*, 4:760.

<sup>47</sup> P. W. Comfort, "Temple," in *DPL*, 923.

<sup>48</sup> Against Wood, *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament*, 86, who says that "nowhere does either the Old or New Testament ever speak of the Spirit ministering to Old Testament saints by simply being near them, rather than within them."

<sup>49</sup> See Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 23.

<sup>50</sup> See G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 2 vols., OTL, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1962, 1965), 1:336.

<sup>51</sup> See W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2 vols., trans. J. A. Baker, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961, 1967), 1:107.

<sup>52</sup> See Westerholm, "Temple," in *ISBE*, 4:764.

<sup>53</sup> T. L. Brensinger, "Jerusalem," in *NIDOTTE*, 4:772–6; J. T. Strong, "Zion, Theology of," *ibid.*, 4:1314–21; W. J. Dumbrell, *The Search for Order* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 75–95; Preuss, *Old Testament Theology*, 2:39–51.

<sup>54</sup> See Averbeck, "Tabernacle," 825; W. Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 655; Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 31, 37; Wenham, "Deuteronomy and the Central Sanctuary," 103; I. Wilson, *Out of the Midst of the Fire: Divine Presence in Deuteronomy*, SBLDS 151 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 217. Against Preuss, *Old Testament Theology*, 1:251, 2:43.

<sup>55</sup> See R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 179–80.

<sup>56</sup> See E. A. Martens, *God's Design* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 227.

<sup>57</sup> See Preuss, *Old Testament Theology*, 2:50.

<sup>58</sup> I take the singular pronominal suffix to refer back to *šō'nô*, "His flock" (see GBH § 149b on the use of a masculine pronoun with a feminine antecedent). Calvin, however, takes the pronominal suffix to refer to Moses (Isaiah [1551], trans. W. Pringle, in *Calvin's Commentaries* [reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979], 8:350). Dumbrell similarly argues that the reference to the Spirit among the nation in Isa 63:11 has Moses in view ("Spirit and Kingdom of God in the Old Testament," 2). So also F. Delitzsch, *Isaiah*, vol. 7 of *Commentary on the Old Testament*, 602; and D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings*, SNTSMS 5 (Cambridge: University Press, 1967), 211. J. N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah*, NICOT, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986, 1998), 2:608, notes, "While the sg. pronoun him would seem to point to Moses alone as the recipient of the Holy Spirit, it is also possible that Israel, in its leaders, is being referred to (cp. Num. 11:17; Neh. 9:20; Hag. 2:5)." While the reference to the Spirit in Isa 63:11 does not exclude the Spirit on Moses, the fire and cloud in the midst of Israel seems more directly in view.

<sup>59</sup> Against J. Goldingay, "Was the Holy Spirit Active in Old Testament Times?" *ExAud* 12 (1996): 21.

<sup>60</sup> J. A. Motyer, *Isaiah*, TOTC (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999), 388 (emphasis added).

<sup>61</sup> See Dumbrell, "Spirit and Kingdom of God in the Old Testament," 9.

<sup>62</sup> See W. E. March, "God with Us: A Survey of Jewish Pneumatology," *Austin Seminary Bulletin* 83 (1967): 8. See also Pss. Sol. 17:39–42, T. Jud. 24:2–3, and 1QS 4:18b–21.

<sup>63</sup> Block, "The Prophet of the Spirit," 40.

<sup>64</sup> M. Weinfeld, "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel," ZAW 88 (1976): 18–19. So also C. L. Feinberg, Jeremiah, in EBC, 6:574–75.

<sup>65</sup> Since this is a "new" covenant that is "not like" the previous, I am not persuaded by what the Westminster Confession claims in 7.6: "There are not therefore two covenants of grace, differing in substance, but one and the same."

<sup>66</sup> Though the nation is described as "the house of Israel and the house of Judah" in v. 31, in v. 32 the two are lumped together when Yahweh speaks of "their fathers." This continues with Yahweh taking them by "their hand," to lead "them" out of Egypt after "they" broke the covenant though Yahweh was a husband to "them" (31:32). So the nation initially described as Israel and Judah is presented as a unified entity in verse 32. Thus when v. 33 states that the covenant will be cut "with the house of Israel," in 31:33, the reunited nation is in view.

<sup>67</sup> G. L. Keown, P. J. Scalise, and T. G. Smothers, Jeremiah 26–52, WBC (Dallas: Word, 1995), 133.

<sup>68</sup> Weinfeld, "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel," 26.

<sup>69</sup> See Keil, Jeremiah, Lamentations, vol. 8 of Commentary on the Old Testament, 282: "[Bēqirbām, 'In their midst/within them'] is the opposite of [nātan lipnēhem, 'set before them'], which is constantly used of the Sinaitic law, see 9:12, Deut. 4:8; 11:32, 1 Kings 9:6; and the 'writing on the heart' is opposed to writing on the tables of stone."

<sup>70</sup> See Jer 18:18; Ezek 7:26; 22:26; Hos 4:5–6; Mic 3:11; Hag 2:11; Mal 2:6–7.

<sup>71</sup> W. J. Dumbrell, The End of the Beginning (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), 93–94.

<sup>72</sup> Keil, Jeremiah, Lamentations, 283–84.

<sup>73</sup> Keown, Scalise, and Smothers, Jeremiah 26–52, 133.

<sup>74</sup> See Dumbrell, The End of the Beginning, 91–92.

<sup>75</sup> I am grateful to D. A. Carson for the observation that the thesis of this study "strikes at the heart of what it means to be baptist," for the priesthood of all believers is a reality under the new covenant.

<sup>76</sup> See Grogan, "The Experience of Salvation in the Old and New Testaments," 23.

<sup>77</sup> Old covenant believers loved God and were obedient to Him. Although Paul states that God was not pleased with “most” of the wilderness generation (1 Cor 10:5), even in that generation there was a remnant according to God’s gracious choice (Rom 11:5). Caleb and Joshua at least represent those from the wilderness generation who found favor with God. Exclusion from the promised land (e.g., Moses) did not necessarily indicate exclusion from the believing remnant. Some Israelites may have heard with faith the declaration that “Yahweh is with us!” (Num 14:9; cp. Rom 10:17). Some of the seventy elders who “saw the God of Israel” and “ate and drank” (Exod 24:10–11) were probably part of the believing remnant. So perhaps Paul’s “most” does not mean everyone except Moses, Joshua, Caleb, Aaron, and Miriam (for Aaron and Miriam see Mic 6:4). According to John 6:40,63, those who behold God’s revelation and believe inherit eternal life, and the Spirit is the one who makes alive. In chapter six I will argue that this life-giving work of the Spirit is to be connected to the new birth by the Spirit referred to in John 3, and that the NT does not limit these ministries to the age after Jesus’ glorification as it does indwelling (John 7:39).

<sup>78</sup> According to Neh 9:20,30, the Spirit instructed and warned the people, working on their minds and hearts. Such an interior ministry is not equivalent to indwelling. The Spirit can operate upon the heart without taking up residence within the person.

<sup>79</sup> Keil, *Jeremiah, Lamentations*, 120. Cp. ESV: “those who are circumcised merely in the flesh.” HCSB: “circumcised yet uncircumcised.” NIV: “circumcised only in the flesh.” NRSV: “circumcised only in the foreskin.”

<sup>80</sup> See Weinfeld, “Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel,” 33–34.

<sup>81</sup> P. D. Woodbridge, “Circumcision,” in *NDBT*, 412.

<sup>82</sup> The niphil imperative *himmōlû* is generally translated as a reflexive (“circumcise yourselves,” see ESV, HCSB, NIV, NRSV). It could, however, be a passive (“be circumcised”). Although in Deut 10:16 the people are commanded to circumcise their hearts, in Deut 29:4 they are told that Yahweh has not given them hearts to understand, eyes to see, or ears to hear. Then in 30:6 they learn that Yahweh will circumcise their hearts. Like Paul’s command to be filled with the Spirit in Eph 5:18, the command for spiritual circumcision is a call to cry out to God to do for us what we

cannot do for ourselves.

<sup>83</sup> A. H. Lewis, "The New Birth under the Old Covenant," *EvQ* 56 (1984): 44, (emphasis his). Similarly Rea, "The Personal Relationship of Old Testament Believers to the Holy Spirit," 94.

<sup>84</sup> See D. I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 2 vols., NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997, 1998), 2:354 n. 87; also 2:355.

<sup>85</sup> Dumbrell, *The End of the Beginning*, 96. Against R. J. Boone who, following Fredricks, takes Ezek 36:26–27 as proof that the builders of the second temple were indwelt ("The Role of the Holy Spirit in the Construction of the Second Temple," in *The Spirit and the Mind*, ed. T. L. Cross and E. B. Powery [Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2000], 55). Haggai 2:5 informs my objection to Boone's interpretation. See my comments on that verse above.

<sup>86</sup> R. H. Alexander, *Ezekiel*, in EBC, 6:922.

<sup>87</sup> Num 11:20; 14:42; Deut 1:42; Josh 3:5,10; 4:6; 18:7; 24:23; Jer 29:8. See A. Even-Shoshan, ed., *A New Concordance of the Old Testament* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1997), 1033.

<sup>88</sup> Clements, *God and Temple*, 137.

<sup>89</sup> Bëqirbëkem and bëtôkâm are used as synonyms. On bëtôkâm see S. S. Tuell, "with more than two, it means among (e.g., [Exod] 25:8, of the Lord living 'among' the people Israel; the NRSV uses the more traditional reading 'in the midst of them' in this context)" (NIDOTTE, 4:280). BDB is similar on Bëqirbëkem, "of a number of persons, בְּקִרְבָּם in the midst, among" (899, 1.f.). Also relevant are the ten uses of bëtôk- listed as synonymous with bëqereb in Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Old Testament*, 1221–22. See s.v qereb for the listing of bëtôk as synonymous with bëqirbô, bëqereb (1032–33).

<sup>90</sup> It is difficult to determine whether rûah in this passage is meant to be understood as "Spirit" or as "the breath of life." M. V. Fox suggests, "It is 'the wind' (vv. 1–10), something external to God that can be addressed and summoned. But at the very end (v. 14) God promises to put rûhî 'my spirit' into the revived Israel. ... Israel will get not the ordinary life-breath, but God's spirit" ("The Rhetoric of Ezekiel's Vision of the Valley of the Bones," in *The Place Is Too Small for Us*, ed. R. Gordon, SBTS 5 [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995], 190).

<sup>91</sup> Mettinger writes, "The third of Ezekiel's 'visions of God' (Ch. 40–48)

brings this progression full circle; here the Glory enters the new Temple by the same route it had used during its departure, that is, via the east gate (43:1-5)" (The Dethronement of Sabaoth, 108). I am suggesting that Ezek 36:27 also points to this return.

<sup>92</sup> G. K. Beale writes, "The same promise from Ezek. 37:26-28 to Israel is cited in Jub. 1:17 ('I will build my sanctuary in their midst, and I will dwell with them, and I will be their God and they will be my people'). ... Ezek. 37:26-28 equate this final dwelling of God among His people with the coming latter-day tabernacle, and Jub. 1:17, 29; 2 Cor. 6:16; Rev. 7:15; 21:3a, 22 follow suit" (The Book of Revelation, NIGTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999], 1046-47).

<sup>93</sup> See R. Mason, "He encourages them with the promise that the restored temple would be the scene of the return of Yahweh's presence to dwell in the temple and rule over all nations. ... Ezekiel's promise of the return of the glory of God to Jerusalem and the temple (Ezek 43:1-5) will be fulfilled" ("Haggai: Theology of," in NIDOTTE, 4:692).

<sup>94</sup> See Beale, "It is in light of the references to the temple of Ezekiel 40-48 to come in [Rev] 21:9-22:5 that the promise in Ezek. 43:7 is echoed in [Rev] 21:3: the endtime temple will be 'where' God 'will dwell (κατασκηνώσει) among the sons of Israel forever'" (Revelation, 1046 [emphasis his]).

<sup>95</sup> See Dumbrell, The End of the Beginning, 95-96.

<sup>96</sup> For a discussion of this type of "inner-biblical interpretation," see J. Day, "Inner-biblical Interpretation in the Prophets," in The Place Is Too Small for Us, 230-46.

<sup>97</sup> There are several factors that challenge the understanding of Ezek 36:27 offered here. First, the Targum on Ezekiel does not seem to have understood the passage as suggested here (see S. H. Levey, The Targum of Ezekiel, The Aramaic Bible, vol. 13 [Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987], 102). Second, I have yet to locate a commentator on Ezekiel who takes Ezek 36:27 as an answer to chaps. 8-11, promising that the Spirit will again inhabit the temple. In spite of these factors I find the evidence presented above persuasive.

<sup>98</sup> Commenting on Ezek 37:1-14 M. S. Horton writes, "As interpreted by the New Testament, this was not fulfilled in any subsequent era of Israel's history until Pentecost" (Covenant and Eschatology [Louisville:

Westminster John Knox, 2002], 267).

<sup>99</sup> Weinfeld, "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel," 35. See Block, Ezekiel, 2:355.

<sup>100</sup> D. Lys, Rûah, 140–41; H. Schüngel-Straumann, Rûah bewegt die Welt, Stuttgarter Bibel-studien 151 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1992), 48,51,62. The latter asserts they are "nearly synonymously used [ja fast synonym gebraucht werden] (11,19; 18,31; 36,26)" (p. 51).

<sup>101</sup> Against Block, Ezekiel, 2:355–56, who observes that the parallelism is not exact (with different prepositions). He concludes that "new spirit" in v. 26b is clarified as Yahweh's Spirit in v. 27a.

<sup>102</sup> Dreytza apparently classes Ezek 36:26 as an anthropological rather than theological usage of rûah (i.e., human spirit rather than Spirit of God), for he does not cite this passage in his chart of the theological uses of rûah (Der theologische Gebrauch von RUAH im Alten Testament, 248).

<sup>103</sup> See Weinfeld, "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel," 32. Weinfeld is probably not using the term "regeneration" in precisely the same sense that I am. He seems to have in view the eschatological renewal of all things, whereas I am suggesting that we can see here the gift of a submissive, believing, obedient spirit to people who were previously recalcitrant.

<sup>104</sup> VanGemeren, "The Spirit of Restoration," 90.

<sup>105</sup> Paul explains that being "dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph 2:1) means walking according to the spirit of the age, under Satanic influence (Eph 2:2), and living in the desires of the flesh and doing the will of the fallen mind (2:3). In this state people only choose to gratify their own sinful desires. Paul sees this being remedied by the free mercy and love of God who by grace makes people alive in Christ (2:4–5). B. Demarest explains, "Sin has corrupted every aspect of their being: mind, will, emotions, relationships, and actions. By virtue of their anti-God bias and predilection to sin, the unregenerate, apart from grace, are incapable of turning to God, pleasing God, and saving themselves ... Left to their own resources, sinners degenerate from bad to worse (Rom 1:26–32). This grim human condition, widely attested by revelation and life experience, constitutes the stage for the display of God's marvelous grace" (The Cross and Salvation, [Wheaton: Crossway, 1997], 75). See Jer 13:23; John 12:37–40; 14:17;

Rom 8:7–8; 1 Cor 2:14; 2 Cor 4:3–4.

<sup>106</sup> Chapter six will argue that indwelling in John is informed by God's dwelling in the temple. Clements observes, "The ancient promises that God would dwell with his people were eagerly taken up by Christians and applied to the Church, the Body of Christ, in which God dwelt by the Holy Spirit. The major difference between the new fulfilment and the old promise is that whereas the Old Testament had spoken of a dwelling of God among men, the New Testament speaks of a dwelling of God within men by the Holy Spirit" (God and Temple, 139; emphasis added).

<sup>107</sup> For a classification of each use of *rûah* in the OT, see the appendix, "The Semantic Range of *rûah* in the Old Testament," in Hamilton, "God with Men in the Torah," 131–33. For discussion of Gen 2:7, see Appendix 1 of the present study, "The Use of *emphusaō* in John 20:22."

<sup>108</sup> Fredricks suggests, "A careful examination of each of the items promised in the new covenant passages will reveal that almost all of them were possible for those living under the previous covenants if they would walk in faith and obedience to the Lord" ("Rethinking the Role of the Holy Spirit in the Lives of Old Testament Believers," 102). Unfortunately, he cites no textual evidence for this claim. Fredricks has no answer for the eschatological setting of these promises. He appeals to his view that obedience to the covenants was possible and asks, "If the Spirit is the one who is to enable a renewed 'Israel' to 'walk in my statutes' and 'keep my ordinances' (Ezek 36:27), then is it too much to think that those living before the inauguration of the new covenant also had the indwelling Spirit enabling them to keep His commandments? If they did not have the power of the Spirit available, then what other power did they have?" (*ibid.*, 102–3). These rhetorical questions ask the reader to infer, in the absence of textual evidence, that old covenant believers were indwelt by the Spirit since they were able to obey. In answer to Fredricks questions, I respond first that in view of John 7:39 and the absence of explicit data from the OT it is too much to think that "those living before the inauguration of the new covenant also had the indwelling Spirit enabling them." Second, the "other power" they had was (1) circumcised hearts, that is, regeneration by the Spirit—made alive from deadness in trespasses and sins (see chapter six); and (2) the sanctifying effect of the presence of God with them dwelling in the temple (e.g., 1 Kgs 8:57–58; Ps 73:17).

<sup>109</sup> So also Rea, "The Personal Relationship of Old Testament Believers

to the Holy Spirit," 99–103. At this point March's observation on a contrast between early Judaism and Christianity is germane: "For the Jewish community the fullness of the Spirit was yet to come. When the Messiah appeared to deliver God's people, then the power of the Spirit would be fully known. ... The coming of the Spirit was part of the future expectation. In contrast to this mood the early Christians knew the Messiah had appeared" ("God with Us," 13).

# **Chapter 4**

## **THE SPIRIT IN JOHN**

# Introduction

Before considering specific aspects of Johannine pneumatology, this chapter will survey references to the Spirit in the Gospel of John as a framework for later discussions. The present chapter will discuss all of the references to the Spirit in John.<sup>1</sup> First, each reference to the Spirit in John 1–12 will be briefly discussed, leaving more detailed discussion of several of these passages to subsequent chapters. This material will be treated under three headings: the Spirit and the Messiah; the life-giving Spirit; and the sphere of the Spirit. The next topic is the eschatological gift of the Paraclete. This second section will explore the meaning of *paraklētos*, especially through an exegesis of the Paraclete passages in the farewell discourse (14:15–17,26; 15:26; 16:7–11,13–15), and will finally take up the question of when, according to John, the eschatological gift of the Paraclete is given and received.

# The Spirit in John 1–12

The first twelve chapters of John's Gospel contain statements about the Spirit and His ministries in salvation history. Since the reception of the Spirit in relation to salvation history will be the focus in chapters five and six, the reader will be referred to those later discussions. This section will merely outline John's teaching about the Spirit, first as He relates to the Messiah, then as life-giver. Finally, we will discuss those references that indicate there is a "sphere of the Spirit."

## The Spirit and the Messiah

The first mention of the Spirit in the Gospel of John is found in John 1:32–33.<sup>2</sup> The Spirit's descent on Jesus signifies to John the Baptist that Jesus is the Messiah. The Ebionite and Adoptionist heresies held that Jesus was ontologically altered when the Spirit descended on Him. The Spirit does not change Jesus ontologically, however, for before Jesus was anointed with the Spirit at His baptism He was the Word, who was God (1:1–3) and became flesh (1:14).<sup>3</sup> Not only does the Spirit remain on Jesus (1:32–33), He also empowers Him to speak the word of God (3:34).<sup>4</sup> Jesus, speaking by the Spirit, speaks words that are spirit and are life (6:63). When the Spirit comes, He will glorify Jesus (16:14), accomplished by His

ministry to the world and to believers. Jesus will also baptize with the Spirit (1:33).

## **The Life-giving Spirit**

Three texts in John connect the Spirit with the creation of new life. In His conversation with Nicodemus, Jesus announced the need for new birth (3:3), corrected Nicodemus's mistaken notion that physical life was in view (3:4–5), and said,<sup>5</sup> “What has been born from the flesh is flesh; what has been born of the Spirit is spirit” (3:6). In these words physical life is contrasted with new life by the Spirit. Nicodemus is not to be surprised by the necessity of new birth (3:7). The Spirit's activity is like the wind: “Thus it is with all who are born of the Spirit” (3:8). The new birth (3:6,8) is contrasted with natural birth, which results in life in the flesh (3:4,6), while the new birth by the Spirit is necessary for entering the kingdom of God (3:3,5).<sup>6</sup>

Later in the Gospel of John, Jesus will again speak of the life-giving ministry of the Spirit: “The Spirit is the one who makes alive; the flesh profits nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and are life” (John 6:63). This life is one that only the Spirit can give “flesh” cannot aid in bringing it about (cp. 3:6).

## **The Sphere of the Spirit**

The Gospel of John seems to envision a distinct "sphere of the Spirit." <sup>7</sup> Jesus declared, "What has been born of the Spirit is spirit" (3:6), and "The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and are life" (6:63). That which is born of the Spirit and is thereby spirit is contrasted with what has been born of flesh and is flesh (3:6). Jesus' words, which are life, contrast with the flesh, which "profits nothing" (6:63). In both cases "flesh" seems to refer to the natural order of things, whereas "spirit" corresponds to the order of things that are "from above." When Jesus says, "My words are spirit" (6:63), He means that they belong to the sphere of the Spirit rather than that they communicate the Spirit,<sup>8</sup> though perhaps the two concepts are not mutually exclusive. Jesus' words belong to the sphere of the Spirit, and the Spirit takes Jesus' words and makes people live (6:63).<sup>9</sup>

As Bernard states, "The ῥήματα [rhēmata] of Christ are words of God (8<sup>47</sup> 17<sup>8</sup>), and as such belong to the sphere of spiritual realities." <sup>10</sup> Similarly, Schweizer states,

If 3:6 speaks of γεννηθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος ["being born from the Spirit"], 3:3 and 1:13 speak of γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν ["being born from above"] or ἐκ θεοῦ ["from God"], εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ["being from God"] is contrasted with εἶναι ἐκ τῶν κάτω ["being from below"], ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ["of the devil"], ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ["of the world"], and similarly γεγεννημένον ἐκ

τοῦ πνεύματος [“having been born of the spirit”] is the opposite of γεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ τῆς σαρκός [“having been born of the flesh”], 3:6. πνεῦμα [“spirit”], ἄνω [“above”], θεός [“God”] are thus equivalent on the one side, σὰρξ [“flesh”], κάτω [“below”], διάβολος [“devil”], κόσμος [“world”] on the other.<sup>11</sup>

This “sphere of the Spirit” helps us understand how true worshipers worship “in spirit” (4:21–23). Local worship, whether in Jerusalem or on Mount Gerizim, will be replaced by worship “in spirit and in truth” (4:24). This is not likely a reference to the human spirit,<sup>12</sup> any more than the truth is human truth. Rather, “spirit” refers to God's order as contrasted with the natural order, and “truth” refers to that which corresponds to God's reality. “Truth” also alludes to Jesus, who is the truth (14:6), and to the Spirit, who is the Spirit of truth (e.g., 14:17).<sup>13</sup> Jesus' demand that we “worship in spirit and in truth” should not be taken as a reference to the beginning of genuine worship, for worship at the place Yahweh chose to set His name was divinely sanctioned in the period prior to the coming of the Messiah (see Deut 12:5). Rather, Jesus meant that local worship would be replaced by worship that takes place in the Spirit's domain, namely, in spirit and in truth.<sup>14</sup> Jesus' words to the Samaritan woman in John 4 provide the foundation for the “strong consciousness of living in the realm and time of the Spirit [that] permeates every aspect of early Christian faith and

practice.”<sup>15</sup>

Thinking in terms of the sphere of the Spirit also sheds light on the statement in John 4:24 that “God is spirit.” There is no consensus on what this text means. Morris says it means “God’s essential nature is spirit” and that it probably alludes to “the life-giving activity of God.”<sup>16</sup> Jesus does not seem to be refuting a material conception of God, but rather explaining that the sphere of the Spirit is the sphere of God, as contrasted with the earthly sphere to which localized worship corresponds.<sup>17</sup> Because God is of the sphere of the Spirit, His true worshipers must worship Him in a manner that corresponds with that same sphere.

The sphere of the Spirit being described here could be in view in John 3:5 when Jesus says, “Unless one is born from water and spirit ...” This could be a reference to distinct elements: (1) water, and (2) the Holy Spirit, but “water” and “spirit” are both governed by the same preposition, indicating that they are to be taken together.<sup>18</sup> If birth from water and from the Holy Spirit—as distinct entities—were in view, we might expect a different grammatical construction. As it is, “water and spirit” form a hendiadys, two elements designating the same reality. The new birth, as described in this phrase, is a birth that is sprinkled clean, as the reference to water indicates,<sup>19</sup> and it is from the life-giving Spirit, as the reference to spirit indicates. Carson writes,

In short, born of water and spirit (the article and the capital 'S' in the NIV should be dropped: the focus is on the impartation of God's nature as 'spirit' [see 4:24], not on the Holy Spirit as such) signals a new begetting, a new birth that cleanses and renews, the eschatological cleansing and renewal promised by the Old Testament prophets.... It appears that individual regeneration is presupposed.<sup>20</sup>

When Carson says, "the focus is on the impartation of God's nature as 'spirit,'" rather than "on the Holy Spirit as such," he appears to see regeneration but not indwelling in John 3:5, with which I agree.

One final reference to the sphere of the Spirit could be found in John 7:39. There John explains that those who had believed in Jesus had not yet received the Spirit, "For it was not yet spirit." In this instance, however, because the reception of the Spirit by those who have believed in Jesus is at issue, this statement probably refers to the giving of the Spirit rather than to the sphere of the Spirit. Thus, the idea is probably not so much, "the sphere of the Spirit was not yet in effect," as it is "the Spirit was not yet given."<sup>21</sup>

Morris takes John 7:39 as a reference to "the era of the Spirit," but it appears that he is slightly off the mark when he writes,

The words I have rendered 'it was not yet Spirit' are

THE WORDS I HAVE RENDERED 'IT WAS NOT YET SPIRIT' ARE usually understood to mean 'as yet the Spirit had not been given' ... The trouble with such translations is that the Spirit had been given, and there was a Spirit. John has spoken of the Spirit as coming down on Jesus (1:32), and he has said that Jesus would baptize with the Spirit (1:33).<sup>22</sup>

The problem with Morris's explanation is that John is speaking of "the Spirit, whom those who had believed in Him were about to receive" (7:39). Neither the Spirit's existence nor Jesus' reception of the Spirit is in view. The sense in which the Spirit is yet to be given is that believers are about to receive Him at the glorification of Jesus. Read in light of John 14:17 and 20:22, it seems that the reception in view is reception of the indwelling Spirit (see the argument for this in chapter five). When we compare what comes before Jesus (no mention of the Spirit indwelling all members of the remnant) with what comes after Him (references to believers being indwelt, see Rom 8:9–11; 1 Cor 6:19), this understanding is confirmed. But Morris is correct to emphasize that after Jesus is glorified, the era in which the Spirit will be received will ensue.

## **Summary**

In the first twelve chapters John teaches that the Spirit anointed and empowered Messiah Jesus to speak the Word of God (1:32–33; 3:34). The Spirit gives new life

(3:6,8; 6:63), and the Spirit's domain is contrasted with the domain of the natural order of things apart from God (3:6; 4:23–24; 6:63).

# The Eschatological Gift of the Paraclete

In the farewell discourse, Jesus referred to the Spirit as *ho paraklētos* four times (John 14:16,26; 15:26; 16:7).<sup>23</sup> The choice of this word has occasioned considerable discussion.<sup>24</sup> To gain a clearer understanding of the word "Paraclete" (*paraklētos*) as John uses it, we will consider relevant lexical and background information and then how the word is used in John's Gospel. Finally, we will try to determine from the Gospel when the glorification of Jesus takes place and the eschatological gift of the Paraclete/Spirit is received by believers.

## Lexical and Background Considerations for the Meaning of *ho paraklētos*

**Lexical considerations.** We will attempt to establish the meaning of *paraklētos* by considering its morphological derivation and then looking at pertinent uses. Finally, we will examine suggestions as to how it should be translated in the farewell discourse.

Although the Greek word *paraklētos* serves as a noun, it is formally a verbal adjective related to the verb *parakaleō*, "I encourage." Some understand its meaning in light of the perfect passive participle (*paraklēmenos*,

“having been encouraged”) of *parakaleō*.<sup>25</sup> Thus the word has a passive nuance with a meaning such as “one called alongside.”<sup>26</sup> In secular usage *paraklētos* seems to have carried judicial overtones. Thus, LSJ offers “legal assistant” and “advocate” as appropriate glosses when used as a noun.<sup>27</sup>

It has been argued, however, that “although the form of the word ... points to a probable passive sense ..., an active sense ‘Counselor,’ ‘Comforter’) [sic] cannot altogether be excluded.”<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, the lexicon claims that “the pass[ive] idea of *παρακεκληῖσθαι* [“to have been encouraged”] retreated into the background, and the active idea of *παρακαλεῖν* [“to encourage”] took its place.”<sup>29</sup>

The lexical range of *parakaleō* includes the sense, “call to one's side.” It is reasonable, then, to consider the “one called to another's side” as the *paraklētos*. But the verb *parakaleō* can also mean “appeal to,” “implore,” and “comfort/encourage,”<sup>30</sup> and the verbal adjective may have assimilated these meanings, for an advocate before God is presumably appealing to God on behalf of the one He represents (see m. Abot 4:11). Those who seek to counsel someone in distress are presumably seeking to comfort and encourage (see Aquila and Theodotion on Job 16:2). J. G. Davies argues that “it is reasonable to hold that the term *πράκλιτος* must derive its primary significance from

the meaning of παρακαλεῖν ... irrespective of voice."<sup>31</sup>

This does not solve the problem, however, for some hold that "none of the possible meanings of parakalein, either active or passive, squares precisely with the various functions attributed to the Paraclete in the Gospel."<sup>32</sup> The use of the word in 1 John 2:1 ("We have an Advocate before the Father") fits what most expect the word to mean.<sup>33</sup> The use of the word in the farewell discourses, however, points more in the unexpected direction of "Counselor" or "Comforter" (see particularly John 14:16 in view of its context).

The Rabbis adopted the word paraklētos as a loanword (pěraqlēṭ), and in their literature it "always denoted an advocate before God" (e.g., m. 'Abot 4:11).<sup>34</sup> The lexicon states, "In the few places where the word is found in pre-Christian and extra-Christian literature] ... it has for the most part a more general sense: one who appears in another's behalf, mediator, intercessor, helper."<sup>35</sup> Regarding the translation "helper," Philo says that God employed no helper (paraklētos) in the work of creation (Philo, Opif., 6 [23]).

Other uses of the word point to its being understood in a more active sense ("comforter," "counselor"). Both Aquila (fl. ca. AD 130) and Theodotion (late second century AD) translate the phrase "troublesome comforters"

(mēnaḥmē `āmāl) in Job 16:2 as “paracletes” (paraklētoi).<sup>36</sup> Here the plural renders a Hebrew term (plural piel participle) that can mean “comfort” (nḥm).<sup>37</sup> In view of the fact that two translators, Aquila and Theodotion, render this term (mēnaḥēm, piel participle of nḥm, which used substantively means “comforter”) as “paracletes,” it is curious that Brown should write, “The closest study has not yet produced a Hebrew or Aramaic title for which paraklētos is clearly a translation.”<sup>38</sup> To the contrary, paraklētos is clearly a translation of the Hebrew participle mēnaḥēm. Even if the translations of Aquila and Theodotion were influenced by Christian usage,<sup>39</sup> this nevertheless indicates that early in the second century AD the word paraklētos could carry the nuance of “comforter” in the Middle East (Aquila was active in Jerusalem, Theodotion in Ephesus<sup>40</sup>).

This evidence from Aquila and Theodotion receives relatively little attention in the literature on the Paraclete. Behm calls this occurrence of the word “unusual in Jewish usage,” says that it is “an exception which the history of the word alone can hardly explain,” and appeals for support to the conjecture of Johannine influence made by Hastings.<sup>41</sup> However unusual the usage may seem, the possibility exists that the word was in common use with the meaning of “comforter,” even if it has only survived for us in these few instances. Both Aquila and Theodotion found it appropriate, and “for at least parts of the Hebrew

Bible, a translation very similar to Theodotion's was already in use in the first century B.C.E."<sup>42</sup>

It could be that the use of the word in John with overtones of "comfort" gave it a connotation it had not previously enjoyed.<sup>43</sup> It is difficult to know whether or not Christian usage decisively influenced the word's range of meaning. From the translation of Job 16:2, and the common understanding that the word bears the nuance of "comforter" in the farewell discourses, it seems unwise to insist on always translating the word according to its morphologically passive form, viz., as "advocate" or the like.<sup>44</sup> Without more evidence, it is difficult to be more precise regarding the nuances carried by the word *paraklētos*, but the word was used to denote comforters/counselors (Job 16:2, Aquila and Theodotion).

Origin [AD c. 185–253/4] seems to have been the first interpreter of John's Gospel to understand *paraklētos* as "comforter" in the farewell discourse and "advocate" in 1 John 2:1.<sup>45</sup> James Hastings provides a helpful summary of the way the word has been interpreted,

(1) The Old Latin has *Advocatus* in the Ep[istle] in all copies; in the Gospel there is variation between *Advocatus* ... and *Paracletus* or *Paraclitus*\* ...

(2) The Syriac versions seem to have retained the

original word 'Paraclete' everywhere.... (3) The Arabic, Ethiopic, and Memphitic versions also retain 'Paraclete.' The Thebaic has 'Paraclete' in the Gosp[el], but in the Ep[istle] 'One that prayeth for us' ... (4) The Vulg[ate] has Paracletus... in the Gosp[el] and Advocatus in the Ep[istle]. (5) Wyclif and Purvey translated the Vulg[ate] Paracletus into 'Comforter' in the Gosp[el] and retained 'Advocate' ... in the Ep[istle] .... Luther likewise has 'Tröster' in Jn and 'Fürsprecher' in 1 Jn. Then Tindale also adopted 'Comforter' in the Gosp[el] and 'Advocate' in the Ep[istle], and these translations have come down through all the Eng[lish] versions..."<sup>46</sup>

Hastings demonstrates that, while the term was often simply transliterated, many translations have distinguished between the nuances of the word in the Gospel and in the Epistle. The following modern English translations offer additional examples:

ESV: Gospel: "Helper,"	Epistle: "Advocate."
HCSB: Gospel: "Counselor"	Epistle: "Advocate"
KJV: Gospel: "Comforter,"	Epistle: "Advocate."
NAB Gospel: "Advocate,"	Epistle: "Advocate."

NAS: Gospel: "Helper,"	Epistle: "Advocate."
NIV: Gospel: "Counselor,"	Epistle: "One who speaks...in our defense."
NJB: Gospel: "Paraclete,"	Epistle: "Advocate."
NKJV: Gospel: "Helper,"	Epistle: "Advocate."
NRSV: Gospel: "Advocate,"	Epistle: "Advocate."
REB: Gospel: "Advocate,"	Epistle: "One who will plead our case"
RSV: Gospel: "Counselor,"	Epistle: "Advocate." <sup>47</sup>

Transliterations of the word are now far less common, for in these eleven translations only the NJB opts to do so. The NAB, REB, and NRSV reject the sense of "comforter/counselor" and opt for identical translations in the Gospel and the Epistle. The other eight translations distinguish between uses in the two books.

Various equivalents have proposed to capture the word's range of meaning. Wycliffe's choice of "comforter," which some find "weak and misleading,"<sup>48</sup> should be understood as in Wycliffe's day: "its first meaning, like the Latin con-fortare (from con intensive prefix, and fortis 'strong'), is to strengthen."<sup>49</sup> But "Comforter," in terms of consolation, has been supported by J. G. Davies and U.

B.Müller.<sup>50</sup> Some prefer "Helper,"<sup>51</sup> and Snaith has argued for "'Convincer,' i.e. He who convinces men of the things of God, and accomplishes in them a change of heart."<sup>52</sup> Morris prefers "friend" if the legal background of the term can be kept in view.<sup>53</sup> Others think that "advocate/intercessor" is best.<sup>54</sup> Dunn regards the RSV's "Counselor" as "both sufficiently precise and sufficiently comprehensive."<sup>55</sup> Johnston asserts, "The most useful word in English to cover all the meanings of the Greek παράκλητος is the word 'representative.'"<sup>56</sup> C. K. Barrett believes that "exhortation" shades into the meaning of the word from its relation to parakalein.<sup>57</sup> Because of these shades of meaning, some argue that, like other terms (e.g., apostle, Christ, deacon), the transliteration Paraclete should be brought over as a loanword,<sup>58</sup> although others reasonably claim that this term is "neutral and meaningless, unless the G[ree]k background is known."<sup>59</sup>

Some scholars have maintained that the notion of "comfort" only arises from the context of the farewell discourses in John.<sup>60</sup> The idea of comfort/consolation, however, seems to be supported by the evidence adduced by Davies,<sup>61</sup> as well as the translation of Job 16:2 by Aquila and Theodotion, although Aquila and Theodotion are later than the Gospel of John. The Gospel of John is generally dated no earlier than AD 60 and no later than AD 95. Aquila's translation was probably complete by AD 150. If Jesus spoke in Aramaic and the word paraklētos was

selected by John in the latter half of the first century AD, it is not inconceivable that he and Aquila were using the word at about the same time with the connotation of "comfort."

In summary, translating the word as "comforter/helper" in the farewell discourses and as "advocate/intercessor" in 1 John 2:1 seems firmly entrenched in modern translations. In view of the contexts in which *paraklētōs* is employed in the farewell discourses, its use at Job 16:2, and the way the Rabbis employed the term, this is acceptable.<sup>62</sup> Because "comforter/counselor" does not cover all the functions ascribed to the Paraclete in the farewell discourse,<sup>63</sup> transliterating the word would perhaps be preferable. This would identify its use as a title.<sup>64</sup> Those who bear titles often do things that are not encompassed by the definition of the word used as their title (see e.g., "the secretary of state"). The nature of translation is such that no translation is perfectly transparent but will always require explanation at various points (thus providing strong motivation for pastors and teachers to be competent in biblical languages). We now turn to consider the concepts and motifs suggested as influences on John's understanding of the Paraclete.

**Background considerations.** The Johannine Paraclete passages have been explained through recourse to Mandaean Gnosticism;<sup>65</sup> the Qumran literature;<sup>66</sup> combinations of Old Testament, Qumran literature, and

Zoroastrian Literature;<sup>67</sup> various themes from the Old Testament and InterTestamental literature;<sup>68</sup> the Johannine community;<sup>69</sup> or the actions<sup>70</sup> and even words<sup>71</sup> of Jesus himself. Some of these explanations are more illuminating than others, and not all deny that Jesus is speaking of the Spirit of God who actually exists.

In response to these suggestions, Rudolph Schnackenburg wisely declares, "The search for a completely unambiguous derivation of the term [paraklētōs] has to be abandoned, although considerations based on the history of traditions and influences exerted by the environment can certainly be taken into account."<sup>72</sup> Herman Ridderbos's conclusion is similar, though more specific in its focus on John: "For the specific use and meaning of the name 'Paraclete' in John 14–16 we are dependent on the texts themselves and cannot base our conclusions on representations and figures in other sources."<sup>73</sup> D. M. Smith likewise writes, "The surest guide to understanding the Paraclete is the description of its functions in the Gospel itself."<sup>74</sup> Following the advice of these statements, we turn our attention to the Paraclete passages in John's Gospel, providing further background information as necessary.<sup>75</sup>

## **Johannine Considerations for the Meaning of ho paraklētōs**

The Paraclete fulfills a variety of functions in the Gospel. He provides the disciples with the experience of God's presence (14:15–17); He teaches them (14:26; 16:13–15); He testifies to Jesus (15:26); He convicts the world (16:7–11); and in all this He glorifies Jesus (16:14).

Jesus delivers His farewell discourse to disciples who are troubled by Jesus' announcement that He is leaving and they cannot follow Him (13:33,36).<sup>76</sup> Peter claims he is ready to die with Jesus (13:37), but Jesus announces that Peter will soon deny Him (13:38). Nevertheless, Jesus commands His disciples to trust in God and in Him (14:1),<sup>77</sup> and He gives them reasons they can trust Him. Although He is leaving, He will prepare a place for them and will return for them (14:2–3). Because they know Him, they also know the Father (14:4–11). The disciples will continue Jesus' work, do even greater work than He has done, and enjoy greater access to God in prayer because Jesus goes to the Father (14:12–14). It is here that we meet the first Paraclete passage (John 14:15–17), assuring the disciples that they will continue to experience the divine presence.

**Divine presence in John 14:15–17.** In Jesus' presence the disciples enjoyed the presence of God. In John 14:9 Jesus had said, "He who has seen me has seen the Father." Here He assures them that the Paraclete will come to them so that they will forever enjoy the divine

presence in a deepened way (14:16–17).

If the disciples love Jesus,<sup>78</sup> they will keep His commands, and He will petition the Father to send them the Comforter, the Spirit of truth. At this point in the Fourth Gospel, with Judas gone, we have every indication that these disciples do love Jesus. They have confessed that He is the Messiah (1:41), that He is the one of whom Moses wrote (1:45), and that He is the Son of God (1:49). They saw His glory and believed in Him (2:11), they trusted His intentions even when He was in questionable circumstances (4:27), and when others departed they realized they had nowhere else to go, for He had the words of eternal life (6:66–68). They had believed and come to know that was the holy one of God (6:69). Although faltering, these disciples have followed Jesus into danger (11:16; 13:37).<sup>79</sup> They confess their belief that He has come from the Father (16:30), and Jesus affirms that belief (17:8). These are good grounds for thinking the disciples love Jesus.

In addition, in John 14:17 Jesus contrasts the disciples with the world, saying that they already know the Spirit of truth, the Paraclete, because He remains with them. Later (14:21–24) Jesus will explain that their loving obedience is the reason He will reveal (emphanizō) himself to the disciples and not to the world. It seems, therefore, that when Jesus says to the disciples “If you love me” in 14:15,

the evangelist means for his audience to understand that the disciples do love Him (see 16:27, "For the Father himself loves you, because you have loved me and have believed that I came from the Father").<sup>80</sup>

The condition, "If you love me," has a twofold consequence<sup>81</sup> consisting of two future indicative verbs linked by "and";: "you will keep my commands; and I will petition the Father ..." That is, the consequence of the disciples' love for Jesus is something the disciples will do—keep His commands—and something Jesus will do—ask the Father to send another Paraclete.

Failure to recognize the grammar prompts J. J. Suurmond to write, "I cannot accept the interpretation that a moral life is prerequisite for the reception of the Holy Spirit... I therefore take the condition of v 15 to mean that one must be willing to love and obey Christ, before the ministry of the Spirit-Paraclete can be fully operational in one's life."<sup>82</sup> Suurmond wrongly attributes the gift of the Spirit to "a moral life," for Jesus did not condition the Spirit either on morality or on "willingness" but on love, which will be manifest in obedience/ morality. I contend that this desire comes from regeneration, and that the disciples had already experienced new birth by the Spirit. The same misreading prompted the editors of the NASB to introduce a paragraph division, omit the "and," and insert a subtitle between John 14:15 and 14:16. Leaving out the word "and" makes v. 16 begin "I will ask the Father ..." Such

moves alleviate possible theological tension, but they fly in the face of the grammar of the passage.

The disciples will keep the commands of Jesus because they love Him, and He will ask the Father to give to them another Paraclete because they love Him. The Father's gift of the Paraclete comes not as a result of the disciples' love, but of Jesus' request. The request will not be made because they keep His commands, but because they love Him. Nor will they keep His commands because they will have the Spirit (although that thought is consonant with New Testament teaching elsewhere; see Rom 8:1–4).<sup>83</sup> According to this passage, the disciples will obey Jesus because they love Him, not because they have the Spirit. It seems, therefore, that Jesus assumes the disciples are able to love Him (see 16:27) and obey Him (14:15) even though they are yet to receive the Spirit (see 7:39).

The Gospel of John has been clear to this point that no one is able to come to Jesus unless the Father draws him (6:44,65), and that "everyone who does sin is a slave to sin" (8:34). If the disciples can love Jesus and keep His commandments, it is because they have been drawn to Jesus by the Father and freed from sin by the Son (8:36). Many assume that enabling an individual to believe is equivalent to an individual's reception of the indwelling Spirit.<sup>84</sup> But John 7:39 speaks of people who had been enabled to believe in Jesus but had not yet received the

Spirit. Similarly, in this passage the disciples are assumed to be able to love and obey Jesus before they receive the Spirit. The grammatical connection between John 14:15 and 16 demonstrates the need to recognize that regeneration and indwelling are separate ministries of the Spirit. The disciples are able to love Jesus because they have been regenerated, though they are yet to receive the Spirit. If regeneration and indwelling are not separated, this text becomes very difficult to interpret because of its grammar.

Jesus tells the disciples in John 14:15–17 that the Spirit will be given to those who love Him. Their ability to love Jesus comes from the enabling new birth by the Spirit (John 3:3–8). This regeneration then manifests itself in love for Jesus, which results in obedience. Thus John 14:15–17 fits with John 7:39, where those who have believed (i.e., those who have been born again) are described as those who are about to receive the Spirit.

The purpose of the Father's gift of the Paraclete is "that He might be with you forever" (14:16). The reason for the Paraclete's coming is that they might continue to enjoy God's presence forever.<sup>85</sup> As Barrett correctly concludes, "The Spirit is given in order that the divine presence may be with the disciples continually ..."<sup>86</sup> Jesus is giving His disciples reason to trust Him (14:1) and so tells them that they will continue to experience God's presence (14:15–

17, 20–23).

The identity of “another Paraclete” (allon paraklēton) in v. 16 is given by the appositional phrase beginning v. 17, “the Spirit of truth” (to pneuma tēs alētheias). Most scholars agree that “Spirit of truth,” “Holy Spirit,” and “Paraclete” are all used to designate the Spirit of God in John.<sup>87</sup> Most also agree that the designation “another Paraclete” implies that Jesus has served as a Paraclete for the disciples<sup>88</sup> and that it is because of His departure that He will ask the Father to provide for them “another Paraclete.”<sup>89</sup>

The phrase, “the Spirit of truth” (14:17) is used by John three times to designate the Paraclete—14:17, 15:26, and 16:13.<sup>90</sup> As Morris rightly states, “Clearly truth is very closely associated with the Godhead.”<sup>91</sup> Jesus claimed to be the truth (14:6) and declared that those who worship the Father must worship Him in truth (4:23–24). In his first epistle, John reminded his readers that “The Spirit is the truth” (1 John 5:6). The phrase “the Spirit of truth” has been interpreted by some to mean “the Spirit who communicates truth,”<sup>92</sup> or “the Spirit who bears witness to the truth which is Jesus.”<sup>93</sup> The genitive case is flexible enough to allow for such translations, and since in the immediate context the Spirit teaches truth (14:26; 16:13) this is certainly true, whether or not this is what Jesus meant by the phrase. Since the stress in 14:15–17 is not

on the Spirit's teaching but on the Spirit's abiding presence with and in the disciples,<sup>94</sup> the phrase probably refers more broadly to the Spirit as closely associated with truth.

Some have suggested a direct relationship between the Spirit of truth in the Gospel of John and the Testament of Judah and the Qumran Scrolls.<sup>95</sup> Because of the vastly different contexts, the theological differences, and the impossibility of establishing that Jesus or the fourth evangelist ever endorsed these documents, a genealogical relationship between the Gospel of John and either the Testament of Judah or the Qumran Scrolls cannot be established.<sup>96</sup> Although the expressions are similar, the contexts make clear that the same concepts are not in view. As Barrett states,

T. Judah 20.1, 5 ... which is sometimes quoted, is not relevant, since the 'spirits' seem to be the good and evil 'inclinations.' This applies also to the spirits of truth and wickedness ... in I QS 3.18f.; 4.23. The Spirit of truth ... in 1 QS 4.12 is ... an agent of cleansing, not of instruction, and there is nothing to connect the Prince of lights (... I QS 3.20) with the Paraclete.<sup>97</sup>

At the same time, Beasley-Murray correctly observes that "these citations illustrate the familiarity of these notions in contemporary Judaism,"<sup>98</sup> and C. M. Pate believes that

“the similarities between the DSS and the NT are due ... to their common parent tradition (the story of Israel) but presented from antithetical perspectives.”<sup>99</sup> The likelihood is that Jesus is using terminology that is current with his contemporaries to present his view of the true “Spirit of truth.”<sup>100</sup>

Jesus can be understood as defining a new concept for the disciples on this occasion. He introduces the Paraclete and immediately places the phrase “the Spirit of the truth” in apposition to “another Paraclete” in order to define who the Paraclete is. The phrase “the Spirit of the truth” is then immediately defined as well for the disciples. They are told that the world is not able to receive the Spirit of the truth because it neither sees Him nor knows Him (14:17a). By contrast, the disciples know the Spirit of the truth because He abides with them and will be in them (14:17b-c).<sup>101</sup> In the Gospel of John the Spirit has come down on Jesus to remain on Him (1:33), so it seems that by being with Jesus the disciples are with the Spirit.

Jesus tells the disciples that by virtue of knowing Him they know the Father (14:7). In 14:17 Jesus tells them that by knowing Him they also know the Spirit. “He will be in you” refers to the anticipated reception of the Spirit (7:39) whom the world will not receive. As Carson states, “There are peculiar ways in which the Spirit of truth remains with them already, and will be in them following Jesus' glorification.”<sup>102</sup> In John 14:15–17 Jesus introduces

the other Paraclete to His disciples as a word of encouragement to stimulate their trust (14:1).

**Teaching in John 14:25–26; 16:12–15.** In these texts, the Spirit's teaching ministry is prominent. The overall thrust of the farewell discourse is to comfort the disciples in light of Jesus' announced and imminent departure. He has assured them that God's presence will continue with them and take on a new level of intimacy (14:15–24). In John 14:25–26 Jesus connects the Paraclete's ministry with His own.<sup>103</sup> Just as the Paraclete will be not only with them but also in them (14:17), so also the Paraclete will teach them all things (14:25–26). The text begins with Jesus' words, "These things I have spoken while remaining with you" (14:25),<sup>104</sup> referring primarily to what Jesus has said in this farewell discourse, although things Jesus said on other occasions may also be in view.

The words *par' humin menōn* in 14:25 echo *par' humin mēni* in 14:17, connecting the Paraclete's presence with the disciples in 14:17 to Jesus' presence with them in 14:25, supporting the claim that the Spirit is with the disciples in 14:17 because the disciples are with Jesus, who has the Spirit without measure (3:34). Brown notes that the phrase "while remaining with you" is "an unhappy reminder that Jesus' time with His disciples is running out."<sup>105</sup>

In 14:26, Jesus says, "But the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you all things and will remind you of all that I myself spoke to you" (14:26). The teaching ministry of the Paraclete is presented as superior to that of Jesus because the Paraclete will teach them "all things" and will remind them of "everything" that Jesus said (14:26). The Paraclete's ministry is set clearly in the future.<sup>106</sup> Jesus again identifies this "Paraclete" with the Holy Spirit,<sup>107</sup> whom the disciples would know from the Old Testament (Ps 51:11; Is. 63:10,11): "But the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit—the Father will send Him in My name" (14:26). This sending will fulfill Old Testament promises as well as Jesus' request (14:16). The sending of the Paraclete in Jesus' name not only links the sending to Jesus' request but also supports the claim that the Paraclete comes to continue Jesus' ministry.<sup>108</sup>

The Paraclete's ministry to the disciples both goes beyond and is limited by Jesus' ministry. On the one hand, the Paraclete would teach the disciples "all things" (14:26), and so the disciples would know more from the Paraclete's teaching than they knew from Jesus' teaching (see 1 John 2:27). On the other hand, "all things" is immediately qualified by the words, "and He will remind you of everything I myself spoke to you" (14:26; see 8:31–32). Brown regards the last two lines of 14:26 (teach all things, remind what I said) as synonymous parallelism.<sup>109</sup> John shows throughout his Gospel that the Paraclete

indeed exercised this ministry among the disciples by noting that the disciples later understood things that were not understood when Jesus spoke them (2:22; 12:16; 14:26; 20:9).<sup>110</sup> The Paraclete's ministry of teaching "all things" to the disciples most likely amounts to His teaching them the truth about Jesus and the significance of what Jesus himself taught (see 2 John 9). The Spirit's teaching went beyond what Jesus taught only in that it deepened their understanding of what He said.

Jesus' statements in John 14:25–26 are closely paralleled by those in 16:12–15.<sup>111</sup>

John 14:25–26	John 16:12–15
v. 25- "These things I have spoken to you while remaining with you.	v. 12- "Still many things I have to say to you, but you are not able to bear them now.
v. 26-But the Counselor, the Holy Spirit—the Father will send Him in My name—will teach you all things and remind you of everything I have told you.	v. 13-When the Spirit of truth comes, He will guide you into all the truth. For He will not speak from Himself, but He will speak whatever He hears. He will also declare to you what is to come.
	v. 14-He will glorify Me, because He will take from what is Mine and declare it to you.

v. 15-Everything the Father has is Mine. This is why I told you that He takes from what is Mine and will declare it to you.

What may be implicit in John 14:25–26, that Jesus had limited what He told the disciples because of their inability to understand, is made explicit in 16:12. They had trouble understanding what He did tell them, and now the reason for that is made plain: their abilities are limited. Their limitation, however, is not the world's inability to “know” or “see” the Spirit (14:17), but is a function of their location on the salvation-historical time line (note 16:12, “you cannot bear them now [arti] ” and “whenever [hotan] the Spirit of truth comes” in 16:13).<sup>112</sup>

As in 14:25–26 the Paraclete will teach more than Jesus taught; in 16:12–13 He will “guide them into all truth” and speak of “things that are to come,” including things they are yet unable to “bear.”<sup>113</sup> Jesus again speaks of the Paraclete as to pneuma tēs alētheias (16:13). Although (as above) the genitive could be rendered “the Spirit who communicates truth,” supported by the immediately following phrase, “He will lead you into all truth” (16:13),<sup>114</sup> it may be better to leave the genitive uninterpreted since the context clearly supplies that nuance. In view of 1 John 5:6 (“the Spirit is the truth”), more may be intended by the phrase to pneuma tēs alētheias than merely that the Spirit communicates truth.

The explanation given (note the explanatory gar“for”) of

the whole truth into which the Spirit will lead the disciples is that the Spirit will not speak "from Himself" (i.e., on His own); rather, He will speak what He hears (16:13). This is just the way that Jesus Himself has spoken—not "from Himself" but what He has heard (12:49–50).<sup>115</sup> The Spirit will also declare to the disciples "what is coming" (ta erchomena, 16:13).<sup>116</sup> The Spirit's proclamation should be understood in light of the rest of the New Testament. As Holwerda writes,

The task of the Spirit to teach all things, to lead into all the truth, and to declare the things to come is essentially one: the Spirit reveals the meaning of the Heilsgeschichte, the meaning of the saving events, past, present, and future. The Spirit reveals to the disciples the meaning of the work of the historical Jesus, the exalted Jesus, and the Jesus who is to come. The proper commentary on this work of the Spirit is the New Testament itself.<sup>117</sup>

Jesus declares the purpose of the Paraclete's ministries: "He will glorify me."<sup>118</sup> The Paraclete, He says, would take "from what is mine" (ek tou emou) and proclaim it to the disciples (16:14). This genitive phrase refers to what the Father and the Son "have" (echei, "he has," in 16:15). There could also be a sense in which ek tou emou means "from the things concerning me." The Paraclete glorifies Jesus by proclaiming to the disciples what the Father and

the Son “have”—including the significance of the things that Jesus said and did.<sup>119</sup> When the Spirit reminds the disciples of all that Jesus said to them (14:26), He is taking what belongs to Jesus and declaring it to the disciples (16:14). F. F. Bruce concludes, “We are no doubt intended to infer that the Gospel of John provides a prime example of the fulfillment of this promise.”<sup>120</sup>

In John 14:25–26 and 16:12–15 the Paraclete's teaching ministry is prominent. He continues Jesus' own teaching ministry (“in Jesus' name”), but He also goes beyond what Jesus taught (“all truth”), while remaining focused on what belongs to Jesus and the Father (16:14–15). By teaching the disciples the meaning and significance of what Jesus said and did, the Spirit makes known to them what they did not understand during Jesus' ministry, namely, how it is that the cross is glory (13:31–33). Thus Jesus claims, “He will glorify me” (16:14).<sup>121</sup>

**Testimony in John 15:26.** Having continued to discuss the intimacy of relationship that will continue even after His departure (15:1–17), Jesus warns His disciples that they will be received as He has been received (15:18–25). Some will accept them (15:20b); others will reject them (15:20a). To reject Jesus is to reject the Father (15:23). In spite of the reality that Jesus, and by implication those who carry His name, will be hated (15:25), testimony to Jesus will continue (15:26–27). The remaining occurrence of *paraklētos* in John 15:26 reaffirms and refines what we

have seen in the other texts.

The coming of the Spirit as a future event is specified by the initial clause, "When the Paraclete comes."<sup>122</sup> As before, "the Paraclete" is identified as "the Spirit of the truth." But whereas in 14:26 the Father sends the Spirit in Jesus' name (also 14:16), in 15:26 Jesus sends the Spirit. There is no tension here (see 10:30).<sup>123</sup> Just as Jesus is sent and given by the Father (e.g., 3:16–17), so the Spirit is given and sent by the Father and the Son. That the Spirit goes out from the Father shows that, like the Word (1:1–2), the Spirit was (and is) with the Father.<sup>124</sup> That the Spirit goes out from the Father being sent by Jesus (15:26) is another indication of the unity of purpose and action between the Father and Jesus<sup>125</sup> and shows that Jesus has at His disposal all that belongs to the Father (see 13:3; 16:14–15). The Spirit's mission would be to testify to Jesus, as the Baptist (1:15), the woman at the well (4:39), the Father (5:32), Jesus' works (5:36), the Scriptures (5:39), Jesus himself (8:18), and the crowd (12:17) had done.

As the Spirit taught the disciples the meaning of Jesus' words and actions, he glorified Jesus. The Spirit's testimony to Jesus would teach the disciples, but the testimony was not only directed at the disciples. Just as the other testimony in John is experienced both by those who accept and reject Jesus, so the Spirit's testimony

would be experienced both by believers and by the world. The disciples also would testify—the implication being that their testimony was not to each other but to outsiders. This testimony was met by either rejection or acceptance, as Jesus warned them (15:20; see 1:11; 14:17). Just as the Spirit's testimony to the disciples was related to his teaching them, so the Spirit's testimony to the world is related to his ministry of conviction.

**Conviction in John 16:7–11.** Jesus continues to confront the sorrow that has filled the hearts of His disciples (16:6). Jesus' declaration that His departure would benefit them must have sounded absurd (16:7a). The explanation is that Jesus' departure is necessary for the Paraclete to come to them (16:7b). Indeed, if Jesus does not go away the Paraclete will not come.<sup>126</sup> His coming, however, is not only for their benefit. The Paraclete's ministry of convicting the world (16:8–11) seems to be the natural result of His testimony to Jesus (15:26).<sup>127</sup> Just as the Paraclete replaces Jesus as the disciples' teacher (14:25–26), He replaces Jesus as the witness against the world.<sup>128</sup>

In John 16:8–11, Jesus describes one aspect of the Paraclete's better ministry, that of convicting the world. The object of the verb *elenxei* ("he will convict") is *ton kosmon* ("the world" in v. 8). It is the world that is convicted here; strengthening the disciples in their convictions is only secondary.<sup>129</sup>

The nature of the action in view seems relatively clear from the use of this verb, *elenchō*, and from related expressions elsewhere in John's Gospel (the verb is also used in 3:20 and 8:46). In John 8:46 Jesus asks, "Which of you convicts me concerning sin?" (*tis ex humōn elenchei me peri hamartias*). Syntactically, John 16:8 and 8:46 are parallel—verb, object, prepositional phrase:

<i>elenxei</i>	<i>ton kosmon</i>	<i>peri hamartias</i>
He will convict	the world	concerning sin
<i>elenchei</i>	me	<i>peri hamartias</i> <sup>130</sup>
convicts	me	concerning sin

In John 8:46 Jesus is not asking that someone convince Him that He is wrong; He is challenging His hearers to demonstrate His culpability or guilt. The only other use of this verb in John is in 3:20 (see 7:7).<sup>131</sup> There too the verb has to do with the demonstration of culpability not with persuasion. It would seem likely, then, that the verb has to do with the demonstration of culpability in John 16:8.<sup>132</sup>

The three prepositional phrases identify three points on which the world will be convicted.<sup>133</sup> In each case the same preposition *peri* is used, which the lexicon explains is used (with an object in the genitive) "to denote the object or pers. to which (whom) an activity or esp. inward process refers or relates." After verbs expressing such ideas as "charging, judging, censuring, punishing,

praising,” including elenchō, it means “on account of, because of, for, concerning.” <sup>134</sup> The world will be convicted concerning sin, concerning righteousness, and concerning judgment (16:8).<sup>135</sup> These three prepositional phrases are elaborated on in 16:9–11. The explanation of the world's conviction is given in parallel statements containing a clause showing why the world is guilty (each introduced by the word “because,” a causal hoti).<sup>136</sup>

First, the world will be convicted concerning sin because it does not believe in Jesus (16:9). “The one who believes is not condemned; but the one who does not believe has already been condemned, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God” (3:17–18; cp. 1:10). The Paraclete will convict the world of the sin of unbelief (16:9). In John, the sin of not believing in Jesus results in condemnation (3:18).

Second, the Paraclete will convict the world “concerning righteousness, because I go to the Father and you no longer see me” (16:10). John 16:8 and 16:10 are the only two uses of dikaiosunē (“righteousness”) in the Gospel of John. Jesus stated in John 5:30 that His judgment is righteous (dikaios). He challenged those questioning Him to make a righteous judgment (7:24) and addressed the Father as “righteous Father” (17:25).<sup>137</sup> It may be that the world is “convicted concerning righteousness” (16:8,10) because of its failure to make a “righteous judgment” (7:24; cp. 5:30).<sup>138</sup> It is better, however, to understand

“righteousness” in 16:8,10 in view of the hoti clause. Thus “righteousness” is bound up with Jesus going to the Father.

Jesus' departure to the Father refers to the cross.<sup>139</sup> Jesus goes to the Father, and the disciples will no longer see Him (16:10), then “again in a little while you will see me” (16:16). The disciples will see Jesus again after His resurrection, when their grief will be turned to joy (16:20). Conversely, at His death the world will rejoice (16:20).

The righteousness (or rather lack of righteousness) concerning which the world is convicted here is righteousness that is made known when Jesus goes to the Father and His disciples no longer see Him.<sup>140</sup> Jesus' departure to the Father is His glorification/exaltation, but in John, Jesus is glorified when He is crucified. Earlier in John Jesus declared, “When you lift up the Son of Man, then you will know that I Am” (8:28). Here Jesus appears to say that when His enemies crucify Him, it will become apparent who He truly is. It is a small step from this absolute “I Am” statement to the manifestation of righteousness.

When Jesus is crucified, true righteousness is put on display for the world to behold. The cross is glory and righteousness because there the supreme worth of the Father is made known (13:31–32). Jesus said, “Father, the

hour has come. Glorify Your Son that Your Son may glorify You ... And now glorify Me, Father, with Yourself, in the glory which I had with You before the world was" (17:1,5). The cross makes plain that only the Son can satisfy the Father's offended holiness. That the Son is able to satisfy the demand of the Father's holiness exalts the Son. That the Father's holiness requires one who shared His pre-incarnate glory (17:5), one who possessed life within Himself (5:26), indeed, one who was God (1:1), exalts the Father. Thus it is that Jesus can say, "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him. If God is glorified in Him, God will also glorify Himself in Him, and He will glorify Him immediately" (13:31–32).<sup>141</sup> The Paraclete will convict the world concerning this righteousness.

Third, the Paraclete will convict the world "concerning judgment [krisēōs], because the ruler of this world [ho archōn tou kosmou toutou] has been judged" (16:11). Just after Jesus declared that the hour had come for the Son of Man to be glorified (12:23), He also declared, "Now is the judgment [krisis] of this world; now the ruler of this world [ho archōn tou kosmou toutou] shall be cast out" (12:31; see Rev 12:7–12). Based on the parallel expressions in John 12:31 and 16:11, the judgment in view in 16:11 appears to be the cross. At this judgment, the ruler of this world has been condemned (16:11) and cast out (12:31).<sup>142</sup> Jesus triumphed over the ruler of this world at the cross, and the Paraclete will demonstrate to the world its culpability with reference to the cross. As Brown writes,

"In condemning Jesus the world itself was judged."<sup>143</sup>

These three prepositional phrases are therefore related as follows: the world's chief sin is failure to believe in Jesus (3:18; 16:9); the world will be convicted by the display of the righteousness of God and Christ on the cross (16:19);<sup>144</sup> the judgment in view is also the cross (16:11). The world stands condemned by the righteousness manifested in God's judgment of sin at the cross because it has not believed in Jesus.<sup>145</sup> The Paraclete will show the world its culpability— that it stands guilty for not believing in Jesus. The judgment at the cross typifies the judgment that is to come (see Rev 20:2,10–15). If the world continues in its rejection of Jesus, it will face judgment on the last day and be condemned by the righteousness of God and Christ seen at the cross.

This understanding of the relationship between righteousness and judgment in John 16:10–11 fits with the explanation of John 16:12–15 above. The disciples at this time cannot bear the message of the cross (16:12). But when the Paraclete comes, He will take these things concerning Jesus and the Father and proclaim them to the disciples, thus leading them into all truth (16:13–15). It is in this sense that the Paraclete will glorify Jesus (16:14), by teaching the disciples the truth about the cross (16:13–15) and applying to the world the salvation purchased at the cross (16:8–11).

Brown suggests, "The idea that the world is to be convinced by the Paraclete contradicts the statement of xiv 17 that the world cannot accept the Paraclete."<sup>146</sup> But two pieces of evidence indicate that members of the world can be convicted, repent, and become believers in Jesus. First, Jesus came for the world to be saved through Him (3:18); and second, the disciples were given to Jesus out of the world (17:6). Jesus does describe the disciples as not being of the world (15:19; see 14:17), but in view of John 17:6 this seems to signify that He regards them as having been converted from the world—they have experienced new birth (3:3, 5; 5:24–25; 6:63–69). With regard to the ministry of the Spirit-Paraclete Holwerda rightly concludes, "The convicting of the world by the Paraclete has two results: viz. conversion and judgment."<sup>147</sup> All the world experiences the convicting ministry of the Paraclete. Some are converted, and like the disciples, come out of the world (see 15:19; 17:6). The rest are not converted but condemned.

So the Spirit will teach the disciples (14:26; 16:13–15), testifying particularly about Jesus.<sup>148</sup> The Spirit-instructed disciples will then join the Spirit in testifying to Jesus (15:26–27), and the testimony to Jesus given by the Spirit and the disciples will convict the world of the sin of not believing in Jesus (16:8–9) and of its guilt in rejecting the righteousness manifested at the cross (16:8,10). The testimony will also show the world that it is wrong and stands judged before the cross, where its ruler was

condemned (16:8,11).<sup>149</sup> Some will receive this testimony; others will reject it (see 15:20). In all this, the Spirit will glorify Jesus (16:14).

## **The Eschatological Gift**

At several points we have noted the temporal markers John uses to designate when the Paraclete would be received by believers. This is perhaps most prominent in John 7:39, where John explains that the Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified, and 16:7, where Jesus states that only if He goes away will He send the Paraclete to the disciples.<sup>150</sup> The question this section seeks to explore is when, according to John, the Spirit-Paraclete is given. The answer to this question rests on two other questions: first, according to John, when was Jesus glorified? Second, exactly what happened in John 20:22 (sometimes called the Johannine Pentecost)?

**The Paraclete and the glorification of Jesus.** References to Jesus' glorification/exaltation in John are references to the cross.<sup>151</sup> When Jesus declares in John 12:23, "The hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified," He clearly refers to His impending death at the cross (12:24,33–34). When Judas leaves to betray Him, Jesus declares, "Now is the Son of Man glorified" (13:31).

It seems clear that in the statements of Jesus' departure

in John both the cross and the ascension are at times in view.<sup>152</sup> It does not seem, however, that John “works to show the unity of the diverse events of ‘the hour’” in the sense that he “has a clear motive for bringing the Spirit into Easter.”<sup>153</sup> Nor is it “arbitrary to insist that because Jesus was glorified in His death and resurrection, the bestowal of the Spirit on Easter Sunday was that gift indicated in 7:39.”<sup>154</sup> John is able to distinguish between the glorification of the cross and Jesus' ascension when he desires to do so. The departure of the cross is in view when Jesus acknowledges that sorrow has filled the hearts of His disciples (16:6). The cross is still in view as Jesus speaks of the world rejoicing and the disciples mourning (16:20). But when He speaks of the disciples' sorrow being turned to joy, resurrection is in view (16:20).

Jesus' appearances after the resurrection show that He has already been glorified.<sup>155</sup> He says to Mary that He has not yet ascended (anabainō, 20:17), not that He has not yet been glorified. Also, He possesses a changed body that can enter a room whose doors are shut (20:19).<sup>156</sup>

When John asserts, then, that the Spirit is not given until Jesus is glorified (7:39), He is speaking of Jesus' death and resurrection. As Burge explains, “The prerequisite departure of Jesus does not refer to his necessary absence when the Paraclete appears. It refers to the preliminary death and glorification of Jesus for which the Spirit must wait (7:39).”<sup>157</sup>

**The Paraclete and John 20:22.** On the evening of the resurrection,<sup>158</sup> Jesus met His followers in a locked room, showed them His wounded hands and side (20:20), and twice bestowed on them His peace (20:19,21). The second time, He added, "Just as the Father sent me, I also send you." Then He "exhaled" and said to them, "Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of someone, they have been forgiven; if you retain the sins of someone, they have been retained" (20:22–23).

This episode has three main components: Jesus sends the disciples just as the Father sent Him (20:21); Jesus "exhales"<sup>159</sup> and says, "Receive the Holy Spirit" (20:22); and Jesus gives the disciples authority to forgive and retain sins (20:23).<sup>160</sup> It would seem natural to understand this text as Jesus sending the disciples and supplying them with the promised Spirit that they might accomplish the task He gives them.

Some interpreters view this account as John's version of what Luke depicts taking place fifty days later on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2.<sup>161</sup> Others believe John depicts a "parabolic anticipation" or "symbolic pre-figuration" of what would happen on Pentecost fifty days later.<sup>162</sup> Still others suggest that the disciples received the Spirit in different ways on both occasions.<sup>163</sup> I will present evidence for this last position.

If John were read by persons with no knowledge of the events in Acts 1–2, there would be little question as to when the Spirit was given and received. The Spirit would be given after Jesus was glorified in His death and resurrection. Jesus appears to His disciples in a risen, glorified body. He then breathes on them and says the words, “Receive the Holy Spirit” (20:22).<sup>164</sup> The natural conclusion would be that the Spirit-Paraclete was given to the disciples by Jesus on resurrection day as recorded in John 20:22.<sup>165</sup>

I will argue that both John 20:22 and Acts 2 happened as described. There is no need for tortuous “harmonization” or exegetical gymnastics.<sup>166</sup> Here we will briefly discuss the relationship between the baptism in the eschatological Spirit, the filling of the Spirit, and the eschatological indwelling of the Spirit. A more thorough discussion, focusing on Acts, can be found in Appendix 3.

John knows the word “baptize” (see John 1:33), but he does not use that word to describe what happened on the day of resurrection. When Luke describes the Spiritbaptism that took place fifty days later in Acts 2, he states that the disciples were “filled” (2:4, using the verb *pimplēmi*). The disciples were “baptized” in the Spirit on the day of Pentecost (see Acts 1:5), but all “fillings” are not “baptisms.” Baptisms in the Spirit happen only in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19. There is no indication that the other “fillings” in Acts (see the use of “fill,” *pimplēmi*, in Acts

4:8,31; 9:17; 13:9) were also regarded as "baptisms." Regarding the "filling" in Acts 4:31, F. F. Bruce comments, "While this was a fresh filling of the Spirit, it could not be called a fresh baptism."<sup>167</sup>

These baptisms do not happen at every conversion. Luke records at least fifteen conversion accounts in Acts, and not one is described as a baptism in the Spirit (see Acts 2:41,47; 4:4; 5:14; 6:7; 8:12–13,36–37; 9:35,42; 13:48; 16:5,14,31–34; 17:11–12; 18:8). After Jesus' glorification, believers are indwelt at conversion, but the indwelling presence of the Spirit should not be equated with the powerful, dramatic, visible, audible manifestation of the Spirit that Luke depicts in these "baptisms" in the Spirit. Each time a baptism in the Spirit occurs, it marks divine approval of a significant movement in the church's advance.<sup>168</sup> In Acts 2 the church is brought into the open for the first time. In Acts 8 the age-old breach with Samaria is healed. In Acts 10 Gentiles are brought into the church without circumcision. And in Acts 19 believers in the prophets of Israel are shown that they must believe in the one to whom the prophets point.<sup>169</sup> These instances of baptism in the Spirit are not recorded to show what happens at conversion. Nor are these "baptisms" necessary for indwelling, for Luke seems to show people who are "full of the Spirit" (using *plērēs/plēroō*, not *pimplēmi*; see 6:5; 7:55; 11:24; 13:52), whom he has not shown being "baptized" in the Spirit.

Luke reserves the word *pimplēmi*, “fill,” to describe occasions of Spirit filling for empowerment. The use of the word *pimplēmi* is significant for this discussion because both Peter and Paul are “filled” multiple times in Acts (see 2:4; 4:8,31; 9:17; 13:7). Being “filled” by the Spirit for a task, therefore, can happen repeatedly and is not presented as an ongoing state. This “filling” is akin to what was experienced by certain persons in the Old Testament. The enabling of certain individuals in the Old Testament is not unlike what happens when Paul and Peter are “filled” for inspired proclamation in Acts (see Exod 28:3; 31:3; 35:31; Deut 34:9, where the verb *empimplēmi*, “fill,” is used to translate the Hb. verb *mālē*’).

We have claimed that when Peter, for instance, was “filled” anew in Acts 4:8 he was not “baptized” anew. Nor does it seem that these “fillings” where the word *pimplēmi* is used are to be equated with the reception of the abiding, indwelling Spirit that only takes place after Jesus has been glorified (John 7:39; 14:16–17; 20:22), for again, why should that experience be repeated? Therefore, we may conclude that the indwelling Spirit-Paraclete the disciples received on resurrection day (20:22) is distinct from what they experienced when they were filled with power for inspired proclamation on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:4).<sup>170</sup>

If the disciples were “filled” for inspired proclamation on the day of Pentecost (see Acts 2:4), then Acts 2 presents

no more difficulty for John 20:22 than Acts 4:8, or any other instances of filling in Acts. Nor do the baptisms in the Spirit described in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19 present a difficulty for John 20:22, for John 20:22 is not recording a dramatic demonstration of God's approval (i.e., a baptism in the Spirit) as Acts 2 is. Understanding the relationship between Acts 2 and John 20 in this way saves us from the false dichotomy set up by some authors: "There is no question of viewing the sending of the Spirit as taking place at Easter and at Pentecost. It is one or the other, in view of the nature of each Evangelist's presentation of the event."<sup>171</sup> On the contrary, it is precisely the nature of each evangelist's presentation that enables us to maintain that the Spirit was given in different ways at Easter and Pentecost.

Turning from baptism and filling to consider the indwelling of the Spirit, it does not seem that John means to describe either a baptism or a filling in John 20:22, but a reception (see 7:39; 14:17, see [chapter 5](#)). John 20:22 seems to be indicating that Jesus has been glorified and that He is making good on His promise. The disciples need not wait for Pentecost to be converted. The Gospel of John indicates that they have already believed in Jesus as the Messiah in John 1:41,45,49. The fact that they stumbled on the night Jesus was crucified is not evidence that they were not believers, for they stumbled after Pentecost as well (see Gal 2:11–14). Nor need the disciples wait until

Pentecost to receive the indwelling Spirit, for what they received at Pentecost was a temporary empowerment, an experience that was repeated and therefore not ongoing (see 2:4; 4:8). By contrast, the indwelling Spirit is described as the divine presence with and in the disciples forever, i.e., indwelling is ongoing (John 14:15–17). Is it too difficult to maintain that people who are indwelt can also be empowered?

Read in the context of the Gospel of John, John 20:22 fits nicely as the fulfillment of the promised reception of the indwelling Spirit (see the argument in chapter five that John 20:22 refers to the indwelling of the Spirit).<sup>172</sup> Max Turner objects to this understanding of John 20:22 because of the absence of Thomas (see John 20:24–29), and because “Paraclete activity” does not immediately commence. Turner holds that John 20:22 is a “climacteric in the process that was already under way,” not a real giving of the Spirit.<sup>173</sup> Against these objections, Thomas is clearly a believer after Jesus appears to him (“My Lord and my God!” 20:28), and since Jesus was now glorified he probably had the Spirit—even though there had been no dramatic, visible manifestation of the Spirit’s coming. Once Jesus has been glorified, believers (including Thomas) are indwelt by the Spirit at conversion.

We are not told who else was not present to receive the Spirit on resurrection day, but the absence of Thomas is

no indication that the Spirit was not given. John does not address the question of those who were not present. If the indwelling Spirit was received when Jesus said, "Receive the Holy Spirit" (20:22), then "Paraclete activity" did commence immediately—they were indwelt (see 14:16–17). To suggest that the Spirit was not really bequeathed when Jesus said, "Receive the Holy Spirit," requires that Jesus spoke parabolically. This suggestion does not arise from the passage at hand, but from the desire to alleviate the tension between John 20 and Acts 2. The solution offered here does not demand that "Receive the Holy Spirit" be read as parabolic, and it sheds light on the different ways in which the Spirit is given on the two occasions.

From the different descriptions given by John and Luke, there is ample evidence to support the claim that the two authors are describing two different manifestations of the one Spirit. We need not choose between Luke and John. Careful examination makes each author's message more clear. Baptisms in the Spirit, fillings with the Spirit, and indwelling by the Spirit are three distinct manifestations of the eschatological gift of the Spirit. The disciples received the gift of the indwelling Spirit on the day of the resurrection in John 20:22 when Jesus breathed on them and told them to receive the Spirit. Fifty days later at Pentecost they were baptized with the Holy Spirit, which was a public attestation that this messianic community had God's approval. The disciples were then periodically "filled"

with the Spirit, whereby they were empowered to proclaim God's word with authority.

# Conclusion

John recounts the Spirit anointing Jesus, remaining on Him, and empowering Him to speak the word of God (1:32–33; 3:34). Those who are physically alive must be born of the Spirit to partake of the kingdom of God (3:5–8). Through the words of Jesus the Spirit makes alive (6:63). Those made alive belong to the sphere of the Spirit as opposed to the sphere of the flesh (3:6). It is in this sphere of the Spirit that believers worship the Father in truth (4:21–24).

The Spirit-Paraclete is promised by Jesus in the farewell discourse, delivered on the day of His resurrection, and continues the ministry of Jesus. He is sent to the disciples to ensure them of God's continued favor, and He guarantees that they will enjoy God's presence forever (14:16–17). He testifies to Jesus (15:26), teaching the disciples (14:26; 16:12–15) and convicting the world (16:8–11).

---

<sup>1</sup> Though all the Johannine literature is significant for this investigation, here we are primarily concerned with the Gospel of John. The word *pneuma*, “spirit,” occurs in reference to the Holy Spirit in John in the following places (superscript numbers indicate multiple uses of the word in a verse), 1:32,33 (2x); 3:6,8,34; 6:63; 7:39 (2x); 14:17,26; 15:26; 16:13; 20:22. In addition to these unambiguous references to the Holy Spirit, *pneuma* is used for the category of spirit as opposed to flesh, things that are qualitatively of the Spirit, see 3:5, 6; 4:23, 24 (2x); 6:63. Wind is in view in 3:8, and Jesus’ (human) spirit in 11:33; 13:21; and 19:30. On *paraklētos*, “Paraclete,” see below.

<sup>2</sup> This text will be addressed more fully in chapter five, where it will be argued that John is presenting Jesus as the fulfillment of the OT expectation for a Spiritanointed Messiah (see e.g., Isa 11; 48:16; 61:1–3).

<sup>3</sup> It is legitimate to speak of Jesus being functionally installed as Messiah when he was anointed with the Spirit. See the helpful discussion in O. Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple* (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity, 2002), 309–12.

<sup>4</sup> See [chapter five](#) for discussion of this text.

<sup>5</sup> For strong arguments that “there is no reason to deny that Jesus said exactly what John says he said,” see D. Wenham, “A Historical View of John’s Gospel,” *Them* 23 (1998): 18. In this vein Craig Blomberg notes, “It is not quite true that the discourses of Jesus in John are wholly indistinguishable from John’s narrative style elsewhere. No less than 145 words spoken by Jesus in John appear nowhere in the Evangelist’s narrative material, and many of these are general enough in meaning that we might have expected them elsewhere” (*The Historical Reliability of John’s Gospel* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001], 52).

<sup>6</sup> For further discussion of when in salvation history the Spirit creates this new life, see [chapters five](#) and [six](#). For further discussion of the nature of the new life, see [chapter six](#).

<sup>7</sup> Note the following: John 3:6, “what has been born of the Spirit is spirit” (τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος πνεῦμά ἐστιν) 4:23, “they will worship the Father in spirit and truth” (προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ); 4:24, “God is spirit” (πνεῦμα ὁ θεός); 6:63, “the words I have spoken ... are spirit and are life” (τὰ ῥήματα . . . πνεῦμά ἐστιν καὶ ζωὴ ἐστιν) and 7:39, “For it was not yet spirit” (οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα).

<sup>8</sup> For the view that in John 6:63 Jesus conveys the Spirit through His words, see F. Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort* (Frankfurt: Knecht, 1974), 211.

<sup>9</sup> Similarly R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, 2 vols., AB (New York: Doubleday, 1966, 1970), 131, 141. R. Schnackenburg speaks of “the two realms of being, σὰρξ [flesh] and πνεῦμα [spirit]” (*The Gospel according to St. John*, 3 vols., trans. K. Smith [New York: Crossroad, 1968, 1979, 1982], 1:371). See also D. Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1981), 528.

<sup>10</sup> J. H. Bernard, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 2 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928), 218; also p. 106. Also G. M. Burge, *The Anointed Community* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 168–69.

<sup>11</sup> E. Schweizer, “πνεῦμα”, in TDNT, 6:438.

<sup>12</sup> Against L. Morris, *Jesus is the Christ: Studies in the Theology of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 146.

<sup>13</sup> See D. E. Holwerda, *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John* (Kampen: Kok, 1959), 60.

<sup>14</sup> For discussion of the salvation-historical implications of John 4, see [chapter five](#).

<sup>15</sup> Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple*, 374.

<sup>16</sup> L. Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 271–72.

<sup>17</sup> Similarly D. A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 225.

<sup>18</sup> M. J. Harris, “Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament,” in NIDNTT, 3:1178; L. Belleville, “‘Born of Water and Spirit:’ John 3:5” TJ 1 (1980): 135–36; Brown, *John*, 131.

<sup>19</sup> Belleville, “Born of Water and Spirit,” 140.

20 Carson, John, 195 (italics and bracketed note his); similarly Belleville, "Born of Water and Spirit," 140–41.

21 For further discussion of John 7:39, see [chapter five](#).

22 Morris, *Jesus is the Christ*, 153.

23 It is impossible to know for sure whether the Greek word *paraklētos* came from the lips of Jesus (was he speaking Aramaic?) or from the fourth evangelist, who may have chosen this Greek term to translate an Aramaic term spoken by Jesus. The only other use of this word in the NT is in reference to Jesus in 1 John 2:1. LSJ lists the form as a derivative of *paraklēsis* and the range of meaning given for the word is as follows: "I. 1. called to one's aid, in a court of justice: as Subst., legal assistant, advocate... 2. summoned ... II. intercessor" (LSJ, 1313). To the form *paraklētor* LSJ gives the gloss, "one who encourages, comforter" (ibid. [italics original throughout]).

24 For extensive bibliography on the Paraclete, see J. M. Hamilton, Jr., "He Is with You and He Will Be in You: The Spirit, the Believer, and the Glorification of Jesus" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003), 76 n. 30.

25 J. Behm, "παράκλητος", in TDNT, 5:800.

26 Westcott directs attention to the cognate forms, κλητός, "called;" ἀνάκλητος, "called back to service;" ἀπόκλητος, "chosen out;" ἔγκλητος, "liable to a charge;" ἐπικλητος, "called upon;" σύγκλητος, "called together" (glosses from LSJ). Having listed these forms, Westcott asserts, "No example of a like form with an active (middle) sense can be brought forward" (*The Gospel According to St. John*, 2 vols. [London: John Murray, 1908], 2:189).

27 LSJ, 1313; see also MM, 485. But K. Grayston concludes, "The whole range of evidence for the appearance of *paraklētos* in classical and hellenistic Greek, as a rabbinic loanword, and in patristic texts denies that it is a term deriving from legal activity" ("The Meaning of *PARAKLĒTOS*," *JST* 13 [1981]: 79).

28 J. Ashton, "Paraclete," in *ABD* 5:152. Against Morris, John, 589–90.

29 *BDAG*, 766.

30 *BDAG*, 764–65.

31 J. G. Davies, "The Primary Meaning of ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ," *JTS* 4

(1953): 37. Against Behm, “παράκλητος,” in TDNT, 5:803.

<sup>32</sup> J. Ashton, “Paraclete,” in ABD, 5:152; A. L. Mansure, “The Relation of the Paraclete to the Spiritual Presence of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel” (Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1950), 135.

<sup>33</sup> The Epistle of Barnabas [ca. AD 70–130] refers to πλουσίων παράκλητοι (“advocates of the wealthy”; Barn. 20:2). 2 Clement asks, “Or who will be our advocate παράκλητος if we are not found having holy and righteous works” (2 Clem. 6:9). Eusebius’s *Historia Ecclesiastica* 5.1.10 speaks of Vettius Epagathus, “Having been called Paraclete of the Christians, having in himself the Paraclete, the Spirit of Zacharias” (παράκλητος Χριστιανῶν χρηματίσας ἔχων δὲ τὸν παράκλητον ἐν ἑαυτῷ, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Ζαχαρίου). Because of the context, where Epagathus is intervening on behalf of persecuted Christians, most translate παράκλητος here as “advocate” (so Westcott, John, 2:190). In the Loeb edition, however, K. Lake translates the word as “Comforter” in both instances (K. Lake, trans., *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 5.1.10 [LCL 153] [1926]: 411).

<sup>34</sup> Behm, “παράκλητος,” 5:802; also BDAG, 766. Behm notes that the forms 𐤀𐤓𐤏𐤃, 𐤀𐤓𐤏𐤃𐤁, and 𐤀𐤓𐤏𐤃𐤁𐤀 also occur, and that παράκλητος appears to be synonymous with **σὺγκλητος**, “counsel”—𐤀𐤓𐤏𐤃, the antonym of which is—κατήγορος, “accuser” 𐤀𐤓𐤏𐤃 (“παράκλητος,” 5:802).

<sup>35</sup> BDAG, 766; similarly K. Grayston, “The Meaning of PARAKLÉTOS,” 75.

<sup>36</sup> The Rahlfs text has παρακλητορες from παρακλητωρ, “one who encourages, comforter” (LSJ, 1313).

<sup>37</sup> In the piel, 𐤀𐤓𐤏𐤃 carries the nuance, “comforter.” See BDB, 636–37; HALOT<sup>SE</sup>, 688–89. Davies concludes, “The meaning of παρακαλεῖν in the LXX is ... primarily that of 𐤀𐤓𐤏𐤃 i.e. to comfort or console” (Davies, “The Primary Meaning of ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ,” 37).

<sup>38</sup> Brown, John, 1136.

<sup>39</sup> So Behm, “παράκλητος” 5:805 n. 39; following Hastings, “Paraclete,” 3:666.

<sup>40</sup> K. H. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000), 38–42.

<sup>41</sup> Behm, “παράκλητος” 5:801, 803, 805; see also Hastings, “Paraclete,”

3:666–68.

<sup>42</sup> Jobs and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 42.

<sup>43</sup> See H. N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel according to John*, trans. J. Vriend (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 503.

<sup>44</sup> See A. J. Köstenberger, *John*, in vol. 2 of *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary*, ed. C. E. Arnold (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 140.

<sup>45</sup> Origin, *De principiis*, 2.7.4. See the discussion of fathers who opt for both meanings, with Origin, and others who choose one meaning or the other in A. Casarella, *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers*, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese* 25 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 141–43.

<sup>46</sup> Hastings, “Paraclete,” 3:667.

<sup>47</sup> These translations all employ the same gloss consistently throughout the Paraclete passages in the Gospel of John.

<sup>48</sup> G. Braumann, “παράκλητος,” in *NIDNTT*, 1:91 (editorial note). Carson argues, “In today’s ears, ‘Comforter’ sounds either like a quilt or like a do-gooder at a wake, and for most speakers of English should be abandoned” (John, 499). This seems slightly overstated. Those who troubled Job meant to comfort him (see Job 16:2, Aquila and Theodotion). Are most speakers of English so insensitive that they would not distinguish between the Holy Spirit and a quilt?

<sup>49</sup> Hastings, “Paraclete,” 3:667.

<sup>50</sup> J. G. Davies argues from the LXX, “The Primary Meaning ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ,” 35–38, while U. B. Müller argues from the literary genre of the farewell discourse that ὁ παράκλητος in John is equivalent to ὁ παράκαλῶν in apocalyptic literature, in which case it bears the active meaning “comforter” (“Die Parakletenvorstellung im Johannesevangelium,” *ZTK* 71 [1974]: 31–77). H. Riesenfeld argues for “Comforter” based on the OT figure of Wisdom (Prov 8:4) and the eschatological overtones of comfort, e.g. in Isa 40:1 (“A Probable Background to the Johannine Paraclete,” in *Ex orbe religionum*, 2 vols. [Leiden: Brill, 1972], 1:266–74).

<sup>51</sup> G. Braumann, “παράκλητος,” in *NIDNTT*, 1:91 (the preference for helper is expressed in a note by the editor); B. M. Newman and E. A. Nida, *A Translator’s Handbook on the Gospel of John* (London: United Bible

Societies, 1980), 466–67.

<sup>52</sup> Snaith, “The Meaning of ‘The Paraclete,’” 50. Similarly J. Giblet, who argues that the Paraclete pleads the case of Christ (“Les Promesses de L’Esprit et la Mission des Apôtres dans les Evangiles,” *Irenikon* 30 [1957]: 34).

<sup>53</sup> Morris, John, 576, 590.

<sup>54</sup> Behm, “παράκλητος,” in TDNT, 5:814.

<sup>55</sup> J. D. G. Dunn, “πνεῦμα,” in NIDNTT, 3:704 (article reproduced in *The Christ and the Spirit*, vol. 2, Pneumatology [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 3–21).

<sup>56</sup> Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, 87 (emphasis his). Johnston, however, agrees that because of the context “Comforter” is appropriate (90).

<sup>57</sup> C. K. Barrett, “The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel,” *JTS* 1 (1950): 14–15; id., *The Gospel according to St. John*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 462.

<sup>58</sup> E.g., G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., WBC 36 (Nashville: Nelson, 1999), 242; Brown, John, 1137; Hastings, “Paraclete,” 3:668; W. B. Simon, “The Role of the Spirit-Paraclete in the Disciples’ Mission in the Fourth Gospel” (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002), 130–31.

<sup>59</sup> G. Braumann, “παράκλητος” in NIDNTT, 1:91 (editorial note).

<sup>60</sup> Hastings, “Paraclete,” 3:667.

<sup>61</sup> See Davies, “The Primary Meaning of ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ,” 36–38.

<sup>62</sup> So also Schnackenburg, *John*, 3:75; 3:413 n. 91.

<sup>63</sup> See Ashton, “Paraclete,” in ABD 5:152; Brown, John, 1137; Ridderbos, John, 501, 503;

<sup>64</sup> See Ashton, “Paraclete,” in ABD 5:152.

<sup>65</sup> See R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 566–72; H. Windisch, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel*, Biblical Series 20, trans. J. W. Cox (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968).

<sup>66</sup> See Betz, *Der Paraklet*; A. R. C. Leaney, “The Johannine Paraclete

and the Qumran Scrolls," in John and Qumran, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (London: Chapman, 1972), 38–61.

<sup>67</sup> See Breck, *The Spirit of Truth*. W. Eichrodt comments on the possibility of Zoroastrianism influencing Jewish thought on the Spirit, "The balance of probability is against such an assumption. ... The history of the concept in Zoroastrianism ... is precisely the reverse of the development of the Jewish conception, and this must be a constant warning against the tendency to find a causal relation between Persian and Jewish ideas of the Spirit" (*Theology of the Old Testament*, 2 vols., OTL, trans. J. A. Baker [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961, 1967], 2:68).

<sup>68</sup> See G. Bornkamm, "Der Paraklet im Johannesevangelium," in *Festschrift Rudolf Bultmann* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1949), 12–35; E. Franck, *Revelation Taught: The Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, *Coneiectanea Biblica, New Testament Series 14* (Lund: Gleerup, 1985); N. Johansson, *Parakletoi. Vorstellungen von Fürsprechern für die Menschen vor Gott in der alttestamentlichen Religion, im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (Lund: Gleerup, 1940); S. Mowinckel, "Die Vorstellungen des Spätjudentums vom heiligen Geist als Fürsprecher und der johanneische Paraklet," *ZNW 32* (1933): 97–130.

<sup>69</sup> E.g., Barrett, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel."

<sup>70</sup> See Brown, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," *NTS 13* (1967): 126–28; Burge, *Anointed Community*, 41; M. Turner, "Holy Spirit," in *DJG*, 349. With others these scholars have drawn attention to the parallels in John between the ministry of Jesus and the ministry of the Spirit. What has not been so often noted is that the ministry parallels are not limited to Jesus and the Spirit. The Father also does many of the things that the Son and the Spirit do. Father, Son, and Spirit give life (John 5:21; 5:25; 6:63), proclaim the future (1:33; 13:19; 16:13), indwell believers after Jesus is glorified (14:23; 14:20; 14:17), teach (6:45; 7:14; 14:26), testify to Jesus (8:18; 15:26), and glorify Jesus (5:22–23; 17:24; 16:14). Some ministries are shared by the Father and the Son, and some actions are done by (or to) both the Son and the Spirit. This information is summarized on the table, "God's Actions in John."

<sup>71</sup> See Behm, *παράκλητος*, in *TDNT*, 5:812–13; J. Kremer, "Jesu Verheissung des Geistes: Zur Verankerung der Aussage von Joh 16:13 im Leben Jesu," in *Die Kirche des Anfangs, Erfurter Theologische Studien 38*, ed. R. Schnackenburg, J. Ernst, and J. Wanke (Leipzig: St. BennoVerlag,

1977), 247–76.

<sup>72</sup> Schnackenburg, John, 3:148.

<sup>73</sup> Ridderbos, John, 503.

<sup>74</sup> D. M. Smith, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 140. Likewise S. S. Smalley, “The Paraclete: Pneumatology in the Johannine Gospel and Apocalypse,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John*, ed. R. A. Culpepper and C. C. Black (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 291.

<sup>75</sup> For a full discussion of the literature on the Paraclete, see especially Burge, *Anointed Community*, 6–43. Brown’s summary of the proposed backgrounds for the Paraclete is also helpful (“The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel,” 119–26).

<sup>76</sup> See Schnackenburg, John, 3:74.

<sup>77</sup> The two occurrences of πιστεύετε in 14:1 could be parsed as indicatives (“You [pl.] believe”), but in view of the context it is more likely that they are imperatives (“Believe!”).

<sup>78</sup> The protasis of this third class conditional clause is Ἐὰν ἀγαπᾷτέ με (“If you love me”).

<sup>79</sup> The disciples’ faltering continued after Jesus was glorified; see Gal 2:11–14.

<sup>80</sup> So also F. J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, SP4 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 402.

<sup>81</sup> See Barrett, John, 461; Carson, John, 498–99; Westcott, John, 2:176.

<sup>82</sup> J.J. Suurmond, “The Ethical Influence of the Spirit of God” (Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1983), 241.

<sup>83</sup> Against Snaith, “The Meaning of ‘The Paraclete,’” 50.

<sup>84</sup> See the stress on ability and inability in John 3:1–12. A form of the word “can” or “able” [δυναμί] occurs six times there.

<sup>85</sup> See I. F. Wood, *The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature* (New York: Armstrong, 1904), 237.

<sup>86</sup> Barrett, John, 463. Similarly Morris, John, 576–77.

<sup>87</sup> Against Leaney, “The Historical Background and Theological

Meaning of the Paraclete," *Duke Divinity School Review* 37 (1972): 157.

<sup>88</sup> Jesus is called a Paraclete in 1 John 2:1. See A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960), 298; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 256; Brown, *John*, 644; Bultmann, *John*, 615; Carson, *John*, 500; Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort*, 243; Schnackenburg, *John*, 3:74–75.

<sup>89</sup> Abbott's suggestion that Jesus referred to "Another, a Spirit like yours [as] Paraclete [to you]" has not won wide support (Johannine Grammar, § 2793), nor have others like it (e.g., Michaelis, "Zur Herkunft des Johanneischen Paraklet-Titels," 153). For discussion, see Morris, *John*, 576 n. 43.

<sup>90</sup> For the Spirit and truth, see 1 John 4:6, "From this we know the Spirit of Truth and the spirit of error;" and 1 John 5:6 [ET 5:7], "And the Spirit is the one who testifies, because the Spirit is the Truth." Note the wording of John 14:16, "that he might be with you forever" (ἵνα μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ᾗ) with the wording of 2 John 2, "the Truth that abides in us and will be with us forever" (τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὴν μένουσαν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). In John 14:16 the Paraclete, who is named the Spirit of Truth in 14:17, will be with them forever, and in 14:17 he will be in them. In 2 John 2 the Truth "remains in us and will be with us forever."

<sup>91</sup> Morris, *John*, 577.

<sup>92</sup> Barrett, *John*, 463; Brown, *John*, 639.

<sup>93</sup> Beasley-Murray, *John*, 257.

<sup>94</sup> The potential such free renderings have to skew the meaning of passages is one reason that I do not like "dynamic equivalence" as a translation theory for Bibles that are going to be studied and interpreted. I much prefer the translation philosophy reflected in the ESV, the HCSB, and the NASB.

<sup>95</sup> See J. Breck, *Spirit of Truth*, vol. 1 (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991); O. Betz, *Der Paraklet, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums* (Leiden: Brill, 1963).

<sup>96</sup> The texts usually cited are T. Jud. 20:1–2,5 and 1QS 3:3,6–8,15–18; 4:20–23. For discussion of the Spirit in Judaism, see M. A. Elliott, *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 393–432; J. R. Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums*

und des Urchristentums 29 (New York: Brill, 1997); A. A. Anderson, "The Use of 'Ruah' in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM," JSS 7 (1962): 293–303. For John and Qumran, see R. E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," CBQ 17 (1955): 403–19; the essays in J. H. Charlesworth, ed., John and Qumran (London: Chapman, 1972); as well as L. Morris, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and St. John's Gospel," in Studies in the Fourth Gospel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 321–58.

<sup>97</sup> Barrett, John, 463; Morris notes that we have here "a coincidence of language, not thought" (John, 577 n. 46).

<sup>98</sup> Beasley-Murray, John, 257.

<sup>99</sup> C. M. Pate, Communities of the Last Days (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), 20.

<sup>100</sup> Johnston, The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John, 121.

<sup>101</sup> See Bultmann, John, 616; Barrett, John, 463; Schlatter, Johannes, 299.

<sup>102</sup> Carson, John, 500. Similarly Barrett, who writes, "παρ' ὑμῖν [with you], like μεθ' ὑμῶν [with you] (v. 16) suggests the presence of the Spirit in the church, ἐν ὑμῖν [in you] his indwelling in the individual Christian" (John, 463).

<sup>103</sup> See Holwerda, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John, 60; W. B. Hunt, "John's Doctrine of the Spirit," SWJT 8 (1965): 54; Westcott, John, 2:182.

<sup>104</sup> "These things I have spoken to you" (ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν) occurs in John 14:25; 15:11; 16:1,4a,6,25,33. Bernard comments, "In these Last Discourses the phrase ... recurs like a solemn refrain seven times ... just as ἐγὼ κύριος λελάληκα ["I the Lord have spoken"] recurs several times in Ezekiel (5<sup>13</sup>. 15. 17 6<sup>10</sup> 7<sup>21</sup>. 24 etc.)" (John, 485).

<sup>105</sup> Brown, John, 652.

<sup>106</sup> See J.Frey, Die johanneische Eschatologie: Das johanneische Zeitverständnis, Band II, WUNT 110(Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 223.

<sup>107</sup> This is the only place in John where the full Greek form, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ("the Holy Spirit"), occurs (Brown, John, 650; Westcott, John, 2:183).

<sup>108</sup> See the other uses of "in my name/in the Father's name" in John

5:43; 10:25; 12:13; 14:13,14; 15:16,21; 16:23,24,26; 17:6,11,12,26; 20:31.

<sup>109</sup> Brown, John, 651. Similarly Westcott, John, 2:183; Beasley-Murray, John, 261; Bultmann, John, 485 n. 1.

<sup>110</sup> In 14:26 the verb “remind” is *ὑπομιμνήσκω*. In 2:17,22 and 12:16 the related verb, “remember,” *μιμνήσκομαι* is used. The most thorough treatment of these narratorial comments in John is by G. Van Belle, *Les parenthèses dans l'Évangile de Jean*, SNTA 11 (Leuven: University Press, 1985). See also M. C. Tenney, “The Footnotes of John’s Gospel,” *BSac* 117 (1960): 350–63; J. J. O’Rourke, “Asides in the Gospel of John,” *NovT* 21 (1978–79): 210–19; T. Thatcher, “A New Look at Asides in the Fourth Gospel,” *BSac* 151 (1994): 428–39.

<sup>111</sup> See the argument for a “macro-chiasm” set forth by W. Brouwer, *The Literary Development of John 13–17: A Chiastic Reading*, SBLDS 182 (Atlanta: SBL, 2000).

<sup>112</sup> See Burge, *Anointed Community*, 214. Against Westcott, who takes 16:12–13 as a reference to a “point in [the apostles’] spiritual growth” (John, 2:223).

<sup>113</sup> See Bernard, John, 510; Brown, John, 708.

<sup>114</sup> John’s diction echoes Ps 24:5 (LXX; Hb., Eng. 25:5), *ὁδηγήσόν με ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλήθειάν σου καὶ διδάξόν με* ὅτι οὐ εἶ ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὠπτήρ μου καὶ σὲ *ὑπέμεινα* ὄλην τὴν ἡμέραν (“Lead me in your truth and teach me, for you are God, my Savior, and I wait for you all the day”). Also Ps 142:10 (LXX; Hb., Eng. 143:10), *δίδαξόν με* τοῦ ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημά σου ὅτι οὐ εἶ ὁ θεὸς μου *τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἀγαθὸν ὁδηγήσει με ἐν γῆ εὐθείᾳ* (“Teach me to do your will, for you are my God. Your good Spirit will lead me on level ground”); Rev 7:17, ὅτι *τὸ ἄρνιον* τὸ ἀνά μέσον τοῦ θρόνου ποιμανεῖ αὐτούς καὶ *ὁδηγήσει* αὐτούς ἐπὶ *ζωῆς πηγᾶς ὕδατος* (“for the lamb in the middle of the throne will shepherd them, and he will lead them to fountains of living water”); and Isa 63:14 (LXX), κατέβη πνεῦμα παρὰ κυρίου καὶ *ὠδήγησεν* αὐτούς οὕτως ἤγαγες τὸν λαὸν σου ποιήσαι σεαυτῷ ὄνομα *δόξης* (“The Spirit came down from the Lord and led them; thus you led your people to make for yourself a glorious name”). Also Ps 107:7; Acts 8:31.

<sup>115</sup> For similar references see the table, “Actions of God in John” p. 56.

<sup>116</sup> The ability to proclaim the future is uniquely God’s. (See particularly Isa 41:23, “Declare the things to come that we may know that

you are gods!" For discussion, see B. A. Ware, *God's Lesser Glory* [Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2000], 100–41). In John, the Father proclaims the future to John the Baptist (1:33), Jesus tells the disciples what will take place so that they will believe when His word comes to pass (13:19), and the Spirit will disclose things to come to the disciples (16:13). Brown points out, "Almost the same expression that John uses is found in the LXX of Isa xiv 7 where Yahweh challenges anyone else to declare the things that are to come" (John, 708). The text Brown alludes to reads, "and let them proclaim to you the things that are to come before they arrive!" καὶ τὰ ἐπερχόμενα πρὸ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν ἀναγγειλᾶτωσαν ὑμῖν (Isa 44:7; correspondences with John 16:13 underlined). See the similar arguments in E. W. Young, "A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel," ZNW 46 (1955): 224–27.

<sup>117</sup> Holwerda, *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John*, 62. Thus Holwerda takes the Spirit's declaration of "what is coming" to refer to: (1) the book of Revelation; (2) the meaning of salvation history; (3) the meaning of the work of the historical Jesus; (4) the exalted Jesus; (5) the coming Jesus; and (6) the NT. Most interpreters opt for one or more of these six items. See R. Hoefkamp, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel from the Viewpoint of Christ's Glorification," CTM 33 (1962): 528.

<sup>118</sup> Franck explains, "Glorifying, on the other hand, may be said to be the function which covers all the others and is their ultimate goal" (*Revelation Taught*, 74).

<sup>119</sup> See I. de la Potterie, "The Truth in Saint John," in *The Interpretation of John*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., ed. J. Ashton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 77.

<sup>120</sup> F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 320. Similarly U. Schnelle, "Johannes als Geisttheologe," *NovT* 40 (1998): 22.

<sup>121</sup> Bernard, *John*, 512; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 284.

<sup>122</sup> Also Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 2:223. Against Morris, who thinks that "the ὅταν that introduces the verse leaves the time indefinite" (*John*, 606).

<sup>123</sup> See Brown, *John*, 689. Although Burge says that John 15:26 is in "direct tension" with 16:7, he proceeds to clarify, "As Brown comments, there is no theological tension here. Jesus and the Father are one (10:30)." Then Burge cites Loisy's words: "They are variant formulas, not variant

ideas" (Anointed Community, 203, and n. 22). Carson gives the impression that he is disputing with Burge's position, but Carson and Burge seem to be saying the same thing. Carson explains, "The same sending can be described in various complementary ways" (John, 499).

<sup>124</sup> Similarly Moloney, John, 434.

<sup>125</sup> Note the language of the third paragraph of the Nicene Creed, *Και εἰς τὸ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ἍΓΙΟΝ, τὸ κύριον, (καὶ) τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ οὐν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συν προσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον* ("And [I believe] in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the one who makes alive, the one who goes out from the Father, the one who is worshiped and glorified with the Father and the Son") (my translation, Greek text from P.Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 3 vols. [New York: Harper & Brothers, 1896], 2:57–58). Carson helpfully notes, "The Evangelist ... cannot be thought to be speaking without reflection.... Thus although the clause 'who goes out from the Father' refers to the mission of the Spirit, in analogy with the mission of the Son, this is the mission of the Spirit who in certain respects replaces the Son, is sent by the Father and the Son, and belongs (so far as we can meaningfully use such ambiguous terminology) to the Godhead every bit as much as the Son. In short, the elements of a full-blown doctrine of the Trinity crop up repeatedly in the Fourth Gospel; and the early credal statement, complete with the filioque phrase, is eminently defensible, once we allow that this clause in 15:26 does not itself specify a certain ontological status, but joins with the matrix of Johannine Christology and pneumatology to presuppose it" (John, 529).

<sup>126</sup> Smalley, "'The Paraclete': Pneumatology in the Johannine Gospel and Apocalypse," 291.

<sup>127</sup> See Holwerda, *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John*, 53; J. C. Thomas, "The Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Spirit and the Mind*, ed. T. T. Cross and E. B. Powery (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2000), 100.

<sup>128</sup> For Jesus' ministry of conviction, see John 3:19–20; 4:16–18; [8:7]; 8:34; 9:39–41; 11:40; 12:7–8; 13:8,38. Similarly Bernard, John, 506; Turner, "Holy Spirit," in DJG, 349.

<sup>129</sup> For the view that John 16:8–11 does not refer to the world being proven guilty but to proof provided to believers to make them certain, see M. F. Berrouard, "Le Paraclet, défenseur du Christ devant la conscience du croyant (Jo XVI, 8–11)," *RSPT* 33 (1949): 361–89. Similarly Brown, John,

704–14; I. de la Potterie, *La Vérité dans Saint Jean*, 2 vols. (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977), 399–421; S. Lyonnet, “The Paraclete,” in *The Christian Lives by the Spirit*, by I. de la Potterie and S. Lyonnet, trans. J. Morris (New York: Alba House, 1971), 73–75; Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort*, 280–89.

130 See the similar construction in *Jude* 15, “to convict every soul concerning all their ungodly deeds” (ἐλέγξαι πᾶσαν ψυχὴν περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν). Less similar, but still close, is *Luke* 3:19, “being convicted by him concerning Herodias” (ἐλεγχόμενος ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ περὶ Ἡρωδιάδος).

131 *John* 3:20 reads, “For everyone who practices evil hates the light and does not come to the light, that his deeds might not be shown wrong” (πᾶς γὰρ ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων μισεῖ τὸ φῶς καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἐηγεχθῆ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ).

132 See E. Büchsel, “ἐγέγχω κτλ.,” in *TDNT*, 2:474.

133 Against Brown, *John*, 705, the righteousness and justice do not need to belong to the world for the world to be convicted concerning righteousness and judgment.

134 *BDAG*, 797.

135 Schlatter notes, “ἀμαρτία = ΓΑΝΩΝ, δικαιοσύνη = ΠΡΤΣ and κρίσις = ]” sind die aneinander gebundenen zentralen Anliegen der vom Pharisäismus bestimmten Frömmigkeit” [“... are bound together as central concerns of the piety determined by the Pharisees”] (*Johannes*, 311). Similarly Westcott, *John*, 2:219–20.

136 A number of interpreters take the ὅτι clauses as explicative (in that) rather than as causal (because). See the summary in Carson, “The Function of the Paraclete in *John* 16:7–11,” 549–58. Even if the ὅτι clauses are explicative, however, their function is to explain—give the reason why the world is guilty.

137 Jesus is the one in whom there is no unrighteousness (ἀδικία), see *John* 7:18.

138 This seems to be what Carson means by the world's (wrong ideas about) righteousness (see “The Function of the Paraclete in *John* 16:7–11,” 558–65).

139 See Barrett, who directs attention here to *Rom* 3:21–31 (*John*,

488). Beasley-Murray also points to the cross (John, 282).

<sup>140</sup> For the position that the righteousness in view is that possessed by Jesus in view of His origin, see W. Stenger, "Δικαιοσύνη in Jo. XVI 8.10," Nov T. 21 (1979): 2–10. Brown thinks that the vindication of Jesus' righteousness is in view (John, 712); so also Burge, Anointed Community, 210.

<sup>141</sup> I have translated the αὐτὸν (lit., "him") in John 13:32 as a reflexive, "God will glorify himself in Him" (rather than the NASB's "God will glorify him in him") because John elsewhere uses αὐτόν as a reflexive: Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς ("Jesus did not entrust himself [lit., "him"] to them," 2:24). See E. A. Abbott, Johannine Grammar (London: Black, 1906), 279 § 2374: "Αὐτὸν ... John uses it always to mean 'himself.'"

<sup>142</sup> See Beasley-Murray, John, 282.

<sup>143</sup> Brown, John, 713.

<sup>144</sup> Jesus was obediently righteous in going to the cross. See John 10:17–18, "For this reason the Father loves me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it up again. No one takes it from me, but I lay it down on my own. I have authority to lay it down, and I have authority to take it up again. This command I received from my Father." Cp. 12:27–28.

<sup>145</sup> Similarly Morris, John, 620.

<sup>146</sup> Brown, John, 711.

<sup>147</sup> Holwerda, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John, 58.

<sup>148</sup> See de la Potterie, "The Truth in Saint John," 73.

<sup>149</sup> See Burge, Anointed Community, 210.

<sup>150</sup> Other temporal indicators are the future verbs in 14:17,26; 15:26–27; 16:8 and ὅταν ("when") in 15:26 and 16:13.

<sup>151</sup> See e.g., Bernard, John, 284–85.

<sup>152</sup> The statements that use the word ἀναβαίνω, "go up, ascend", "have the ascension in view, see 3:13; 6:62; 20:17 (See Bernard: "ἀναβαίνειν ... never refers to the Crucifixion, but to the Ascension" John, 217]). Those that use the words δοξάζω, "glorify," and ὑψόω, "exalt," primarily have the cross in view (for δοξάζω see 7:39; 12:16, 23; 13:31–32; ὑψόω see 3:14 [2x]; 8:28; 12:32,34). The verb ἀνέρχομαι (go away) is

used twice in John 16:7, and these probably refer to the cross since grief is filling the disciples' hearts (16:6). The statements with ἀνάγω ("go away, depart, return") probably indicate both the cross and Jesus' return to the place from whence he came, i.e., His ascension (see 7:33; 8:14,21,22; 13:3,33; 14:4,5,28; 16:5,10,17). G. C. Nicholson unsuccessfully argues that all of these refer primarily to Jesus' "return to the Father" ("To Your Advantage": The Lifting up of Jesus and the Descent-Ascent Schema in the Fourth Gospel" [Ph. D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1980]).

<sup>153</sup> Burge, Anointed Community, 148.

<sup>154</sup> Holwerda, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John, 17. Holwerda says this because in his view, "It is not possible to restrict it [glorification] to this event [the cross]" (p. 11).

<sup>155</sup> S. Booth shows that the crucifixion is the climactic episode of the Gospel of John (Selected Peak Marking Features in the Gospel of John, American University Studies 7, Theology and Religion 178 [New York: Peter Lang, 1996], 119, 121). Against Holwerda, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John, 17. Rightly Guthrie, New Testament Theology, 529.

<sup>156</sup> Beasley-Murray, John, 378.

<sup>157</sup> Burge, Anointed Community, 133 (italics his).

<sup>158</sup> Beasley-Murray writes, "John is not recording in vv 19–23 something that took place in five minutes on the first Easter Sunday evening. In briefest compass he summarizes the acts of the risen Lord, bringing together sayings and happenings uttered and performed in the Easter period. ... The Fourth Evangelist does not specify the Easter events according to chronology" (John, 382). Against this, it seems that John does mean to present what takes place here as having happened on the day of the resurrection. See John 20:19, "Then when it was evening, on that day, the first day of the week" (emphasis added). Carson provides a helpful clarification here, "John is undoubtedly selecting and moulding and explaining the history he reports, but he is not trying to write a theological treatise which uses history in purely symbolic ways" (Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994], 142).

<sup>159</sup> For discussion of the use of this verb (ἐμφυσάω) in Gen 2:7; Ezek 37:9; and John 20:22. see Appendix 1, "The Use of ἐμφυσάω in John 20:22."

160 On the connection between the giving of the Spirit and the forgiveness and retention of sins, see [chapter six](#).

161 Dunn, πνεῦμα," in NIDNTT, 3:704; Burge, Anointed Community, 133.

162 The interpretation of John 20:22 as an "acted parable" or as a "symbolic promise" to explain how John 20:22 fits with Acts 2 was condemned as heretical at the fifth ecumenical council in AD 553 (see NPNF<sup>2</sup> vol. XIV, 315). Nevertheless, a number of recent evangelicals have endorsed this interpretation. See Carson, John, 651–55; A.J. Köstenberger, Encountering John (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 186; G. E. Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament, revised and ed. by D. A. Hagner (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 325; Thomas, "The Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," 104; B. Witherington, John's Wisdom (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 340.

163 Bernard, John, 516, 677. Blomberg, The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel, 267; Morris, John, 748; id., Jesus is the Christ, 165–67.

164 If the cross is Jesus' departure, there is no problem with His being present when he bestows the Spirit in 20:22, against Holwerda, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John, 23.

165 Rightly J. L. Kipp, "The Relationship between the Conceptions of 'Holy Spirit' and 'Risen Christ' in the Fourth Gospel" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1967), 147.

166 Dunn thinks we should recognize that the death, resurrection, ascension, and the gift of the Spirit form a single theological unity, which "should render unnecessary any attempt to achieve a chronological or theological harmonization of Jn. 20:22 with Acts 2" (Dunn, "Spirit," in NIDNTT, 3:704). There is no need for harmonization in this case, for the two events clearly take place on different occasions (resurrection day, Pentecost) and are different experiences of the Spirit (indwelling is not to be equated with filling, see below). There would only be need for harmonization if John 20:22 and Acts 2 were conflicting accounts of the same experience, which they are not.

167 F. F. Bruce, The Book of the Acts, rev.ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 100.

168 On the "baptism" of the Samaritans in Acts 10 Bruce writes, "Apart

from such external manifestations, none of the Jewish believers present, perhaps not even Peter himself, would have been so ready to accept the reality of the Spirit's coming upon them" (Acts, 217).

<sup>169</sup> Similarly F. R. Harm, "Structural Elements Related to the Gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts," *Concordia Journal* 14 (1988): 28, 38.

<sup>170</sup> So also Bernard with less detail: "The Day of Pentecost is described in Acts 2 as a Day when a special gift of spiritual power was manifested, and there is nothing in Jn. which is inconsistent with such a manifestation" (John, 516).

<sup>171</sup> Beasley-Murray, John, 382 (emphasis his).

<sup>172</sup> See Bernard, "The action and words of Jesus here are a complete fulfilment of the promise of the Paraclete" (John, 677).

<sup>173</sup> Max Turner, "The Concept of Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel," *VE* 10 (1977): 34 (emphasis his).

# **Chapter 5**

**THE SPIRIT WAS NOT YET GIVEN**

# Introduction

Chapter 2 surveyed the various positions taken on whether or not old covenant believers were indwelt by the Holy Spirit. Chapter 3 argued that the Old Testament does not present its faithful as indwelt by the Holy Spirit. Chapter 4 provided an overview of the Holy Spirit in the Gospel of John. We now turn our attention to what John says about the Spirit in salvation history.<sup>1</sup> The objective of this chapter is to set John 7:39 against Old Testament expectation in order to demonstrate that John presents the reception of the indwelling Spirit by believers as an eschatological blessing only experienced after the glorification of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> As George Ladd put it, the reception of the indwelling Spirit indicates that “the eschatological experiences associated with the age to come have reached back into the present age.”<sup>3</sup>

This chapter aims to show that the indwelling of the Spirit is the fulfillment of an eschatological hope promised in the Old Testament (e.g., Isa 32:15; 44:3; Ezek 37:14; 39:29; Joel 3:1–2[Eng. 2:28–29]). Another aspect of the Old Testament’s eschatological hope is the coming of a Spirit-anointed Messiah<sup>4</sup> (Isa 61:1). Certain texts suggest that the Messiah would bring the Spirit to His people (e.g., Isa 48:16).<sup>5</sup> John presents Jesus as the fulfillment and fulfiller of these hopes. The lines of expectation converge in Jesus, the Spirit-anointed Messiah (John 1:33), who

ushers in the eschaton and gives the Spirit to His people (20:22) after His glorification (7:39).<sup>6</sup>

The logic of this chapter proceeds from four premises to the conclusion:

1. The Old Testament expected both a Spiritanointed Messiah and a renewal by the Holy Spirit in the last days (e.g., Isa61:1; Ezek 37:14).
2. John presents Jesus as the Spiritanointed Messiah (John 1:32–33; 3:34), who inaugurates the age to come (4:23; 5:25) and gives the Spirit to those who believe in Him (15:26; 20:22).
3. To the existing expectation of the eschatological reception of the Holy Spirit, John adds that this reception of the Spirit awaits the glorification of Jesus (7:39).
4. In chapter three I have argued that the Old Testament does not present its faithful as individually indwelt by the Spirit.
5. The conclusion follows that only believers who live in the age when the Spiritanointed, Spirit-bestowing Messiah has come and been glorified can be indwelt by the Holy Spirit.<sup>7</sup>

The veracity of this argument depends upon whether each premise is sound and whether the conclusion drawn from these premises follows. The present chapter seeks to

validate this argument.

After making the argument from John 7:39 that old covenant saints were not indwelt by the Holy Spirit, we will consider whether this understanding of the Spirit in salvation history resonates with the rest of the New Testament.

# The Old Testament Expectation

The aim here is to show that the Old Testament gave rise to eschatological hopes for a Spiritanointed Messiah and a renewal by God's Spirit.<sup>8</sup> After considering the hope for a Spiritanointed Messiah, we will discuss the evidence for the hope of renewal by the Spirit. Then we will briefly consider messianic expectations in first century Judaism that resulted from the Old Testament's proclamation.

## The Coming Messiah

This section will draw attention to three elements in the promises given by Yahweh to His people that are essential for understanding the significance of Jesus' life according to John. The Old Testament indicated that God would raise up for His people an anointed ruler in the last days. These three elements can be most clearly seen in the prophecies of Isaiah: (1) the coming ruler, (2) His being anointed with the Spirit of God, and (3) His inauguration of a new epoch characterized by the reversal of the curse (Gen 3). What follows will focus on the development of these elements in Isaiah.<sup>9</sup>

Israel was promised a figure who would vanquish evil (Gen 3:15).<sup>10</sup> This figure would speak the words of God to

the people (Deut 18:18) and be an anointed, Davidic King, who would reign forever in peace and righteousness (2 Sam 7:13; Ps 72:1-4). Moses had specified that Israel's king would be chosen by Yahweh (Deut 17:15), just as David was (1 Sam 13:14; 16:3). While Moses had also specified that priests were to be anointed (Exod 29:7), apparently the practice of anointing came to be associated with king-making (Judg 9:8,15).<sup>11</sup> Yahweh commands Samuel to anoint Saul as ruler of Israel (1 Sam 9:16) and later to anoint David: "So Samuel took the horn of oil, anointed him in the presence of his brothers, and the Spirit of Yahweh took control of [lit., "rushed to"] David from that day forward. Then Samuel set out and went to Ramah. Now the Spirit of Yahweh had left [lit., "left from being with"] Saul, and an evil spirit sent from Yahweh began to torment him" (1 Sam 16:13-14).<sup>12</sup> David was promised that his descendant would sit on his throne and be peculiarly anointed of Yahweh (e.g., 2 Sam 7; Pss 2; 45; 72; 110). The fact that the Spirit came on David when he was anointed engendered the expectation that if David's son was to be the anointed of Yahweh, he too would have the Spirit.

Isaiah reveals further details regarding the anointed son of David. Particularly significant is the close link between the Spirit of Yahweh and the longed-for messianic King. In Isaiah 4 a day is prophesied when "the Branch of Yahweh will be beautiful and glorious" (4:2), and as a renewed creation is ushered in "He will cause the bloodstains of

Jerusalem to be cleansed from the midst of her by the Spirit of Judgment and the Spirit of Burning” (4:4).<sup>13</sup>

The future prophecy of Isaiah 11 again links a “branch” (11:1) with “the Spirit of Yahweh” (11:2).<sup>14</sup> The new creation language in the immediate context, the uniquely anointed Davidic ruler who will reign in absolute righteousness (11:2–5), hunters and hunted resting together, and the seed of woman and serpent at peace with one another (11:6–9; see Gen 3:15) confirm that Isaiah is speaking eschatologically. Thus, the “in that day” in verse 10 is not contrasted with but continuing the prophecy found in the first 9 verses of the chapter.

This same joining of eschatology, Yahweh's Spirit, and the promise of a (Branch) Messiah found in Isa 4:2–4 and 11:1–2 is also in Isa 61 (see 42:1). The chapter begins, “The Spirit of the Lord Yahweh is upon me, because Yahweh has anointed [māšāḥ] me” (61:1), and closes with “For as the earth brings forth its growth [šimḥāh, also “branch”], and as a garden enables what is sown to grow [tašmîaḥ], so the Lord Yahweh will cause righteousness and praise to grow [yašmîaḥ] before all the nations” (61:11). At the very least we can say that in his repetition of the root šmḥ Isaiah probably intended an allusion to 4:2, where his only other use of the term “branch” (šemaḥ) occurs.<sup>15</sup> That “branch” (šemaḥ) is a term laden with messianic overtones can be seen from the way later prophets take up the theme (see Jer 23:5; 33:15; Zech

3:8; 6:12).<sup>16</sup> Most significant, however, is the clear connection between the "Spirit of the Lord Yahweh" and the anointing from Yahweh in v. 1. Here the Spirit is a direct result of the anointing from Yahweh. Thus to be the anointed of Yahweh (Messiah, derived from māšāḥ) is to possess the Spirit of Yahweh.

Several items in the chapter locate this prophecy in the eschaton. The One on whom the Spirit rests has been anointed by Yahweh "to proclaim the year of Yahweh's favor, and the day of our God's vengeance, to comfort all who mourn" (61:2). He will grant gladness and praise in Zion, when the planting of Yahweh will have grown into oaks of righteousness (61:3; cp. 6:13). The year of favor and day of vengeance promise restoration for Israel and the subjugation of the enemies of the people of God (61:4–5). Also significant in this context is the promise that Yahweh "will make an everlasting covenant with them" (61:8).

David's anointing, with the Spirit of Yahweh rushing on him (1 Sam 16:13), is paradigmatic for the anointing of David's greater Son (Ps 2:2; 110:1). Central to the discussion of these messianic texts from Isaiah is that in each context three items are prominent: the ruler, the Spirit of Yahweh, and the time. In Isa 4, 11, and 61 the coming Messiah is seen as uniquely anointed with Yahweh's Spirit and ushering in the eschatological "day"<sup>17</sup>

## The Outpouring of the Spirit

The Spirit-anointed Messiah is an eschatological concept. Because some have appealed to certain texts that speak of the outpouring of the Spirit to support the view that old covenant believers were indwelt, it is important to highlight the eschatological nature of these promises.

Several times the Old Testament promises that the Spirit will be poured out (e.g., Isa 32:15; Ezek 36:27; 39:29; Joel 3:1–2[Eng. 2:28–29]; and Zech 12:10; see also Isa 44:3; Ezek 11:19; 37:14.). These promises are eschatological. In some cases the context indicates that when the Spirit is poured out the Messiah will have come.

Isaiah 32 opens with the proclamation, “Behold the King will rule for righteousness” (32:1). G. W. Grogan notes, “The reader almost inevitably makes a link with the picture of the righteous messianic King given in chapter 11.”<sup>18</sup> Isaiah proclaims the blessings that will come when this King reigns by contrasting that time with the time in which he speaks (32:1–5; see *lo’* ... *’ôd* “no longer” v. 5). He then calls his contemporaries to repentance (32:9–12) and states that the devastation will continue (32:13–14), “until [’ad] the Spirit is poured out upon us from on high” (32:15).<sup>19</sup> The blessings of that time are then described (32:15–20). The description of the King’s reign and the outpoured Spirit are so far reaching that they are most

easily understood as eschatological blessings (32:15–20). As Childs states, “A new age results in which both the natural world and human society are transformed.”<sup>20</sup>

The eschatological context of Yahweh putting His Spirit among the people in Ezek 36:27 has been discussed in chapter 3. Ezekiel 39:28–29 similarly speaks of the eschatological regathering of the people and the pouring out of the Spirit. Between these two promises is another promise that when the Spirit is poured out “My servant David will be King over them, and there will be one shepherd for all of them” (37:24). The three themes of the glorious future, the Davidic King, and the outpouring of the Spirit are in Ezekiel as well.

The eschatological outpouring of Joel 3:1–2(Eng. 2:28–29) is set vaguely in the future, “after this” (3:1 [2:28]). The outpouring of the Spirit promised in Zech 12:10 follows the destruction of the nations who oppose Jerusalem (12:9), and the recipients of the Spirit “will look on Me whom they pierced, and they will wail because of Me, like one wails for an only son ...” (12:10).

Each passage locates the outpouring of the Spirit in the future, and several contain messianic elements. The texts discussed here are not the only messianic promises in the Old Testament but have been selected because they bring together the Spirit, the Messiah, and the age to come.<sup>21</sup> From such texts Adolf Schlatter concludes, “Prophetic

pronouncements did not describe merely the Christ as the bearer of the divine Spirit; they also cast the endtime community as filled by him."<sup>22</sup>

The prophecies of the One anointed with Yahweh's Spirit who brings in the eschaton were never presented to the people as a clear portrait (see Isa 6:9–10; 8:16–18). Given the mysterious and partial nature of what the prophets announced, we should not be surprised by the variety of expectations built on their proclamations. Not even those Jesus chose to be His apostles had put together a full picture of what God would do (Mark 8:31–10:45). In what follows, we are not seeking to show uniform messianic hope, but universal messianic hope.

## **The Contemporary Expectation**

The religious milieu at the time that the Word became flesh (John 1:14) was rife with hope for a figure such as the texts seen in the previous section describe.<sup>23</sup> This section will highlight expectations that reflect the themes noted above: a Messiah anointed by the Spirit of God who would appear in the latter days.<sup>24</sup> This brief survey will note texts in the Pseudepigrapha, the Qumran scrolls, and the New Testament.

These three bodies of literature are employed because they represent a broad spectrum of religious opinion. The

Pseudepigrapha reflects the way that some, perhaps even many, religious Jews read the Old Testament. The Qumran scrolls represent Old Testament interpretation done by a conservative group of Jews who separated themselves from the rest of the nation in expectation of the last days.<sup>25</sup> And the New Testament is the witness borne by a group of Christians who believed that their messianic expectations based on the Old Testament had been fulfilled in Jesus. At several places, the early chapters of Acts in particular, they are seen seeking to persuade their contemporaries that Jesus is the Messiah on the basis of commonly held messianic expectations.

**Evidence from the Pseudepigrapha.** Psalm of Solomon 17, a hymn to the anticipated Messiah,<sup>26</sup> reflects the hope for a Spiritfilled ruler based on the promise given in Isa 11:2. The psalm identifies the Messiah as "the son of David" (17:21), who is said to be "free from sin" (17:36) and "weak in his days because of his God, for God wrought in him ability by the holy spirit" (17:37).<sup>27</sup> The blessing pronounced upon "those born in those days" (17:44) suggests that this hope is eschatological. Thus the three elements seen in Isaiah-Messiah, Spirit, and the last days-are also present in Psalm of Solomon 17.<sup>28</sup>

**Evidence from the Qumran Scrolls.** Although some discontinuity exists between the expectations reflected among the various writings, there is evidence in the Qumran literature of a messianic hope, that the end time

is near, and that an outpouring of the Spirit of God is expected.

The Qumran community conceived of themselves as living in the last days (see "The Damascus Document"). They described their time as "the last generation" (CD 1:12) and "the age/time of wickedness" (CD 6:10,14; 12:23; 15:7).<sup>29</sup> Among the reasons for their withdrawal to the desert is a desire to "be segregated from within the dwelling of the men of sin to walk to the desert in order to open there His path. As it is written: 'In the desert, prepare the way of \*\*\*\*, straighten in the steppe a roadway for our God'" (1QS 8:13–14; citing Isa 40:3).<sup>30</sup> The expectation of cleansing from God by "the spirit of truth" is seen in 1QS 4:20–22. Messianic hope is reflected in 1QS 9:11 (apparently they expected two messiahs and perhaps a prophet).<sup>31</sup> While there appears to be some variation between these writings, the Old Testament prophecies had created expectations for a Messiah and a better age to come.<sup>32</sup>

**Evidence from the New Testament.** In his effort to persuade his audience on the day of Pentecost that "God made this Jesus both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:36), Luke records that Peter made several connections between Jesus and the ancient promises given to Israel: that the last days have begun (2:17); that Jesus was a man "having been attested to by God" (2:22); that He had "received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father"

(2:33); and that the Spirit is now available through Jesus the Messiah to all who declare their allegiance to Him (2:38). On another occasion, Peter spoke of "Jesus of Nazareth, how God anointed Him with the Holy Spirit and power" (10:38). It seems evident that Peter bases his appeal on commonly held messianic expectations. For the first time in Scripture, it is proclaimed that God's people can now receive God's Spirit (2:38). Unique individuals in Israel's history have had the Spirit (e.g., Joshua, Num 27:18), but when an individual has the Spirit in the Old Testament, it is precisely the Spirit that marks that individual as in some way exceptional among God's people.<sup>33</sup> The reception of the Spirit was prophesied in the Old Testament (e.g., Ezek 36:26–27), but never before had it been proclaimed that now those who would repent and be baptized could receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

From this discussion of the Old Testament, first century Jewish Literature, and the New Testament, I consider the first premise in the argument of this chapter established. The Old Testament expected an eschatological, Spiritanointed Messiah as well as a deeper experience of the Spirit in the age brought about by the Messiah's coming.

# Jesus in John's Gospel

The focus of this section is on John's presentation of Jesus as the fulfillment of the Old Testament expectation for an eschatological Messiah (see 20:31).<sup>34</sup> John presents Jesus (1) being anointed by the Spirit, (2) speaking by the power of the Spirit, and (3) ushering in the eschaton.<sup>35</sup> This section will place particular emphasis on the Messiah's role as the possessor of the Spirit.

## The Spirit-Anointed Messiah

All four Gospels record that the Spirit descended upon Jesus in the form of a dove (Matt 3:16; Mark 1:10; Luke 1:22).<sup>36</sup> The Synoptics record that this took place after Jesus was baptized by John. The Fourth Gospel does not recount Jesus' baptism, but reports the descent of the Spirit in the form of a dove as part of the Baptist's testimony to Jesus (John 1:32). John saw this take place and solemnly testified to what he saw (see John 1:32–34).<sup>37</sup> Most significant for this discussion, however, is what John saw and proclaimed.

The Baptist declared that he saw the Spirit “come down” and “remain on” Jesus (1:32).<sup>38</sup> This is the sign given him by the One who sent him to baptize in water so that the Baptist would be certain that, “This is the One who will

baptize in the Holy Spirit" (1:33). The Spirit is the decisive marker of the Messiah to whom John testifies—apart from this he would not be known (1:31,33).<sup>39</sup>

The Spirit not only comes down upon Jesus, but remains on Him (note the verb *menō* three times in 1:32–33). Here and in 3:34, where Jesus is said to have the Spirit "without measure," the evangelist emphasizes the unique manner in which Messiah Jesus has the Spirit.<sup>40</sup> Formerly the Spirit came down upon those engaged in particular tasks, but He did not abide continually on them (see the discussion in chapter 3).<sup>41</sup>

The Baptist testifies, "I have seen and I have borne witness that this is the Son of God" (1:34; see 2 Sam 7:14).<sup>42</sup> Here "Son of God" seems to be equated with "the One who will baptize in the Holy Spirit" (1:33).<sup>43</sup> Both of these designations work with others in the context ("Messiah" in v. 41; "King of Israel" in v. 49) to present Jesus as the awaited Messiah.<sup>44</sup> His anointing as the Messiah occurred when the Spirit came down upon Him (1:32–34).<sup>45</sup> As the Spirit-anointed Messiah, Jesus would baptize with the Holy Spirit (1:33), ministering the Spirit to His people.<sup>46</sup> Since the coming of the anointed Messiah and the pouring out of the Spirit on God's people are eschatological realities, their arrival means "that the promised age is dawning."<sup>47</sup> As C. K. Barrett states, "Jesus has the Spirit in order that he may confer it; and it is the

gift of the Spirit that pre-eminently distinguishes the new dispensation from the old (see v. 26f.); it belongs neither to Judaism nor even to John [the Baptist]."<sup>48</sup> John the evangelist presents Jesus as the Messiah promised in the Old Testament.<sup>49</sup>

## **The Spirit Empowered Messiah**

The next hint that the relationship between Jesus and the Spirit is unique comes at John 3:34– “For the One whom God sent speaks the words of God, for He gives the Spirit not from measure.” While some conclude that the One whom God sent (i.e., Jesus) gives the Spirit as He speaks the words of God,<sup>50</sup> this is unlikely in view of the context,<sup>51</sup> which emphasizes Jesus' greatness. The Baptist testifies that he is not the Christ (3:28), nor the bridegroom (3:29), and that while Jesus must increase, he must decrease (3:30). Whether the words of the Baptist or the evangelist,<sup>52</sup> vv. 31–36 continue the comparison and contrast between Jesus and the Baptist. Jesus, the One who comes from heaven, is above all. He testifies to what He has seen and heard, utters words of God, is loved by the Father, and has received “all things into His hand.” Verses 32–33 concern the significance of the rejection or reception of Jesus' testimony, and v. 34 explains why the reception of His testimony signifies that God is true (3:33). Whereas the Baptist can receive only what is given him from heaven (3:27) because he is from the earth and

speaks as one from the earth (3:31), God gives the Spirit without measure to Jesus (3:34), who is from heaven (3:31). It is not Jesus but God who gives the Spirit in 3:34,<sup>53</sup> which fits with 3:35– “The Father loves the Son and has given all things into His hand.”<sup>54</sup> God is the giver throughout this passage.<sup>55</sup>

Jesus is the Messiah upon whom the Spirit remains (1:32–34). Not only is Jesus anointed, He is empowered to proclaim the words of God because He has the Spirit in full (3:34). Just as there was probably a contrast intended by the emphasis on the Spirit remaining upon Jesus (1:32–33), here too there is likely a contrast between the unmeasured Spirit upon Jesus and those who received “portions” of the Spirit in the past (cp. 2 Kgs 2:9, where Elisha is concerned to receive a “double portion” of Elijah’s spirit).<sup>56</sup>

There could also be a contrast in Johannine literature between the way Jesus has the Spirit and the way believers have the Spirit. According to John 3:34, “God sent Him, and He speaks God’s words, since He gives the Spirit without measure [ou gar ek metrou didōsin to pneuma].” Whereas Jesus has the Spirit without measure, 1 John 4:13 declares, “In this we know that we remain in Him and He in us, because He has given to us from His Spirit [hoti ek tou pneumatou autou dedōken hēmin]” (cp. 1 John 3:24). Unlike those who believe, Jesus has the Spirit without measure, for “the One who comes from above is

above all ... the One who comes from heaven is above all” (3:31).

Jesus' possession of the Spirit plays a significant role in John's argument that He is the Messiah who fulfills Old Testament expectation.<sup>57</sup> The Old Testament prophesied an eschaton of the Spirit ushered in by the Spiritfilled Messiah. John presents Jesus as that Spiritfilled Messiah who will bestow the Spirit on His people (1:33). The corollary to this conclusion is that prior to the coming of the Messiah who will pour out the Spirit in the last days, the people of God do not experience the eschatological blessing of the indwelling Spirit.

# The Coming Hour That Now Is

The purpose of this section is to explore what John believed, based on what he learned from Jesus, about the eschatological age that had dawned.<sup>58</sup> That the age to come had dawned during Jesus' ministry is clearly seen at several places in John's Gospel (e.g., 4:23; 5:24–25; 6:47; 17:3). First, in response to the Samaritan woman's question about the place of worship,<sup>59</sup> Jesus declared that “an hour comes and now is when the true worshipers will worship the Father in Spirit and truth” (John 4:23), indicating that a change had taken place in the nature of reality as a result of His coming. A salvation-historical transition had already begun.

What is significant for us about these words in John 4:23 is that Jesus contrasts worship at concrete locations, Gerizim and Jerusalem, with worship that takes place in the realm of the spirit and truth.<sup>60</sup> The time for the former has ceased, while the time for the latter has come. The present apparently contains an element of the future, yet there is more to come. D. A. Carson is particularly helpful here.

To worship the Father ‘in spirit and truth’ clearly means much more than worship without necessary ties to particular holy places (though it cannot mean

any less). The prophets spoke of a time when worship would no longer be focused on a single, central sanctuary, when the earth would be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. The Apocalypse concludes with a vision of the consummated kingdom, the new Jerusalem, in which there is no temple to be found, 'because the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are its temple' (Rev. 21:22). The fulfillment of that vision has not yet arrived in its fullness. Even so, Jesus insists, through his own mission the hour was dawning.<sup>61</sup>

Prior to His teaching on worship in Spirit and truth, Jesus had spoken to the woman of "the gift of God" and of "living water" that He was able to provide (4:10). The only other passage in John's Gospel that brings both "living water" and "Spirit" together is 7:37–39.<sup>62</sup> Jesus proclaims, "If anyone thirsts he must come to Me and he must drink. The one who believes in Me, just as the Scripture says, from his belly shall flow rivers of living water." John explains, "and this He spoke concerning the Spirit, which those who had believed in Him were about to receive; for the Spirit was not yet given,<sup>63</sup> because Jesus was not yet glorified" (7:39).

It is likely that the only other references to "living water" in the Gospel, those at 4:10–14, can also be taken to be "concerning the Spirit."<sup>64</sup> In both 4:23 and 7:39, immediately after referring to "living water" Jesus speaks

of a new age characterized by the Spirit. Allowing these two passages to be read in light of one another could also shed light on the question of whether the "belly" the living waters flow from in 7:38 is that of Jesus or the believer.<sup>65</sup> John may be intentionally ambiguous here, such that the reader could understand the water to come from both Jesus and the believer. This seems to be warranted from John's account of Jesus' words to the Samaritan woman. In 4:10, the source of the water is clearly Jesus, but in 4:14 "the water that I will give to him will become in him a well of water, springing up to eternal life." So too in 7:38, the source of the water is Jesus, but the water can then be understood to flow from the believer.<sup>66</sup>

There appears to be a temporal tension between the two passages. In 4:23 the time for "worship in Spirit and truth" has already come, whereas in 7:39 the fulfillment "was not yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified." This tension, however, is only apparent, for the element of fulfillment in 4:23 is that created by the presence of Jesus,<sup>67</sup> who offers the gift of God (4:10), the coming Spirit that those who had believed were yet to receive (7:39).<sup>68</sup> Fulfillment had begun in Jesus, but would be completed with the still future (at the time of John 4 and 7) gift of the Spirit.<sup>69</sup> The Word becoming flesh in Jesus (1:14) marked an expected hour that had come (4:23). The time for physically localized centers of worship had come to an end.<sup>70</sup> The time of worship in Spirit and truth

had begun (4:23) and yet still awaited a greater fullness to be experienced when Jesus was glorified (7:39). <sup>71</sup>

The epoch that was ending when Jesus spoke (4:21–24) was one in which God was worshiped in Jerusalem at the temple (see Deut 12:5; Ps 84:10[Hb. 84:11]).<sup>72</sup> The Spirit of God did not then inhabit each individual believer; the temple was His dwelling place.<sup>73</sup> In the Gospel of John, Jesus replaces the temple (2:18–21), and the time for worship in Jerusalem is over (4:21).<sup>74</sup> The blessings formerly mediated by the temple are administered by Jesus (e.g., 4:10–14; 7:37–39), and when He goes away the Spirit of God takes up residence in a new temple, each individual believer (7:39; 14:17; 20:22; cp. 1 Cor 6:19; see further [chapter 6](#)).

# The Spirit Was Not Yet Given

The thesis of this section is a central tenet not only for this chapter but for the argument of this study as a whole. John's distinctive contribution to the biblical promise of the eschatological Spirit was that the Spirit expected in the messianic age would be received only after Jesus was glorified (7:39).<sup>75</sup> The first thing to establish is whether or not John 7:39 has indwelling in view.

According to John 20:22, Jesus "exhaled and said, 'Receive [labete] the Holy Spirit.'"<sup>76</sup> When John 7:39 speaks of "the Spirit, whom those who had believed in Him were about to receive [lambanein]," it is natural to conclude that the reception of the Spirit occurring in 20:22 is the one expected in 7:39. There is no other account of a reception of the Spirit in the Gospel.

The question is whether the reception of the Spirit referred to in 7:39 is in fact the reception of the indwelling Spirit. In John 14:15–17, Jesus tells His disciples that while the world is not able to receive (labein) the Spirit, the Spirit is with the disciples and will be in them (14:17). The contrast between the disciples and the world turns on the disciples' ability to receive the Spirit. Since the reception of the Spirit results in His being in the disciples until the end of the age, the reception of the Spirit in John 7:39 is the event Jesus promises in 14:17. The same verb *lambanō*,

“receive,” is used in all three texts (7:39; 14:17; and 20:22). But what did Jesus mean when He said the Spirit would be “in them”?

Not only does Jesus become the new temple according to John 2:18–21, but in John 7:37–38 Jesus claims that He fulfills what the temple rites foreshadowed. Moloney explains, “Within the context of a Jewish feast marked by libations and the promise of the coming Messiah who will repeat the Mosaic gift of water Jesus presents himself as the source of living water.”<sup>77</sup> When Jesus stands and cries out on the last and greatest day of the feast that anyone who is thirsty should come to Him and drink (7:37; cp. Isa 55:1), He appears to be directly addressing the water pouring ceremony that took place at the feast of tabernacles (see m. Sukkah 4:9).<sup>78</sup> The necessity for the people of God to participate in Israel's national worship has been replaced by the necessity to come to Jesus and drink from Him (note the imperatives in 7:37),<sup>79</sup> that is, to believe in Him (ho pisteuōn eis eme, 7:38). Finding in Jesus what was formerly available through Israel's national celebration is the fulfillment of Old Testament eschatological promises. The phrase “just as the Scripture says” is difficult because no Old Testament text says precisely this. Several Old Testament texts speak of waters flowing from the temple (Ezek 47:1–12; Joel 4:18; Zech 14:8), and these may be in view here since the indwelling of the Spirit makes believers the eschatological temple (see 14:17; 1 Cor 6:19).<sup>80</sup>

Though much about these verses is debated, several things are certain about John 7:37–39. First, John states, “This He spoke concerning the Spirit” (7:39a).<sup>81</sup> The demonstrative pronoun “this” refers broadly to all that Jesus said in 7:37–38, and specifically to the eschatological promise of rivers of living water. Second, though the water pouring ceremony typifies this eschatological blessing, the Holy Spirit is not poured out on God’s people through the rites of the old dispensation’s temple, but only through Jesus, who has replaced the temple (2:21). Third, even during the earthly ministry of Jesus this eschatological reality is not yet enjoyed;<sup>82</sup> it awaits His glorification (7:39).

John 7:37–38 depicts Jesus standing in the old temple and proclaiming that the promised blessings of the eschaton are available for those who will believe that He is the anticipated Messiah—their belief being manifested in obedience to His call to come to Him and drink (7:37). In this context, given the connection between Jesus’ promise of “living water” and the water pouring ceremony at the feast of tabernacles, these eschatological blessings appear to be blessings formerly associated with the temple.<sup>83</sup> John 7:39 explains that the eschatological blessing Jesus referred to was the Spirit, “which those who had believed in Him were about to receive.” That the Spirit had not been received even by those who have believed in Jesus (*hoi pisteusantes eis auton*) excludes any possibility that

Old Testament believers had received the eschatological blessing of the indwelling Spirit.<sup>84</sup>

If believers living when Jesus proclaimed "An hour is coming and now is" (4:23; 5:25) had not received the Spirit, how could those living prior to the dawning of the eschaton have been indwelt by the Spirit? The eschatological blessing of the Spirit awaited not merely the coming of the Spiritanointed Messiah and His inauguration of the age to come, it also awaited Jesus' glorification (7:39; cp. 16:7),<sup>85</sup> that is, the cross (3:14; 12:23; 13:31).<sup>86</sup>

To summarize: First, the Old Testament promises that in the last days a Spiritanointed Messiah will come, and also that in the last days the people of God will receive the Spirit. Second, John argues that Jesus is the Spiritanointed Messiah who ushers in the last days. Third, John adds to the Old Testament expectation of the reception of the Spirit that Jesus must be glorified before believers receive the Spirit. Therefore, believers who lived prior to the glorification of Jesus were not indwelt by the Spirit. This conclusion fits with the conclusion of chapter 3 that the Old Testament does not ascribe to individual believers the continual indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

Some will object as I did that if old covenant saints were dead in their sins and yet became believers, they must have been indwelt by the Spirit. Chapter 6 will attempt to

deal with this objection. Before turning to this critical question of the common equation of regeneration and indwelling, however, we must compare our conclusions from John's writings with the rest of the New Testament.

# **The Gift of the Spirit in the New Testament**

A similar understanding of salvation history can be found in every part of the New Testament. The New Testament often refers to the believing community as God's temple, the place where He dwells. The temple in Jerusalem was understood to be the dwelling place of God in the Old Testament. Locations for worship were significant in the Old Testament, and we have noted John 4:21–24, where Jesus declared that locations would no longer be a decisive factor in the worship of God.

Selected soundings from the New Testament writings will suffice to show that what has been found in John's Gospel fits the rest of the New Testament. Here we can establish that, whereas in the old covenant God dwelt in the temple, in the new covenant His people are His temple. The New Testament transforms the Old Testament temple language and applies it to God's people, indicating that with Jesus' coming a salvation-historical shift has taken place, and God now takes up residence in His people, rather than in the temple.

## **The Synoptic Gospels**

One of the few events recorded in all four gospels is the

Baptist's promise of One greater than he, who "will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire" (Matt 3:11; Mark 1:7 [without "and in fire"]; Luke 3:16; cp. John 1:26–27).<sup>87</sup> All four gospels also recount that at Jesus' baptism the Spirit descended visibly, as a dove, upon Him (Matt 3:16; Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22; cp. John 1:32).

Further, the Synoptic Gospels are clear: "The time has been fulfilled" (Mark 1:15) and "the kingdom of God has drawn near" (Matt 4:17; Mark 1:15). The prophecies of Malachi 4 are fulfilled in the Baptist (Matt 11:14; 17:10–12; Mark 9:11–13; Luke 1:17). Those looking for "the consolation of Israel" need wait no longer (Luke 2:25–26,38). So while only Luke extends the account into Acts to show the Messiah dispensing the Spirit (Acts 2:33), all three Synoptic Gospels agree that with the coming of the expected Spiritanointed Messiah the new age is dawning. The temple cleansing recorded by the Synoptics (Matt 21:12–17 and parallels) fits John's temple-replacement theme. As the church has long held, John's account supplements that of the Synoptic Gospels (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., 6.14.7).<sup>88</sup>

## **The Letters of Paul**

As Paul walks the Galatians through salvation history, he argues that the blessing promised to Abraham, the gift of the Holy Spirit, comes to those who are "in" and "of" the

Messiah Jesus (Gal 3:14,28–29).<sup>89</sup> This reception of the Spirit by those who are in Christ was apparently not available prior to the exaltation of Jesus. Paul wrote, “Before the faith came we were kept under law, being shut up for the coming faith to be revealed” (Gal 3:23).<sup>90</sup> But with the coming of Jesus, a salvation-historical shift has taken place,<sup>91</sup> since “Now that the faith has come, we are no longer under the law” (Gal 3:25). The connection between the reception of the Spirit and freedom from the law may be found in Gal 4:4–6: “When the fullness of time came, God sent forth His Son, born of woman, born under law, in order that He might redeem those under law, in order that we might receive the adoption as sons. Now because you are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts crying, ‘Abba, Father!’” With God’s sending the Messiah, the age that was coming has dawned,<sup>92</sup> and with the dawning of that age, the Spirit can also be sent to dwell in the hearts of the people of God (Gal 3:14; 4:6).<sup>93</sup>

Since these things have taken place in salvation history, Paul can proclaim to his readers that they are now God’s temple, and their status as the temple is, at points, directly connected with the indwelling of the Spirit (e.g., 1 Cor 3:16).<sup>94</sup> In Paul’s letters we find direct statements, “you are the temple” (e.g., 1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16), the imagery of a cornerstone and a house being built up as a dwelling of God (Eph 2:20–22), and also the language of “pillars and foundations” (Gal 2:9; 1 Tim 3:15). In line

with Romans 12:1–2, Skarsaune points out, “The new people of God are not in a temple, attending a service led by priests, they are the temple and they are its priests, themselves conducting the service.”<sup>95</sup> Whereas formerly it was right to worship in Jerusalem at the temple (Deut 12:5), God's people are now His temple through the indwelling of the Spirit. This salvation-historical order of events is precisely what we saw in John.<sup>96</sup>

## **The Catholic Epistles**

Hebrews declares that these are the last days, and that God has given definitive revelation in His Son (Heb 1:2). Hebrews 8–9 emphasizes the superiority of the new covenant. Hebrews 8 cites Jeremiah 31 to the effect that the law has been written on the hearts of the people (8:10; Jer 31:33).<sup>97</sup> These realities are directly connected to the supercession of the high priesthood and the sacrificial system (Heb 10:19–21). Perhaps the author of the letter would view the promise of the new covenant in Jeremiah 31 as virtually equivalent with the promise in Ezekiel 36:26–27 that God would put His Spirit within His people and thereby cause them to obey. If so, since Hebrews declares that the new covenant has been inaugurated (8:6,13; 10:19–25) as in John, we find the age to come, the Messiah, and with the new covenant, the Spirit.

First Peter 1:11 speaks of the Spirit of Christ within Old Testament prophets. This reference can be understood in much the same way as 2 Peter 1:21, namely, that God had come upon the prophets to empower them to speak His word truly. This does not indicate that all old covenant believers had the Spirit, for the description of the Spirit coming upon an Old Testament figure always indicates the uniqueness of that person.

We should also note the temple imagery in 1 Peter 2:5–6 and the priestly language of 1 Peter 2:9, on which Skarsaune comments, “since the whole people is priestly, all leadership ministries are called by entirely non-priestly, non-cultic terms.”<sup>98</sup> We might also mention 1 John 2:20,27, where John apparently regards the new covenant promises of Jeremiah 31:34 as having been fulfilled in his readers through their having been “anointed” (Ezek 36:26–27 is probably also in view; see 1 John 3:24; 4:13). Such statements are simply not found in the Old Testament.

## **The Apocalypse of John**

Revelation does not explicitly mention indwelling,<sup>99</sup> but we do find the reality fulfilled to which indwelling points, namely, God dwelling with man.<sup>100</sup> Things have come full circle: from full fellowship with God in Eden<sup>101</sup> to the separation of the Fall, then God's dwelling among His chosen people in the tabernacle and later the temple, then

God's taking up residence in His people after Jesus' glorification, and finally the restored edenic dwelling of God with men when the eschaton is consummated.

Temple imagery is important in Revelation. In Revelation 3:12, John writes, "As for the one who overcomes, I will make that person into a pillar in the temple of My God," again seemingly portraying God's people as His temple.<sup>102</sup> The final chapter of Revelation depicts a "river of living water radiant as crystal, proceeding from the throne of God and of the Lamb" (Rev 22:1). In the New Testament, the image of living water is found only in the Gospel of John and in the Apocalypse.<sup>103</sup> Isaiah prophesied that God's people would draw water from "the springs of salvation"(Isa12:3), Ezekiel 47:1–2 saw water flowing from the temple, and Zechariah spoke of "living waters" flowing from Jerusalem (Zech 14:8). Jesus too spoke of living waters flowing from God's temple, the believer (John 4:10,14; 7:38). Revelation 21–22 depicts the consummated state, when the dwelling of God will be with men (21:3), and the living waters will flow from His throne.

Thus the rest of the New Testament presents a picture that parallels what we found in John.<sup>104</sup> The Spiritanointed Messiah foretold in the prophets has come in Jesus. He ushers in the age to come, is glorified, and pours out the Spirit. The age to come awaits its consummation, at which

time the dwelling of God will be with men, of this the indwelling of the Spirit is a foretaste and seal (Eph 1:13–14).

# Conclusion

The indwelling of the Holy Spirit is a blessing of the inaugurated age to come which is experienced by believers in the present as a sealing, sanctifying promise of the presence of God to be enjoyed when Jesus comes. Whereas in the old covenant God dwelt in the temple, in the new covenant God dwells in His people, rather than merely among or with them. What I have argued concerning John 7:39 fits with the rest of the New Testament's teaching on the Spirit. Therefore, John 7:39 does not permit us to regard those who were believers prior to the glorification of Jesus as indwelt by the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>1</sup> For salvation history more generally, see P. E. Satterthwaite, "Biblical History", in NDBT, 43–51. For a thorough study of time in John, see J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie: Das johanneische Zeitverständnis*, Band 2, WUNT 110 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

<sup>2</sup> Such an investigation is warranted by John's consistent distinction between what was believed, experienced, or understood before and after Jesus' time on earth was complete: e.g., 2:22; 12:16; 13:7,19; 14:26; 16:12–13; 20:9. See also C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 201; R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, 2 vols., AB (New York: Doubleday, 1966, 1970), 121; Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 2:221.

<sup>3</sup> G. E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. D. A. Hagner (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993 [1974]), 344. Similarly N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, *Christian Origins and the Question of God* 3 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 282.

<sup>4</sup> The phrase "Spirit-anointed Messiah" is redundant, for "Messiah" is precisely the person who has been anointed by the Spirit. I use the phrase because the significance of the word Messiah is often overlooked.

<sup>5</sup> See J. J. Suurmond, "The Ethical Influence of the Spirit of God" (Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1983), 235; J. D. G. Dunn, "Spirit and Fire Baptism," in *The Christ and the Spirit: Pneumatology*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 102.

<sup>6</sup> See W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2 vols., OTL, trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961, 1967), 1:26.

<sup>7</sup> This understanding of the Spirit in salvation history also seems to be reflected in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* 87.4–6. For discussion, see O. Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002), 340.

<sup>8</sup> On the legitimacy of allowing the NT to inform one's reading of the OT, see W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 1:26; G.

Goldsworthy, *According to Plan* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002), 76. For authors and approaches, see E. A. Martens, "The Flowering and Foundering of Old Testament Theology," in *NIDOTTE*, 1:175.

<sup>9</sup> For the significance of Isaiah in regard to John's Gospel, see F. W. Young, "A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel," *ZNW* 46 (1955): 215–33; C. A. Evans, "Obduracy and the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis*, ed. C. A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring (Atlanta: Scholars, 1987), 221–36; D. A. Carson, "John and the Johannine Epistles," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 245–64. For a study of John's use of the OT, see A. T. Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991).

<sup>10</sup> For the messianism of the Pentateuch, see T. D. Alexander, *From Paradise to the Promised Land* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995); id., "Royal Expectations in Genesis to Kings: Their Importance for Biblical Theology," *TynBul* 49 (1998): 191–212; id., "Further Observations on the Term 'Seed' in Genesis," *TynBul* 48 (1997): 363–67; J. Collins, "A Syntactical Note (Genesis 3:15): Is the Woman's Seed Singular or Plural?" *TynBul* 48 (1997): 139–48; J. Sailhamer, "Creation, Genesis 1 - 11, and the Canon," *BBR* 10 (2000): 89–106; id., "Messiah and the Hebrew Bible," *JETS* 44 (2001): 5–23; W. Wifall, "Gen 3:15—A Protevangelium?" *CBQ* 36 (1974): 361–65.

<sup>11</sup> In the Greek translation of Judges 9:8 and 15 we find forms of  $\chi\rho\iota\epsilon\nu$ , to anoint, for the Hebrew verb  $\text{מָשַׁח}$ . See D. H. Engelhard, "Anoint, Anointing," *ISBE* 1:129; L. W. Hurtado, "Christ," in *DJG*, 107.

<sup>12</sup> See the discussion of this text in chapter 3.

<sup>13</sup> Given that Isaiah's prophecy profoundly influenced John the Baptist (see John 1:23; Isa 40:3), it is possible that Isa 4 grounds his declaration that the greater One who comes after him "will baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire" (Matt 3:11; Luke 3:16; see Mark 1:8; John 1:33).

<sup>14</sup> Some modern scholars are dissuaded from linking "the branch" in chaps. 4 and 11 because different Hebrew ( $\text{צֶמַח}$ ; 4:2,  $\text{צֶמַח}$ ; 11:1,  $\text{צֶמַח}$ ) and because in 4:2 the branch is "of Yahweh," while in 11:1 He is "of Jesse." Regarding the former, this stylistic variation is to be expected from a poet of Isaiah's artistic brilliance; the breadth and freshness of his vocabulary is perhaps unparalleled in the OT. Regarding the latter, in my view it is a false

disjunction to separate these two, for in Jesus the branch of Yahweh is also the shoot of Jesse. See also Childs, *Isaiah*, 99–106.

<sup>15</sup> Isaiah may also be alluding to Gen 2:5,9. See J. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah*, Chapters 40–66, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 575; G. Van Groningen, *Messianic Revelation in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990), 661–63, 880.

<sup>16</sup> Further, Jesus took Isa 61 as a messianic passage: Luke records Him reading it and claiming to fulfill it in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke 4:16–21).

<sup>17</sup> See the helpful synthesis of the messianic promise in P. House, *Old Testament Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998), 242–43.

<sup>18</sup> G. W. Grogan, *Isaiah*, in EBC, 6:205. Similarly, J. A. Motyer, *Isaiah*, TOTC (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999), 204.

<sup>19</sup> See F. Delitzsch, *Isaiah*, trans. J. Martin, vol. 7 of *Commentary on the Old Testament* (Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1866–91; reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001), 334.

<sup>20</sup> Childs, *Isaiah*, 241.

<sup>21</sup> Much more could be said about the Messiah as Isaiah, for instance, foresees Him (see e.g., Isa 33, 42, and 53). We must note, too, that texts such as Jer 31, Ezek 36–37, and Joel 3:1–5 (2:28–32) bear on the role of the Spirit in the age to come.

<sup>22</sup> A. Schlatter, *The History of the Christ*, trans. A. J. Köstenberger (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997 [1923]), 58.

<sup>23</sup> See e.g., M. De Jonge, "Jewish Expectations about the 'Messiah' according to the Fourth Gospel," *NTS* 19 (1972–73): 246–70; Hurtado, "Christ," 107. Against E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE – 66 CE* (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1992), 295.

<sup>24</sup> On Messianic expectation in first century Judaism, see further J. Neusner, W. S. Green, and E. Frerichs, *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: University Press, 1987); E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, 3 vols. in 4, rev. and ed. by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), 2:488–554.

<sup>25</sup> See F. Garcia-Martínez, "Introduction" to *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*, 2d ed. trans. by W. G. E. Watson

(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), liv

<sup>26</sup> See J. R. Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*, *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 29 (New York: Brill, 1997), 143.

<sup>27</sup> Translations of the Pseudepigrapha come from OTP.

<sup>28</sup> See also Ps. Sol. 18:7; Jub. 1:23; 1 En. 49:2–3; 52:4; T. Jud. 24:1–3; T. Levi 18:7,11. For discussion of these writings, see the introductions in OTP as well as G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. M.E. Stone, CRINT 2.2 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 89–156.

<sup>29</sup> D. Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, 493.

<sup>30</sup> The translation is that of Garcia-Martínez (asterisks original, representing divine name). See Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 498.

<sup>31</sup> For discussion of the messianic expectation at Qumran see J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, Anchor Bible Reference Library (New York: Doubleday, 1995). See also Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple*, 115.

<sup>32</sup> For these topics and the Qumran scrolls, see A. A. Anderson, “The Use of ‘Ruah’ in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM,” *JSS* 7 (1962): 293–303; R. E. Brown, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles,” *CBQ* 17 (1955): 403–19; L. Morris, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and St. John’s Gospel,” in *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (1969), 321–58; C. M. Pate, *Communities of the Last Days* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), esp. chap. 4, “Messianism in the DSS & in the NT,” 107–32; J. Pryke, “‘Spirit’ and ‘Flesh’ in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts,” *RevQ* 5 (1965–66): 345–60.

<sup>33</sup> See the argument for this conclusion in chapter three.

<sup>34</sup> D. A. Carson has convincingly reasserted the primacy of John 20:31 when considering the purpose of the Gospel. His syntactical argument that the phrase should be translated, “the Messiah is Jesus,” however, is possible but not necessarily persuasive (“The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:31 Reconsidered,” *JBL* 106 [1987]: 639–51). See the discussion in D. B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 46–47. See further D. A. Carson, “Syntactical and Text-Critical Observations on John 20:30–31: One More Round on the Purpose of the

Fourth Gospel," JBL 124 (2005): 693–714.

<sup>35</sup> Though here we are focusing on the way John's presentation of the Messiah more or less corresponds with what others in the period expected, we must also note that in many ways John presents Jesus as redefining messiahship. See the summary in Hurtado, "Christ," 114–15.

<sup>36</sup> J. H. Bernard explains that "the dove was regarded among the Semites as a symbol of the Spirit." He also reports that the reference in Song 2:12 to the "voice of the turtledove" is interpreted as "the voice of the Spirit," and that "the Jewish doctors" compared the hovering Spirit of Gen 1:2 to a dove (The Gospel according to St. John, 2 vols., ICC [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928], 49). Unfortunately, Bernard does not cite his sources. See also Carson, John, 153.

<sup>37</sup> Testimony based on what has been experienced is significant for John. See 1:34; 3:11,32; 1 John 1:2. On the Baptist's testimony, see J. M. Boice, *Witness and Revelation in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970), 80–88.

<sup>38</sup> See F. J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, SP4 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 53.

<sup>39</sup> See Barrett, John, 178; Bouman, "The Baptism of Christ with Special Reference to the Gift of the Spirit," 2; G. M. Burge, *The Anointed Community* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 51–58; R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 92; D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 151; R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 3 vols., trans. K. Smith (New York: Crossroad, 1968, 1979, 1982), 1:303–4.

<sup>40</sup> See G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., WBC (Nashville: Nelson, 1999), 25.

<sup>41</sup> See Burge, *Anointed Community*, 55; id., *John*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 74; Carson, *John*, 151–52; Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:303–4; B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1908), 1:44. Against Barrett, *John*, 178.

<sup>42</sup> If "Chosen One" ἐκλεκτός is the original reading (as the NET Bible concludes), the point argued here is not altered.

<sup>43</sup> Note the parallel clauses:

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (1:33)  
("this is the One who baptizes in the Holy Spirit");  
οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (1:34)  
("this is the Son of God").

<sup>44</sup> In the first chapter of John Jesus is called the Logos (1:1,14), God (1:1), the true Light (1:9), the Lord (1:23), the Lamb of God (1:29,36), the One who baptizes in the Holy Spirit (1:33), the Son of God (1:34,49), Messiah (1:41), Christ (1:41), the One of whom Moses wrote in the law, along with the Prophets (1:45), Rabbi (1:49), King of Israel (1:49), and He calls Himself the Son of Man (1:51). See S. Van Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, NovTSup 83 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 26; E. Haenchen, *John*, 2 vols., trans. R. W. Funk, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 1:154.

<sup>45</sup> See Tertullian, *On Baptism* 7; and see Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple*, 369; Westcott, *John*, 1:43.

<sup>46</sup> See Bernard, *John*, 51; Brown, *John*, 66; Moloney, *John*, 53; Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:304; Westcott, *John*, 1:44-45.

<sup>47</sup> Carson, *John*, 152. See also S. S. Smalley, "'The Paraclete': Pneumatology in the Johannine Gospel and Apocalypse," in *Exploring the Gospel of John*, ed. R. A. Culpepper and C. C. Black (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 290.

<sup>48</sup> Barrett, *John*, 178.

<sup>49</sup> Similarly Burge, *John*, 74; Carson, *John*, 151.

<sup>50</sup> W. F. Howard, *Christianity according to St. John* (London: Duckworth, 1943), 73; F. Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort* (Frankfurt: Knecht, 1974), 101-05; I. de la Potterie, "l'Esprit saint dans l'Evangile de Jean," *NTS* 18 (1971-72): 448-51.

<sup>51</sup> See Beasley-Murray, *John*, 54; J. L. Kipp, "The Relationship between the Conceptions of 'Holy Spirit' and 'Risen Christ' in the Fourth Gospel" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1967), 144.

<sup>52</sup> Barrett thinks the Baptist continues to speak (*John*, 224). Brown thinks that Jesus is speaking (*John*, 160). Bernard thinks the evangelist is commenting (*John*, 123); so also Beasley-Murray, *John*, 53; C. L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel* (Downers Grove:

InterVarsity, 2001), 97; F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 96.

<sup>53</sup> Perhaps the strength of this argument motivated Porsch to dislocate the text, placing 3:31–36 after 3:12, in the attempt to argue that it is Jesus, not God, who gives the Spirit in 3:34 (*Pneuma und Wort*, 101–05). There is no manuscript evidence indicating that the pericope belongs there.

<sup>54</sup> See Bernard, *John*, 125; Burge, *Anointed Community*, 83–84.

<sup>55</sup> See Barrett, *John*, 226; Bernard, *John*, 125; Carson, *John*, 213; H.N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel according to John*, trans. J. Vriend (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 150; Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:387. See Burge, *Anointed Community*, 81–84.

<sup>56</sup> See also Midrash Rabbah on Lev 15:2, “Rabbi Aha says, ‘The Holy Spirit rested on the prophets by measure.’” See G.Vos, *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments* (Eerdmans, 1948; reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1996), 321; Carson, *John*, 213; Brown, *John*, 158; Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:386.

<sup>57</sup> Among other relevant texts are 6:63; 19:30[?]; and 20:22. On 20:22 see the discussion of Acts 2 and John 20:22 in chapter 4 of the present work. On John 19:30 Burge claims, “Nowhere in Greek literature is παραδίδωμι τὸ πνεῦμα used as a description of death” (*Anointed Community*, 134; also *id.*, *John*, 529). This staggering claim is being passed around in the scholarly literature. Recently C. Bennema (“The Giving of the Spirit in John’s Gospel—A New Proposal?” *EvQ* 74 [2002]: 200) has cited Burge, who cites F. Porsch (*Pneuma und Wort*, 328), who cites I. de la Potterie (*Passio et Mors Christi: Jo 18–19* [Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964–65], 129). Aside from the fact that such a sweeping statement (“nowhere in Greek literature...”) is impossible to prove, Bernard notes, “In the second century Acts of John (§ 115) παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα is used of Jn.’s own death” (*John*, 641). Though later than John, the existence of this note refutes the claim that this statement is nowhere in Greek literature (none of the authors cited above qualify the claim), and the use of this phrase in the Acts of John shows that, unusual as it may have been, it was understood to designate death in the second century (see also the Acts of Peter and Paul §83). It is also relevant, as A. J. Köstenberger has pointed out, that “the same verb is used in Isaiah 53:12 to describe the death of the Suffering Servant: ‘His soul was handed over [παρεδόθη] to death ... and he was handed over [παρεδόθη] because of their sins’” (*John*, in vol. 2 of

Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary, ed. C. E. Arnold [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002], 179). John portrays Jesus actively laying down His life, as He said He would do in 10:17. Luke 23:46 is also similar (πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου, "Father, into your hands I commit My spirit").

<sup>58</sup> The concept of "realized eschatology" in the Gospel of John has been much discussed. R. Bultmann was inclined to view the statements that leave some things in the future as later redactional glosses (Theology of the New Testament, 2 vols., trans. by K. Grobel [New York: Scribner's, 1951, 1955], 2:39), but many scholars have rightly recognized that both the "realized eschatology" and the "consistent eschatology" are thoroughly Johannine and biblical. See Ladd, Theology, 268, 334-44; Burge, Anointed Community, 114-16; Smalley, John, 265-70. For the history of the discussion since Reimarus, see J. Frey, Die johanneische Eschatologie: Ihre Probleme im Spiegel der Forschung seit Reimarus, Band 1, WUNT 96 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

<sup>59</sup> Her question was a response to Jesus' affirmation of Jewish, as opposed to Samaritan, worship (4:22). It is likely that the ἡμεῖς in 4:22 refers not to Jesus and His disciples, but to the Jews as opposed to the Samaritans, for the ground of the utterance is not, "because salvation now comes through Me" (as in 14:6), but "because salvation is of the Jews" (4:22; cp. 1:17).

<sup>60</sup> On the realm/sphere of the Spirit, see the discussion in chapter four.

<sup>61</sup> Carson, John, 226. See also Ladd, Theology, 341; H. Sasse, αἰών, αἰώνος in TDNT, 1:197-209, see esp. 206-07.

<sup>62</sup> Beasley-Murray, John, 60; T. L. Brodie, The Gospel according to John (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 318; Carson, John, 219; J. D. G. Dunn, "Δωρεά as the Gift of the Holy Spirit," in The Christ and the Spirit: Pneumatology, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998 [originally Exp Tim 81 (1970): 349-51]), 207-09; L. Morris, The Gospel according to John, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 230-31; R. Hoferkamp, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel from the Viewpoint of Christ's Glorification," CTM 33 (1962): 526.

<sup>63</sup> The addition of δεδομενον attested in various manuscripts (B pc e q sy<sup>h\*\*</sup>) is probably a secondary expansion, but since the phrase is explaining why the reception (λαμβάνειν) of the Spirit has not yet taken

place, the addition captures the meaning of the text (see B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994], 186). The NRSV is wrong to indicate that the Spirit was not in existence ("as yet there was no Spirit"). A new time is about to begin when those who believe in Jesus will receive the Spirit. Then the Spirit will be given (see 20:22). See Schlatter, *History of the Christ*, 58.

<sup>64</sup> But see Wai-Yee Ng, *Water Symbolism in John*, *Studies in Biblical Literature* 15 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 141.

<sup>65</sup> For the debate over how the verse should be punctuated, from whence the citation comes, and from whose belly the water flows, with the commentaries, see Burge, *Anointed Community*, 88–93; J. B. Cortés, "Yet Another Look at Jn 7:37–38," *CBQ* 29 (1967): 75–86; S. H. Hooke, "The Spirit Was Not Yet (Jn 7:39)," *NTS* 9 (1963): 372–80; J. Marcus, "Rivers of Living Water from Jesus' Belly (John 7:38)," *JBL* 117 (1998): 328–30; M.J.J. Menken, "The Origin of the Old Testament Quotation in John 7:38," *NovT* 38 (1996): 160–75.

<sup>66</sup> So also Cortés, "Yet Another Look," 86. Against Menken, "Origin," 165. Similarly Brodie, *John*, 318–19; M. L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2001), 125–28; Z. Hodges, "Rivers of Living Water—John 7:37–39," *BSac* 136 (1979): 242; P. Hoskins, "Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple in the Gospel of John" (Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2002), 240; R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple*, Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 80–81.

<sup>67</sup> See G. T. Tew, "The Pneumatology of John as Seen in the Fourth Gospel" (Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993), 72; Barrett, *John*, 237; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 104; Westcott, *John*, 158–59.

<sup>68</sup> Bultmann understands "living water" as a reference to the wisdom and revelation that Jesus offers (John, 182–87). Brown argues that "living water" can refer both to Jesus' revelation and to the Holy Spirit (John, 179). Coloe argues that the waters flowing from the temple in Ezek 47:1–12 provide "the primary background for the symbol of water" (*God Dwells with Us*, 95, see her discussion, 94–96).

<sup>69</sup> See Beasley-Murray, *John*, 62; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 104.

<sup>70</sup> See W. G. Fowler, "The Influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel: Intertextuality and Interpretation" (Ph.D. diss., Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, 1995), 135–36.

<sup>71</sup> See Brodie, John, 223; Smalley, John, 168.

<sup>72</sup> On the legitimacy of worship in Jerusalem under the old covenant, see S. Westerholm, "Temple," in ISBE, 4:764.

<sup>73</sup> See Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple*, 44.

<sup>74</sup> See Westerholm, "Temple," in ISBE, 4:775.

<sup>75</sup> See D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings*, SNTSMS 5 (Cambridge: University Press, 1967), 287.

<sup>76</sup> For discussion of "He exhaled" (ἐμφυσάω), see Appendix 1, "The Use of *emphusaō* in John 20:22."

<sup>77</sup> Moloney, John, 252. Similarly Barrett, John, 328.

<sup>78</sup> For a helpful description of the feast and the ceremony, see W. B. Simon, "The Role of the Spirit-Paraclete in the Disciples' Mission in the Fourth Gospel" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002), 74–76.

<sup>79</sup> See Moloney, John, 252.

<sup>80</sup> This possibility will be explored in chapter six.

<sup>81</sup> See also Genesis Rabbah 70:8, where the water drawing ceremony of the Feast of Tabernacles is interpreted as the drawing of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>82</sup> Rightly Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, 529; Morris, John, 379.

<sup>83</sup> See chapter six for other connections between the indwelling of the Spirit and blessings formerly found at the temple.

<sup>84</sup> See Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, 513; against those who would claim that, "What is new ... is that finally the physical boundaries of the nation of Israel will be coterminous with its spiritual boundaries" (M. V. Van Pelt, W. C. Kaiser Jr., and D. I. Block, "יְהוָה" in NIDOTTE, 3:1077).

<sup>85</sup> See Smalley, "The Paraclete': Pneumatology in the Johannine Gospel and Apocalypse," 291; Barrett, John, 329; Bruce, John, 182; Ng, *Water Symbolism*, 81.

<sup>86</sup> See Moloney, John, 253; Beasley-Murray, John, 117.

<sup>87</sup> For a study of the Spirit in Mark, see J. E. Yates, *The Spirit and the*

Kingdom (London: SPCK, 1963). For the Spirit's role in purification and prophecy in the Gospels and Acts, see C. S. Keener, *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power* (Peabody MA:Hendrickson,1997). For the Spirit in Luke-Acts, see M. Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1998);id., *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, rev. ed. (Peabody, MA:Hendrickson,1998). For a study of the modern pentecostal movement and the Spirit (mainly) in Acts, see E. D. Bruner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970).

<sup>88</sup> D. Wenham, "Spirit and Life: Some Reflections on Johannine Theology," *Them* 6 (1980): 7.

<sup>89</sup> For a thorough study of the Spirit in the letters of Paul, see G. D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence* (Peabody MA:Hendrickson,1994).

<sup>90</sup> Similarly S. K. Williams, "Justification and the Spirit in Galatians," *JSNT* 29 (1987): 95.

<sup>91</sup> See P. W. L. Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 119–22.

<sup>92</sup> See M. M. B. Turner, "The Significance of Spirit Endowment for Paul," *VE* 9 (1975): 56, 65,66.

<sup>93</sup> Note that Rom 8:1–17 begins with a salvation-historical marker, "There is therefore now no condemnation ..." This now (*vūv*) in v. 1, which is explained by what has been accomplished by "the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" in v. 2, appears to be contrasted with the former time when the law was in effect in vv. 2 and 3. Thus what Paul says about the Spirit in Rom 8 points us to the realized eschatology we also see in Galatians.

<sup>94</sup> So also Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, 285.

<sup>95</sup> Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple*, 162 (emphasis his). Skarsaune is commenting on 1 Pet 2:9 (see below).

<sup>96</sup> For development of the temple themes in John, see chapter 6. For points of contact between Paul and John, see Smalley *John*, 193–95; Wenham, "Spirit and Life," 6.

<sup>97</sup> See the discussion of Jer 31 in chapter three, where it was suggested that the writing of the law on the heart might have replacement of the temple/indwelling by the Spirit overtones.

<sup>98</sup> Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple*, 162.

<sup>99</sup> For the “apparent divergences” and “close parallels” between the Spirit in the Gospel of John and Revelation, see Smalley, “‘The Paraclete’: Pneumatology in the Johannine Gospel and Apocalypse,” 293. For a discussion of the Spirit in Revelation more generally, see F. F. Bruce, “The Spirit in the Apocalypse,” in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, ed. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 333–44.

<sup>100</sup> See McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 187.

<sup>101</sup> There are significant temple overtones in the description of the garden of Eden. See G.J. Wenham, “Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story,” in *I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood*, SBTS 4 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 399–404; J. H. Walton, “Eden, Garden of,” in *DOTP*, 203, 206.

<sup>102</sup> This might also be seen in Rev 11:1–2. See Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City*, 247. Not all agree that believers are the temple in Rev 11:1–2. For a concise summary of the interpretations of the temple in this passage, see G. R. Osborne, *Revelation*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 408–09.

<sup>103</sup> See Smalley, “‘The Paraclete’: Pneumatology in the Johannine Gospel and Apocalypse,” 295.

<sup>104</sup> See Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City*, 296–303.

# **Chapter 6**

## **REGENERATION AND INDWELLING IN JOHN**

# Introduction

If, as I have argued thus far, old covenant believers were not indwelt by the Holy Spirit, how did they become and remain believers? This chapter seeks to move toward an answer to that question through an examination of regeneration and indwelling in John's Gospel. There are two parts to this discussion, one negative and one positive. Negatively, I will seek to show that regeneration is not indwelling,<sup>1</sup> and positively, I will demonstrate what indwelling signifies in John. We begin with the distinction between regeneration and indwelling in John.

# Regeneration in John

We saw in chapter two that some who argue that old covenant believers were indwelt appeal to Jesus' words to Nicodemus in John 3. Chapter five showed that John 7:39 poses a problem for those who argue for the indwelling of old covenant believers. These two texts, John 3 and John 7, are central to the argument of this section. From these two passages, an exegetical basis for the distinction between regeneration and indwelling will be sought.

## New Birth by the Spirit

For the purposes of this study we are concerned with two questions arising from the dialogue in John 3:1–12.<sup>2</sup> First, what does it mean for a person to be “born from above”<sup>3</sup> (3:3)? And second, when, in salvation history, is it possible for a person to be “born of the Spirit” (3:6)?

**John 3:3–8.** Nicodemus addresses Jesus with a statement containing three elements: (1) what he knows, (2) what is possible by human ability, and (3) an “unless” clause. He says, “Rabbi, we know that you have come from God as a teacher; for no one is able to do these signs that you are doing unless God is with him” (John 3:2). Jesus responds to Nicodemus with a statement also containing three elements: (1) an unless clause, (2) what

is possible by human ability, and (3) what can be seen. "Truly, truly I say to you, unless one is born again, he is not able to see the kingdom of God" (3:3).

These paired elements concerning (1) knowledge/sight, (2) human ability, and (3) what is necessary ("unless ...") are instructive as we consider John's understanding of the new birth from above. In this account, Nicodemus has rightly recognized that Jesus has come as a teacher and that God is with him (3:2), but Jesus tells him that if one is going to have the ability to see the kingdom of God, he must be born again (3:3). Thus, for John, being "born again" gives people the "ability" to "see" the kingdom of God (3:3).

Whatever context Nicodemus might have had to understand Jesus' reference to "new birth,"<sup>4</sup> his surprise is apparent in his response in v. 4: "How is a man able to be born being old? He is not able to enter the womb of his mother a second time to be born is he?" As before, Jesus answers with (1) an "unless" clause, about (2) human ability, and (3) the kingdom of God (v. 5). Though "seeing" is replaced by "entering," seeing and entering are overlapping concepts.<sup>5</sup> Jesus' words in John 3:3 and 3:5 are strikingly parallel:

John 3:3	John 3:5
amēn amēn legō soi,	amēn amēn legō soi,

Truly, truly I say to you,	Truly, truly I say to you,
ean mē tis gennēthē anōthen,	ean mē tis gennēthē ex hudatos
	kai pneumatos,
unless one is born again,	unless one is born from water and
	spirit,
ou dunatai idein tēn basileian	ou dunatai eiselthein eis tēn
tou theou	basileian tou theou
he is not able to see the kingdom	he is not able to enter the
of God.	kingdom of God.

Jesus, then, is restating the same concepts with different language to clarify what He means.<sup>6</sup> Here being born “again/from above” is matched by being born “from water and spirit.”<sup>7</sup> This new birth “from above” by “water and spirit” enables people to partake of the kingdom of God. Apart from this birth, people neither see nor enter God’s kingdom.

Jesus explains this new birth in John 3:6–8. “What has been born from the flesh is flesh” (v. 6a) refers to natural birth.<sup>8</sup> Spiritual birth is then described in v. 6b, “What has been born from the Spirit is spirit” (3:6b). The three phrases—from above/again, from water and spirit, and

from the Spirit—refer to the same spiritual birth. In Bernard's words, "To be begotten ἀνωθεν means to be begotten from heaven, 'of the Spirit.'"<sup>9</sup> John earlier described this as birth "not from bloods, nor from the will of flesh, nor from the will of man, but from God" (1:13). As Calvin put it, "By the phrase born again is expressed not the correction of one part, but the renovation of the whole nature."<sup>10</sup> Similarly, Guthrie states, "Nothing short of a complete renewal would satisfy the meaning of Jesus' words."<sup>11</sup>

While the intended symbolism of certain components in John 3:3–8 has been disputed,<sup>12</sup> this new birth is not something that people do to or for themselves.<sup>13</sup> Each time the verb *gennaō* appears in John 3:3–8 it is passive (3:3,4 [2x],5,6 [2x],7,8). John 1:13 ("born of God") provides clear warrant for seeing these as divine passives. God causes people to experience the new birth from above by the Spirit.<sup>14</sup>

The need for new birth is connected to another clear feature in this passage: the stress on human inability to experience God's kingdom apart from this new birth. The word *dunamai* appears five times in 3:2–5 and again in v. 9. The new birth is brought about by God, and without it people are unable to see/enter the kingdom of God.

**What is this new birth?** The new birth from above is a "second birth" (see 3:4–5).<sup>15</sup> The stress on ability (five

uses of *dunamai* in vv. 2–5) suggests that the new birth brings a new ability. Regeneration, then, involves the Spirit enabling people to believe. Being “born of God” (1:13) and being “born of the Spirit” (3:6) in John’s Gospel are equivalent.<sup>16</sup> As in John 1:11–13, the new birth in John 3 is for those who “receive” what Jesus says (3:11) and “believe” Him (3:12). No one is able to believe Jesus, however, unless God draws that person to Jesus (6:44,65), and the Spirit is like the wind, which “blows where it wishes” (3:8). Those to whom the Spirit is pleased to give new birth (3:6) are those whom the Father draws to Jesus (6:44), and they believe Him not because of human will, but because they have been born of God (1:12–13). Those who experience the new birth from above see and enter the kingdom of God; that is, they have eternal life (3:3,5,15).<sup>17</sup>

There is no exegetical warrant, however, for equating regeneration and indwelling in John 3. Nowhere is it stated in John 3 that the Spirit takes up residence within those who experience the new birth, although some have suggested that indwelling is in view in vv. 5 and 6.

**Indwelling in John 3:5?** In John 3:5 Jesus speaks of one who is “born of water and spirit.” As noted in chapter four, “water” and “spirit” in this verse are both governed by one preposition (*ex hudatos kai pneumatos*), suggesting they refer to a single reality, not “of (baptismal) water and the Spirit.” Rather, the phrase signifies the eschatological

cleansing and renewal promised by Israel's prophets (see Isa 44:3; Ezek 36:25–26).

Since John is presenting a discussion between Nicodemus and Jesus, it seems best to understand the phrase “from water and spirit” as primarily designating something Nicodemus would recognize. Read as a conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus, which is the way John frames the passage, these verses say nothing explicitly about Christian baptism. Therefore, we should expect the phrase “born of water and spirit” to make sense to Nicodemus (cp. the function of water and Spirit in Isa 44:3 and Ezek 36:25–26).<sup>18</sup>

Birth “from water and spirit” only hints at indwelling if one holds that the indwelling Spirit is conferred at baptism, and that baptism is referred to here in John 3:5.<sup>19</sup> Though many New Testament scholars see baptism everywhere water is mentioned in the New Testament, John 3:5 speaks not of the Spirit inhabiting the one who is born again, but causing new birth.<sup>20</sup> If an allusion to baptism is intended here, it is not the primary thrust of the text. The only way to see indwelling in John 3:5 is to assume that John intended for his audience to import their own understanding into his description of what Jesus said to Nicodemus, which, given the fact that John depicts this as a conversation that took place prior to the cross, is unlikely.

A stronger case is made by scholars arguing that John 3:5 speaks of regeneration, the creation of a new "spirit" in a person such that he is reborn (Belleville even calls this new spirit "God's nature"), but this regeneration is not the reception of the Holy Spirit "as such."<sup>21</sup> This view allows the text to speak with force and avoids reading what will be true after the cross into a discussion that John presents taking place before the cross. John 7:39 does not say that the Spirit was not yet causing the new birth, but that He was about to be received by those who had believed in Jesus. How had these people believed in Jesus if they had not received the Spirit? A Johannine response would be that they had been "born of water and spirit" and thus had the ability to believe as a result of the new birth by the Spirit. These believers, however, had not yet received the indwelling Spirit because Jesus was not yet glorified (7:39, see the argument of chapter five).

**Indwelling in John 3:6?** In chapter four I argued that according to John 3:6 one born of the Spirit belongs to the realm of the Spirit as opposed to the realm of the flesh. The two clauses in v. 6 are parallel.

What has been born from the flesh is flesh,  
And what has been born from the Spirit is spirit (3:6),

If the second line meant that the Spirit takes up residence in the one born of the Spirit, the first line would mean that the flesh takes up residence in the one born of the flesh.

Since John does not speak of unbelievers as “indwelt by the flesh,” it seems more natural to view “flesh” and “spirit” as contrasting realms. The realm of the flesh is the natural realm into which all people are born; the realm of the Spirit is God’s realm, where those who are born from above live (see the discussion in chapter four).

Commentators on John do not generally engage in the present discussion of whether indwelling is distinct from regeneration, so we can only anticipate possible objections. It could be argued that the phrase “what has been born of the Spirit is spirit” in John 3:6 means that the regenerated person has a new nature, the very nature of God Himself. Then one could argue that another way to express this reality is to say that God’s Spirit dwells in believers. If this view is correct, the phrase “What has been born of the Spirit is spirit” means that the regenerated person is indwelt, and regeneration and indwelling are not presented as distinct ministries of the Spirit in John 3.

A number of factors militate against this way of understanding the passage. First, as I argued in chapter four, “What has been born of the Spirit is spirit” (John 3:6b) should not be taken to indicate that people who are born again become the Spirit of God (see the parallel expressions cited in chapter four).<sup>22</sup>

Second, unlike John 7:39, there is no indication in John 3 that Nicodemus will only be able to experience what

Jesus is describing after the cross. Jesus expects Nicodemus to understand what He has articulated (3:10; see further below).

Third, new birth from above by the Spirit appears to be explicitly described with this language for the first time as Jesus speaks with Nicodemus.<sup>23</sup> The first explicit description of indwelling will also be described in John, but not until John 14:17. The "reception" language used in John 7:39 and the explicit statement in 14:17, "He will be in you," show that John is able to describe indwelling. Here in 3:6 the point is not indwelling but new birth.<sup>24</sup> The fact that John reserves explicit mention of indwelling for Jesus' final discourse with His disciples urges against reading the statements on indwelling (7:39; 14:17; 20:22) into the statements on regeneration (e.g., 3:3–8; 6:63).

Fourth, John speaks elsewhere of entrance into life by the Spirit with no mention of indwelling (see the discussion of John 6:63 below). Though it might be objected that this is an argument from silence, it seems valid to observe what the texts do and do not say, particularly in view of the fact that John regards people who have not yet received the Spirit as believers (7:39).

Fifth, as will be argued below, John's understanding of indwelling is intrinsically linked to his concept of the temple. If this is the case, the reality to which indwelling

points is not the creation of a new ability in persons who were formerly spiritually dead (regeneration), but the covenant presence of God. Further, John's understanding of indwelling seems to preserve the distinction between the Spirit and the humans inhabited by the Spirit. Therefore, if the phrase "what has been born of the Spirit is spirit" refers to indwelling (after the manner of 2 Pet 1:4), this is the only place in John where it is described in these terms.

Sixth, if humans are dead in trespasses and sins, and if both regeneration and indwelling are eschatological realities only possible after the cross, how were old covenant believers enabled to believe? Some use this as an argument for the indwelling of old covenant believers, but John 7:39 bars that path. We can avoid the use of the word "regeneration" regarding Old Testament saints if we wish, but most (if not all) are willing to acknowledge that if people are to believe they must be enabled, renewed, or otherwise lifted out of deadness in sin. If they are to be saved by faith, it would seem that they need to be enabled by the Spirit to believe. If John 3:6 is speaking of regeneration and not indwelling, then the door is open to an inward enablement by the Spirit (which the Old Testament calls "circumcision of the heart") prior to the cross. Since John 7:39 refers to believers who are yet to receive the Spirit, it would seem that prior to Jesus' glorification people could be enabled, i.e., regenerated, though they were not indwelt. These considerations make

unlikely the view that John 3:6 is speaking of indwelling.

John 3:5–6 describes a new birth by the Spirit but does not indicate that the Spirit of God takes up residence in those who are regenerated. John 3, therefore, provides exegetical warrant for the claim that regeneration and indwelling are distinct ministries of the Spirit.

**Eschatological Regeneration?** Could what Jesus proclaimed to Nicodemus be experienced prior to Jesus' glorification? This question is important because if new birth by the Spirit is equivalent to the reception of the indwelling Spirit, then new birth by the Spirit is an eschatological blessing which John 7:39 dictates will not be experienced until after Jesus is glorified.<sup>25</sup> On the other hand, if, as I have argued, new birth by the Spirit can be distinguished from the reception of the indwelling Spirit, then new birth by the Spirit is not affected by John 7:39.

D. A. Carson does not distinguish between the regeneration spoken of in John 3 and the reception of the Spirit in John 7. As a result, he must explain how the two texts fit together.

Some have argued that the flow of the passage is ... hopelessly anachronistic, for John's Gospel makes it abundantly clear (cf. esp. 7:37–39) that the Holy Spirit would not be given until after Jesus is glorified, and it is this Holy Spirit who must effect the new birth, even if the expression 'born of water and spirit' does not refer to the Holy

Spirit per se. So how then can Jesus demand of Nicodemus such regeneration?

The charge is ill conceived. Jesus is not presented as demanding that Nicodemus experience the new birth in the instant; rather, he is forcefully articulating what must be experienced if one is to enter the kingdom of God. ... The coming-to-faith of the first followers of Jesus was in certain respects unique: they could not instantly become 'Christians' in the full-orbed sense, and experience the full sweep of the new birth, until after the resurrection and glorification of Jesus.<sup>26</sup>

If John 3 speaks of regeneration, while John 7 speaks of indwelling, the difficulty Carson undertakes to explain is resolved. John 7:39 does not say that the Spirit was not yet operating on the hearts of God's people. It says rather that those who had believed in Jesus "were about to receive the Spirit, for the Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified." The contention here, therefore, is that John 7:39 precludes indwelling but not regeneration prior to Jesus' glorification.<sup>27</sup>

If John 7:39 does not preclude regeneration prior to Jesus' glorification, does Jesus' message to Nicodemus in John 3 concern a strictly eschatological event? At least two factors weigh against the view that the new birth Jesus describes must await the resurrection. First, when John elsewhere communicates truth that would not be understood or experienced until after the resurrection, he consistently employs temporal markers to designate when what has been spoken will take effect.<sup>28</sup> Whereas

elsewhere John designates what was understood or in effect before Jesus' resurrection and what was understood or in effect after the resurrection, in John 3:1–12 no such temporal indicators (hote, "when"; oupō, "not yet"; arti, "now," etc.) are found. Rather, as Jesus introduces the new birth to Nicodemus (3:3), He expresses it in Old Testament terms (3:5) and expects him to understand (3:10). John does not consider this something that was only understood later and not during Jesus' ministry, for here he does not supply a note that this teaching on the new birth was only understood after Jesus completed his time on earth (cp. 2:22; 12:16; 20:9).

A second indication in John 3 that the new birth is not an eschatological reality that must await the resurrection is that Jesus considers it "earthly" not "heavenly" (3:12).<sup>29</sup> In John 3:12, Jesus says to Nicodemus, "If I told you earthly things and you do not believe, how will you believe if I tell you heavenly things?" This question indicates that Nicodemus should believe what Jesus has said to this point in the conversation. The conversation has been about the new birth, and Carson thinks that "heavenly things" might refer to the consummated kingdom of the new heavens and new earth. If this is correct, the new birth is a present reality, and as Carson says, "it is 'earthly' in that it takes place here on earth when people are born again."<sup>30</sup>

On the other hand, Belleville has convincingly shown that the phrase "born of water and spirit" has in view "the

promised eschatological cleansing and renewal of the OT prophets."<sup>31</sup> Further, Mounce has shown that "The Christian metaphor of rebirth originated within the creative genius of Jesus' mind."<sup>32</sup> Is this regeneration, then, like indwelling, limited to the inaugurated new age? These points by Belleville and Mounce do not limit regeneration to the eschaton because of the connection we find between the New Testament reality of regeneration and the Old Testament reality of circumcision of the heart (see Rom 2:29; Phil 3:3; Col 2:11–13). Both inner circumcision and new birth point to enabling by the Spirit (cp. Jer 6:10, "their ear is uncircumcised, and they are not able to listen"), so although the Old Testament uses different language, the same reality seems to be in view. God gives people the ability to believe, a willingness to do so that they did not previously have. The New Testament does not say that regeneration will not take place until after Jesus is glorified, though it does say this of the reception of the indwelling Spirit (John 7:39). Moreover, we find evidence of regeneration in the Old Testament.

C. Bennema seems to suggest that the disciples' experience of the life-giving Spirit was an entrée to indwelling:

Within Jesus' earthly ministry, people (including the disciples) could already have "foretastes" or experiences of the life-giving Spirit, but authentic

Christian faith became a reality only after the cross, the resurrection and the gift of the Spirit (in 20:22).<sup>33</sup>

But the texts do not indicate that the Spirit's regenerating work is the same as, or a preview of, His indwelling work. Rather, we should regard the disciples as fully regenerate, not merely experiencing a foretaste, though they are only indwelt after Jesus is glorified.

If by "authentic Christian faith" Bennema has the content of faith in view and means a faith that is aware of all that God has accomplished in Jesus, he is correct that this is only possible after "the cross, the resurrection and the gift of the Spirit." If, on the other hand, he has a quality of faith in view and refers here to a genuine trust that God will save—being aware of as much as has been revealed in salvation history and resulting in God counting the believer righteous, this kind of faith is possible at any point in salvation history (see Abraham, Gen 15:6).

Old covenant believers were regenerated by the Spirit (see below, "Glimpses of regeneration in the Old Testament"). This enabled them to have authentic, saving faith even though the content of their faith was limited by their location in salvation history. The Spirit indwelt the temple and not their persons (see [chapter three](#)).

Bennema later indicates that the view to which he had earlier given his approval—concerning foretastes of the Spirit—is "too weak."<sup>34</sup>

A few texts seem to speak of adequate understanding and belief on behalf of the disciples already within Jesus' ministry. ... However, the availability of life and the activity of the Spirit were tied to the human Jesus, and the anticipated departure of Jesus would create a problem for the participation in the divine life the disciples experienced through Jesus.<sup>35</sup>

Bennema does not here raise the question of those who appear to have had "adequate faith" prior to the coming of Jesus. I suggest that "adequate faith" results from regeneration, that regeneration is not equivalent to indwelling, and that regeneration is possible at any point in salvation history (again, it is the reception of the Spirit that awaits Jesus' glorification in John 7:39). Bennema's proposal does not account for the authentic faith of old covenant believers who lived prior to the incarnation.

An important question now arises: does the Old Testament give any indications that its faithful were regenerate?

### **Glimpses of regeneration in the Old Testament.**

God said that eating the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil would result in death (Gen 2:17). Adam and Eve ate from the tree, but they did not immediately die physically (Gen 3:6). Though they did not experience

physical death right away, the couple did die spiritually (Gen 3:7–8).<sup>36</sup> At a fundamental level they were separated from God and cursed (3:8–19).<sup>37</sup> With the curses, however, came a promise of redemption (3:15).

Though the text does not say that God caused Adam and Eve to be born again from above by the Spirit, Adam and Eve responded in hope to the promise God gave them. Their response of faith and hope can be seen in the name Adam gave Eve, “the mother of all living” (3:20). Kenneth Mathews explains that the Hebrew form of Eve’s name, ḥawwâ, “is phonetically related to the word ḥay (‘living’)” and that this phonetic wordplay “is a tribute to Adam’s faith in the prospect that God had revealed (vv. 15–16). Adam had learned, albeit through the most calamitous lesson, to accept God’s word in faithful obedience.”<sup>38</sup> Adam was convinced that God had shown mercy and would allow them to live and procreate. Further, Eve’s responses to the births of Cain (4:1) and Seth (4:25) indicate that she was looking for the fulfillment of the promise given in Gen 3:15.<sup>39</sup> Their hope indicates that they have been lifted out of spiritual separation from God and enabled to trust Him. It seems that they experienced regeneration.

Another hint of regeneration in the Old Testament is in Psalm 87. Those who by natural descent are not participants in the kingdom of God (Rahab, Babylon,

Philistia, Tyre, Ethiopia [87:4]) have somehow become participants in God's kingdom by being "born there" (87:6). Psalm 87 is perhaps eschatological, but the Old Testament knows of those born elsewhere who come to be reckoned "true Jews" (e.g., Melchizedek, Rahab, Ruth, perhaps Agur [Prov 30:1], Lemuel [Prov 31:1], and Job). Those mentioned in Psalm 87 were not physically born in Zion, but in a sense they experienced a second birth whereby they were counted among those who belonged to God's realm. Psalm 87 may be one of the passages from which Jesus expected Nicodemus to recognize His teaching on the new birth from above (John 3:10).

Other hints at regeneration may also be found in the Old Testament. The Psalmist, who is physically alive, asks God to cause him to live (Ps 119:25).<sup>40</sup> Isaiah proclaims to his hearers, who are physically alive, "Hear, that your souls may live!" (Isa 55:3). Among others, Eichrodt sees regeneration as possible for Old Testament saints: "No longer is it only in the age of salvation to come that the spirit is expected to consummate God's rule by the inner transformation of men's hearts."<sup>41</sup> He goes beyond the evidence, however, and ignores evidence from the New Testament when he applies Eph 1:14 to old covenant believers.<sup>42</sup>

To summarize the main points of this section, while some reject the use of the term "regenerate" to describe Old Testament saints, since the term is not used in the Old

Testament, I view this metaphor as being equivalent to "circumcision of the heart." Further, the reality signified by the term "regeneration" is a theological necessity if those who lived under the old covenant were dead in sin and became believers. While the New Testament explicitly states that the reception of the indwelling Spirit could not take place prior to the glorification of Jesus (John 7:39), it does not say that regeneration could not take place.

## **The Spirit Is the One Who Gives Life**

Another indication that regeneration is separate from indwelling is found in John 6:63. When Jesus scandalized His hearers in the synagogue at Capernaum, He challenged those who found His teaching to be difficult by asking how they would respond if they saw the Son of Man ascend to where He was before. Having known from the beginning that some did not believe, and who it was that would betray Him, Jesus explained in 6:63 how those who were not scandalized were enabled to perceive that His were "the words of eternal life" (6:68): "The Spirit is the One who makes alive."<sup>43</sup> No conjunction joins the question in v. 62 to the statement in v. 63, but the context seems to indicate Jesus is explaining that unless the Spirit gives life, His words cannot be received. This view is supported by Jesus' next two statements in v. 63: "The flesh profits nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and are life."

The juxtaposition of Spirit and flesh in John 6:63 calls to mind the similar contrast between these spheres in 3:6.<sup>44</sup> As there, in 6:63 Jesus seems to be saying that the words He is speaking belong to the realm of the Spirit. Thus, “The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and are life” (6:63c) can be interpreted to mean that Jesus' words are “spirit” in the sense that they cannot be apprehended by mere human power (cp. 8:43, “You are not able to hear My word”). This explains why Jesus would say “The flesh profits nothing” (6:63b). Jesus' words belong to the realm of the Spirit,<sup>45</sup> and the realm of the Spirit is not understood by those who belong to the realm of the flesh. Those who belong to the realm of the flesh, however, can be brought over to the realm of the Spirit, for “the Spirit is the One who makes alive” (6:63a), and Jesus' words “are spirit and are life” (6:63c).

Jesus' words result in life for those whom the Spirit makes alive.<sup>46</sup> In other words, the Spirit's life-giving work enables people to receive Jesus' message. Anyone whom the Spirit makes alive understands what Jesus says, finds it compelling, and believes. Those who do not believe reject Jesus' message—not because it is not true, but because they remain in the realm of the flesh and do not experience the life-giving work of the Spirit.

**When is this possible?** This passage is relevant for our purposes for two reasons: first, the life-giving work of the Spirit is featured, but no mention is made of the Spirit

indwelling those who are made alive; and second, Jesus is presented speaking in the present tense. "The Spirit is [estin] the One who makes alive [zōopoion]" (6:63a).<sup>47</sup> Unlike John 7:39, where the narrator explains an offer of living water that Jesus makes to the crowd in 7:38 as "about to be received" when Jesus is glorified, here John does not inform the readers/hearers of the Gospel that this ministry of the Spirit could not be received until after the cross.<sup>48</sup> As Jesus speaks the word of God (3:34), the Spirit enables some to receive His message (6:63). These people recognize Jesus' message as their only hope ("to whom shall we go?"), as "the words of eternal life" (6:68).<sup>49</sup>

Just as the Spirit gave new life to the elect who heard the words of Jesus in John 6:63, the Spirit gave new life to the elect who heard the word of God spoken in the days prior to the incarnation and the dawn of the kingdom of God. This would explain Isaiah's call to his contemporaries: "Hear, that your souls may live!" (Isa 55:3). When the Spirit of God enables a person to hear the word of God and believe it, regardless of where that person is on the salvation-historical time line, he can be described as regenerate. The heart of the person is circumcised, and the ability to believe is created. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit, however, only accompanies the Spirit's life-giving work after the glorification of Jesus. After the glorification of Jesus, regeneration and indwelling can be seen as concurrent, though they remain distinct

ministries of the Spirit. The evidence presented here indicates that prior to the glorification of Jesus, believers were regenerated by the Holy Spirit but not indwelt by Him.

# God's New Temple in John

I have argued thus far that the Spirit's life-giving ministry is not to be equated with His indwelling of believers. But if indwelling is not regeneration, what is it? This section seeks to explain an important aspect of indwelling as John presents it. The standard interpretation of the Spirit's presence with the disciples after Jesus goes away is that the Spirit continues Jesus' presence.<sup>50</sup> This is true enough but is insufficient because it does not make explicit the connection between the ministry of Jesus that the Spirit continues and the new role the disciples would play as God's temple.

The Holy Spirit's indwelling of believers is shaped by concepts that are bound up with the ministry of Israel's temple.<sup>51</sup> This understanding of indwelling will address the larger question of whether old covenant believers were indwelt, for if the indwelling of new covenant believers is parallel to the indwelling of the old covenant temple, then the indwelling of believers would have been out of place in the era when the old covenant's temple was the means of God's dwelling with His people.

Johannine scholars generally agree that John presents Jesus as the reality to which the temple points.<sup>52</sup> During His earthly residence, Jesus was the locus of God's

presence, and sacrificial atonement found its perfect expression at the cross (note Jesus' announcement that "It is finished" in John 19:30). Skarsaune writes, "[Jesus] was Himself to be the final sacrifice, the sacrifice that (by implication) put an end to all other atoning sacrifices. That would result in a redefinition of what—or rather who—the temple would be from now on."<sup>53</sup> These two blessings, God's presence<sup>54</sup> and God's provision for atonement, were formerly conveyed by the temple in Jerusalem. They are transferred to Jesus in the incarnation. The thesis of this section is that when Jesus sends the disciples as the Father has sent Him (17:18; 20:21), He confers to the disciples the temple authority that He received. The disciples become the locus of God's presence and the place where sin is dealt with. This temple authority is part of what indwelling expresses.

The idea that a community rather than a physical structure had become the temple is not foreign to first century Judaism. The Qumran community appears to have conceived of itself as the temple. They regarded themselves as making atonement (1 QS 5:6; 8:10; 9:4) and likened themselves to the foundation for the holy of holies (1 QS 8:5–9; 9:6). They appear to have regarded this as only a temporary situation, however, for when the exiled sons of light (1 QM 1:3) triumph, "The chiefs of the tribes, and after them the fathers of the congregation, shall have charge of the sanctuary gates in perpetuity" (1

QM 2:3).

There is no evidence that Christians derived their understanding of themselves as God's temple from the Qumran community.<sup>55</sup> As Coloe states,

The Temple-as-community imagery found in these scrolls is more functional than the imagery found in the Fourth Gospel. The Johannine text develops the imagery of Temple-as-people around the concept of divine indwelling expressed in the various forms of μένω [remain/abide] in chapters 14 and 15. The Qumran literature does not have this concept. Their notion of community-as-Temple is tied up with the concept of sacrifice and atonement.<sup>56</sup>

For the Christians, not only was the community the temple (1 Cor 3:16), each individual was indwelt (1 Cor 6:19, see further below). Coloe also suggests that the temple imagery at Qumran "does not apply to the entire community but to a select group within the community called the 'council of union.'"<sup>57</sup>

After Jesus' departure the disciples became the locus of God's presence (14:17; 20:22). They were also given authority to forgive and retain sins (20:23), a blessing formerly mediated through the sacrifices of the temple. Therefore, as Wright says, "Jesus and the church together

are the new Temple."<sup>58</sup> This is clear enough from the New Testament and other early Christian literature.<sup>59</sup> The burden of this section is to show that it is in John. If so, it would seem that John's account of the words and actions of Jesus are the historical foundation for the church's conception of itself as the temple of God.<sup>60</sup>

In order to show that this is what indwelling is for John, this section will proceed in three movements. First, the significance of the temple in the first century will provide a backdrop against which John can be understood. We will then survey John's presentation of Jesus as the temple. Third, we will trace Jesus' sending of the disciples and the indications that they would continue His ministry of mediating blessings formerly found at the temple. The argument of this section is that the reception of the indwelling Spirit constitutes believers as the New Temple. We begin with the significance of the temple in Jerusalem.

## **The Temple in Jerusalem**

In chapter three we saw the importance of the temple in the Old Testament. As Skarsaune claims regarding second temple Judaism, "The common point of reference for all Jews was the temple."<sup>61</sup> Similarly, N. T. Wright asserts, "The Temple was the focal point of every aspect of Jewish national life."<sup>62</sup> At the heart of the disputes between the Jewish groups who were contemporaries of Jesus was the

temple.<sup>63</sup>

The high estimation of the temple is not without Scriptural foundation, for Israel had been commanded to seek their God at the place He chose to set His name (Deut 12:5). S. Safrai provides a helpful summary of the centrality of the temple for the people,

The Temple, its vessels and even the high priest's vestments were depicted as representing the entire universe and the heavenly hosts ... It was firmly believed that the Temple was destined to exist eternally, just like heaven and earth. ... Viewed within this context, it is possible to understand the devotion to the temple ... as well as the agony and despair and spiritual vacuum which was created within the nation when the Temple was burned down. With the destruction of the Temple the image of the universe was rendered defective, the established framework of the nation was undermined and a wall of steel formed a barrier between Israel and its heavenly Father.<sup>64</sup>

John portrays Jesus entering into this holy place with a startling statement about where Israel's God dwelled,<sup>65</sup> and where they made atonement for their sin:<sup>66</sup> "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it" (John 2:19).

## **Jesus: The New Temple in John**

This section aims to establish two points regarding John's presentation of Jesus as the new temple. First, Jesus replaces the temple as the location where God's presence must be sought and found, and second, Jesus fulfills the temple's sacrifices for atonement.<sup>67</sup> These two components of the temple replacement theme in John will be explored. The first will be considered primarily from John 1:14 and 51. The focus for the second component will be on John 2:13–22.

**Presence: John 1:14,51.** John specifically identifies the body of Jesus as the temple in John 2:19–22. Earlier, in describing the incarnation, John writes that Jesus, “the Word,” “tabernacled [eskēnōsen] among us” (1:14). This expression evokes Old Testament images of God's presence with His people at the tabernacle in the wilderness.<sup>68</sup> John suggests that where Jesus was present, God was present.<sup>69</sup> Craig Koester connects the tabernacle with God's glory.

The verb σκηνώω can also be connected with the idea of glory, for it resembles the noun σκηνή which the LXX uses for the Israelite tabernacle. The tabernacle was the place where God spoke with Moses (Exod 33:9) and where he manifested his glory (Exod 40:34). Therefore tabernacle imagery is uniquely able to portray the person of Jesus as the locus of God's

## Word and glory among humankind.[70](#)

Thus John continues in 1:14: "And the Word became flesh and tabernacled among us, and we saw His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth."

Also adding to the idea that God is present where Jesus is are the prophetic indications that one day Yahweh Himself would tabernacle among the people. As Koester puts it,

The verb σκηνώ may also echo passages from the prophets, where God promises, "Sing and rejoice O daughter of Zion, for behold, I will tabernacle κατασκηνώσω in your midst" (Zech 2:14[10]); "So you shall know that I am the Lord your God, who tabernacles κατασκηνών in Zion" (Joel 3:17); and "My tabernacled-place κατασκήνωσις shall be among you [sic] (Ezek 37:27; cf. Lev 26:11 MT). The promise of God's tabernacled presence was realized when the Word became flesh.[71](#)

In John 1:51, Jesus says to Nathanael, "Truly, truly I say to you, you will see the heavens opened and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man," alluding to Gen 28:12, where Jacob "dreamed, and behold, a flight of steps placed on the earth, and its top touched the heavens; and behold the angels of God were

ascending and descending upon it." Scholars dispute what exactly Jacob saw, for the word translated "flight of steps" or "ladder" (sullām) occurs only here in the Old Testament.<sup>72</sup> Given Jacob's response after Yahweh addresses him (28:13–15) and he awakes (28:16), it appears that Jacob saw something like a ziggurat, or a tower, with steps going up the side that reached the heavens.<sup>73</sup> Jacob exclaimed, "Surely Yahweh is here in this place and I did not know it. How awesome is this place! This place is nothing other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven!" (28:16–17). Consequently, he named the place Bethel (bêt-'ēl), house of God (Gen 28:19).

McKelvey connects this account to Israel's temple.

The rabbis identified the stone on which Jacob slept as the foundation-stone of the temple of Jerusalem, and there is a tradition to the effect that Jacob's ladder marked the site of the new temple (Gen. R. 68.12; 69.7). What John would appear to be saying therefore is that the bond joining heaven and earth is no longer the temple of Jerusalem, where the glory or presence of God was hidden in the holy of holies, but Christ, in whom the divine glory is made visible.<sup>74</sup>

Even if Jacob only saw a ladder, and not a temple, it remains that Jesus claimed to be the connection between

earth and heaven. Whereas before, God's presence was associated with a particular place, Bethel,<sup>75</sup> Jesus proclaimed to Nathanael that it is now where He is.<sup>76</sup> The locus of God's presence has shifted from a particular house, in a particular city, in a particular land, to a particular person, Jesus.<sup>77</sup>

Jesus' words to the Samaritan woman, that the time for worship at the temple in Jerusalem has come to an end (John 4:21–24), have been discussed, but they are another part of John's "temple replacement" theme.<sup>78</sup> Along with that passage and John 2:12–19, John 1:14,51 show that Jesus replaces the temple as the dwelling place of God. Those who saw Him saw "His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father" (1:14). Further, as Jacob saw angels ascending and descending and knew he was at the gate of heaven, the house of God, now Jesus is a new Bethel, a new house of God (1:51). At times in John Jesus is even more explicit: "The one who sees Me sees the One who sent Me" (12:45; cp. 14:9).

These are some of the ways that John presents Jesus as the place where God was present. Just as the glory of God filled the tabernacle (Exod 40:34–38) and the temple (1 Kgs 8:10–11), Jesus tabernacled among humans and manifested God's glory (John 1:14).<sup>79</sup> In John, Jesus replaces the temple as the place where God is especially present.<sup>80</sup> We now turn to "the hermeneutical key identifying Jesus as the Temple of God [which] occurs in

the narrative at the start of Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem,"<sup>81</sup> John 2:13–22. As Paul Hoskins says, "John 2:18–22 contributes to a proper understanding of 1:14, 1:51, and 4:20–24. John 1:14, 1:51, and 4:20–24 clarify that Jesus is not only the replacement of the Temple, but also of other OT holy places."<sup>82</sup>

**Sacrifice: John 2:13–22.** John presents Jesus not only as the new locus of God's presence, but also as the new and final sacrifice. Our main interest here is to highlight the sacrificial aspects of this passage.<sup>83</sup>

The account of the temple cleansing is framed by references to the Passover (2:13,23), reminding the reader of the sacrifice of lambs and the sprinkling of their blood at the base of the altar.<sup>84</sup> The large animals—oxen and sheep—add to the sacrificial timbre heard in this passage (2:14).<sup>85</sup> The evangelist has already presented Jesus as "the lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world" (1:29). Now Jesus drives animals of sacrifice out of the temple.

Jesus' passion that the temple courts<sup>86</sup> not be made into a marketplace (2:16)<sup>87</sup> reminded the disciples of Ps 69:10:<sup>88</sup> "the zeal of your house will consume Me" (ho zēlos tou oikou sou kataphagetai me).<sup>89</sup> Commentators are in general agreement that the citation of this passage points forward to Jesus' death.<sup>90</sup> Psalm 69 will be quoted

again when Jesus is on the cross (Ps 69:21 in John 19:28). The house referred to in the Psalm is the temple. Jesus clears the temple because of His zeal for His Father's house. The zeal that will consume Him, however, is zeal for the new temple, those who believe. It is somewhat surprising that Jesus causes such havoc—driving out the animals with a whip, pouring out the coins of the moneychangers, overturning tables, and berating the merchants (2:15–16)—and the only repercussion is a request for a sign to demonstrate His authority (2:18)! Witherington explains that the request for a sign “grows out of the teachings in Deut. 13:1–5 and 18:20–22 about testing prophets.”<sup>91</sup> He also explains that “in view of the fact that the outer court of the Temple was some 300 meters wide by 450 in length, and served as the marketplace for Jerusalem in various respects, it is unlikely that Jesus drove everyone out of the Temple court.”<sup>92</sup> Yet even if the cleansing was limited to a certain area of the temple courts, we might still expect more than a question to follow. Perhaps John presents the authorities not apprehending Jesus but asking for a sign because he means for his readers/hearers to discern that the authorities knew that Jesus had in fact acted in a righteous manner. Clearing the temple of commerce was the right thing to do because, though these business elements were necessary for the worship at the temple to take place,<sup>93</sup> it was not necessary for them to be in the temple itself.<sup>94</sup> By asking for a sign, they were asking to be shown that Jesus

was qualified to do what He did.<sup>95</sup>

In response to the request for a sign, Jesus said, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it" (John 2:19). The Jews naturally took Jesus to be referring to the destruction of the temple building as the sign of His authority. They responded in amazement that Jesus claimed the ability to raise in only three days a temple that had taken 46 years to construct (2:20). Then the reader is told, "But He was speaking concerning the temple of His body" (2:21). John next explains, "Then when He was raised from the dead, His disciples remembered that He said this, and they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus spoke" (2:22). So John connects the destruction of the temple Jesus spoke of in 2:19 with Jesus' death, and links the raising of the temple which Jesus declared He would accomplish in three days to the resurrection.

From the vantage point of John 2:22, then, the details of the temple cleansing take on deeper significance. It would appear that John means for his readers to observe that in this passage "the house of My Father" (2:16) ceases to be the building on mount Zion in Jerusalem and becomes the body of Jesus (2:20–21). Before Jesus came, sacrifice for sin took place at the temple. Jesus claims that temple sacrifice will take place at a new temple, His body, and that He will be raised in three days (2:19–22). In view of what John says about the death of Jesus (e.g., 1:29;

11:50; 19:30), it is no wonder that McKelvey should write, "The death of Christ is presented as a new and better sacrifice."<sup>96</sup> John presents Jesus as the replacement of the temple with regard to the presence of God and sacrifice for sin. John appears to connect Jesus and the temple in other ways as well.

Jesus is the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (John 1:29)<sup>97</sup> and dies on behalf of the people (11:50–51). Whereas bread was kept in the tabernacle (Exod 25:30), Jesus is the bread of life (John 6:34). Water was expected to flow from the eschatological temple (Ezek 47; Zech 14:8); Jesus offers living water to those who will come to Him (John 4:10–14; 7:37–38). Whereas the lampstand stood in the tabernacle (Exod 25:31–40), Jesus is the light of the world (John 8:12).<sup>98</sup>

As God formerly dwelt in the temple, now the Father dwells in Jesus: "The Father is in Me and I am in the Father (10:38; 14:10; see 1:14,51; 2:19; 4:21–26; 10:30). Thus during Jesus' ministry John shows Him declaring that a time is coming when worship in Jerusalem will no longer be necessary (4:21–24).<sup>99</sup> Once Jesus finishes His work (19:30), no more sacrifices of atonement need be offered.<sup>100</sup> This enables the possibility of a redirection of the temple's role in dealing with sin. As has been noted, "The Jewish Temple was only a foreshadowing of the temple of his own body and of the coming church which he would establish through his death

and resurrection.”<sup>101</sup> In the next section it will be argued that Jesus confers the ability to minister these temple blessings to His disciples.

## **Believers: The Temple When Jesus Leaves**

This section has three parts. First we will look at the way in which Jesus sent His disciples. Second, the disciples become the new locus of the presence of God. And third, Jesus gives them authority over sin. These aspects of John's presentation of the indwelling of believers by the Spirit are best understood as corollaries to the ministry of the old covenant temple. John's identification of the believing community as the temple is not as explicit as his identification of Jesus as the temple, but the evidence seen in the three parts of this section indicate that John regards believers as the temple when Jesus goes away<sup>102</sup>

**As the Father Has Sent Me.** A radical salvation-historical shift took place when the Father sent the Son into the world. As John presents it, the two central events propelling salvation history forward were when God gave Israel the law and when the Son of God became flesh in Jesus Christ (John 1:17). The surpassing glory of the incarnation is emphasized by the stress on Jesus' unparalleled relationship with and explanation of the

Father (1:18).

The previous section has argued that when the Father sent the Son into the world, the locus of God's presence and the means of atonement shifted from the temple in Jerusalem to Jesus Himself. In John, Jesus claims that He is the true meaning of the Old Testament Scriptures: "these are the ones who bear witness concerning Me" (John 5:39). The temple and the blessings it mediates feature prominently in the Old Testament Scriptures, and Jesus claimed that these Scriptures point to Him. Jesus accomplished the work that the Father sent Him into the world to do (17:4; 19:30). The work that the Father sent the Son to accomplish fulfilled all the temple sacrifices, creating the possibility of a new level of access to God through the cross.<sup>103</sup>

If Jesus sent the disciples as the Father sent Him,<sup>104</sup> as Jesus declared (20:21; cp. 17:18), then the blessings that Jesus mediated would be mediated by the disciples. So if the Father sent Jesus as the replacement of the temple, it would appear that, in part, Jesus sent His disciples as the replacement of the temple. When Jesus told His disciples that God would dwell with and in them (14:17,23), and when He gave them the authority to forgive and retain sins (20:23), He was transferring the mediation of the temple's blessings from Himself to His disciples.

**Indwelling: God's Presence.** While the indwelling of

the temple helps to flesh out those statements that indicate God will dwell in believers, the temple analogy might not be sufficient to canvass the statements that speak of a mutual indwelling (e.g., John 14:20: "In that day you will know that I am in My Father and you are in Me and I am in you;" cp. 14:10–11). The vine-branch metaphor in John 15:1–7 also informs John's concept of indwelling, but it may or may not be directly related to temple motifs. Mary Coloe argues that both mutual indwelling and the vine and the branches involve temple symbolism.<sup>105</sup> She translates John 15:4, "Make your home in Me, as I make Mine in you."<sup>106</sup>

Another facet of John's understanding of indwelling that is perhaps not directly informed by temple concepts is the unity resulting from the relationships of mutual indwelling (see 17:11,21–23). Here too, though, an explanation of how this relates to the way the temple functioned has been offered: Israel's temple "welded the different tribes together in the service of the one God," which corresponds to believers' unity.<sup>107</sup> To examine each of these suggestions would take us far beyond the scope of this chapter. What is covered here is sufficient to show that in John's thinking the indwelling of the Spirit is only possible once the temple, which was formerly indwelt by the Spirit, has been rendered unnecessary by the atoning death of Jesus. It is then replaced by the believing community.

John presents Jesus as the temple and then presents

Jesus conferring the authority of the temple to His disciples. This fits with the interpretation of John 7:37–38 offered in chapter five, that Jesus gives living water to those who believe in Him, and the water then flows from the believer.

John explains that this water is the Holy Spirit (7:39), which supports the argument that indwelling is to be understood in terms of the temple, for here John is presenting the Holy Spirit in believers as the living water flowing from the eschatological temple. The phrase, “just as the Scripture says” (7:38), most likely refers to those passages indicating that water will flow from the eschatological temple (Ezek 47:1; Zech 14:8).<sup>108</sup> Coloe writes,

While Jesus is in the world, his body is the Temple of God's presence and so he can offer living water (4:10). ... Jesus' words [John 7:37–38] point ahead to the believers, who, having received the Spirit, have been constituted as the new Temple/household of God and can continue to provide access to a source of living water (20:22).<sup>109</sup>

In being with Jesus during His ministry, the disciples were with the temple where the Spirit dwelt. This explains the words of John 14:17, “You know Him [the Spirit], for He is with you.” The next phrase of John 14:17, “and He

will be in you,” is to be understood in terms of Jesus conferring upon His disciples the mediatorship of temple blessings.<sup>[110](#)</sup> As Walker explains,

In that earlier verse [14:2], the disciples had been looking forward to a future ‘dwelling’ with God in heaven; now they are promised in the interim God’s ‘dwelling’ with them through the agency of the Holy Spirit. ... Whilst the disciples must still await their coming to that heavenly Temple, they can in the meantime know what it is to be a ‘Temple’ themselves, the place where God makes his ‘dwelling’.<sup>[111](#)</sup>

Jesus’ words in John 14:23, “If anyone loves Me he will keep My word, and My Father will love him and We will come to him and make Our home with him;” evoke God’s word to Solomon regarding the necessary conditions under which God would indwell the temple.

And the word of Yahweh came to Solomon saying, “This house which you are about to build, if you will walk in My statutes and do My judgments and keep all My commandments to walk in them, then I will establish my word with you which I spoke to David your Father, and I will dwell in the midst of the sons of Israel and I will not forsake My people Israel” (1 Kgs 6:11–13).

God would dwell among the people of Israel in the temple if Solomon—as the representative head of the nation—would obey. Köstenberger rightly notes that “Jesus' words echo the demands of the Deuteronomic covenant.”<sup>112</sup> Solomon could not earn God's presence by obeying. Nor does John 14:15,23 say that the disciples could earn the gift of the indwelling Spirit if they obeyed.<sup>113</sup> Both texts, 1 Kgs 6 and John 14, are addressed to those whom the Lord has drawn to Himself and enabled to obey. Just as the people's obedience in the old covenant would create a holy environment in which Yahweh could dwell in the temple in the midst of the people (Num 35:34), obedience to the word of Jesus results in a sanctified temple—the corporate and individual bodies of the believing remnant—in which God can dwell.<sup>114</sup>

This concept of Jesus and the church replacing the temple would also appear to make sense of the statements in John 7:39 and 16:7 that the Spirit would not come to the disciples until Jesus' glorification and departure. These statements, which might otherwise seem to be arbitrary divisions in salvation history, reflect the reality that for the temple to be replaced, sacrifice must be fulfilled. Until Jesus went to the cross, atoning sacrifices had to be made at the temple. If the temple was to be replaced as the dwelling place of God and He was to take up residence in individuals and among the community of the Messiah, something was required to answer the need for atonement. Deeds of lovingkindness do not atone for sin (against Avot de Rabbi Nathan 8; 1 QS 9:1–6;

cp.Heb 9:22). However, once Jesus goes to the cross to glorify the Father and be glorified in Him (John 13:31–32) by dying on behalf of the people (11:50) as the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (1:29), there is no longer need for temple sacrifices to make atonement (Heb 9:25–28).<sup>115</sup> After the death of Jesus, sacrifice is no longer necessary, and God can take up residence in a temple where no atoning sacrifices are offered.

**Forgiveness of sins.** In John 20:21–23, Jesus communicates the authority to mediate the blessings of the temple by sending the disciples just as the Father sent Him. The temple blessings that the disciples thereby mediate are the presence of God and the means for sins to be forgiven.

Having put an end to sacrifice (cp. 19:30), on the day of the resurrection Jesus appeared to the disciples in a glorified body (20:19). “Then Jesus said to them again, ‘Peace to you. Just as the Father has sent Me, I also send you.’” Here He compares His sending the disciples to the Father’s sending Him.<sup>116</sup> The Father sent Jesus not only as the new locus of His presence (1:14), but also as the One who would deal with sin (1:29).

Then “He breathed and says to them, ‘Receive the Holy Spirit’” (20:22). As the Spirit came down upon Jesus to remain (1:33–34), officially appointing Him to His

Messianic office, Jesus gives the Spirit to the disciples and sends them on their divinely appointed mission (20:21–22). Bruce rightly notes, “It is not the bestowal of life that is in view now, but empowerment for ministry.”<sup>117</sup> By giving them the Spirit He makes the disciples the new locus of God's presence.

The words that immediately follow reinforce the conclusion that the reception of the indwelling Spirit is to be understood in terms of the temple, and they also correspond to Jesus' own ministry. Just as Jesus replaced the temple as the place where sin was dealt with, He tells the disciples, “If you forgive the sins of anyone they are forgiven them, if you retain the sins of anyone they are retained” (20:23). Ridderbos, among others, notes that the passives, “are forgiven” and “are retained” are divine passives.<sup>118</sup> When sacrifices were formerly offered at the temple, God forgave His people (see Lev 4:20,26,31,35; 5:10,13,16,18; 6:7; 19:22). Now in Jesus, sacrifice for sin has been made, God has breathed His Spirit into a new temple, and this new temple is the place where forgiveness is to be found (20:23). Forgiveness is possible because of Jesus' death on the cross, but when He gives His disciples authority to forgive and retain sins He gives the church the ability to mediate the forgiveness His death makes possible. Those who are not united to the body of Christ are not forgiven (see the application of this in chapter seven). As Coloe puts it, “The new Temple, endowed with the Spirit, will be an ongoing source within

the world of life-giving waters (John 4:14, 7:38) and cleansing from sin (20:23)."[119](#)

I know of no commentary on John which makes recourse to temple motifs to explain John 20:21–23. But in summing up the message of the New Testament as a whole regarding Jesus and those who believe in Him as the new temple, Walker writes,

Whether the Temple was thought of as the place which embodied God's presence on earth or as the place of sacrifice, the New Testament writers affirmed in their different ways that both these aspects had been fulfilled in Jesus: his death was the true sacrifice and his person the true locus of God's dwelling upon earth. By extension Christian believers too might be seen as a "Temple."[120](#)

# Conclusion

In this chapter I have argued that regeneration is not to be equated with indwelling. Regeneration happens when God gives spiritual life to a person who was previously spiritually dead. Understood this way, regeneration is possible at any time in salvation history.

The Spirit indwells believers when God takes up residence in His new temple, which consists both of each individual member of Christ's body and of the community of believers as a whole. Understanding indwelling this way leads to the conclusion that this aspect of the Spirit's ministry is only possible in salvation history after Jesus has put an end to all sacrifices for atonement by dying on the cross. Once Jesus makes the old covenant temple with its cult obsolete, God dwells not only with but also in His new covenant people. Commenting on John 14:23, Köstenberger explains, "In Old Testament times, God dwelt among his people, first in the tabernacle (Ex. 25:8; 29:45; Lev. 26:11–12), then in the temple (Acts 7:46–47). In the New Testament era, believers are themselves the temple of the living God (1 Cor. 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; cp. 1 Peter 2:5)." <sup>121</sup> Indwelling does exist in the old covenant, but it is not each individual that is indwelt. In the old covenant God indwells the temple. In the new covenant the people of God are the temple, and God dwells in them. McKelvey sums this up well, "God no longer dwells in a

house with his people; he dwells in them; they are his temple."[122](#)

---

<sup>1</sup> G. Goldsworthy appears to regard regeneration and indwelling as distinct works of the Spirit. He writes of the Spirit's work, "He gives faith and new birth, he testifies to our hearts about Christ, he indwells the people of God and sanctifies them" (According to Plan [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002], 83 [emphasis added]).

<sup>2</sup> There is some question as to when the conversation with Nicodemus ends and the evangelist's commentary begins. The last change from first person to second person is found in 3:12, "How will you believe if I tell you heavenly things?" When the point of view switches to third person in 3:13, it could be that the evangelist is commenting on the dialogue between Jesus and Nicodemus (e.g., G. R. Beasley-Murray, John, 2d ed., WBC[Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999], 46). Some see the words of Jesus continuing until 3:15, because usually Jesus alone refers to Himself as "Son of Man" (e.g., D. A. Carson, The Gospel according to John, PNTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 185, 203). Others see the words of Jesus continuing through 3:21. E.g., F. J. Moloney views 3:11–21 as a discourse with Jesus speaking and Nicodemus listening in the background (The Gospel of John, SP 4 [Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998], 90).

<sup>3</sup> The term ἄνωθεν can mean "from above" or "again" (BDAG, 92). In this case it appears that the term is misunderstood by Nicodemus to mean "again" in 3:4, and clarified as "from above" by Jesus in 3:5 (see E. A. Abbott, Johannine Grammar [London: Black, 1906], §1903–8).

<sup>4</sup> Relevant OT background that could have informed Nicodemus' understanding of a second birth is sometimes found in 2 Sam 7:14; Ps 2:7; 87:4; 89:27. See J. H. Bernard, The Gospel according to St. John, 2 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928), clxiii. See also the discussion of the Jewish background of the new birth in O. Skarsaune, In the Shadow of the Temple (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002), 354–74. Several scholars, including Skarsaune, discuss the references to Gentiles undergoing proselyte baptism becoming as newborn children. The texts cited in this regard include b. Yebam. 48b; 22a; 62a; 97b; b. Bek. 47a (cp. A.

J.Köstenberger, John, in vol. 2 of Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary, ed. C. E. Arnold [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002], 35).

<sup>5</sup> Cp. "seeing" death in John 8:51 *θεωπέω*, and "seeing" corruption in Acts 2:27 (*ἰδέϊν* as in John 3:3). For more references, see Bernard, John, 102–3.

<sup>6</sup> Similarly T. L. Brodie, *The Gospel according to John* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 196; U.Schnelle, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, *Theologische Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament* 4(Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1998), 70.

<sup>7</sup> See Köstenberger, John, 35.

<sup>8</sup> See Brown, John, 141.

<sup>9</sup> Bernard, John, 102.

<sup>10</sup> J. Calvin, *Commentary on the Gospel according to John* [1553], (trans. W.Pringle, in *Calvin's Commentaries* (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1847; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 17:108 (*italics original*)).

<sup>11</sup> D. Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1981), 586.

<sup>12</sup> For the discussion, see L. Belleville, "'Born of Water and Spirit': John 3:5," *TJ* 1 (1980): 125–41; I. de la Potterie, "Naitrede l'eau et na itre de l'Esprit: Le texte baptismal de Jn 3,5," *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 14 (1962): 418–24; and P. Toon, *Born Again: A Biblical and Theological Study of Regeneration* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), esp. chapters 8 and 9.

<sup>13</sup> See Schnackenburg, John, 1:367.

<sup>14</sup> See S. S. Smalley, "'The Paraclete': Pneumatology in the Johannine Gospel and Apocalypse," in *Exploring the Gospel of John*, ed. R. A. Culpepper and C. C. Black (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 290; E. C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, 2d ed., ed. F. N. Davey, (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), 213.

<sup>15</sup> For an unsuccessful attempt to maintain that "the term 'protognostic' as a description of the gospel's anthropology is apt," see J. A. Trumbower, *Born from Above*, *Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie* 29(Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 4. This is particularly unlikely in view of the fact that the gnostic Acts of John was written to counter the Fourth Gospel (see K.Schäferdiek, "Introduction" to the Acts of John, in *NTapoc* 2:164–65).

<sup>16</sup> See Bernard, John, 105; Carson, John, 189.

<sup>17</sup> The only references to the “kingdom of God” in John are in 3:3 and 5 (cp. “My kingdom” in 18:36 [3x]). The “kingdom of God” here seems to be equivalent to “eternal life” (3:15,16). Entrance “into life” is also parallel to entrance “into the kingdom of God” in Mark 9:45,47. See G. R. Beasley-Murray, “John 3:3,5: Baptism, Spirit and the Kingdom,” *ExpTim* 97 (1986): 168.

<sup>18</sup> Rightly H. Ridderbos, *The Gospel of John*, trans. J. Vriend (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 127–28; G. Burge, *John*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 115; cp. also J. A. Kowalski, “Of Water and Spirit: Narrative structure and theological development in the Gospel of John” (Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 1987), 86–87.

<sup>19</sup> So C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 209; Brown, John, 140.

<sup>20</sup> D. Guthrie discusses regeneration in John 3 twice in his *New Testament Theology* (527,585–87), and in neither case does he equate it with indwelling. Similarly G. M. Burge, *The Anointed Community* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 158–68; M. M. Thompson, *The God of the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 165–70. Cp. the definition of regeneration given by L. Berkhof: “Regeneration is that act of God by which the principle of the new life is implanted in man, and the governing disposition of the soul is made holy” (*Systematic Theology*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1941 ], 469 [italics his]). Berkhof does not define regeneration as indwelling, nor does he treat indwelling in his discussion of regeneration.

<sup>21</sup> So Belleville, “Born of Water and Spirit,” 140; Carson, John, 195; Harris, “The Gospel of John,” [online] <http://www.bible.org/docs/nt/books/joh/harris/gjohn-07.htm#TopofPage>; Internet accessed Feb 2003.

<sup>22</sup> The most exact parallel is John 6:63. Cp. John 3:6 and 6:63:

3:6, τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος πνεῦμά ἐστιν

“what has been born of the Spirit is spirit.”

6:63, τὰ ῥήματα . . . πνεῦμά ἐστιν καὶ ζωὴ ἐστιν

“the words ... are spirit and are life.”

In both cases the concluding phrase, “is spirit πνεῦμά ἐστιν,” indicates that what is described belongs to the sphere of the Spirit as opposed to the sphere of the flesh, for in both contexts there is an explicit flesh-Spirit contrast.

<sup>23</sup> See W. D. Mounce, “The Origin of the New Testament Metaphor of Rebirth” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, December, 1982), 11; based on W. D. Mounce, “The Origin of the New Testament Metaphor of Rebirth” (Ph.D. diss., Aberdeen University, 1981).

<sup>24</sup> See Calvin, John, 17:114.

<sup>25</sup> So Brown, John, 140. Chapter five has argued that the eschatological blessings promised in the OT began to be fulfilled with Jesus’ glorification.

<sup>26</sup> Carson, John, 195–96 (emphasis his).

<sup>27</sup> See [chapter five](#).

<sup>28</sup> John does this with phrases such as: “Then when He was raised from the dead the disciples remembered ...” (2:22). “For the Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified” (7:39). “His disciples did not understand these things at first, but when Jesus was glorified, then they remembered” (12:16). “Now He was saying this signifying by what kind of death He was about to die” (12:33). “What I do you do not understand now” (13:7). “From now on I am telling you before it happens, in order that when it happens you may believe that I Am” (13:19). “For they did not yet understand the Scripture, that it was necessary for Him to rise from the dead” (20:9).

<sup>29</sup> This, of course, is not the only way to understand “earthly” here.

See the discussion of “earthly” and “heavenly” in Beasley-Murray, John, 49–50; Schnackenburg, John, 1:377–80; Harris, “The Gospel of John,” (on-line) [http://www.bible.org/docs/nt/books/joh/harris/gjohn-07.htm#P1115\\_I79233](http://www.bible.org/docs/nt/books/joh/harris/gjohn-07.htm#P1115_I79233); Internet accessed Feb 2003.

<sup>30</sup> Carson, John, 199.

<sup>31</sup> Belleville, “Born of Water and Spirit,” 141; cp. Burge, John, 116.

<sup>32</sup> Mounce, “The Origin of the New Testament Metaphor of Rebirth,” 11.

<sup>33</sup> C. Bennema, “The Giving of the Spirit in John's Gospel—A New Proposal?” *EvQ* 74 (2002): 196.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 208.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>36</sup> See 1 Cor 15:22, “For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive,” and see M. Barth's comments on Eph 2:1 (Ephesians 1–3, AB 34 [New York: Doubleday, 1974], 213).

<sup>37</sup> See E. H. Merrill, “Fall of Humankind,” in NIDOTTE, 4:638–39; T. D. Alexander, *From Paradise to the Promised Land* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 35.

<sup>38</sup> K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26*, NAC (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996), 254.

<sup>39</sup> See C. F. Keil, *The Pentateuch*, vol. 1 of *Commentary on the Old Testament*, by C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, trans. J. Martin (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1866–91; reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001), 68; Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26*, 265; J. H. Sailhamer, *Genesis*, in *EBC*, 2:60, 69.

<sup>40</sup> See BDB, 311 s.v. פִּי Pi. 2., 3.

<sup>41</sup> W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2 vols., OTL, trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961, 1967), 2:61, cp. 66.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:65.

<sup>43</sup> Beasley-Murray calls this sentence “startlingly unexpected” (John, 96).

<sup>44</sup> See Bernard, John, 218; Brown, John, 299–300.

<sup>45</sup> Bernard, John, 218.

<sup>46</sup> See J. L. Kipp, “The Relationship between the Conceptions of ‘Holy

Spirit' and 'Risen Christ' in the Fourth Gospel" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1967), 145.

<sup>47</sup> Thompson recognizes that this text regards "the life he confers as a present reality," but because she does not distinguish between regeneration and indwelling, she thinks that "the actual reception of life seems to be deferred until after Jesus' death" (The God of the Gospel of John, 178). It is not, however, the reception of life given by the Spirit that is deferred, but the reception of the indwelling Spirit.

<sup>48</sup> To speak as Brown does confuses the distinction between the Spirit's life-giving work in 3:6 and 6:63 and the reception of the indwelling Spirit in 7:39 and 14:17. He writes, "The man who accepts the words of Jesus will receive the life-giving Spirit" (John, 300). Again, John 7:39 does not say that the Spirit was not yet making alive, but that those who had believed in Jesus were about to receive the Spirit, for the Spirit had not yet been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.

<sup>49</sup> G. T. Tew, "The Pneumatology of John as Seen in the Fourth Gospel" (Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993), 69.

<sup>50</sup> The classic expression of this is found in R. E. Brown, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," NTS 13 (1967): 113–32; id., John, 1135–44. His followers are legion.

<sup>51</sup> Having arrived at many of these conclusions, I found them independently confirmed by M. L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001). See too O. Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple*, 155–60, 162.

<sup>52</sup> See the commentaries on John 2:21 and Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body*. Similarly P. Hoskins, "Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple in the Gospel of John" (Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2002). B. D. Johnson also comes to this conclusion ("The Temple in the Gospel of John," in *Christ's Victorious Church*, ed. J. A. Weatherly [Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001], 110–32).

<sup>53</sup> Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple*, 142.

<sup>54</sup> "The temple in its most basic sense symbolizes the dwelling place of God" ("Temple," in DBI, 849).

<sup>55</sup> Rightly Westerholm, "Temple," in ISBE, 4:776.

<sup>56</sup> Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 168.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 169, citing B. Byrne, "'Building' and 'Temple' imagery in the Qumran Texts" (M.A. Thesis, University of Melbourne, 1971). Similarly Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body*, 296–98.

<sup>58</sup> N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God 1 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 366 n. 31.

<sup>59</sup> See the discussion of indwelling and the church as the new temple in the NT in chapter five. The church is also portrayed as the temple of God indwelt by the Spirit in the Apostolic Fathers. Note 1 Clem. 9:3, δεῖ οὖν ἡμᾶς ὡς ναὸν θεοῦ φυλάσσειν τὴν σάρκα ("it is necessary, therefore, for us as the temple of God to guard the flesh"); Ign. Eph. 15:3, αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικοῦντος ἵνα ὦμεν αὐτοῦ ναοὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν θεὸς ἡμῶν ("while He dwells in us, that we might be His temples, and He, in us, our God"). Cp. Ign. Magn. 12,14; Rom. 6:3; Phld. 7:2; 8:1. Did. 10:2, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ("for your holy Name, which you have caused to tabernacle in our hearts"); Barn. 16:8,10, <sup>8</sup> ... ἐγενόμεθα καινοὶ, πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κτιζόμενοι· διὸ ἐν τῷ κατοικητηρίῳ ἡμῶν ἀληθῶς ὁ θεὸς κατοικεῖ ἐν ἡμῖν; <sup>10</sup> . . . τοῦτο ἐστὶν πνευματικὸς ναὸς οἰκαδομούμενος τῷ κυρίῳ (" <sup>8</sup> ... we became new, being created again from the beginning; therefore in our dwelling God truly dwells, that is, in us; <sup>10</sup> ... This is the spiritual temple being built up for the Lord"). Cp. Barn. 16:1–10.

<sup>60</sup> See D. Wenham, *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 183; P. W. L. Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 172; and I. F. Wood, *The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature* (New York: Armstrong, 1904), 238–39.

<sup>61</sup> Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple*, 106.

<sup>62</sup> Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 224.

<sup>63</sup> Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple*, 121; Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 225. Cp. m. Abot 1:2, "On three things does the world stand: on the Torah, and on the Temple service, and on deeds of loving kindness." Unless otherwise noted translations of the Mishnah come from J. Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).

<sup>64</sup> S. Safrai, "The Temple," in *The Jewish People in the First Century*,

CRINT 1.2, ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 906.

<sup>65</sup> See the summary of the temple as God's dwelling place in Westerholm, "Temple," in ISBE, 4:764, and M. O. Wise, "Temple," in DJG, 813.

<sup>66</sup> Kerr writes, "The Temple, then, is the place where YHWH's name dwells, sins are forgiven, prayer is made and heard, diseases are healed and agricultural prosperity is assured" (The Temple of Jesus' Body, 35).

<sup>67</sup> See J. Ådna, *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel*, WUNT 2. Reihe 119 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 448.

<sup>68</sup> See "Tabernacle," in DBI, 839; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 23; Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body*, 123.

<sup>69</sup> See Kipp, "The Relationship between the Conceptions of 'Holy Spirit' and 'Risen Christ' in the Fourth Gospel," 148.

<sup>70</sup> C. Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*, CBQMS 22 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989), 102. Similarly W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 366–67.

<sup>71</sup> Koester, *The Dwelling of God*, 104. Cp. Hoskins, "Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple," 170–83; McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 76.

<sup>72</sup> See BDB, 700; HALOT<sup>SE</sup>, 757–58.

<sup>73</sup> A. M. Harman, *NIDOTTE*, 3:266. Cp. A. P. Ross, *Creation and Blessing* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 489.

<sup>74</sup> McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 77.

<sup>75</sup> See Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 1:102; Kerr points out that in the Greek translation of Gen 28:10–19, "Place" (τόπος) occurs no less than six times" (The Temple of Jesus' Body, 153).

<sup>76</sup> See Koester, *The Dwelling of God*, 105, citing Cullmann, Brown, Hoskyns, and Schlatter. For further discussion of the relationship between John 1:51 and the temple replacement theme in John, see Hoskins, "Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple," 184–98.

<sup>77</sup> See "Temple," in DBI, 851; Davies, *The Gospel and the Land*, 296–97.

<sup>78</sup> Against J. Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue in John," NTS 45 (1999):

67. Rightly Köstenberger, John, 48; Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body*, 195).

<sup>79</sup> The Spirit coming down on Jesus to remain is relevant here as well (1:32–34; cp. 3:34).

<sup>80</sup> Against Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue in John," 63–64.

<sup>81</sup> Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 214.

<sup>82</sup> Hoskins, "Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple," 157.

<sup>83</sup> For a broader study of John 2:13–22, see Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body*, 67–101.

<sup>84</sup> See the description in m. Pesahim 5:6, "An Israelite slaughtered [the Passover lamb] and a priest received the blood, hands it to his fellow, and his fellow to his fellow, [each one] receiving a full basin and handing back an empty one. The priest nearest the altar tosses [the blood] in a single act of tossing, toward the base." Cp. the descriptions of the sacrifice in E. P. Sanders, *Judaism* (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1992), 136–37; and M. R. Wilson, "Passover," in *ISBE*, 3:677.

<sup>85</sup> Brown observes that the large animals are not mentioned in the account of the temple cleansing given in the Synoptics (John, 115). Coloe writes, "These larger animals were for holocausts and peace offerings (Leviticus 1, 3)" (*God Dwells with Us*, 72; cp. McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 77).

<sup>86</sup> Some take  $\epsilon\rho\tilde{\omega}$  in 2:14 to refer to "the outer court of the Temple, the Court of the Gentiles" (Brown, John, 115; so also Bernard, John, 89; Carson, John, 178; Westcott, John, 90). Against this Moloney writes, "In fact hieron refers to the Temple as a whole (cf. BAGD 372). This is the meaning intended by the author in vv. 14–15. It enables the misunderstanding that will occur in vv. 19–21" (John, 80–81).

<sup>87</sup> For discussion, see Hoskins, "Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple," 159; V. Eppstein, "The Historicity of the Gospel Account of the Cleansing of the Temple," *ZNW* 55 (1964): 42–58; C. A. Evans, "Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction?" *CBQ* 51 (1989): 267; Köstenberger, John, 32.

<sup>88</sup> Brown (John, 115) points out that it is not clear whether the words were remembered when the event took place or after the resurrection (see 2:22).

<sup>89</sup> Among LXX manuscripts apparently only *Codices Vaticanus* and

Sinaiticus have the future tense καταράγεται. The aorist κατέφαγέν has more widespread attestation. The Masoretic Text has the reading ~~אָפֶּאָג~~. For discussion of the variants, see Barrett, John, 198–99.

<sup>90</sup> See Barrett, John, 199.

<sup>91</sup> B. Witherington, *John's Wisdom* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 88.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 87 (emphasis his).

<sup>93</sup> Bernard, John, 88; Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, 193.

<sup>94</sup> Bernard, John, 91. Against L. Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament*, 2 vols., trans. J. E. Alsup, ed. J. Roloff (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981, 1982), 1:96.

<sup>95</sup> L. Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 173.

<sup>96</sup> McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 77. Cp. McKelvey, "Temple," in NDBT, 808; and Hoskins' discussion of Jesus as the fulfillment of passover, which "makes Jesus the true place of sacrifice" ("Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple," 259–66, quotation from 259).

<sup>97</sup> Scholars disagree over which Old Testament lamb John the Baptist had in mind. C. K. Barrett summarizes the several lambs from the Old Testament that could inform this context: the paschal lamb of Exodus 12, the servant lamb of Isa 53:7, the goat of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16), and the ram provided in place of Isaac in Genesis 22 ("The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 48 [1947]: 155–56; also *id.*, "The Lamb of God," *NTS* 1 (1954–55): 210–18). Also see the summary in Brown, John, 58–63, which adds the view of the apocalyptic lamb, the view favored by Beasley-Murray (John, 24–25). G. L. Borchert understands here a "synthesis of two biblical motifs," the servant of the Lord and the Passover (John 1–11, *NAC* [Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996], 135). The lamb of Isa 53:7 might rise to prominence since the Baptist has just cited Isaiah (John 1:23) and with the Isaianic overtones in John 1:32–34.

<sup>98</sup> Connecting Jesus' words in John 7:37–38 with His words in 8:12 and arguing that the "greatest day" was the eighth day, Coloe writes, "On the last day ... the great day' (7:37), when the menorahs have been extinguished, Jesus offers a new guiding light, not just for Israel but for the entire world" (*God Dwells with Us*, 135; italics and ellipses hers). Cp. Brown, John, 201–04; and see Hoskins' argument that Jesus replaces the

temple and fulfills Israel's feasts ("Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple," 235–66).

<sup>99</sup> McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 75.

<sup>100</sup> See the comments of F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 374.

<sup>101</sup> H. Giesbrecht, "The Evangelist John's Conception of the Church as Delimited in His Gospel," *EvQ* 58 (1986): 108.

<sup>102</sup> For a study of John's understanding of the church focusing on Jesus' prayer in John 17 and the concepts of glory and sending, see J. Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, JSNTSup 160 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1998). Being focused on John 17, Ferreira does not explore the temple connections presented here.

<sup>103</sup> The theme of the new access the disciples will have to God in prayer may also be connected to their new status as God's temple (see John 14:13–14; 15:7; 16:26).

<sup>104</sup> For a detailed study of the sending language used in John, see A. J. Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples according to the Fourth Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

<sup>105</sup> Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 159–60.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, vii.

<sup>107</sup> R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*, Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 3, cp. 183, 187; similarly A. R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 220 (New York: Sheffield, 2002), 354–65.

<sup>108</sup> So also McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 80–81. Hoskins notes that Isa 48:21 serves as the "anchor" for these other texts ("Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple," 240–45).

<sup>109</sup> Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 208–09.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 175.

<sup>111</sup> Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City*, 171. For an examination of the temple connections in John 14:2–3, see J. McCaffrey, *The House with Many Rooms: The Temple Theme of Jn. 14, 2–3*, *Analecta Biblica* 114 (Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1988).

112 Köstenberger, John, 139 (citing Deut 5:10; 6:5-6; 7:9; 10:12-13; 11:13,22).

113 See J. Piper's distinction between works and "conditional grace" in *Future Grace* (Sisters, OR: Multnomah, 1995), 231-49.

114 Paul's appeal to the believers in Corinth is not that they should look to the Spirit who dwells in them for the power to obey, but that they should obey because they are the temple of God which must be kept holy: "Or do you not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you, whom you have from God, and you are not your own?" (1 Cor 6:19).

115 See Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple*, 157-58.

116 See Westcott, John, 2:350.

117 Bruce, John, 392. Köstenberger says that in John 20:22 "Jesus constitutes them as the new messianic community" (John, 189).

118 Ridderbos, John, 644.

119 Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 207.

120 Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City*, 303.

121 Köstenberger, John, 141.

122 McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 180 (emphasis added). Similarly Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body*, 33, 375.

# **CHAPTER 7**

## **RESULTS AND RELEVANCE FOR TODAY**

# Old Covenant Believers: Regenerate, Not Indwelt

As I embarked upon this study I planned to argue that Old Testament saints were indwelt, but the evidence to the contrary forced me to abandon that position. Those who hold that old covenant believers were indwelt have not given satisfactory explanations of the salvation-historical aspects of John's Gospel, particularly John 7:39 and 16:7.

The major objection to the assertion that old covenant believers were not indwelt by the Holy Spirit is the question of how they could have been believers if the Spirit of God did not dwell in them. Fuller argues, "The only way depraved people can acquire a heart attitude and behavior pleasing to God is to be indwelt by the Holy Spirit (that is, regenerated)."<sup>1</sup> While maintaining that neither the Old nor the New Testament gives textual support to the notion that old covenant believers were indwelt, this study seeks to clarify that, against Fuller and others, the indwelling of the Spirit is not the same as regeneration by the Spirit.

The indwelling of the Spirit is God's favorable presence abiding with those who enjoy His merciful establishment of a covenant relationship. John Frame explains, "God is not merely present in the world; he is covenantally present. He is with his creatures to bless and to judge them in

accordance with the terms of his covenant.”<sup>2</sup> This positive, covenant presence of God is to be distinguished from God's omnipresence, and even His presence for physical, temporary blessing.<sup>3</sup>

Regeneration by the Spirit is not the ongoing experience of the Spirit abiding within each individual believer. Regeneration by the Spirit has to do with the Spirit enabling those who are spiritually dead to experience spiritual life (John 6:63). When the Spirit regenerates a person, that person gains the ability (see John 3:3–8) to see, hear, understand, and believe God's Word.<sup>4</sup> There is nothing in the texts examined in this study to indicate that the ability to hear and believe the word of God, which results from one experiencing the new birth from above, is equivalent to the indwelling ministry of the Spirit.

I am convinced that the Old Testament metaphor of heart-circumcision, which results in ability (Deut 30:6; Jer 6:10), is parallel to the New Testament metaphor of regeneration. Old Testament believers necessarily had circumcised hearts because they had been regenerated by the Spirit. The Old Testament does not explicitly make this connection, but there are hints in this direction. Isaiah calls on his audience to “Hear, that your souls may live”(Isa55:3). This new life of the soul offered to people who are already physically alive may be identified as regeneration. The Holy Spirit actively caused people to

trust God and live faithful lives under the old covenant (see Neh 9:20,30). However we choose to describe it, in all ages God, through the agency of His Spirit, restores to certain people an ability that all humanity lost at the fall.

Under the old covenant, God's Spirit caused people to experience spiritual life. God supernaturally opened the spiritual ears and eyes of people who were spiritually dead in trespasses and sins, enabling them to believe.<sup>5</sup> Nothing in the New Testament prohibits the conclusion that old covenant believers, who had circumcised hearts, were regenerated by the Spirit. VanGemenen agrees: "The saints were those who were circumcised of heart, or 'regenerate.'"<sup>6</sup>

John 7:39, however, does prohibit the conclusion that old covenant saints had received the Spirit. As I argued in chapter six, when the Spirit was received by the disciples in John 20:22, Jesus conferred on them the power to mediate blessings formerly mediated by the temple—the presence of God and the forgiveness of sins (20:21–23). It is through the indwelling Spirit that the church enjoys the presence of God (14:16–17). Therefore, the reception of the Spirit in John 20:22 seems to be the inception of the indwelling ministry of the Holy Spirit. Allowing John 20:22 to inform John 7:39, the reception of the Spirit referred to in John 7:39 is the reception of the indwelling Spirit (see [chapter five](#)).<sup>7</sup> My conclusion, then, is that old covenant believers were regenerated by the Spirit, but they were

not indwelt by the Spirit. This fits with the fact that the Old Testament does not present its remnant as the dwelling of God, as seen in chapter three.

# God's Temple: First a Building, then Believers

If regeneration enables old covenant saints to believe, how were they maintained in faith if they were not indwelt? The Old Testament's answer to that question is the covenant-sustaining presence of God with the nation as He dwelled in the tabernacle and later the temple.<sup>8</sup> At several points in the Old Testament it is clear that God's presence with His people in the temple has a sanctifying effect upon them.<sup>9</sup>

The contrast between the Old and New Testaments on this point is striking. On the one hand, there is no indication in the Old Testament that the Spirit dwelled in each individual member of the believing remnant, and the Old Testament consistently affirms that God's dwelling place among His people is the temple. On the other hand, in the New Testament we have affirmations both that God's Spirit dwells in each individual member of the believing remnant (e.g., John 14:17; 1 Cor 6:19), and we have direct statements that believers are the temple, the dwelling place of God (e.g., 1 Cor 3:16).<sup>10</sup>

Other authors have noted that under the old covenant God dwelled in the temple and that under the new covenant God's people are His temple.<sup>11</sup> Some of these

authors have emphasized that it is the indwelling of the Spirit that constitutes God's people as His temple,<sup>12</sup> and others have noted that Jesus' death renders the temple sacrifices unnecessary.<sup>13</sup> Others, however, have apparently not made the connection between these conclusions and the Spirit's role in salvation in the old and new covenants. nor has it been argued that these concepts inform such passages as John 14:15–17 and 20:21–23. Such a connection increases clarity in our understanding of the Spirit's role in regeneration and indwelling.

Jesus' coming brought about a salvation-historical shift. John depicts Him replacing the temple (John 2:17–21), then proclaiming that the time for worship at the temple has ended (4:21–23). God would have a new temple once Jesus was glorified, that is, once He put an end to sacrifice (7:39; 14:15–17). Indeed, if Jesus had not put an end to sacrifice, sacrifice at the temple would still be necessary (16:7). When Jesus finished His work, He gave the Spirit to the disciples, making them the locus of God's presence (20:22). He then gave them authority over sin (20:23), for they had become the new temple.

# **Newness in the New Covenant**

If old covenant believers were regenerated by the Spirit, what is new about the new interiority promised in Jer 31:31–34? The newness does not consist in the Spirit's regenerating ministry of enabling people to hear God's word and believe. What is new is the indwelling ministry of the Spirit and the spiritualized view of the temple. No longer is worship restricted to one physical location (Deut 12:5). Worship takes place wherever the people of God assemble, for they are His temple (Matt 18:20). No longer must believers pilgrimage to Jerusalem three times a year (Deut 16:16). Christians have no altars of sacrifice in specific places (Gen 12:8; 13:4; 26:25), and the New Testament does not designate certain locations as "holy places" (Gen 28:17–22). Old covenant believers longed for Jerusalem (Ps 137:5–6) and specifically the temple (Ps 122:1). New covenant believers long for no holy place on earth; they worship wherever God puts them (Acts 14:24–25) and long for Jesus' return and His heavenly city (2 Tim 4:8; Heb 11:16; Rev 22:17,20).

# **Church Discipline and the Priesthood of All Believers**

The conclusions reached in this biblical theology of the Spirit's role in salvation have important implications for our understanding of what it means to be the people of God at this point in salvation history. It is critically important that we understand the Holy Scriptures, and the bulk of this book has been given to pursuing clarity on the topic investigated. As the Scriptures everywhere indicate, what we believe shows itself in what we do. Having sought to understand what the Scriptures say, it remains to connect the dots between what the Bible says and what the church does.

The conclusions of this study have many implications for the way that believers in Jesus conduct themselves as His church in the twenty-first century. Two topics in particular need to be addressed. Since I live in the southern part of the United States, am a Southern Baptist teaching at a Southern Baptist Seminary, and currently preach at a Southern Baptist Church, I will apply my comments directly to my own ecclesiastical setting. I offer apologies to those in other contexts or from other denominations who might have to transpose these reflections for different settings.

## **Church Discipline**

Unfortunately, it is more difficult to get on a city bus than it is to join most Southern Baptist churches. This circumstance makes church discipline all but impossible. History shows us that things have not always been this way.<sup>14</sup>

In chapters four and six, considerable attention was given to Jesus' words to Nicodemus in John 3:3,5. Unless a person is "born again," that is, "born of water and the Spirit," he cannot "see" or "enter" the kingdom of God. Does this not imply that those who have not been born again should not be admitted to church membership? I have been in Southern Baptist churches where an absolute stranger can walk down the aisle, profess to believe and to have undergone believers' baptism, and immediately be admitted to church membership. I know a person who joined a Southern Baptist church because only members could have their weddings in that church. This individual had no intention of participating in the life of the church, but it was the prettiest church in town, so the person jumped the hurdle, became a member, and got the desired wedding with no questions asked. Church membership is meaningless under such conditions.

While only God infallibly knows whether a profession of faith is genuine, it seems virtually impossible to determine whether a person understands the Gospel during the invitation hymn in which they made their journey down the aisle. This leads to a practical suggestion: when a person

walks down the aisle and expresses a desire to join the church, that person needs to have had a conversation with a pastor of the church before the body votes to make the individual a member. In this pastoral conversation, the goal is at least twofold: (1) to determine whether or not the individual can articulate the Gospel on his own with no prompts from the pastor; and (2) to hear or see some evidence of the fruit of faith. Not every convert needs to be able to give the argument of the Book of Romans in detail. But if someone appeals to human merit in explaining the basis for his assurance of salvation, that person needs further instruction before being voted on for membership in the church.

If we are to practice church discipline in our churches, however, we must inform those who express a desire to join our churches that as members they are submitting themselves to the discipline of the church. This means that we are committing ourselves to both formative and corrective discipleship, and that when we have issues that need to be addressed we will follow the pattern set forth in Scripture (e.g., Matt 18:15–17). In today's context, we should bear in mind that lawsuits can be and have been filed against churches, and if we intend to obey the Scriptures in this area we simply must make sure that the members of our churches are aware of the fact that they have submitted themselves to the Scriptures and to the discipline of the church. This will only become a reality in Southern Baptist churches if we become more concerned

with the purity of Christ's bride than we are with our own ease or with inflated numbers on our membership rolls.

Why is church discipline worth pursuing? It is worth it because the people of God are God's new temple. The presence of God's Spirit in His people should both sober and energize us. Jesus said to His disciples, "If you love Me, you will keep My commandments; and I will ask the Father, and He will give you another Paraclete" (John 14:15–16). We seek to keep the commandments of Jesus, and we should pursue the purity of the church because we love Jesus. Why do we not pursue these things? Is it because we want to make life easy for ourselves or to have impressive statistics? Do we love ourselves more than we love Jesus?

Church discipline is difficult, but in John 14:15–17 Jesus makes His request to the Father to give the Spirit contingent upon love and obedience.<sup>15</sup> John 14:23 echoes the same theme: Jesus states that He and the Father will make their dwelling among those who love Jesus and keep His word. Paul commands that we neither grieve (Eph 4:30) nor quench (1 Thess 5:19) the Spirit, and in Revelation a warning is given that a church's light might be snuffed out for lack of vigilance (Rev 2:5). We cannot afford to ignore the practice of church discipline.

God's dwelling must be holy. The New Testament gives instructions on church discipline that we might keep God's

new temple holy. In order to practice church discipline, we must pursue a regenerate church membership. Our prayer should be that God will enable us to live as those in whom He is pleased to dwell.<sup>16</sup>

## **The Priesthood of All Believers**

The priesthood of all believers is a consequence of the Spirit's presence in those who believe. It hints at the members of the body of Christ mediating the forgiveness of sins to one another (John 20:23). This too is connected to church discipline, for in John 20:23 Jesus confers authority not only to forgive but also to retain sin. Further, the priesthood of all believers speaks to the access that all believers have to God in prayer.

But nowhere is there any indication that the priesthood of all believers gives anyone the right to decide which parts of the Bible to submit to. Priests are subject to Christ and His Word. Christ is only known through His Word. Priests serve one another, and they forgive and retain sin—which implies that since all believers are priests, all believers need to be involved in formative and corrective discipleship (i.e., church discipline).

Regeneration and indwelling thus have important implications for God's new temple, the church. Only the regenerate should be members of the church, and

indwelling necessitates church discipline. The regenerate members of the church, who are inhabited by God and constitute His temple, serve as priests. These priests make God known by proclaiming the truths of the Bible so that more might be regenerated, and they forgive and retain sin that Christ's bride might be pure. Truth is to lead us to godliness (Tit 1:1).

# **He Is with You and He Will Be in You**

This study began with an assertion that the pursuit of biblical theology assumes that the Divine author of the Bible has inspired the human authors to produce a coherent document. I have argued that the Old and New Testaments agree that old covenant believers were not indwelt. Prior to the glorification of Jesus, God was with His people (Deut 31:6; John 7:39). After the glorification of Jesus, God dwells in His people (John 14:17,23). John's account of the words of Jesus in John 14:17 ("He is with you, and He will be in you") reveals Jesus of Nazareth as an astute Old Testament theologian and as the shaper of the church's understanding of itself as God's new temple. To Him be the glory, forever and forever. Amen.

---

<sup>1</sup> D. P. Fuller, *The Unity of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 229.

<sup>2</sup> J. M. Frame, *The Doctrine of God* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2002), 94 (emphasis his).

<sup>3</sup> Consider, for instance, the statement that God was with Ishmael (Gen 21:20), which immediately follows God's assertion to Abraham that the covenant would be kept through the line of Isaac (21:12; cp. Rom 9:7). This shows that God's presence with Ishmael did not carry the same benefits as His presence with Isaac (Gen 26:3).

<sup>4</sup> D. Guthrie describes this in terms of "a restitution of man to his full capacity as a human being" (*New Testament Theology* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1981], 160–61).

<sup>5</sup> In Jer 5:21 the prophet recognizes that the people have eyes but not sight, ears but not hearing—another indication that a renewed spiritual condition was required.

<sup>6</sup> W. A. VanGemeren, *The Progress of Redemption* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988), 167.

<sup>7</sup> So also C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 570: "It had been promised that the Spirit would be given after the glorification of Jesus (7.39; 16.7) and there can be no doubt that this is the gift intended."

<sup>8</sup> See the relevant discussions throughout this study, and my article, "God with Men in the Torah," *WTJ* 65 (2003): 113–33.

<sup>9</sup> See [chapter three](#). Perhaps most prominent in this regard are 1 Kgs 8:57–58 and Ps 73:17.

<sup>10</sup> For discussion of indwelling and the believing community as the temple in the NT, see [chapter five](#). For the indwelling and temple connections in John, see [chapter six](#). For references to these themes in the Apostolic Fathers, see [chapter six](#), n. 59.

<sup>11</sup> So R. E. Clements, *God and Temple* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), 139; M. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2001), 3; R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple*, Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 180. G.Vos, *Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948; reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1996), 148.

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g., Frame, *The Doctrine of God*, 96: “God dwells with Israel in the tabernacle and in the temple, and supremely in Jesus—God living with his people in the tabernacle of the flesh (John 1:14, 2:21), Immanuel. Through Christ, God’s people themselves are his temple, the dwelling of his Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19).”

<sup>13</sup> P. W. L. Walker draws this conclusion from a synthesis of the NT’s teaching (*Jesus and the Holy City* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996], 303).

<sup>14</sup> Consider, for instance, the serious approach taken to church discipline and church membership in the First Baptist Church of Columbia, South Carolina prior to the Civil War (G. A. Wills, *The First Baptist Church of Columbia, South Carolina: 1809–2002* [Brentwood, TN: Baptist History and Heritage Society, 2003], 61–81).

<sup>15</sup> See [chapter six](#), n. 113.

<sup>16</sup> For a wider discussion of church discipline, see M. Dever, *Nine Marks of a Healthy Church* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2000), 152–79. Useful information is also available on a related website, [www.9marks.org](http://www.9marks.org).

# Appendix 1

## THE USE OF EMPHUSAŌ IN JOHN 20:22

In John 20:22 when Jesus “exhaled and said to them, Receive the Holy Spirit,” the verb *emphusaō* (“breathe/exhale”) is used. The same verb is employed in the Greek translation of Gen 2:7. When God gave life to Adam, he “breathed (*enephusēsen*) into his face the breath [*pnoēn*] of life” (Gen 2:7).<sup>1</sup> The verb also occurs in the Greek translation of Ezekiel 37:9: “Prophecy to the wind [to *pneuma*] and say to the wind [*tō pneumatī*], Thus says the Lord, ‘Come from the four winds [*pneumatōn*] and blow [*emphusēson*] into these dead, and let them live.’”

The verb *emphusaō* in these three texts may seem to suggest that regeneration is in view in all of them, integrally connecting regeneration and reception of the Spirit. If this were true, then old covenant believers would not only be regenerate but indwelt by the Spirit for they would have the breath of life within themselves. But this interpretation seems unlikely since Adam experienced this before the fall. Ezekiel also presents it as an eschatological

blessing, and John states that the Spirit would not be received until Jesus was glorified.

Evidence has been presented in this study that old covenant believers were regenerate and that regeneration is not equivalent to indwelling. More significantly, the details of Genesis 2 and Ezekiel 37 resist the notion that in these texts God is causing spiritual life by breathing his Spirit into people who are already physically alive.

The use of the verb in Gen 2:7 is prior to the account of the fall in Genesis 3, and so Adam is not yet dead in trespasses and sins. Genesis 2:7 refers to the inception of Adam's physical life. By employing this verb, Ezekiel and John might be hinting at a recreation, a cosmic regeneration, the awaited renewal of all things.<sup>2</sup> It does not seem that this sense of regeneration, however, is equivalent to the new birth from above articulated in John 3. If it is, then the new birth from above is not possible until the renewal of all things is consummated.

In Gen 2:7 and Ezek 37:9 what seems to be in view is not so much the indwelling of the Spirit as the impartation of the breath of life. Adam becomes a living being when the breath of life is given to him, and the dry bones come to life when they experience the same. It also seems significant that whereas in Gen 2:7 God breathes into Adam, in Ezek 37:9 it is "the breath"<sup>3</sup> that does the

breathing. There is no indication that this usage of *rûah* in Ezek 37:9 should mean anything other than "breath" or "wind," for its source is "the four winds."<sup>4</sup> Therefore, in Genesis 2 and Ezekiel 37 what is in view is not the reception of the Spirit of Yahweh, but merely the reception of the breath of life.<sup>5</sup> This reception of the breath of life by Adam and the dry bones may typify the regeneration of all things, but it is not directly analogous to the creation of an ability to hear and believe God's word in those previously dead in trespasses and sins (see John 3:3–8).

We may also note the use of *emphusaō* in the Greek translation of 1 Kgs 17:21. As Elijah seeks to raise the widow's son, we are told, "And he breathed [*enephusēsen*] into the child three times, and he called on the Lord" (1 Kgs 17:21). When this child is raised from the dead, spiritual regeneration is perhaps typified, just as it is typified in Gen 2:7 and Ezek 37:9, but there is no indication here that the Holy Spirit now indwells this child. Nor is there an indication that the Holy Spirit indwells Adam in Gen 2:7. Adam and the boy have the breath of life, but that is not the same phenomenon as the indwelling of the Spirit. The two concepts are connected, but they are not equivalent.

To equate regeneration and indwelling on the basis of the use of the verb *emphusaō* in Gen 2:7, Ezek 37:9, and John 20:22 would be to invite confusion. It requires

conflation of texts which are related typologically but do not speak of the same thing. Genesis 2:7 has the inception of life in view. Moreover, it would be very difficult to prove that the translator(s) of Ezekiel into Greek was (were) already influenced by the Greek translation of Gen 2:7.

Ezekiel 37:9 has the resurrection of the dead in view. John 20:22, in my view, depicts the disciples' reception of the indwelling Spirit.<sup>6</sup> It seems that these contexts are too disparate to build a strong case for the equation of regeneration and indwelling. Nor will the usage of *emphusaō* in Gen 2:7, Ezek 37:9, and John 20:22 provide evidence for the indwelling of each individual old covenant believer strong enough to overcome the explicit statements of John 7:39 and 16:7.

---

<sup>1</sup> This verb is also found in Wisdom 15:11, which refers to Gen 2.

<sup>2</sup> Many commentators on John seem inclined to this view. Carson writes, "That Jesus breathed on them is reminiscent of Genesis 2:7 and Ezekiel 37:9; this 'insufflation' ... is the beginning of the new creation, the awakening of the dead" (The Gospel according to John, PNTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 651 [italics his]). Also C. K. Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 570; R. E. Brown, The Gospel according to John, 2 vols., AB (New York: Doubleday, 1966, 1970), 1037.

<sup>3</sup> MT רוח; in the LXX the subject is implied from the previous τῷ πνεύματι.

<sup>4</sup> See D. I. Block, The Book of Ezekiel, 2 vols., NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997, 1998), 2:377–78.

<sup>5</sup> The MT of Gen 2:7 does not employ רוח ("Spirit") but נשמה ("breath"). Similarly, the Greek translation of Gen 2:7 does not have πνεῦμα ("Spirit") but πνοή ("wind/breath").

<sup>6</sup> For evidence from the Gospel of John that the disciples were believers prior to John 20:22, see [chapter four](#). For the argument that the reception of the indwelling Spirit is in view in John 20:22, see [chapter five](#).

# **Appendix 2**

**“HE IS WITH YOU, AND HE IS IN YOU?”  
THE TEXT OF JOHN 14: 17c**

# Introduction

One of the key texts for our study has been John 14:17c, which we have treated according to the widely accepted rendering, "He is [or "remains" or "dwells"] with you, and He will be [estai] in you." A few English translations, however, have "He/he is in you," following a variant found in some manuscripts, the present tense *estin* rather than the future tense *estai* (e.g., NJB, TEV). Though the text of John 14:17c is important for this study, the thesis does not stand or fall on the future tense being original.<sup>1</sup> In fact, as we will see, the internal evidence for the future tense is so strong that some who accept the present tense as original translate it as a future.<sup>2</sup>

If the present tense is original and must be read as a present, in view of the fact that in John's Gospel the Spirit is not given until Jesus goes away (7:39; 16:7), a likely translation could be, "He is with you and he is among you" (rather than, "he is in you").<sup>3</sup> As will be seen, however, the textual evidence favors the future tense ("He will be in you"). Having examined the manuscript (external) evidence, we will turn our attention to the internal evidence (from John's Gospel).

## External Evidence

The manuscript evidence for the two readings is

summarized on the chart, "External Evidence for the Text of John 14:17c." Consideration of external evidence as a whole entails the date of the witnesses, their geographical distribution, and genealogical relationships between texts and families of witnesses.

## **Date of the Witnesses**

The earliest manuscripts are papyri and uncials.<sup>4</sup> The earliest manuscript evidence for the two readings in John 14:17c is as follows:

Each reading has early support. Metzger notes regarding P<sup>66</sup> that most of the 440 alterations "appear to be the scribe's corrections of his own hasty blunders."<sup>5</sup> If that is the case in John 14:17c, the earliest support for the present tense becomes Codex Vaticanus (B), in the fourth century. The corrected P<sup>66</sup> and what can be seen of P<sup>75</sup> weigh slightly in favor of the future having earlier attestation.<sup>6</sup> The acknowledged relationship between B and P<sup>75</sup>, and the fact that P<sup>75</sup> is the earlier of the two, also lend support to the future as the earlier and more likely reading.<sup>7</sup>

Table 3: External Evidence for the Text of John 14:17c

Reading	Manuscript Types	Textual Families			
		Byzantine	Alexandrian	Western Others	
ἔστιν (he is) adopted by Westcott and Hort NEB, TEV, NJB	<b>Papyri</b>		p <sup>66</sup> *		
	<b>Uncials</b>		B	D <sup>c</sup> W	
	<b>Miniscules</b>				1 69 565
	<b>Versions</b>			it <sup>b, h, c, d, e, f, g, q</sup>	
ἔσται (he will be) adopted by NA <sup>27</sup> , UBS <sup>4</sup> , and <i>H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ</i> ESV, HCSB, KJV, NASB, NET, NIV, NKJV, RSV, NRSV	<b>Papyri</b>		p <sup>66c</sup> p <sup>75</sup> vsd		
	<b>Uncials</b>	A E K M Δ Θ Ψ	Ⲛ L	D <sup>c</sup>	Q U
	<b>Miniscules</b>	Ⲙ	33 <sup>vid</sup>		28 118, f <sup>13</sup> 700
	<b>Versions</b>	eth	cop <sup>bo</sup>	syr <sup>ec, h</sup>	arm geo

## Geographical Distribution of the Witnesses

Both readings are supported by Byzantine, Alexandrian, Western, and Caesarean<sup>8</sup> readings. Many think that when Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus (Ⲛ) agree the text is reliable.<sup>9</sup> In this case, however, these two manuscripts stand against one another. With Alexandrinus (A) adding its weight to Sinaiticus, and with Codex Bezae (D) and p<sup>66</sup> being “corrected” to read the future, the present tense is only supported by Vaticanus among the Alexandrian witnesses and W among the Western. Against the preponderance of Alexandrian readings (see the chart), which includes Ⲛ, L, and possibly 33,<sup>10</sup> only B challenges the future as the original reading. Metzger notes of Codes

Regius (L), "Its type of text is good, agreeing very frequently with codex Vaticanus."<sup>11</sup> With L here aligned against B, and Vaticanus seemingly standing alone, the future has more widespread support.

## **Genealogical Relationships of Texts and Families of Witnesses**

The future reading is attested by the Sinaitic Syriac version, as well as the Harclean Syriac. The Sinaitic "is a representative of the Western type of text," and the form of the text it preserves dates from the close of the second or beginning of the third century.<sup>12</sup> The Harclean is also Western, and these two Syriac manuscripts substantiate the correction made to the original hand of Codex Bezae.

The support given by the Syriac versions might well be cancelled out, however, by the Old Latin translations, which also preserve a Western text-type. Though some of the later Vulgate manuscripts attest the future, the present tense is strong among the Old Latin manuscripts. It is found in Codex Vercellensis, Codex Veronensis, Codex Colbertinus, the Latin side of Codex Bezae, and Codex Corbiensis.

The future is attested in the Bohairic version of the Coptic translation. "The Greek prototype of the Bohairic version appears to be closely related to the Alexandrian

text-type.”<sup>13</sup> Although it is late, this witness gives support to the other Alexandrian witnesses that attest to the future reading. This would seem to raise doubts about the present tense in the Alexandrian text-type, even though it is found in Vaticanus.

The Armenian version, which has been hailed as “the Queen of the versions,”<sup>14</sup> reflects a Caesarean text-type and reads the future tense. Also Caesarean and reading the future is the Georgian version. The Ethiopic and Old Slavonic versions, representing the Byzantine text-type, likewise read the future.

In sum, the strongest evidence for the present tense is Codex Vaticanus. Every other line of evidence—date, geographical distribution, and genealogical relationships—supports the future being the original reading of the text.

# Internal Evidence

Two sorts of probabilities are considered in evaluating internal evidence: transcriptional and intrinsic.<sup>15</sup> Transcriptional probabilities have to do with scribal activity, while intrinsic probability is concerned with what the author is more likely to have written.

## Transcriptional Probabilities

The three canons of text criticism here come into play. The reading generally favored as likely to be original is (1) the most difficult reading, (2) the shortest reading, and (3) the one that best explains the other readings. Since length of reading is not an issue in this case (*estin* or *estai*), the second canon will not be discussed here.

**The more difficult reading.** This consideration favors the present tense, for as Westcott observes, the present “appears to be less like a correction.”<sup>16</sup> Sometimes, however, the “more difficult reading” can be too difficult. That seems to be true in this case. As already noted, those who opt for the present tense on text critical grounds are compelled to explain it as semantically future (note 2 above). In view of John 7:39 and 16:7, if Jesus was telling the disciples in John 14:17 that the Spirit was in them, he would appear to be contradicting himself (16:7, “But I tell you the truth, it is better for you that I go.

For if I do not go, the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you"). This prompts Blomberg to conclude that the present "is probably too difficult to be accepted."<sup>17</sup> Many commentators, therefore, opt for the future.<sup>18</sup>

**The reading that best explains the others.** It is relatively easy to imagine a scribe "harmonizing" John 14:17c with its context, and changing the present *estin* to the future *estai*. This might provide an adequate explanation for the future readings attested in the manuscripts, but it fails to explain why both P<sup>66</sup> and D were corrected to read the future. If the present were the stronger reading, among all the manuscripts that witness to the future (Swanson lists more than twenty),<sup>19</sup> we might expect that at least one would have undergone similar alteration, "correcting" from the future to the present. But no such corrections are listed as evidence for the future reading.

Whence, then, came the present? The best explanation, if the future is original, appears to be unintentional scribal error. Perhaps the ending *-ai* was misread as *-in*. Another possibility would be that parablepsis (the scribe's eye returning to the wrong place in the original) and/or homoeoteleuton (words having the same or similar endings, a frequent cause of parablepsis) occurred, and the scribe copied the wrong ending. There are three

words in the verse that end with -in: labein, "to receive," and humin, "you," twice. This error could have been facilitated by the lack of spaces between the words, or by the poor quality of writing materials of early manuscripts.

## **Intrinsic Probabilities**

The intrinsic probability that the future is the original reading is strong. Jesus states that he will ask (future, *erōtēsō*) and that the father will give (fut., *dōsei*) the Paraclete (14:16). John 14 as a chapter is concerned with things that will take place in the future: Jesus will go prepare a place and will return and take the disciples to himself (14:3); The one who believes in Jesus will do what Jesus has been doing (14:12); and Jesus will not leave the disciples as orphans (14:18). This is not to minimize the present elements in the passage (e.g., 14:7, "you will also know the Father. And from now you know [present] him and have seen him"). Both future and present elements are found in John 14, and neither is to be collapsed into the other.

The future promise in v. 16, the statement in 7:39 that the Spirit had not been received because Jesus was not yet glorified, and the statement in 16:7 to the effect that the Spirit will not come unless Jesus goes away, form a cord of three strands not easily broken. The intrinsic probability is that the future is original.

# Conclusion

By both external and internal criteria, the future is the stronger reading, as the UBS<sup>4</sup> committee decided.<sup>20</sup> In view of the evidence, the "C" rating given by the committee appears to result from cautious respect for Codex Vaticanus. The stronger manuscript support for the future, however, and the fact that the future best fits the context of John's Gospel outweigh respect for Vaticanus.

---

<sup>1</sup> There are a number of variants in the phrase, but we are concerned here with whether the final phrase of the verse reads ἐν ὑμῖν ἔστιν “he is in you,” or ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται “he will be in you.” Where the accent was placed on the word μένει (μένει, present tense— “he remains,” or μενεῖ, future tense— “he will remain,”) is not treated as a variant by R. Swanson, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: John* (Sheffield: Academic, 1995), 203–4, though the future is listed as a possible variant by NA<sup>27</sup>. The Uncial texts were not accented, and the future receives minimal textual support (pc aur vg sa ac<sup>2</sup> pbo). The other variant in 14:17c is inconsequential: f<sup>1</sup> reads σὺν ὑμῖν ἔστιν, “he is with you.” The σὺν, “with,” has little support, but it is interesting that these manuscripts have σὺν rather than ἐν, “in,” with the present tense.

<sup>2</sup> C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 463; J. H. Bernard, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T & T; Clark, 1928), 546; R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 3 vols., trans. K. Smith (New York: Crossroad, 1968, 1979, 1982), 3:413 n. 93; E. W. Comfort, *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1990), 124.

<sup>3</sup> Comfort also makes this suggestion (*Early Manuscripts*, 124), as does R. A. Whitacre, *John*, IVPNTC (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999), 358–59 note on 14:17.

<sup>4</sup> Although minuscules are not as ancient, they sometimes prove more significant than some later uncials because of the older text type they reflect (B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 3d ed. [New York: Oxford University Press], 209). Manuscript 33 is the most relevant in the present instance, on which see below.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 40.

<sup>6</sup> Both C. L. Porter and Swanson note that P<sup>75</sup> has a lacuna (where the verb in question would be located) ending in αι, indicating that the

future reading was present (Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: John*, 204; Porter "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the text of Codex Vaticanus," *JBL* 81 [1962],373).

<sup>7</sup> Porter, "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus," 374–74; G. D. Fee, "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John," *NTS* 15 (1968–69): 29, 44.

<sup>8</sup> Although I follow Metzger in referring to these manuscripts as "Caesarean," on the chart the Caesarean readings are listed under the heading "Others."

<sup>9</sup> J. H. Greenlee, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, rev. ed. (Peabody, MA:Hendrickson,1995), 81.

<sup>10</sup> According to Swanson, 33 omits the phrase altogether (*New Testament Greek Manuscripts: John*, 204). UBS<sup>4</sup>, however, lists it in support of the future, marking it 33<sup>vid</sup>. If 33 does support the future, a strong case might be mounted from genealogical relationships that the Alexandrian text-type, in spite of Vaticanus, supports the future (because 33, the Queen of the cursives, is a late copy of a good Alexandrian manuscript).

<sup>11</sup> Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 54.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*,69.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 80.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 82.

<sup>15</sup> See *Ibid.*, 209–11.

<sup>16</sup> B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1908), 2:177–78.

<sup>17</sup> C. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001), 201 n. 291.

<sup>18</sup> For a sampling (with Blomberg), see R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, 2 vols.,AB 29, 29A (New York: Doubleday, 1966, 1970), 640; G. M.Burge, *John*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 396; D. A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 509–10; and L. L. Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 577 n. 52.

<sup>19</sup> For space considerations, I have not detailed the full list of

manuscripts that read the future either on the chart or in the foregoing discussion. Swanson lists the following as reading the future: p<sup>66c</sup>, p<sup>75v</sup>id  
x A D<sup>c</sup> M K L M Q U Δ θ ψ 118 f<sup>13</sup> 2 28 157 579 700 1071 1424 (New  
Testament Greek Manuscripts: John, 204).

<sup>20</sup> B. M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament,  
2d ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 208.

# **Appendix 3**

**RUSHING WIND AND ORGAN MUSIC:  
TOWARD LUKE'S THEOLOGY OF THE  
SPIRIT IN ACTS**

# Introduction

I have suggested that the disciples were indwelt when Jesus breathed the Spirit on them in John 20:22. Acts 2 recounts the Spirit coming on the disciples in power. Elsewhere in Acts people are said to be “filled with” or “full of” the Spirit. This appendix seeks to understand the language Luke uses to communicate the coming of the Spirit in Acts. I believe three ministries of the Spirit can be identified in Acts. First, Luke describes the ongoing Christian experience of being indwelt by the Spirit. For this he uses the verb *plēroō*, “fill” (Acts 13:52), and the cognate adjective *plērēs* in the phrase “full of the Spirit” (e.g., Acts 6:3). Second, Luke shows Christians who are indwelt being empowered by the Spirit to declare divine truth with authority. For this he uses the verb *pimplēmi*, “fill,” in the phrase “filled with the Holy Spirit” (e.g., Acts 2:4). Third, in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19, Luke shows believers being “baptized in the Holy Spirit.” This baptism in the Spirit is not the same as or simultaneous with initial conversion or indwelling. Rather, baptism in the Spirit is God’s public mark of approval—first for the believers in Jesus who are in Jerusalem (Acts 2), then for the Samaritans (Acts 8), then for the Gentiles (Acts 10), then for the followers of John the Baptist (Acts 19). The evidence from Acts indicates that the whole church was representatively baptized when these groups were

baptized on these four occasions. This study shows that Luke and John had a common understanding of the work of the Spirit, even if they used different language to communicate synonymous concepts.

The wind of the Spirit blows throughout Luke's account in the Acts of the Apostles. At times the reader feels a powerful blast, long awaited, but never felt before. Other gusts seem familiar, as though this same breeze blew through the pages of the Old Testament. And then there is the sense that the wind has decisively shifted, and that a comforting draft now blows constantly, wafting the scent of the age to come all around the followers of the Way. Sometimes these winds blow simultaneously; sometimes the particular currents can be distinguished from one another; sometimes one blows but not the others; but in all the ways it comes, whether blustering and blowing or steadily soothing, the wind is of God.

The rushing wind resonates through the terms and phrases Luke marshaled in his campaign to channel the drafts of the Spirit, as it were, through the pipes of an organ. His endeavors sing in the masterfully orchestrated Acts of the Apostles, and his vocabulary is carefully fitted to the various winds that still sound through his book. This study seeks to sift the winds, hoping to distinguish one from another, or to feel where they blow together, by paying attention to the pipes Luke used to let the Spirit sing. We must listen carefully, for in spite of the protest from C. K. Barrett that "it would be wrong to attempt to

deduce from Acts a clear-cut and consistent doctrine of the Holy Spirit, "1 there is music here.

Nine verbs describe the bestowal of the Holy Spirit in the book of Acts.<sup>2</sup> In addition to these verbs that describe the Spirit being given, received, poured out, falling, coming, baptizing, and filling, four times persons are said to be "full of the Holy Spirit."<sup>3</sup> In this terminology, the Spirit is heard resonating through three main pipes which sound the notes of three manifestations of the Spirit.

The first and most basic sense in which Luke depicts the Spirit being manifested is as the eschatological gift promised by the Father,<sup>4</sup> received and poured out by the Son,<sup>5</sup> and offered to those who will repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus.<sup>6</sup> Second, Luke uses the phrase "full of the Spirit" (with the noun plērēs and the verb plēroō) to depict Christian life in the Spirit. This is to be distinguished from the third manifestation of the Spirit in Acts, particular occasions when people are "filled with the Spirit" (using the verb pimplēmi) for inspired proclamation. This proposal—three manifestations of the Spirit according to the phrases Luke employs—develops a theme noticed by I. H. Marshall,<sup>7</sup> a theme whose character has been overlooked by some<sup>8</sup> and minimized by others.<sup>9</sup>

Just as we hear a variety of sounds when wind passes through the different sized pipes of an organ, careful

observation of the terminology Luke used to describe the ministries of the Spirit in the book of Acts will enable us to discern which winds are blowing, when they are blowing together, and when they blow alone. In what follows, three gusts of the Spirit in Acts will be examined: the gale of the eschatological gift of the Spirit; the constant breeze of Christian life as full of the Spirit; and the empowering zephyr, familiar from the Old Testament, of special fillings with the Spirit.

# The Eschatological Gift

The language of giving (*didōmi*) and receiving (*lambanō*) is fundamental to the coming of the Spirit in Acts. This language reflects the twin realities that the Father and Jesus give the Spirit and that those who believe in Jesus receive the Spirit.<sup>10</sup> To refer to the Spirit as an eschatological gift is to recognize with George Ladd that with the coming of the Spirit, “the eschatological experiences associated with the age to come have reached back into the present age.”<sup>11</sup>

Seven of the verbs Luke uses to communicate the coming of the Spirit in Acts cluster around the four major “baptisms in the Spirit” recorded in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19: (1) baptize; (2) pour out; (3) come; (4) come upon; (5) fall upon; (6) give; (7) receive (verse references in note 1).<sup>12</sup> With so many terms, we can think of this as Luke's largest pipe. The big notes sounded here are reserved for special occasions. Like signpost blasts marking transitions in a symphony, when the wind of the Spirit gushes in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19, major movements in salvation history are sounded. These terms are all used to indicate that an extraordinary Spiritbaptism is taking place.<sup>13</sup>

## Baptized with the Holy Spirit

In Acts 1:5 Luke records that Jesus reiterated the Baptist's promise of the baptism in the Spirit. Between Passover (resurrection) and Pentecost, Jesus taught the disciples, perhaps intermittently, for forty days (1:3). Before His ascension He told them that the Spiritbaptism would take place "not many days from now" (1:5). Then the Spiritbaptism predicted in 1:5 took place on the day of Pentecost, as depicted in Acts 2. The only other reference to Spiritbaptism in Acts where the verb baptizō ("baptize") occurs is in Acts 11:16, where Peter quotes the words of Jesus.<sup>14</sup> In view of the fact that Luke only employs the phraseology of "baptism in the Spirit" twice (Acts 1:5; 11:16), it could be that he regards it as a unique experience.

Though Luke evidently portrays the day of Pentecost as the fulfillment of the Spiritbaptism Jesus promised, and though he agrees that Cornelius and his household were baptized with the Spirit, the verb baptizō is not used in either Acts 2 or Acts 10. Since Luke uses other verbs in those accounts, we have warrant for the conclusion that those terms overlap in meaning with baptizō.

I have chosen to call this first manifestation of the Spirit "the eschatological gift of the Spirit" because what seems to be emphasized by Luke is that the Spiritbaptism takes place only after Jesus is ascended (Acts 1:4–5,9–11) and indicates that the last days have begun (2:17). Yahweh had promised through Ezekiel, "I will take you from the

nations, and I will gather you from all the lands. And I will bring you to your land" (Ezek 36:24; cp. Deut 30:3–5). Luke is careful to point out in Acts 2:5 that "Jews from every nation under heaven" were in Jerusalem when the Spirit was poured out, going into some detail in describing their origins (2:9–11). The point seems to be that Ezekiel's prophecy, like Joel's, is being (at least initially) fulfilled.<sup>15</sup> Thus the exalted Jesus ministers baptism in the Spirit to believers, and the significance of the event is to show that God approves of the followers of the One who was slain and that the "last days" (2:17) have begun.

## **The Spirit Will Come upon You**

Luke describes the Spirit "coming upon" (eperchomai, erchomai+ epi) people only twice in Acts (1:8; 19:6). In Acts 1:8 Jesus tells the disciples that they will receive power "when the Spirit has come upon" (eperchomai) them. The Spirit comes upon the disciples in Acts 2, but Luke does not employ the verb eperchomai again, which indicates that the terms he does employ overlap with eperchomai.

The second occurrence of "coming upon" language is found at Acts 19:6. After Paul has informed the "disciples" (19:1) who have believed (19:2) that the age of the Spirit has dawned (19:2), he lays his hands upon them and "the Holy Spirit came upon them" (erchomai + epi); (19:6). In

both the promise that Jesus gives to the disciples and the experience of the believers in Ephesus, the Spirit comes as the sign that the last days have begun (Acts 2:17; 19:2). The Spirit is an eschatological blessing that the church experiences as, in Paul's terms, a pledge of what is to come (Eph 1:13–14).

## **I Will Pour Out My Spirit**

The verb *ekcheō/ekchunnō* occurs only three times in Acts (2:17,33; 10:45). All three uses of the verb involve Peter, and all three references to the Spirit being “poured out” are eschatological in nature in that they refer to the fulfillment of Joel 3:1–5 (Eng.2:28–32). This terminology for the Spirit's coming derives from Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2:16–21.

In response to the extraordinary events that took place on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1–13), Peter explained what was happening with the words, “This is what was spoken through the prophet Joel” (2:16). Peter then quotes, “And it shall be in the last days, <sup>16</sup>says God, I will pour out (*ekcheō*) my Spirit upon all flesh” (Acts 2:17). By stating, “this is what was spoken through the prophet Joel” (2:16), and by indicating that what was spoken concerned “the last days” (2:17), Peter clearly communicates that the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit promised by Joel was happening at last. The Spirit is now available to those

who repent and are baptized in the name of Jesus (2:38) because Jesus has been exalted to the right hand of God, has received the promise from the Father, and has poured out (ekcheō) the Spirit resulting in what the crowd saw and heard (2:33).

Later in Acts, when Luke recounts Peter's proclamation to Cornelius' household (10:34–44), we are told that “the believers of the circumcision who had come along with Peter were amazed because even upon the Gentiles the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out” (10:45).

When Peter defends his decision to eat with the uncircumcised (11:3), he compares the response to his message to what he and the others had experienced on the day of Pentecost (11:15). The “outpouring” of the Spirit experienced by the Gentiles in Acts 10 is identified with to the “outpouring” of the Spirit experienced by the Jews from every nation under heaven (2:5,17–18) recounted in Acts 2. When ekcheō is used in Acts 10, the reader hears an echo of the fulfillment of Joel 3:1–5 as proclaimed by Peter in Acts 2:16–36.<sup>17</sup> Thus the verb ekcheō overlaps with baptizō, erchomai, and eperchomai to emphasize the eschatological nature of the gift of the Spirit, available to the Jew first (Acts 2), but also to the Gentile (Acts 10).

## **The Spirit Fell upon Them**

In Acts 8 “the people of Samaria ... believed Philip's preaching of the gospel concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ and they were baptized, both men and women” (8:9, 12). The apostles in Jerusalem hear of this and send Peter and John (8:14). Upon arrival they pray “that [the Samaritan believers] might receive the Holy Spirit” (8:15). Luke explains with the words, “For He had not yet fallen upon (epiptō) any of them, but they had only been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus” (8:16). The apostles then lay their hands on the Samaritan believers and they receive (lambanō) the Holy Spirit (8:17).

Because time passed between when they believed (8:12) and when they received the Spirit (8:17), it is probably best to think of the Spirit's coming not as an accompaniment of the initial experience of salvation but as signifying that God has accepted these Samaritans into the church of the Messiah. Thus He gives them the eschatological gift of the Spirit, though the Spirit must come to them not only in the name of Jesus (8:12), but also, in some sense, in recognition of the authority and orthodoxy represented by the apostles in Jerusalem (8:14–17).<sup>18</sup>

The Spirit is described as “falling upon” (epiptō) Cornelius and his household in Acts 10:44, and Peter uses the verb again as he recounts what happened, and again he likens this to Acts 2 (11:15). Thus epiptō overlaps

with the verbs discussed above, and here too the issue is the eschatological nature of the coming of the Spirit to verify that God has accepted the Gentiles and the Samaritans.<sup>19</sup>

## **Points of Overlap**

Baptism (1:5; 11:16), coming upon (1:8; 19:6), outpouring (2:17–18; 10:45), and falling upon (8:16; 10:44) are all part of the large pipe sounding the note of the giving (e.g. 11:17) and receiving (e.g. 8:17) of the eschatological gift of the Holy Spirit. The references to baptism in the Spirit fulfill the Baptist's prophecy (1:5), and the references to the Spirit being poured out fulfill Joel's (2:17). The Father has given the promise of the Spirit to the Son, and the Son has poured the Spirit out on those who believe in Him (2:33). The cluster of terms discussed in this section, all of which depict a dramatic coming of the Spirit, are used by Luke to communicate the bestowal of the eschatological gift of the Spirit.

## **Baptism in the Spirit and Conversion?**

The Spiritbaptisms in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19 do not illustrate what takes place at conversion.<sup>20</sup> Ladd offers the standard interpretation when he writes, "We may conclude that the normal pattern is that the baptism of the Spirit occurs at the moment of saving faith."<sup>21</sup> Against this

consensus, Luke's language seems to indicate that baptisms in the Spirit are unique occurrences in the history of the church. Luke only employs this group of terms with reference to the four Spiritbaptisms. When the Spirit blows this way, the wind is moving the sails of salvation history forward, but the point of these texts is not to show the conversion of the people baptized in the Spirit. This seems counter-intuitive, but the case for this view is strong. Luke records at least fifteen conversion accounts in Acts, and not one of these is described as a baptism in the Spirit.<sup>22</sup> Peter offers the Spirit to those who will believe in Acts 2:38–29, but when Luke records the conversions in 2:41 there is no indication that a dramatic outpouring such as is described in 2:1–4 took place.

Whereas believers who live on this side of the cross are indwelt by the Holy Spirit at conversion and remain so until the end of the age, this is not what Luke has in view when he speaks of Spiritbaptism or the outpouring of the Spirit. Baptisms and outpourings are emphatic demonstrations that the eschatological gift of the Spirit has come. Luke has another pipe with which he channels the wind of the indwelling Spirit in believers (see below, "Christian Life in the Spirit"). That phrase, "full of the Spirit" (with *plērēs* and *plēroō*), is distinct from the large, many-termed flue he uses to blast the big notes of Spiritbaptism, which shows that the age of the eschatological gift of the Holy Spirit has begun. The normal pattern at conversion is for

believers to receive the indwelling Spirit apart from a dramatic baptism in the Spirit (see fifteen conversion accounts cited in note 22).

In each instance of Spiritbaptism, those baptized were already believers when the Spirit fell on them.<sup>23</sup> The disciples clearly believed that Jesus is the Messiah when they asked if He was restoring the kingdom to Israel in Acts 1:6.<sup>24</sup> The Samaritans believed and were baptized (8:12) before the Spirit fell on them (8:16–17). The Spirit fell upon the Gentiles at Cornelius' house after they believed (11:17).<sup>25</sup> Luke refers to those at Ephesus as “disciples,” a term he reserves for believers,<sup>26</sup> and Paul seems to assume that they were believers before the Spirit came upon them (19:1–6). Dunn suggests that Paul is mistaken in his assumption that they are believers.<sup>27</sup> But why would Luke perpetuate the error and give the impression that these people were indeed believers? Dunn's claim that Paul is in error seems to be driven by his argument against a two-stage experience. If we recognize that Luke does not present this account, or any of these accounts of Spiritbaptisms, as prescriptive of what takes place in conversion, we need not surmise that Paul is in error. Luke only uses the Spiritbaptism language in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19, and he never uses it elsewhere to describe conversion, which strongly suggests that what takes place in these Spiritbaptisms is unique.

These Spiritbaptisms are given to show God's approval, not to indicate what happens at conversion.<sup>28</sup> In Acts 2 the church is brought out for the first time and God demonstrates that He is with these who believe that Jesus is the Messiah. In Acts 8 the Samaritans are shown that there will be no Samaritan Christianity as there has been Samaritan Judaism, and the apostles are shown that God accepts the Samaritans. In Acts 10 the apostles are shown that the Gentiles receive the Spirit apart from circumcision, a point so controversial that Luke tells the story three times (Acts 10, 11, and 15).<sup>29</sup> And in Acts 19 the followers of the Baptist are shown that what he prophesied has taken place in Jesus, while the readers of the account see that belief in the proclamation of Israel's prophets must be accompanied by belief in the One proclaimed.<sup>30</sup> That these people were believers before they were baptized in the Spirit does not argue for a two stage work of the Spirit, for the uniqueness of each occurrence indicates that these events are not to be viewed as paradigmatic conversion accounts.<sup>31</sup> Some maintain that Luke intends his readers to infer that Spiritbaptisms happen at every conversion whether mentioned or not.<sup>32</sup> This is a theological inference not supported by the text of Acts.

# Christian Life in the Spirit

Luke describes Stephen, Barnabas, and the disciples as "full of the Spirit" (Acts 6:5; 7:55; 11:24; 13:52) and notes that the deacons were expected to be the same (6:3).<sup>33</sup> This pipe is made not for a wind that comes in explosive power resulting in extraordinary deeds, like the mighty rushing on the day of Pentecost (2:2). Rather, this pipe is designed for the continual presence of the Spirit which transforms people downcast by persecution into those who experience the unexpected emotions of joy (13:52), contentment (7:59), and forgiveness for their persecutors (7:60). This is not the music of ecstatic utterance but of characteristic constancy. Luke employs two related words to describe the character of Christian life. The sounds emanating from the plērēs/plēroō pipe are distinct from those given by the larger flue made for the winds of "Spiritbaptism," and they do not match the notes of the pimplēmi pipe (on which see below).<sup>34</sup> This wind of the Spirit seems to blow through the lives of all the Christians in Acts. In other words, they appear to be people whose lives are characterized by the steady presence of the Spirit (5:32; 9:31; 13:52).

Max Turner argues that Peter's speech in Acts 2 implies that "the Spirit given to all Christians is the 'Spirit of prophecy' promised by Joel."<sup>35</sup> This is an

oversimplification, and his arguments are not persuasive. He argues first that Peter offers Joel's "Spirit of prophecy" to the crowd in 2:38–39.<sup>36</sup> But since all in the church could be described as "full of the Spirit" (13:52)—even though it is clear that not all were prophets—it seems better to say that what Peter offered was the "eschatological gift of the Spirit" that would be given in the last days. One wonders why, if Turner is correct, prophets are presented as unique in Acts. In other words, why does Luke tell his readers that certain Christians are prophets (e.g. 11:27; 13:1; 15:32) if in fact all Christians have the Spirit of prophecy?

Turner's second argument is from the way that the Spirit is portrayed in the rest of Acts.<sup>37</sup> He is correct that the Spirit is portrayed as effecting many prophetic actions in the remainder of the book of Acts, but this should not exclude the recognition that the Spirit also has non-prophetic ministries, such as providing comfort (9:31) and joy (13:52).

Describing the Spirit in terms of the eschatological gift/blessing seems better because it is broad enough to be descriptive of those who receive the Spirit and do not prophesy. To show that Luke's usage of *plērēs* and *plēroō* bears witness to a distinct manifestation of the Spirit, we will first examine his use of *plērēs*, then his use of *plēroō*.

## **Luke's Use of *plērēs***

Luke uses the adjective *plērēs* to designate what characterizes people's lives. Three times Luke describes people as full of something other than the Spirit. Tabitha is said to be "full of good works and mercies which she was doing" (9:36); that is, her way of life was characterized by these things.<sup>38</sup> Paul denounced Elymas as "full of deceit and all unscrupulousness" as well as a son of the devil and an enemy of righteousness (13:10). Paul is not charging Elymas with a particular deceitful or unscrupulous deed, but denouncing his way of life.<sup>39</sup> Third, in Acts 19:28 the artisans of Ephesus are described as "full of rage" over the damage Paul has done to their business (19:28). This occurrence of *plērēs* is perhaps closer to Luke's use of *pimplēmi*; but the craftsmen are in a sense characterized by this behavior, for they carry on with their ranting for some two hours (19:34). Turner suggests that "a verbal collocation" results in this abnormal use of *plērēs* in Acts. He writes, "'becoming full of fury' (γενόμενοι πλήρεις θυμοῦ), at Acts 19:28, is simply a stylistic variant for ἐπλήσθισαν θυμοῦ."<sup>40</sup>

The call for deacons who are "full [*plērēs*] of the Spirit" (6:3), the description of Stephen as just such a person (6:5), and the similar description of Barnabas (11:24), all indicate that these are people whose lives are marked by the ongoing ministry of the Spirit.<sup>41</sup> Particular fruit characterized these men and prompt the descriptions. Stephen is described as "full of faith and the Holy Spirit" (6:5). Similarly, Barnabas is "a good man and full of the

Holy Spirit and faith" (11:24). The disciples are likewise "being filled with joy and the Holy Spirit" (13:52). These examples contravene Keener's claim that "prophetic empowerment ... is the only clear sense in which [the Holy Spirit] appears in all other passages in Luke-Acts."<sup>42</sup> It is interesting to note, too, that Paul includes faith, goodness, and joy as part of the fruit of the Holy Spirit (Gal 5:22–23).

We cannot be certain whether Luke intends Acts 7:55 to be read as a statement of Stephen's way of life, or if it describes an intensification of the Spirit's activity. We read, "And being full of the Holy Spirit [huparchōn de plērēs pneumatōs hagiou], having looked into heaven, he saw the glory of God and Jesus standing at the right hand of God." The participial form of huparchō, "being," suggests Stephen's ongoing lifestyle is being described since the verb designates a state of being (see Phil. 2:6). But even if Luke's use of plērēs in Acts 7:55 is closer to his use of pimplēmi,<sup>43</sup> the normal pattern is that when Luke employs the adjective plērēs in the phrase "full of the Spirit" he has in view a life marked by the Spirit's ministry. As I. H. Marshall puts it, "The adjective plērēs is used to describe the state of a person who is full of the Spirit. ... Thus it refers to a permanent endowment that becomes part of a person's character. Closely associated with the adjective is the verb plēroō which is used only once in Acts with reference to the Spirit ... it is used in the imperfect ... the tense suggests a continuing process."<sup>44</sup> This comment sets us up to look at Luke's use of plēroō.

## Luke's Use of plēroō

This same idea of a life marked by the fruit of the Spirit provides the best explanation of Luke's sole use of the verb plēroō in the phrase "full of the Spirit" (Acts 13:52). As it is being persecuted, the general experience of the church is described as "being filled with joy and the Holy Spirit."<sup>45</sup> Joy and fullness in the Spirit characterized the church.<sup>46</sup> Against this, Turner writes, "Luke does not believe all Christians to be 'full of the Spirit': this metaphor is used precisely to distinguish those whose lives are particularly marked by the work of the Spirit from ordinary Christians (see Acts 6:3!)."<sup>47</sup> Turner's assessment fails to incorporate Acts 13:52 and makes a faulty inference. No doubt there were Christians whose giftedness was particularly visible, but this does not imply that those not so marked were not full of the Spirit.

In depicting the lifestyle of these believers as one characterized by the fruit of the Spirit, Luke agrees with John and Paul that Christians are indwelt by the Holy Spirit (see John 14:16–17; 1 Cor 6:19), though he does not communicate it the same way they do. Luke uses the phrase "full of the Spirit" with plērēs/plēroō to designate Christian life in the Spirit.

Table 4: Diagram of the Points of Overlap

In these passages where people are described as “full of the Spirit” with plērēs/plēroō, something other than baptism in the Spirit is in view. Here is not a dramatic demonstration of God's approval, but a lifestyle marked by the Spirit's presence. The baptism terms do not overlap in meaning with plērēs/plēroō. The age in which believers can be indwelt by the Spirit, however, is broadly inaugurated by the baptism of the Spirit that took place at Pentecost.<sup>48</sup> So while the terms do not overlap, Christian life in the Spirit follows the baptism in the Spirit in salvation history.

# Filled for Inspired Proclamation

## Luke's Use of pimplēmi

On at least four occasions (arguably five) Luke describes, with a form of the verb *pimplēmi*, people who have already received the Holy Spirit as being “filled” with the Spirit. Each time this verb is employed to describe someone being “filled with the Spirit,” extraordinary things follow—inspired proclamation of the Gospel (2:4; 4:8,31), restoration of sight and subsequent proclamation (9:17), or authoritative denunciation (13:9–11).<sup>49</sup> Whereas the phrase “full of the Spirit,” using *plērēs/plēroō*, is generally used to characterize a believer's lifestyle, Luke's use of the verb *pimplēmi* to describe a filling is reserved for temporary bursts of the Spirit's power.

Other instances of *pimplēmi* in Acts demonstrate the temporary nature of “fillings” described with this verb. In response to the healing of the lame man, all the people are “filled with wonder and amazement” (3:10). In response to the immense success and influence of the apostles (5:12–16), the high priest and Sadducees are “filled with jealousy” (5:17). In Pisidian Antioch, “the Jews were filled with jealousy” (13:45) when they saw the public response to Paul's preaching. Finally, during the riot

at Ephesus, “the city was filled with confusion” (19:29).<sup>50</sup>

According to Acts 2:4, “They were all filled [emplēsthēsan] with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues just as the Spirit was giving them to proclaim.” The point here is not that the Christian way of life was from that point forward marked by speaking in tongues. There are only two other instances of speaking in other tongues in Acts, both in “baptism” settings (10:46; 19:6). After the day of Pentecost Christians continued to use ordinary languages (see 14:11; 21:37). This “filling” should therefore be understood as a temporary filling that was visibly (2:3) and audibly (2:6,8) manifested in powerful demonstration of God’s approval, which is seen in the outpouring of the eschatological gift of the Spirit. This should not be understood as the conversion of the apostles and their companions—they are clearly believers in Acts 1.<sup>51</sup> Further, this filling is not the ongoing experience of indwelling, for Peter would be filled again (4:8), as would the rest of the church (4:31), and Paul (9:17; 13:9).<sup>52</sup> In each of these instances those “filled” (pimplēmi) had previously received the Spirit. An ancillary result of these observations is that Acts 2 presents no difficulty for John 20:22—no more than Acts 4:8 should be perceived as a difficulty for Acts 2:4.<sup>53</sup>

Luke consistently uses pimplēmi with the Spirit to indicate inspiration for a particular work—usually proclamation. For instance, when the angel tells Zacharias

that his son will be filled with the Spirit as the prophet-forerunner of the Messiah, *pimplēmi* is the verb of choice (Luke 1:15). Luke again employs this verb to explain the prophetic greeting of the virgin Mary by Elizabeth, the Baptist's mother (Luke 1:41). Then upon the birth of the Baptist, Zacharias is filled with the Spirit and prophecies, and Luke describes the filling *pimplēmi*. These are the only times in Luke's Gospel that he describes people as being "filled" with the Spirit using *pimplēmi*. On each occasion prophecy is in view—the promised child will be a prophet (1:15), Elizabeth blesses Mary as the mother of the Lord (1:41–45), and Zacharias prophesies the salvation the Savior will accomplish (1:67–79). Luke's usage of *pimplēmi* accords with the way the term *empimplēmi* is used in the Greek translation of the Old Testament. At several places the Old Testament states that someone was "filled with the Spirit," and the Hebrew verb *ml* ("fill") is translated into Greek with a form of *pimplēmi* (Exod28:3; 31:3; 35:31; Deut 34:9—all employ *empimplēmi*).

## Points of Overlap

The only sense in which the use of *pimplēmi* overlaps with that of *plērēs/plēroō*, with the exception of the point at which they seem to come together in Acts 7:55, is that those who are inspired (*pimplēmi*) also live lives characterized by the Spirit's fruit, i.e., they are "full [*plērēs/plēroō*] of the Holy Spirit." Given the consistent use

of pimplēmi to designate empowerment, it does not seem best to equate these two ministries of the Spirit. On the one hand, the Spirit abides with all Christians and bears fruit in their lives (plērēs/plēroō). On the other hand, at certain points those who experience the ongoing presence of the Spirit are specially empowered for a definite task (pimplēmi).

The one significant point of overlap between the music of the "Spiritbaptism" words and that of pimplēmi to show special empowerment is in Acts 2:4. On the day of Pentecost, "they were all filled [pimplēmi] with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:4), and this is called a "baptism" in 1:5 and a "coming upon" in 1:8. Further, the "falling upon" (10:44) and "pouring out" of the Spirit (10:45) at Cornelius' house is likened to Pentecost in Acts 11:17. Finally, the tongues and prophesying of 19:6 are reminiscent of the "filling" in Acts 2. Although a baptism (1:5) is manifested as a "filling" (2:4), the inference that all "fillings" are "baptisms" would not be warranted.<sup>54</sup> Though the music from the two pipes comes together at Pentecost, its different strains can nevertheless be distinguished. The Spiritbaptism of 1:5 is manifested as a filling in 2:4. But the baptism seems to be God's way of bringing His church out into the open (2:6), and the filling results in an inspired proclamation (2:14–41). The "fillings" of 4:8,31; 9:17; and 13:9 are never called baptisms, outpourings, or the like, and the baptisms and outpourings are never compared to what takes place in these instances. On the "filling" in 4:31, Bruce says,

“While this was a fresh filling of the Spirit, it could not be called a fresh baptism”<sup>55</sup>

The baptisms and outpourings are likened to what took place in Acts 2 because God was “bringing out” the church in Acts 2, He was “bringing in” the Samaritans in Acts 8, the Gentiles in Acts 10, and the disciples of the Baptist in Acts 19. Just as God gave His stamp of approval to the church at Pentecost, these “inbringings” necessitated convincing proof. The Samaritans and the Jews had to be convinced that old animosities were to be abolished (see John 4:9). Those of the circumcision (11:2) had to be convinced that the Gentiles were accepted without being circumcised. And the disciples of the Baptist were persuaded that the time for baptism in the Spirit promised by John had indeed come (19:4–6).<sup>56</sup> A baptism can be manifested as a filling, but Luke never indicates that a filling is also a baptism (see Acts 4:8,31; 9:17; 13:9).<sup>57</sup>

From the distinct purposes that baptisms in the Spirit serve, and from the particular effects of fillings, it does not seem best to say that when Peter was “filled” before the Sanhedrin (4:8) he was “baptized” again.<sup>58</sup> Each baptism serves to extend the eschatological gift of the Spirit in a new way. Each filling, on the other hand, results in power for ministry. The diagram below illustrates the overlap described here.

# Conclusion

The verbs Luke uses for the bestowal of the Spirit in Acts reflect three distinct manifestations of the Spirit: the Spirit as the eschatological gift, the Christian life as characterized by the Spirit, and particular fillings with the Spirit for inspired proclamation. Several verbs overlap to describe the distribution of the eschatological gift of the Spirit (lambanō, didōmi, ekcheō, baptizō, epiptō, erchomai, and eperchomai). When Luke wishes to communicate the character of Christian life in the Spirit he uses plērēs or plēroō in the phrase “full of the Spirit.” When Christians are empowered for ministry in Acts, Luke uses pimplēmi in the phrase “filled with the Spirit.”

These three categories do not exhaust the song of the Spirit in Acts<sup>59</sup> but show us the ministries of the Spirit communicated by the verbs that Luke uses. May the Lord so work that we too may be characterized as plērēs pneumatos hagiou.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994, 1998), 115.

<sup>2</sup> (1) λαμβάνω ("receive") 2:33,38; 8:15,17,19; 10:47; 19:2. (2) δίδωμι ("give") 5:32; 8:18; 11:17; 15:8. (3) ἐκχέω/ἐκχύννω ("pour out") 2:17–18,33; 10:45–46. (4) βαπτίζω ("baptize") 1:5; 11:16 (cp. Luke 3:16). (5) ἐπιπίπτω ("fall upon") 8:16; 10:44; 11:15. (6) ἔρχομαι ("come") 19:6. (7) ἐπέρχομαι ("come upon") 1:8. (8) πίμπλημι ("fill") 2:4; 4:8,31; 9:17; 13:9 (cp. Luke 1:15,41,67). (9) πληρώω ("fill") 13:52. J. D. G. Dunn enumerates seven phrases, listing ἔρχομαι and ἐπέρχομαι as one, and, far more significantly, collapsing πίμπλημι and πληρώω (Baptism in the Holy Spirit [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970], 70). As will be seen below, Luke's usage of πίμπλημι is distinct from his use of πληρώω (Dunn himself recognizes a distinction between the usage of πίμπλημι and πλήρης [ibid., 71], but does not list them separately).

<sup>3</sup> The adjective πλήρης ("full") is used in the expression "full of the Spirit" at 6:3,5; 7:55; and 11:24. This locution is equivalent to the use of the verb πληρώω in 13:52, "and the disciples were being filled with joy and the Holy Spirit." Cp. 6:5, "full of faith and the Holy Spirit."

<sup>4</sup> Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4–5.

<sup>5</sup> Acts 2:33.

<sup>6</sup> Acts 2:38.

<sup>7</sup> I. H. Marshall argues for two manifestations, but not three, in, "The Significance of Pentecost," *SJT* 30 (1977): 347–69,355. C. K. Barrett attributes the position Marshall articulates (making a distinction between πλήρης and πίμπλημι) to F. F. Bruce, but Bruce is not nearly so specific on the page Barrett cites. Barrett objects that "this may make Luke more systematic than he was" (Acts, 226).

<sup>8</sup> M. Turner writes, "Nothing could be clearer than that the gift of the Spirit in Acts is what we have called the 'Spirit of prophecy'" (M. Turner, "Holy Spirit," *NDBT*, 553). What Turner refers to as the "Spirit of

prophecy” roughly corresponds to the overlap between the first and third manifestations of the Spirit I am proposing here, i.e., the overlap between the eschatological gift of the Spirit and special fillings for inspired proclamation. See also *id.*, “The Significance of Receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts: A Summary of Modern Scholarship,” *TJ2* (1981): 131–58; *id.*, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke—Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

<sup>9</sup> As noted above (n. 1), Dunn sees a distinction between *ἡμιπλημι* and *πλήρης* (Baptism, 71), but maintains that all the phrases signify “different aspects of the same operation and experience—the first initiating, i.e. baptizing work of the Spirit” (Baptism, 72 [emphasis his]).

<sup>10</sup> For Luke's use of *δίδωμι* and *λαμβάνω* with reference to the Spirit see note 1 (see also *δωρεά* in 2:38; 8:20; 10:45; 11:17). In Acts 1:8 Jesus tells the disciples that they will receive power when the Spirit has come upon (*ἐπιέρχομαι*) them. Cp. Mic 3:8, where the prophet says, “I am filled with power, with the Spirit of Yahweh.” The Greek translation of Micah employs the verb *ἡμιπλημι* in this phrase.

<sup>11</sup> G. E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. by D. A. Hagner (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993 [1974]), 344. Similarly N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, *Christian Origins and the Question of God 3* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 282.

<sup>12</sup> These verbs are used with reference to the Spirit outside Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19, but they always refer to the events that take place there. *δίδωμι* in 5:32 may be the only exception to this.

<sup>13</sup> Much of the language used of the coming of the Spirit reflects what is done with liquid or air: pouring out (*ἐκχέω*); baptizing (*βαπτίζω*); and filling (*πληρώω*). Still other verbs depict the Spirit falling or coming upon people (*ἐπιπίπτω*, *ἔρχομαι* and *ἐπιέρχομαι*). Luke uses these terms to describe the coming of the Spirit in conjunction with the exaltation of the Messiah Jesus (2:33), His reception of the promise of the Spirit from the Father (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4–5; 2:33), and His pouring out of the Spirit on all those God calls (2:33,38–39; 8:16; 10:44; 11:15; 19:6).

<sup>14</sup> The only other references to Spiritbaptism (with *βαπτίζω*) in the New Testament are those found in the Gospels (Matt 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33). This is one of the ways the Baptist indicated that the One coming after him was his superior (John 1:26–27, 30, 32–33). Not only does it communicate that Jesus is superior to John, it indicates that John believes

that the One who comes after him will minister the Spirit to His people in a manner similar to the way John himself ministered baptism to them. 1 Cor 12:13 looks like a reference to water baptism, and the emphasis falls on the Spirit's work in unifying the church.

<sup>15</sup> Against M. Turner, who argues that, "Luke does not spell out his pneumatology, like Paul, in terms of the fulfilment of Ezekiel 36 and new creation, but in terms of Joel 3.1-5(Eng.2.28-32)" (Power from on High, 352).

<sup>16</sup> Whereas the MT and LXX both read "And it shall come about after this" (Joel 3:1,Eng.2:28), Peter is reported to have said "in the last days" (Acts 2:17) in place of "after this."

<sup>17</sup> Evidently when Peter cited Joel in Acts 2 he understood the reference to the Spirit being poured out on "all flesh" (2:17) to mean male and female, young and old slave and free (2:17-18), but all of them Jewish people. Peter's misunderstanding is corrected when the Spirit is poured out on the Gentiles in Acts 10.

<sup>18</sup> So also Dunn, *Baptism*, 67.

<sup>19</sup> Similarly G. F. Hawthorne, "Holy Spirit," in *DLNT*, 493.

<sup>20</sup> Against Ladd (*Theology*, 384) and Dunn (*Baptism*, 72).

<sup>21</sup> Ladd, *Theology*, 384.

<sup>22</sup> See Acts 2:47; 5:14; 6:7; 16:5; 17:11-12; 2:41; 4:4; 8:12-13,36-37; 9:35,42; 13:48; 16:14,31-34; 18:8.

<sup>23</sup> So also W. McCown, "The Spirit in the Book of Acts," in *The Spirit and the New Age*, ed. L. Shelton and A. R. G. Deasley (Anderson, IN: Warner, 1986), 112-13.

<sup>24</sup> I have argued in this work that they received the indwelling Spirit on resurrection day. See further my dissertation, "He Is with You and He Will Be in You: The Spirit, The Believer, and the Glorification of Jesus" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003).

<sup>25</sup> The aorist participle, πιστεύσασιν ("having believed") in Acts 11:17, communicates action that took place prior to the action of the main verb ἔδωκεν ("[God] gave"). See BDF § 339.

<sup>26</sup> Luke uses the term μαθητῆς ("disciple") 28 times. In each case it refers to believers. Dunn sees the usage in 19:1 as distinctive because it is the only time Luke does not employ the definite article with the noun,

though he does use the indefinite pronoun τῶν (Baptism, 84). This is a very subtle distinction, but it may be valid. If Luke did mean to distinguish these disciples by leaving off the article, he probably did not mean for too sharp of a distinction to be made. It would have been very easy for him to call them “disciples of John” or to simply use another term. As Barrett says, “The word itself strongly suggests Christian disciples” (Acts, 893). What is unique about these disciples has to do with the time in which they lived. They seem to be true believers who have not been apprised of all that had taken place. The problem is not that they held false beliefs, but that they were not aware of all that God had done in Jesus. Thus, when Paul increased their knowledge in 19:4, their faith was added to rather than created. They did not pass from a state of unbelief to a state of belief, but from a state of belief in what John proclaimed to a state of belief that the One whom John proclaimed was Jesus (19:4–5). See A. Fernando, Acts, 505–06; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 643.

<sup>27</sup> Dunn, Baptism, 84.

<sup>28</sup> See D. Jackson, “Luke and Paul: A Theology of One Spirit from Two Perspectives,” *JETS* 32 (1989): 336, 338.

<sup>29</sup> As F. F. Bruce says, “Apart from such external manifestations, none of the Jewish believers present, perhaps not even Peter himself, would have been so ready to accept the reality of the Spirit’s coming upon them” (*The Book of the Acts*, rev.ed. NICNT[Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988],217).

<sup>30</sup> Similarly F. R. Harm, “Structural Elements Related to the Gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts,” *Concor J* 14 (1988): 28, 38; W. Russell, “The Anointing with the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts,” *TJ* 7 (1986): 62–63.

<sup>31</sup> F. F. Bruce helpfully demonstrates the lack of a clear pattern in Luke’s accounts of Spiritbaptisms (e.g. it happens sometimes after days [Acts 8] sometimes after moments [Acts 10] sometimes with laying on of hands [Acts 8] sometimes without [Acts 10]) (“Luke’s Presentation of the Spirit in Acts,” *CTR* 5 [1990]: 27)

<sup>32</sup> Dunn, Baptism, 90; M. Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, rev. ed. (Peabody, MA:Hendrickson,1998), 45.

<sup>33</sup> Luke uses the adjective πλήρης to describe the deacons, Stephen and Barnabas (6:3,5; 7:55; 11:24), but the verb πληρόω is used to

describe the disciples' lifestyle (13:52).

<sup>34</sup> Some equate Luke's use of πλήρης/πληρώω with his use of πίμπλημι, see e.g. G. W. Bromiley, "Holy Spirit," in ISBE, 4:733; R.Schippers, πληρώω in NIDNTT, 1:739.

<sup>35</sup> Turner, Power from on High, 349.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 349–50.

<sup>38</sup> So also Turner, Power from on High, 166–67.

<sup>39</sup> J. B. Polhill writes, "This was what Elymas had been doing all along with Sergius Paulus, deceiving him with all his false claims" (Acts, NAC [Nashville: Broadman, 1992], 294).<sup>40</sup> Turner, Power from on High, 167.

<sup>41</sup> See Bruce, Acts, 121, 227.

<sup>42</sup> C. S. Keener, The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997), 191.

<sup>43</sup> So G. Delling, πλήρης in TDNT, 6:285.

<sup>44</sup> Marshall, "Significance," 355.

<sup>45</sup> Luke says this of "the disciples," but no particular disciples are named, so it probably refers to all the disciples. Some think that "disciples" refers only to Paul and Barnabas, e.g. Fitzmyer (Acts, 522) and Hawthorne ("Holy Spirit," 496). But on either side of this reference to "the disciples" in 13:52, Luke distinguishes between Paul and Barnabas and those to whom they minister, referring to Paul and Barnabas not as "disciples" but as "the apostles" in 14:4 (also 13:50; 14:1,3). Bruce writes, "The converts whom they left behind ... were ... filled with the joy begotten by the indwelling Spirit of Christ" (Acts, 269); similarly B. Witherington, The Acts of the Apostles (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 417.

<sup>46</sup> When Paul gives the command, "Be filled with the Spirit" in Eph 5:18, he uses πληρώω. Paul is not commanding people to be inspired by a rush of the Spirit's power, but is calling for a way of life marked by the fruit of the Spirit. It is not unlikely that Paul means for the participles that follow to flesh out what it means to be "filled with the Spirit" ("speaking to one another in psalms ... singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord, giving thanks always in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ ...

submitting to one another in the fear of Christ" [5:19–21]). Thus for Paul, as for Luke, being "full of the Spirit" (using the verb πληρώ) is characteristic of Christian life in the Spirit.

<sup>47</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, 169.

<sup>48</sup> I have worded this to allow for the possibility that the believing remnant was indwelt by the Spirit on the day of the resurrection (John 20:22).

<sup>49</sup> I recognize that in Acts 9:17 Paul does not immediately begin to proclaim in the manner that Peter does in 4:8, but he will do so soon enough (see 9:20), and 9:17 might be Paul's "anointing" for ministry. J. B. Shelton argues that, "The phrase 'filled with' or 'full of the Holy Spirit' indicates primarily that inspired witness about Jesus or against the devil is occurring" (" 'Filled with the Holy Spirit' and 'Full of the Holy Spirit': Lucan Redactional Phrases," in *Faces of Renewal*, ed. P. Elbert [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988], 81). Shelton does not distinguish between πλήρης/πληρώ and ἰμπλημι. But on ἰμπλημι Marshall writes, "It is especially used where a person is inspired by the Spirit before making a statement under prophetic inspiration or preaching a sermon. ... One filling is not incompatible with another" ("Significance," 355).

<sup>50</sup> Turner's assessment is similar, *Power from on High*, 166–69.

<sup>51</sup> It seems that Luke means to indicate that the 120 received the Spirit and spoke in tongues (Acts 1:15; 2:1). The group is only limited to the twelve when Peter stands up to address the crowd (2:14)

<sup>52</sup> Hawthorne, "Holy Spirit," 493–94.

<sup>53</sup> The interpretation of John. 20:22 as an "acted parable" or as a "symbolic promise" as an attempt to obviate the difficulty of harmonizing John's account with Luke's was condemned as heretical at the fifth ecumenical council in AD 553. Nevertheless, a number of evangelicals have endorsed this interpretation in recent years: D. A. Carson, *John*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 651–55; A. J. Köstenberger, *Encountering John* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 186; Ladd, *Theology*, 325; B. Witherington, *John's Wisdom* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1995), 340. Luke's use of the term ἰμπλημι makes this unnecessary.

<sup>54</sup> Against Hawthorne, who writes: "Baptism with the Holy Spirit and being filled with the Holy Spirit are to be equated" ("Holy Spirit," 494).

<sup>55</sup> Bruce, *Acts*, 100.

<sup>56</sup> See Jackson, "Luke and Paul," 337.

<sup>57</sup> Commenting on 2:38, F. F. Bruce writes, "The baptism of the Spirit which it was our Lord's prerogative to bestow was, strictly speaking, something that took place once for all on the day of Pentecost..." (Acts, 70).

<sup>58</sup> Dunn writes, "The imagery of the language suggests more an occasional 'topping up' of a Spirit once for all bestowed at Pentecost" (The Acts of the Apostles [Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1996], 52–53).

<sup>59</sup> For example, elsewhere in Acts we see that the Holy Spirit is equated with God (5:3–4), with whom Jesus was anointed (10:38). By Him the early church's prophets speak (6:10; 11:28; 21:4,11 [πίμπλημι is not used in these passages]), and in Acts 8:39–40 the Spirit transports Philip in a manner not unlike what Ezekiel experienced (Ezek 8:3; 11:1,24; see also 1 Kgs 18:12; 2 Kgs 2:16). He is the speaker of Scripture (Acts 1:16; 4:25; 28:25), the instigator of missions (10:19; 11:12; 13:2,4), a guide for those on mission (8:29; 16:6,7; 20:23), a factor in theological discussions (15:28), an appointer of leaders (20:28), and the comforter of the church (9:31).

<sup>60</sup> I wish to express my gratitude to Thomas R. Schreiner, Jay E. Smith, Robert H. Stein, Randall K. J. Tan, David A. Thomas, and Brian J. Vickers, who read this Appendix and offered helpful criticisms. An earlier version was presented at the Southwest Regional meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Dallas, TX, in March, 2004.

# SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Johannine Resources

- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 2d ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of John and Judaism*.  
Translated by D. M. Smith. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. *John*. 2d ed. *Word Biblical Commentary*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999.
- Bernard, J. H. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 2 vols. *International Critical Commentary*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928.
- Betz, O. *Der Paraklet. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums*. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel: Issues and Commentary*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001.
- Brown, R. E. *The Gospel According to John*. 2 vols. *Anchor Bible*. New York: Doubleday, 1966, 1970.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Edited by R. W. N. Hoare and J. K. Riches. Philadelphia: Westminster,

- 1971.
- Burge, Gary M. *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John*. NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.
- Carson, D. A. *The Farewell Discourse and Final Prayer of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to John*. Pillar New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Casurella, Anthony. *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers: A Study in the History of Exegesis*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese 25. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Charlesworth, J. H., ed. *John and Qumran*. London: Chapman, 1972.
- Coloe, Mary L. *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Culpepper, R. A. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- de la Potterie, I. *The Hour of Jesus*. Translated by D. G. Murray. New York: Alba House, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *La Vénté dans Saint Jean*. 2 vols. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977.
- Dodd, C. H. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- Ellis, E. Earle. The World of St. John: The Gospel and the Epistles. New York:UPA,1995 (1965).
- Franck, E. Revelation Taught: The Paraclete in the Gospel of John. Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series 14. Lund: Gleerup, 1985.
- Frey, Jörg. Die johanneische Eschatologie: Das johanneische Zeitverständnis. Band II. WUNT 110. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die johanneische Eschatologie: Die eschatologische Verkündigung in den johanneischen Texten. Band III. WUNT 117. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die johanneische Eschatologie: Ihre Probleme im Spiegel der Forschung seit Reimarus. Band I.WUNT 96.Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,1997.
- Haenchen, Ernst. John. 2 vols. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Hermeneia. Philadelphia:Fortress, 1984.
- Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Hengel, Martin. The Johannine Question. Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM, 1989.
- Holwerda, D. E. The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John. Kampen: Kok,1959.
- Hoskyns, E. C. The Fourth Gospel. Edited by F. N. Davey. 2d ed. London: Faber and Faber, 1947.

- Howard, W. F. *Christianity According to St. John*.  
Studies in Theology. London: Duckworth, 1943.
- Johnston, G. *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. Society for New Testament Studies  
Monograph Series 12. Cambridge: Cambridge  
University Press, 1970.
- Kerr, Alan R. *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple  
Theme in the Gospel of John*. Journal for the  
Study of the New Testament Supplement Series  
220. New York: Sheffield, 2002.
- Koester, Craig R. *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel:  
Meaning, Mystery, Community*. Minneapolis:  
Fortress, 1995.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. *Encountering John: The  
Gospel in Historical, Literary, and Theological  
Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. John. In vol. 2 of *Zondervan Illustrated  
Bible Backgrounds Commentary*. Edited by Clinton  
E. Arnold, 2–216. Grand Rapids: Zondervan,  
2002.
- Kysar, Robert. *John, The Maverick Gospel*. Atlanta:  
John Knox, 1976.
- Lindars, Barnabas, ed. *The Gospel of John*. New  
Century Bible. London: Oliphants, 1972
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John*. Sacra  
Pagina4. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John*. Revised  
Ed. *New International Commentary on the New  
Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Jesus is the Christ: Studies in the Theology of John. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studies in the Fourth Gospel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.
- Porsch, F. Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums. Frankfurter Theologische Studien 16. Frankfurt: Knecht, 1974.
- Ridderbos, Herman. The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary. Translated by John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Robinson, J. A. T. The Priority of John. Edited by J. F. Coakley London: SCM, 1985.
- Schlatter, Adolf. Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt. Dritte Auflage. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. The Gospel According to St. John. 3 vols. Translated by K. Smith. New York: Crossroad, 1968, 1979, 1982.
- Schnelle, Udo. Das Evangelium nach Johannes. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 4. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1998.
- Smalley, S. S. John, Evangelist and Interpreter. 2d ed. Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 1998.
- Smith, D. M. John. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Theology of the Gospel of John. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: University

- Press, 1995.
- Talbert, Charles H. Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles. Reading the New Testament Series. New York: Crossroad, 1992.
- Thompson, M. M. The God of the Gospel of John. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Van Belle, Gilbert. Les parenthèses dans l'Évangile de Jean. Studiorum novi testamenti auxilia XI. Leuven: University Press, 1985.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1908.
- Windisch, Hans. The Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel. Biblical Series 20. Translated by James W. Cox. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.

## Other Resources

Alexander, Philip S. "Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature." In *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Vol. 1. Edited by D. A. Carson and Mark A. Seifrid, 261–302. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

Alexander, T. Desmond. "Royal Expectations in Genesis to Kings: Their Importance for Biblical Theology." *Tyndale Bulletin* 49 (1998): 191–212.

\_\_\_\_\_. "From Adam to Judah: The significance of the family tree in Genesis." *Evangelical Quarterly* 61 (1989): 5–19.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Further Observations on the Term 'Seed' in Genesis." *Tyndale Bulletin* 48 (1997): 363–367.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Seed." In *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, eds. T. Desmond Alexander, Brian S. Rosner, D. A. Carson, Graeme Goldsworthy 769–773. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.

Armerding, C. "The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 92 (1935): 277–91, 433–41.

Averbeck, R. E. "Tabernacle." In *Dictionary of the Old Testament Pentateuch*. Edited by T. D. Alexander and D. W. Baker, 807–27. Downers Grove: InterVarsity 2003.

Barrett, C. K. "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel." *Journal of Theological Studies* 1 (1950): 1–15.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition."

- Expository Times 67 (1955–56): 142–45.
- Bauckham, Richard, ed. *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Beale, G. K. "Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?" *Themelios* 14 (1989): 89–96.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. "John 3:3, 5: Baptism, Spirit and the Kingdom." *Expository Times* 97 (1986): 167–70.
- Belleville, Linda. "'Born of Water and Spirit:' John 3:5." *Trinity Journal* 1 (1980): 125–41.
- Bennema, Cornelis. "The Giving of the Spirit in John's Gospel—A New Proposal?" *Evangelical Quarterly* 74 (2002): 195–213.
- Blaising, Craig A. and Darrell L. Bock. *Progressive Dispensationalism: An Up-to-Date Handbook of Contemporary Dispensational Thought*. Wheaton, IL: Bridgepoint, 1993.
- Block, Daniel I. "Empowered by the Spirit of God: The Holy Spirit in the Historiographic Writings of the Old Testament." *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 1 (1997): 42–61.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Prophet of the Spirit: The Use of RWH in the Book of Ezekiel." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 32 (1989): 27–49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Ezekiel*. 2 vols. *New International Commentary on the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997, 1998.

- Briggs, Charles A. "The Use of  $\text{אָרְחֵי}$  in the Old Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 19 (1900): 132–45.
- Brown, Raymond E. "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 13 (1967): 113–32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 17 (1955): 403–19.
- Carson, D. A. "The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7–11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98 (1979): 547–66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:31 Reconsidered." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 639–51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel." *Tyndale Bulletin* 33 (1982): 59–91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Chilton, Bruce. "John XII 34 and Targum Isaiah LII 13." *Novum Testamentum* 22 (1980): 176–78.
- Clements, R. E. *God and Temple*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- Collins, Jack. "A Syntactical Note (Genesis 3:15): Is the Woman's Seed Singular or Plural?" *Tyndale*

- Bulletin 48 (1997): 139–148.
- Collins, John J. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- Cortes, J. B. "Yet Another Look at John 7:37–39." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1967): 75–86.
- Davies, J. G. "The Primary Meaning of PARAKLHTOS." *Journal of Theological Studies* 4 (1953): 35–38.
- de Jonge, M. "Jewish Expectations about the 'Messiah' According to the Fourth Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972–73): 246–70.
- de la Potterie, I. "L'Esprit Saint dans L'Évangile de Jean." *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971–72): 448–51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Naître de l'eau et naître de l'Esprit: Le texte baptismal de Jn 3,5." *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 14 (1962): 417–43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Parole et esprit dans S. Jean." In *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by M. de Jonge, 177–201. Leuven: University Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Truth in Saint John." In *The Interpretation of John*. ed. Edited by J. Ashton, 67–82. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- de la Potterie, I., and S. Lyonnet. *The Christian Lives by the Spirit*. Translated by J. Morris. New York: Alba House, 1971.
- Dreytza, Manfred. *Der theologische Gebrauch von*

- RUAH im Alten Testament: Eine wort-und satzsemantische Studie. Giessen: Brunnen, 1990.
- Dumbrell, W. J. "Spirit and Kingdom of God in the Old Testament." *Reformed Theological Review* 33 (1974): 1–10.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in relation to Pentecostalism today*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Christ and the Spirit: Christology*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Evans, C. A. "New Testament Use of the Old Testament." In *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander, Brian S. Rosner, D. A. Carson, Graeme Goldsworthy, 72–80. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Obduracy and the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." In *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis*. Edited by C. A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring, 221–36. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Fee, Gordon D. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Feinberg, John S. "Salvation in the Old Testament." In *Tradition and Testament*. Edited by John S. Feinberg and Paul D. Feinberg, 39–77. Chicago: Moody, 1981.

- Ferguson, Sinclair B. *The Holy Spirit. Contours of Christian Theology.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1996.
- Fredricks, Gary. "Rethinking the Role of the Holy Spirit in the Lives of Old Testament Believers." *Trinity Journal* 9 (1988): 81–104.
- Fuller, Daniel P. *The Unity of the Bible: Unfolding God's Plan for Humanity.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.
- Goldingay, John. "Was the Holy Spirit Active in Old Testament Times?" *Exauditu* 12 (1996): 14–28.
- Goldsworthy, Graeme. *According to Plan: The Unfolding Revelation of God in the Bible.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002.
- Green, Michael. *I Believe in the Holy Spirit.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Grogan, G. W. "The Experience of Salvation in the Old and New Testaments." *Vox evangelica* 5 (1967): 4–26.
- Hamilton, James M.Jr. "God with Men in the Prophets and the Writings: An Examination of the Nature of God's Presence," *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 23.2 (2005): 166–93.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "God with Men in the Torah." *Westminster Theological Journal* 65 (2003): 113–33.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "N. T. Wright and Saul's Moral Bootstraps: Newer Light on 'The New Perspective'," *Trinity Journal* 25 (2004): 139–55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Old Covenant Believers and the Indwelling

- Spirit: A Survey of the Spectrum of Opinion." *Trinity Journal* 24 (2003): 37–54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Center of Biblical Theology: The Glory of God in Salvation through Judgment?" *Tyndale Bulletin* 57 (2006): 57–84.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The One Who Does Them Shall Live By Them: Leviticus 18:5 in Galatians 3:12," *Gospel Witness* (August 2005): 10–14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Were Old Covenant Believers Indwelt by the Holy Spirit?" *Themelios* (2004): forthcoming.
- Harris, Murray J. "Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament." In *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 4 vols. Edited by Colin Brown, 3:1171–1215. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Hasel, Gerhard. *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah*. Andrews University Monographs V. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1972.
- Hengel, Martin, and Roland Deines. "E. P. Sanders' 'Common Judaism,' Jesus, and the Pharisees." Translated by Daniel P. Bailey. *Journal of Theological Studies* 46 (1995): 1–70.
- Hildebrandt, Wilf. *An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Hodges, Z. "Rivers of Living Water—John 7:37–39." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136 (1979): 239–48.
- Hooke, S. H. "The Spirit Was Not Yet (Jn 7:39)." *New*

- Testament Studies 9 (1963): 372–80.
- Horton, Michael S. *Covenant and Eschatology: The Divine Drama*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Hoskins, Paul. "Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple in the Gospel of John." Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2002.
- House, Paul R. *Old Testament Theology*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity 1998.
- Isaacs, Marie E. "The Prophetic Spirit in the Fourth Gospel." *HeythropJournal* 24 (1983): 391–407.
- Janowski, Bernd. "Ich will in eurer Mitte wohnen." In *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie, Band 2, Der eine Gott der beiden Testamente*, 165–93. Neukirchener Verlag, 1987.
- Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.
- Koester, Craig R. "Hearing, Seeing, and Believing in the Gospel of John." *Bíblica* 70 (1989): 327–48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Messianic Exegesis and the Call of Nathaniel (John 1.45–51)." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 39 (1990): 23–34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Topography and Theology in the Gospel of John." In *Fortunate the Eyes that See*, eds. A. B. Beck, A. H. Bartelt, P. R. Raabe, and C. A. Franke, 436–48. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish*

Literature, and the New Testament. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 22. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989.

Köstenberger, Andreas J. "Frühe Zweifel an der johanneischen Verfasserschaft des vierten Evangeliums in der modernen Interpretationsgeschichte." *European Journal of Theology* 5 (1995): 37–46.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus as Rabbi in the Fourth Gospel." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 8 (1998): 97–128.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus the Good Shepherd Who Will Also Bring Other Sheep (John 10:16): The Old Testament Background of a Familiar Metaphor." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 12 (2002): 67–96.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Greater Works of the Believer According to John 14:12." *Didaskalia* 6 (1995): 36–45.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Seventh Johannine Sign: A Study in John's Christology" *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 5 (1995): 87–103.

\_\_\_\_\_. "What Does It Mean to Be Filled with the Spirit? A Biblical Investigation." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40 (1997): 229–40.

Lacomara, Aelred. "Deuteronomy and the Farewell Discourse (Jn 13:31 – 16:33)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 65–84.

Ladd, George E. *A Theology of the New Testament*.

- Rev. ed. Edited by Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Levison, J. R. "Holy Spirit." In *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter, 507–15. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.
- Lewis, Arthur H. "The New Birth under the Old Covenant." *Evangelical Quarterly* 56 (1984): 35–44.
- Lys, Daniel. *Rûach: Le Souffle dans L'Ancien Testament*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962.
- Malatesta, E. "The Spirit/Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel." *Biblica* 54 (1973): 539–50.
- March, W. Eugene. "God With Us: A Survey of Jewish Pneumatology." *Austin Seminary Bulletin: Faculty Edition* 83 (1967): 3–16.
- McKelvey, R. J. "Temple." In *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander, Brian S. Rosner, D. A. Carson, Graeme Goldsworthy, 806–11. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Menken, Maarten J. J. "Observations on the Significance of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." *Neotestamentica* 33 (1999): 125–43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Origin of the Old Testament Quotation in John 7:38." *Novum Testamentum* 38

- (1996): 160–75.
- Mounce, W. D. "The Origin of the New Testament Metaphor of Rebirth." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, December, 1982.
- Neve, Lloyd. *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament*. Tokyo: Seibunsha, 1972.
- Packer, J. I. *Keep in Step with the Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Revell, 1984.
- Paige, T. "Holy Spirit." In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Edited by G. F. Hawthorne and R. P. Martin, 404–13. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993.
- Pettegrew, L. D. *The New Covenant Ministry of the Holy Spirit*. New York: University Press of America, 1993.
- Pollard, T. E. "The Father-Son and God-Believer Relationships According to St John: a Brief Study of John's Use of Prepositions." In *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by M. de Jonge, 363–69. Leuven: University Press, 1977.
- Poythress, V. S. "Johannine Authorship and the Use of Intersentence Conjunctions in the Book of Revelation." *Westminster Theological Journal* 47 (1985): 329–36.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Testing for Johannine Authorship by Examining the Use of Conjunctions." *Westminster Theological Journal* 46 (1984): 350–69.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of the Intersentence Conjunctions De, Oun, Kai, and Asyndeton in the Gospel of John." *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984): 312–40.
- Preuss, H. D. "ich will mit dir sein!" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 80 (1968): 139–73.
- Pryke, John. "'Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts." *Revue de Qumran* 5 (1965–66): 345–60.
- Pryor, John W. "Jesus and Israel in the Fourth Gospel." *Novum Testamentum* 32 (1990): 201–18
- Sailhamer, J. H. "Genesis." In vol. 2 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by F. E. Gaebelin, 3–284. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Creation, Genesis 1–11, and the Canon." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 10 (2000): 89–106.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Messiah and the Hebrew Bible." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 44 (2001): 5–23.
- Sandys-Wunsch, John, and Laurence Eldredge. "J. P. Gabler and the Distinction Between Biblical and Dogmatic Theology: Translation, Commentary, and Discussion of His Originality." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 33 (1980): 133–58.
- Schaper, Joachim. "The Pharisees." In *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Edited by William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy, 402–27. Cambridge: University Press, 1999.

- Schnelle, Udo. "Johannes als Geisttheologe." *Novum Testamentum* 40 (1998): 17–31.
- Schoemaker, W. R. "The Use of  $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\alpha$  in the Old Testament, and of  $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\alpha$  in the New Testament: A Lexicographical Study." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 23 (1904): 13–67.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Paul, Apostle of God's Glory in Christ: A Pauline Theology*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001.
- Silva, Moisés. "Approaching the Fourth Gospel." *Criswell Theological Review* 3.1 (1988): 17–29.
- Simon, W. B. "The Role of the Spirit-Paraclete in the Disciples' Mission in the Fourth Gospel. Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002.
- Simpson, Ian G. "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel." *Expositor* 4 (1925): 292–99.
- Skarsaune, Oskar. *In the Shadow of the Temple*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002.
- Snaith, N. H. "The Meaning of 'The Paraclete.'" *Expository Times* 57 (1945): 47–50.
- Thomas, John Christopher. "The Fourth Gospel and Rabbinic Judaism." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 82 (1991): 159–82.
- Thompson, M. M. "Eternal Life in the Gospel of John." *Ex auditu* 5 (1989): 35–55.
- Toon, P. *Born Again: A Biblical and Theological Study of Regeneration*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.

- Turner, M., and G. M. Burge. "The Anointed Community: A Review and Response." *Evangelical Quarterly* 62 (1990): 253–68.
- Turner, Max M. B. "The Concept of Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel." *Vox Evangelica* 10 (1977): 24–42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Significance of Spirit Endowment for Paul." *Vox Evangelica* 9 (1975): 56–69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*. Rev. ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998.
- Van Pelt, M. V., W. C. Kaiser Jr., and D. I. Block. "רוּחַ." In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis*. 5 vols. Edited by Willem A. VanGemeren, 3:1073–1078. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- VanGemeren, Willem A. "The Spirit of Restoration." *Westminster Theological Journal* 50 (1988): 81–102.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Progress of Redemption: From Creation to the New Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988. New ed., *The Biblical and Theological Classics Library*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.
- Vawter, Bruce. "Ezekiel and John." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 26 (1964): 450–58.
- Vos, Geerhardus. *Biblical Theology: Old and New*

- Testaments. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948; reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1996.
- Wallace, Daniel B. "Greek Grammar and the Personality of the Holy Spirit." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Institute for Biblical Research, November 17, 2001.
- Walter, Peter W. L. Jesus and the Holy City. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Ware, Bruce A. "Rationale for the Distinctiveness of the New Covenant Work of the Holy Spirit." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, November, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The New Covenant and the People(s) of God." In *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church: The Search for Definition*. Edited by C. A. Blaising and D. L. Bock, 68–97. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. "The Spirit of God in the Old Testament." In *Biblical Doctrines*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1929. Reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1988.
- Weinfeld, M. "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 88 (1976): 17–56.
- Weisman, Z. "The Personal Spirit as Imparting Authority." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93 (1981): 255–34.
- Wenham, David. "A Historical View of John's Gospel." *Themelios* 23 (1998): 5–21.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spirit and Life: Some Reflections on Johannine Theology." *Themelios* 6 (1980): 4–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel: Another Look." *Tyndale Bulletin* 48 (1997): 149–78.
- Wenham, G.J. "Deuteronomy and the Central Sanctuary." In *A Song of Power and the Power of Song. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study* 3. Edited by D. L. Christensen, 94–108. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1993.
- Wifall, Walter. "Gen 3:15—A Protoevangelium?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (1974): 361–65.
- Williams, Sam K. "Justification and the Spirit in Galatians." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29 (1987): 91–100.
- Wise, M. O. "Temple." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight, 811–17. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992.
- Wood, Leon J. *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
- Wright, G. E., H. H. Nelson, and L. Oppenheim. "The Significance of the Temple in the Ancient Near East." *Biblical Archeologist* 7 (1944): 41–88.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God. Christian Origins and the Question of God 2*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New Testament and the People of God. Christian Origins and the Question of God 1*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.