

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1987

The Work of the Holy Spirit in Light of John 14-16

Glenn Nielsen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nielsen, Glenn, "The Work of the Holy Spirit in Light of John 14-16" (1987). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 40.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/40>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
IN LIGHT OF JOHN 14-16

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Systematic Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by
Glenn Nielsen
May 1987

Approved by JOA Preus III
Advisor

Erich Kiehl
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. THE SPIRIT NOT YET GIVEN	5
II. ANOTHER PARACLETE	20
III. I WILL SEND HIM TO YOU	35
IV. SPIRIT OF TRUTH, HOLY SPIRIT	40
V. HE WILL GLORIFY ME	50
Remain and Within	
Teach	
Bring to Remembrance	
Bear Witness	
Guide	
Summary: Glorify	
VI. HE WILL CONVICT THE WORLD	79
VII. THAT HE MAY BE WITH YOU FOREVER	91
The Johannine Witness	
The Spirit's Relation to Christ	
Justification	
Sanctification	
CONCLUSION	123
BIBLIOGRAPHY	127

INTRODUCTION

Why a study on the Holy Spirit? There are obvious reasons, such as, the contemporary prominence given the Third Person of the Trinity by those in the Church, the stress which current culture places on the experiential, including an experience of the divine, or the fact that He seems only "half-known" by the Church.¹ But more personal reasons generated this paper.

Many Christians, particularly Lutherans, have a . . . hesitancy to speak of the Spirit in any isolated or independent sense. The Spirit as He comes from God never operates autonomously but always carries out the Father's will as it has been given to Him from the Son. He brings to completion² in the world what the Father has worked through the Son.

At the same time, the Charismatic movement appears to capture a new vitality or experience of the Holy Spirit beyond my own. Hence, the question, "Am I missing something?" Indeed, Alasdair Heron writes,

They [Pentecostal churches] were distinctive especially in the place given to 'the gifts of the Spirit', by the weight laid on 'baptism in the Spirit' as a 'second

¹Millard Erickson, Christian Theology, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), 3:846; Lorenz Wunderlich, The Half-Known God (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1963).

²David Scaer, "Formula of Concord Article VI: The Third Use of the Law," Concordia Theological Monthly 42 (April 1978):147.

blessing' manifested in glossolalia, and by an inclination to dismiss the older churches as lacking the living presence of the Spirit.³

But this study is limited. The primary focus is John 14-16, the Upper Room Discourse. Here Jesus' own words describe and prescribe the work of the Holy Spirit. Our Lord Himself, speaking through the pen of the Apostle John, instructs the church as to the nature of the ministry of the Paraclete. In less personal words, then, the question this paper seeks to answer is, "How is the work of the Holy Spirit to be understood in light of Jesus' instruction in the Upper Room Discourse?"

Procedurally, this means beginning with the observation that Pentecost marks a distinct and dramatic difference in the work of the Spirit. This leads to an investigation as to why He is now present in a far more powerful way. John's answer is that Jesus is now glorified (John 7:39). The first chapter focuses on what that glorification means, particularly for the ministry of the Spirit.

Next follows the actual examination of the Upper Room Discourse. Here the unifying thread to the Spirit's title "Paraclete" (Chapter two), His arrival (Chapter three), His other titles (Chapter four), His ministry to the disciples (Chapter five), and His work in the world (Chapter six) is its Christocentricity. Very simply, an exclusively Christological emphasis predominates Jesus' instruction

³Alasdair Heron, The Holy Spirit (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), p. 130.

about the Spirit, and is summarized at John 16:14, "He will bring glory to me." Frederick Bruner expresses well this Christ-centered mission of the Spirit.

The work of the Holy Spirit is simply to thrill us with Christ, to infect us with enthusiasm for all that Christ can do for men and women and for the world to change things, to renew institutions, and to salvage lives. The Holy Spirit is shy about absolutely everything except Christ,⁴ but about Christ the Spirit is downright bullish.

But does this Christocentric ministry extend beyond the age of the disciples? Is it in effect for the whole life of the Church? The final chapter examines key passages in John and Paul, with resulting affirmative answers to these questions. Both Jesus and the life of the early Church stress the continuing Christocentricity of the Spirit's work. This is very evident in the doctrines of justification and sanctification.

The paper is thus quite helpful, for now my personal question is answered. No, I am not missing out on anything of the Spirit. My relationship with Christ assures me of that. It also answers the more academic inquiry, which produces the thesis of this study: the work of the Holy Spirit is exclusively and continually Christological. Or, as Frederick Bruner says, commenting on the title of his book, The Holy Spirit: Shy Member of the Trinity,

⁴Frederick Dale Bruner, "The Shy Member of the Trinity," in Frederick Dale Bruner and William Hordern, The Holy Spirit-Shy Member of the Trinity (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984), p. 23.

What I mean here by shyness is not the shyness of timidity (cf. 2 Tim. 1:7), but the shyness of deference, the shyness of a concentrated centering of attention on another; it is not the shyness (such as we often experience) of self-centeredness, but the shyness of an other-centeredness. . . . The Spirit is most present where Jesus is most central. The Spirit does not mind being neglected if Jesus is not.⁵

⁵Ibid., pp. 14, 17.

CHAPTER I

THE SPIRIT NOT YET GIVEN

There is a noticeable difference in the work of the Holy Spirit among men after Pentecost as compared to before that event. Simple arithmetic testifies to this as the more than 260 New Testament references far outpace the approximately 100 Old Testament texts.¹ Even more telling is the relative paucity of references to the Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels. For, although Pentecost is an event in close time proximity to the material in the Synoptics, the Spirit has not yet received His post-Pentecost prominence. Further, those few Synoptic passages that do occur focus on Jesus' Person and work, while very little is said about the Spirit's work in the disciples' lives.

But it is the content of Scripture's witness to the Spirit's activity that dramatically opens the curtain on the aforementioned change. After Pentecost, the Bible portrays a Church alive in the power of the Spirit, a power never known before in such a degree and to such an extent. It is a drastic change. A sudden, fresh outpouring of the Spirit

¹Lorenz Wunderlich, The Half-Known God (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1963), pp. 78, 83. Exact figures are difficult to state because ruach and pneuma have a variety of meanings. Some passages may or may not refer to the Holy Spirit.

has occurred.

The Apostle John reflects this occurrence. Throughout his Gospel, he presents the Spirit primarily as a post-Pentecost figure.² Nowhere is this better indicated than at John 7:39.

. . . the Spirit had not been given, since Jesus had not yet been glorified.³

While appearing to be a simple statement, this is actually a rather striking summarization by which John describes the difference Pentecost marks.

The description is located in the first clause. The Greek reads simply "for the Spirit was not yet." That phrase is undoubtedly difficult to decipher unless a distinction is made between the Spirit's existence and His work among men. The phrase cannot refer to the former because John has mentioned the Spirit as present at Jesus' baptism (John 1:32). An even more basic reason would be the denial of the Spirit's eternal nature and His full occupation in the Trinity if this phrase were understood as referring to His essential being.

Thus it must refer to certain aspects of the Spirit's work among men, and therein lies the description.

²David Holwerda, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1969), p. 1.

³The Holy Bible, New International Version (New York: American Bible Society, 1978). When the Biblical text is set off from the text, indicating a direct quote, this is the translation used. Otherwise, words, phrases or sentences within the text are this writer's own translation.

If John describes the era before Pentecost as a time when the Spirit was not yet given ("given" is almost always supplied by translators to reflect the above distinction), then the era when He is given must be radically different. In other words, John's choice of such absolute terms to describe the difference indicates it was a dramatic change.

Yet this descriptive element should not be carried to its absolute extreme. John is not saying that the Spirit was not at work beforehand. He was, and in many varied ways. The Old Testament is replete with examples of the Spirit's activity, especially in connection with the Old Testament saints.⁴ Rather, the clause is descriptive in a comparative sense. There is nothing before Pentecost that can compare with the Spirit's activity afterwards. John had lived in both eras, and knew the presence of the post-Pentecost Spirit in a way much different than before.

Charles Erdman writes:

Pentecost, therefore, did not mean the literal entrance of the Holy Spirit into the world, but such a new manifestation of divine power, and such a glorifying of the Person and work of the incarnate Son, as to justify such figures of speech as our Savior used when He declared "that the Spirit would "come," would be "sent," would be given."⁵

However, while it is obvious that a change in the

⁴For there to even have been Old Testament saints required the work of the Spirit. "Formula of Concord," article II, paragraph 25, Book of Concord, ed. Theodore Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p. 526, "Holy Scriptures ascribe . . . regeneration, . . . altogether and alone to the divine operation and the Holy Spirit."

⁵Charles Erdman, The Spirit of Christ (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1929), p. 59.

Spirit's activity has occurred, Scriptural evidence as to its exact nature is sparse. Richard Gaffin writes:

But what further, in detail, are the experiential implications of the difference between the old and new covenants, created by union with Christ? Here Scripture is elusive. In fact, I am inclined to say that we are on the wrong track if we are looking for Scripture to sanction a specific pattern or routine of experiences in the inner life of the believer. . . . The Bible is just not interested in the question of individual religious experience, at least in the way we are inclined to be preoccupied with it. . . . The individual repercussions of the Spirit's workings are in the background so that spelling them out will always contain a problematic element.⁶

As a result, any attempt to provide a precise definition of that greater activity creates more confusion than clarification.

But some still try. For example, certain writers state that before Pentecost the Spirit was only a temporary gift for special individuals. They see the Old Testament revealing the Spirit's presence and gifts as granted only to exceptional people, particularly those who held some official position. Michael Green writes:

On the whole, you had to be someone rather special in the Old Testament days to have the Spirit of God. A prophet, a national leader, a king, perhaps some specially wise man (Proverbs 1:23) or artistic person (Exodus 31:3) -- in which case you would be beautifying the Lord's Tent of Meeting, or enunciating the Lord's wisdom. But the Spirit of God was not for every Tom, Dick and Harry. To be sure, there were promises in a very general sense that "My Spirit abides with you; fear not" (Haggai 2:5), but this was an assurance to the people as a whole, not a promise to the individual. The gift of God's Spirit was on the whole to special

⁶Richard Gaffin, "The Holy Spirit," Westminster Theological Journal 43 (Fall 1980):72.

people for special tasks. It was not generally available, nor was it necessarily permanent.⁷

But this attempt to define precisely the difference between the old and new covenants in relation to the Spirit's work, while striving for clarity, actually displays grave theological difficulties. This becomes evident when, besides the above example, other results of this approach are studied. The following list is typical.

1. In the old covenant the Spirit was not given to all believers, while after Pentecost He is.
2. In the old covenant the Spirit was temporarily given and could be withdrawn, while after Pentecost He permanently resides in the believer.
3. In the old covenant the Spirit was upon someone (a more external, physical manner), while after Pentecost He was within the believer (a more internal, spiritual manner).
4. In the old covenant the Spirit acted upon the whole nation of Israel but had not made it into one spiritual body, while after Pentecost He formed the Church, the body of Christ.⁸

Although numerous challenges could be made to this thought scheme, the greatest objection stems from its denial of divine monogermism. It is the Spirit who creates faith. He makes the relationship an individual enjoys with God a

⁷Michael Green, I Believe in the Holy Spirit (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), pp. 25-26. Also see John Walvoord, The Holy Spirit (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1954), pp. 71-72; and John Williams, The Holy Spirit: Lord and Life-Giver (Neptune, NJ: Lorizeaux Brothers, 1980), p. 263.

⁸Rene Pache, The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, trans. J. D. Emerson (Chicago: Moody Press, 1954), pp. 71-72.

reality. The Formula of Concord states:

Prior to man's conversion there are only two efficient causes, namely, the Holy Spirit and the Word of God as the Holy Spirit's instrument whereby He effects conversion.⁹

In this regard, there is not a distinction between the Old and New Testaments, as J. T. Mueller notes.

. . . as to what constitutes the essential difference between the Old and New Testaments, we must seek the difference not in the religion itself, but in the accidental feature of greater clearness and fullness. Essentially the two are the same. The doctrinal content does not differ; for in both we find the same Moral Law, and the same Gospel message, that sinners are saved alone by God's grace in His Son, our Savior.¹⁰

Thus, whether before or after Pentecost, the Spirit initiates all spiritual life; abiding with and in the people of God. He alone grants them faith to believe in the Gospel, including its Old Testament form of promise and prophecy.

The answer to the question of the nature of the difference, then, is not found in any approach which, under the guise of greater clarification, removes the Spirit's activity and presence from the individual saint's life before Pentecost. Regardless of when, the Spirit authors all faith and godliness.

A better approach goes back to John 7:39. There the Apostle supplies not only a summary statement of the drastic

⁹"Formula Of Concord," article II, paragraph 19, The Book of Concord, p. 472.

¹⁰J. T. Mueller, Christian Dogmatics (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955), pp. 28-29.

change in the Spirit's work, but also a succinct solution as to what that change involves. As mentioned before, the meaning of the "not yet given" is expressed in comparative terms. So also should the nature of the difference be expressed. Pentecost simply marks the end of the restrictions on the activity of the Spirit which before had been limited in both distribution and degree.

For example, after Pentecost evangelization becomes the prime directive of the Church. While there was indeed proselytization occurring before Pentecost by the Jewish nation, it in no way compared with the mission work to "all nations" after that event. All the exclusiveness of Israel is shattered as the Spirit's faith-creating activity now begins to encompass the whole world.¹¹ The partial distribution of His power beforehand is replaced by the more global granting of that divine energy so that the Gospel is proclaimed to the ends of the earth.

Further, parallel to this evangelism emphasis, there is also a difference in the degree to which the Spirit is experienced in the believer's life. Despite being active in the individual beforehand, after Pentecost there is a new dimension of the Spirit's presence as known by the members of the Church. While difficult to detail exactly, the post-

¹¹However, this is not to say that the universality of God's grace is not a part of the Old Testament. Isaiah 40-66 indicates God's redemption extends to all nations, including the Gentiles. Still, there was an exclusiveness, a separation from the world by God's people that precluded extensive evangelistic effort.

Pentecost saint is aware of the Spirit's presence in a far more powerful way than before. In fact, the difference was so great that John used some rather absolute terms in John 7:39 to describe it. Charles K. Barrett recognizes this.

John does not mean to deny the earlier existence of the Spirit, nor indeed that He was active in the prophets; and he says expressly that the Holy Spirit descended upon Jesus himself at the beginning of his ministry (1:32). He means rather that the Holy Spirit was not given in the characteristically Christian manner and measure until the close of his ministry.¹²

But even this description of the change is just that -- a description. There is little new insight or explanation or definition into what the nature of that change actually is. This is due to, as stated before, the scarcity of scriptural statement. In fact, any attempt to describe in detail the contrasting eras in the work of the Holy Spirit, separated by Pentecost, will fail if the description goes much beyond John's effort. True, the change in the Spirit's work can be documented. The greater degree in evangelism and personal experience wrought by Him is evident. But an accurate definition is not possible. With John, all that can be stated is that it was as if the Spirit had not been given beforehand -- although He certainly had been.

Therefore, following John's lead, Pentecost is described as the end of a prior restriction on the Spirit's

¹²Charles K. Barrett, The Gospel According to John, 2nd ed. (London: SPCK, 1978), p. 329. Also see Erdman, pp. 66-67; and Richard C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1943), p. 139.

work among men. The resulting drastic change within the Church is beyond comparison with what had been before. Where once the Spirit's activity had been limited or held back, now the Church is alive and pulsating with His power.

This human inability to define precisely the nature of the change or difference in the Spirit's work, however, does not prevent answering the question of why the work of the Spirit was restricted as it was. Again, John provides a concise answer in the second clause of that portion of John 7:39 quoted earlier. It is because Jesus has not yet been glorified. Before the Spirit can come in His post-Pentecost fullness, Jesus must be glorified.

In this regard, John is quite specific when he writes about Christ's glorification. Although the Scriptural use of doxazō can apply to man, John uses it, for the most part, in its theologically significant context, that of the glory of God.¹³ Gerhard Kittel defines this divine glory as "divine honor," "divine splendor," "divine power," and "visible divine radiance."¹⁴

But these meanings, he says, are fluid and can be distinguished only artificially. The important fact is that

¹³The biblical usage of doxa and doxazo is a clear example of a Greek word changing in meaning as it came to be used by the writers of Scripture. However, since only John's use of the term is germane to this paper, that will be the focus of study through the rest of this chapter.

¹⁴Gerhard Kittel, "δοξα," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 2:247.

divine glory always expresses "the divine mode of being, though with varying emphasis on the element of visibility."¹⁵ Thus to give glory to God does not mean to add something that is not already present; it is merely a predication in the sense of active acknowledgment or extolling what already is.¹⁶

In this theological usage, there is a heavy dependence on the Old Testament concept of kāpōd, which is used to describe God's glorious self-revelation. This manifestation of the divine personage in the Old Testament is usually linked with verbs of seeing and appearing, and is expressed above all in salvation history, particularly in God's presence in the sanctuary.¹⁷

John, however, expands the meaning and usage of doxazō in his Gospel by connecting divine glory to the earthly Jesus. There are a number of passages in which John speaks of Jesus being glorified in His humiliation, particularly His death, for example, John 12:23; 13:31; 17:1. Although this seems to run counter to the concept of divine glory, such is not the case. Rather, the connection of the earthly Jesus, including His hour of death, with doxazō effectively brings out the full redemptive significance of

¹⁵Ibid., p. 247-248.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 248.

¹⁷Sverre Aalen, "Glory," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, 3 vols., ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 2:45.

God's self-revelation in Jesus Christ. It is by Jesus' Person and work that God makes Himself known to the human race. Thus the Son of God is glorified because God reveals Himself through Him. Or, conversely, as the revealer of God, Jesus participates in the glory of God. This in turn glorifies God because the obedience of the Son to the Father's will means a divine manifestation of the Father.

Just as kāpōd found its greatest expression in God's acts of salvation history, so also doxazō finds its greatest expression in God's ultimate act of salvation history -- Jesus Christ. In that light, then, there is no conflict in John's use of doxazō in connection with Christ's humiliation.

But this is not to say that John doesn't use doxazō for Christ's exaltation (in the technical, systematic understanding of the word, as in "Christ's State of Exaltation"). There is plenty of evidence that John's use of the term encompasses the whole of Christ's redemptive work. In this regard, David Holwerda presents a strong case that John uses doxazō to refer to Christ's death, resurrection and ascension, items which belong to both Christ's humiliation and exaltation. He writes:

Our discussion has revealed that although John includes the crucifixion in glorification it is impossible to limit the term to this event. In the various contexts the individual events are not isolated from one another. Although one event may be prominent--in most instances it is the crucifixion because these words [the Farewell Discourse] are spoken on the eve of death--the glorification in this event is not viewed apart from the glorification in its culmination. Each of the three

events--death, resurrection and ascension--constitutes an aspect of the single glorification of Jesus.¹⁸

John's use of glorification, then, should not be identified solely with Christ's exaltation, but with God's soteriological revelation of Himself in the Person and work of His Son. Sverre Aalen writes:

. . . glory [in John] is to be understood as a revelation of God, or as the intervention of his power in history (Jn 1:14; 2:11; 11:4; 12:41). . . The glorification of Jesus is not accomplished merely by his entry into heaven; it becomes a reality by His sufferings, death, resurrection (Jn 12:23-28),¹⁹ and finally by the witness of the Spirit (Jn 14:26).

Similarly, John's use of hypsoō reflects the same emphasis on Christ's entire work of salvation. In the four passages (John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32, 34), Georg Bertram writes,

ὑψώω has intentionally a double sense . . . It means both exaltation on the cross and also exaltation²⁰ to heaven. ὑψώω denotes the event of salvation.

Thus hypsoo is not limited to the resurrection and events following Easter morning. It includes that which led up to Easter, particularly the crucifixion, and refers to Christ's work of atonement as a whole.

¹⁸Holwerda, p. 17. Also, Alasdair Heron, The Holy Spirit (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), p. 52, "He [John] locates that completion [of Jesus' work], however, not in a post-Easter exaltation, but in Jesus' glorification, that is, in his death and resurrection (17.1-5)."

¹⁹Aalen, p. 48. Also see Kittel, p. 249; Lenski, p. 580; and Robert Hoferkamp, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel from the Viewpoint of Christ's Glorification," Concordia Theological Monthly 33 (September 1962):519.

²⁰Georg Bertram, ὑψώω κτλ, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 8:610.

With this background to John's use of glory, his explanation for the restriction of the work of the Spirit comes into focus. The Spirit is not able to be present in His post-Pentecost fullness because Jesus has not yet gone to the cross, risen from the dead and ascended into heaven. Until Christ finishes His redemptive work, the Spirit is "not yet given."

In other words, the significance of Christ's Person and work is the reason why there is such a change at Pentecost in the Spirit's work. Because of Christ the Spirit can operate in His post-Pentecost manner. Specifically, it is what Christ has accomplished in these redemptive acts, that is, the barrier of sin between man and God has been broken down, which makes the difference. Ernst Hengstenberg notes:

With the glorification of Christ the outpouring of the Holy Ghost stands historically connected: comp. ch. xx. 22; Acts ii. 33. But how are we to understand that connection? The foundation of the change to which we have referred is the expiation and abolition of sin accomplished by Christ, Rom. viii. 3, and which is appropriated by faith. By this the wall of separation between God and man is removed, so that the Spirit, the bond of the Creator and the creature, may freely be imparted. In the fact of redemption accomplished, we find root of the potency and influence of the Spirit. ²¹

Therefore, the essential reason for the change in the Spirit's activity must be traced to the passing of the promise of a coming redemption and the arrival of the

²¹ Ernst Hengstenberg, Commentary on the Gospel of John, 2 vols., trans. from the German (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1865; reprint ed., Minneapolis: Klock and Klock in the U. S. A., 1980), 1:408-409.

accomplished fact. Before Pentecost the Spirit waited for and pointed to the promised Messiah. This era of promise meant an undefinable limitation on His activity. But, when the Messianic expectations were fulfilled in Christ, when what had been promised from the Fall found actuality in Jesus, then the Spirit could be poured out in His incomparable post-Pentecost fullness. The difference between the promise of Christ and His accomplished work of salvation, then, causes the difference in the activity of the Spirit.

Richard C. H. Lenski writes:

Prior to that completion of Jesus' work all faith was like that of the Old Testament saints, a trust in the promise. Jesus' glorification would fulfill that promise. Then, too, he would send down the Spirit; things were not ready so that he could send him before that time. From that great day onward, even as the Acts report at length, salvation would flow out in great streams to the ends of the earth.²²

The significance of this fact must not be underestimated. At John 7:39 the Apostle reveals an intimate relationship between the Spirit and the Son, making the Spirit's activity among the human race dependent upon the Person and work of Jesus Christ. In fact, without the redemptive accomplishments of the Son, the Spirit lacks the basis for His work. Therefore, whatever the Spirit does in the hearts and minds of men, He does so as a consequence of the saving work of Christ.

The Johannine witness to the coming and activity of the Spirit is bonded to Christ's glorification. Therefore,

²²Lenski, p. 580.

the work of the Spirit cannot be separated from the glorification of Christ. This means every aspect of the Spirit's ministry within human life finds its basis in the redemptive work of Christ. Any effort to examine the work of the Spirit, including that recorded in the Upper Room Discourse, must proceed from that fact.

CHAPTER II

ANOTHER PARACLETE

The previous chapter laid the foundation by fixing the source of the Spirit's work among men in Jesus Christ, particularly His redemptive revelation of the Father. With that background, the purpose of the next five chapters is to determine the Spirit's dependence for the content of His work on the Son of God. This will be done by means of an examination of the Paraclete passages of the Upper Room Discourse. These have been chosen because within them Christ Himself explicitly states what the ministry of the Spirit will be.

However, since there is such a vast amount of material to evaluate, a topical approach has been adopted.¹ The starting point is the meaning and usage of the term "Paraclete." Then follows (chapters 3-6) a study of the four major aspects of that Johannine title: the identity of the Paraclete, the coming of the Paraclete, the Paraclete and the disciples, and the Paraclete and the world.

The term parakletos is a crux exegetica, there being

¹This topical approach is somewhat artificial. In John 14:14-16 any or all of the topics can occur in the same sentence. However, for organizational purposes I am using the divisions found in Raymond Brown, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," New Testament Studies 13 (1966-67):113-114.

little agreement in the various attempts to explain its meaning and origin.² Scholars readily acknowledge that the most problematic issue with the term is its meaning, particularly the active elements ascribed to it considering its passive form. That is, there is a visible gap between the title "paraclete" and the functions John assigns to it. The difficulty reveals itself in the attempt to translate the term. Some suggestions are Comforter, Advocate, Intercessor, Convincer, Strengtheners, Helper and Friend. But none have met with widespread approval. They all fail to capture accurately and comprehensively John's use of the title, a title to which he has given such roles as teacher, reminder, witness and convicter.

The problem, then, is producing an etymologically acceptable meaning of Paraclete which, at the same time, essentially and exhaustively reflects John's use of the term. As will be seen, there is no solution to this crux exegetica. But this can be expected when the approach to the task begins with the prerequisite that the Johannine usage is dependent upon grammatical, historical or philological origins. For John was not constrained by such categories, and, if necessary, he adapted or expanded a word's meaning to give it a certain Christian content. In

²It is not the intent of this study to offer a comprehensive treatment of all the arguments involved. See Brown, pp. 113, 116-117, for a helpful summary; and Leon Morris, The Gospel According to St. John (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), p. 666, for a standard bibliography. For this discussion the term is transliterated to "Paraclete."

other words, the difficulty is insoluble because of a flawed approach. Rather than gathering the word's meaning and usage from John's Christological concern, which the rest of this chapter will seek to substantiate as the proper methodology, the focus is misdirected to the word itself. And paraklētos by itself cannot answer for itself when used by John. A study of both the Hebrew/Classical Greek backgrounds of the term and the various solutions proposed by scholars gives evidence that this is the case.

There appears to be no Hebrew equivalent to paraklētos. If anything, Jewish writings in the second century A. D. indicate that it was a loan word, taken over from the Greek and transliterated to p^eraqlet.³ This leads to the conclusion that John did not have a Hebrew title in mind when he used the word, and, therefore, information into its meaning must come from Greek sources.

Grammatically, the word is passive in form and should have the meaning "called to the side of" or "one called alongside to help." In classical Greek, its primary meaning as a substantive was "advocate, legal assistant," and the forensic sense dominated. However, such a legal use also indicates that the passive meaning is becoming active, as Johannes Behm notes.

³Brown, pp. 115-116.

Thus the history of the term in the whole sphere of known Greek and Hellenistic usage outside the NT yields the clear picture of a legal advisor or helper or advocate in the relevant court. The passive form does not rule out the idea of the παράκλητος as an active speaker "on behalf of someone before someone," nor is there any need of recourse to the active παρακαλέω in this connection.⁴

In the New Testament paraklētos is distinctively Johannine. Besides the Gospel references (John 14:16; 14:26; 15:26; 16:7), the only other occurrence is John's first epistle (1 John 2:1). But in 1 John the reference is to Jesus not the Holy Spirit; its use is descriptive rather than a title; and it comes much closer to the classical Greek background. Jesus is the Advocate for His disciples before the Father.

But the nearness to Classical Greek that 1 John 2:1 displays is not present in the Gospel. There the forensic connotation is not particularly evident. While the Spirit may be a "Prosecuting Attorney" against the world (John 16:8-11), He does not appear as a "Defense Attorney." The closest John comes to a legal concept is at John 15:26 where the Spirit is a witness for Jesus' case before the world. But even there the match is not perfect as He is a witness rather than a lawyer. Thus a purely forensic translation of "Advocate" isn't particularly accurate nor does it do justice to the Spirit's other activities among the disciples,

⁴Johannes Behm, "παράκλητος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), 5:803.

such as His teaching and guiding roles.⁵ In summary, even a brief word study suggests that there is little hope of finding significant data for the essential meaning and origin of John's use of the title beyond the Gospel itself.

Additional evidence for the futility of finding a solution beyond the canonical text comes from a survey of the various proposals by students of the Gospel to answer the question. None is without fault. All are either incomplete or inaccurate. For example, John's active use of what is basically a passive noun leads certain scholars to view the Johannine use as derived from the verb parakalein. To be sure, it is a short step from advocate to the idea of pleading for someone in the sense of a mediator or intercessor. Further, since this is the meaning paraklētos receives in 1 John 2:1 and the majority of Greek Fathers, it is an attractive approach.

However, the same problems of accuracy and inclusiveness arise. The Spirit is not a spokesman for the disciples in this intercessory sense in the Upper Room Discourse. At most, John 16:13-14 indicates that He speaks for the absent Jesus. The approach fails because it only approximates one of the many aspects of the Paraclete's ministry.

Other writers, sensing these difficulties, attempt

⁵Brown, p. 117. Also George E. Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), p. 293, "The linguistic problem is found in the fact that the Johannine paraclete is primarily a teacher to instruct and lead the disciples rather than an advocate to defend them."

to extend this intercessory meaning to the broader concept of "Helper" or "Friend." It is the generality of this translation that is tempting, being vague enough to cover most of the aspects of the Paraclete's work.

Still, not all are included in this generic term. It doesn't bring out the fact that the Paraclete proves the world wrong. Also, its very vagueness is problematic, for it doesn't precisely indicate the known functions of the Paraclete. For example, does it effectively communicate the teaching ministry of the Spirit? Since a more precise translation of the term is preferable, especially one that is at least suggested by the text, expanding the term's meaning to "Helper" or "Friend" is not particularly useful.⁶

Seeing the problems of this intercessory sense of parakalein, other writers opt for the alternate meaning of the verb: comforter. J. G. Davies argues for this connotation as the primary, but not only, meaning of paraklētos on the basis of the Septuagint's use of the verb.⁷

Again, problems arise. While the element of consolation appears in the Upper Room Discourse (John 14:18, 27; 16:6-7, 20-22), there is no explicit mention that the Para-

⁶Brown, p. 113. Brown also notes that this translation is dependent on the the validity of a proto-Mandaean theory for the origin of the title. Since that theory has been shown to be untenable [Behm, p. 809], this approach loses much of its attractiveness.

⁷J. G. Davies, "The Primary Meaning of ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ," The Journal of Theological Studies 4 (April 1953):38.

plete will comfort or console the disciples. Indeed, the translation may capture an aspect of the Paraclete's work, but it is inadequate in providing a comprehensive understanding of the term.⁸

N. H. Snaith offers another approach. He uses "Convincer" to render paraklētōs, that is, "He who convinces men of the things of God, and accomplishes in them a change of heart."⁹ Based upon the verb parakeleō and the Hebrew nāham, he argues that the main idea in both is that of change of mind or attitude.

The inadequacies in this attempt surface when one looks at John's use of the title. The Spirit does not necessarily convince in the Paraclete passages, although it is occasionally implied. Nor does He only convince. There is much more to His ministry. Once again, the resulting concept "convince," "to change one's mind" is not exhaustive enough as an explanation.

There is one final solution of note. Charles K. Barrett takes a different route by focusing on paraklēsis, the exhortation and encouragement found in the preaching of the apostolic witness. According to his thinking, "the

⁸It should be noted that Martin Luther used Tröster to translate parakletos. Likewise many of the English translations come from Wycliff's use of "Comforter" to translate the Latin Consolator. However, the Latin has a broader meaning, for example, strengthen, than the English of today and its idea of consolation. See also, Morris, pp. 663-664.

⁹Norman Snaith, "The Meaning of 'the Paraclete,'" The Expository Times 57 (October 1945):50.

Paraclete is the Spirit of Christian paraclesis."¹⁰ Thus Barrett sees the background to the title as coming from the primitive apostolic preaching, not Greek or Jewish sources. Raymond Brown notes that this suggestion is attractive because much in John's description of the Paraclete corresponds to early Christian paraclesis.

The Paraclete is the teacher and guide of the disciples, forming them in the subject they will preach to others; the witness that the Paraclete bears to Jesus finds its voice through the disciples (xv. 26-7).¹¹

Despite this match of the title and the Paraclete's work, Barrett has sacrificed the historicity of John to arrive at it. To find the background in the apostolic witness which occurred after Jesus' ascension means that Jesus did not necessarily speak these words in the Upper Room. Barrett himself says this approach "was to surrender any attempt to represent historically the words of Jesus."¹² He sees John placing them on the lips of Jesus, having been influenced by the history of the early Church. But such an interpretation fails because it contradicts the historical character of the Gospel. Morris writes:

It is tempting to link the Paraclete with the general Christian paraclēsis. But the price paid is too high. John's method throughout his Gospel will not allow us to

¹⁰C. K. Barrett, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," Journal of Theological Studies, [N. S.], 1 (April 1950):14.

¹¹Brown, p. 118.

¹²Barrett, p. 15.

think that he surrendered "any attempt to represent historically the words of Jesus." Rather the reverse.¹³

While the above survey of the various attempts to explain the origin and meaning of paraklētōs has produced few positive results, it shows some of the varied concepts that the title includes. He is the witness and spokesman for Jesus, a consoler, a teacher and guide of the disciples and He convicts the world. It is little wonder, then, that no one translation captures the complexities of this title. Every translation either limits the functions of the Paraclete, or, when it is general enough, obscures what these functions are and how they complement each other.

It is for that reason that Brown suggests the near transliteration "Paraclete," for it "at least preserves the uniqueness of the title and does not emphasize one of the aspects of the concept to the detriment of the others."¹⁴ Therefore, while John's use of paraklētōs is not totally independent of related Hebrew concepts and the Greek meanings of the word, it is unique. In fact, it is better to transliterate than translate.

This uniqueness, however, does not mean that John's use of paraklētōs is self-created or self-conceived apart from outside sources. Jesus Himself predetermines the specific content for the term, for John 14:16 calls the Spirit another Paraclete. Herein lies the key to understanding

¹³Morris, p. 664.

¹⁴Brown, P. 119.

John's use of the title. Since Jesus is the first Paraclete, the second will be patterned after Him. Just as Jesus was in the midst of His disciples, He has sent Another to take His place at their side. Alasdair Heron notes:

Indeed, the Farewell Discourses more than any other part of the New Testament identify the Spirit as the counterpart of Christ, the 'other Paraclete' (14:16), almost a separate 'individual' whose role is modelled on Christ's own.¹⁵

Research into the word "another" appears to confirm the view that the Spirit as the second Paraclete is modeled after Jesus the first Paraclete. There are two words in the Greek which can be translated as "other" or "another." They are heteros and allos. Many writers see a distinction between the two. Heteros is said to mean "another of a different kind," while allos would mean "another of the same kind." J. B. Lightfoot writes:

ἕτερον] implies a difference of kind, which is not involved in ἄλλος. The primary distinction between the words appears to be, that ἄλλος is another as "one besides," ἕτερος another as "one of two."¹⁶ . . . Thus ἄλλος adds, while ἕτερος distinguishes.

This distinction may then be applied to John 14:16 to indicate that the Spirit is a Paraclete of the same kind as Jesus was. He is One like Christ who would take the

¹⁵ Alasdair Heron, The Holy Spirit (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), p.53.

¹⁶ J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (London: Macmillan, 1910), p. 76. Leon Morris, Spirit of the Living God (Chicago: Intervarsity Press, 1960), p. 36, gives this illustration. "Thus if I ask for another book, using allos, I am seeking another copy of the volume in question. But if you bring a copy of another book altogether I might complain that I didn't say heteros."

Savior's place and do His work. He continues Christ's work because He is another (allos) Paraclete not a different (heteros) One.¹⁷ Henry Barclay Swete is adamant on this interpretation. After pointing out that the Spirit is a Paraclete of the same order, he notes that "it is impossible to conceive of ἕτερον παρακλήτων standing in this context."¹⁸

But initial appearances can be deceiving. There is a difficulty with the distinction, that is, the line of demarcation between allos and heteros is somewhat artificial. Friedrich Buchsel says that often in the New Testament "ἄλλος and ἕτερον are used interchangeably with no recognizable difference."¹⁹ Further, John uses heteros only once (John 19:37), so it is uncertain whether he employs the two terms in this way. Therefore, it is impossible to be dogmatic about the way these two words are used, particularly in John's Gospel. While it is true that the distinction does occur, care must be exercised when such is used in reference to the Paraclete.

Still, keeping that caution in mind, the most natu-

¹⁷ Oswald Sanders, The Holy Spirit and His Gifts (Grand Rapids: Zondervan), p. 21. Also, see Ladd, p. 294.

¹⁸ Henry Barclay Swete, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament (London: Macmillan, 1910; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976), p. 300, note 2.

¹⁹ Friedrich Buchsel, "ἄλλος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 1: 264. Also, Herman Beyer, "ἕτερον," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 2:702.

ral interpretation of allos paraklēton remains that of another Paraclete like Jesus. Since John's first epistle names Jesus as a Paraclete, it is only logical that the reference to the Spirit as another Paraclete would indicate He is one like Christ who comes to take Christ's place and continue His ministry. Michael Green states:

In the Gospel . . . Jesus alludes to himself as Paraclete; for when promising "another paraclete" . . . Jesus is clearly insisting that he is their Paraclete already, just as the Epistle says he is. The identity between Jesus and the Spirit could scarcely be more strongly stressed, particularly as he goes on to say "I will not leave you orphans: I will come to you" (14:18). Nothing of the personality of the Spirit as embodied in Jesus will be lost when the disciples come to experience him as Paraclete.²⁰

Because the Holy Spirit is another paraclete, His role has been defined by the prior one -- Jesus Christ.

This is borne out by the similarity of language in the Spirit's work to that of Christ. For example, the Spirit, as the second Paraclete, comes into the world in a similar manner as Christ, the first Paraclete, did. Brown succinctly describes the rather striking parallel in the descriptions of the arrivals of the Son and the Spirit.

The Paraclete will come; so also has Jesus come into the world (v. 43; xvi. 28; xviii. 37). The Paraclete comes forth . . . from the Father, so also did Jesus come forth (xvi. 27-8) . . . from the Father. The Father will give the Paraclete at Jesus' request; so also the Father gives the Son (iii. 16). The Father will send the Paraclete, so also Jesus was sent by the Father (iii. 17 and passion). The Paraclete will be sent in Jesus' name; so also Jesus came in the Father's name (v.

²⁰Michael Green, I Believe in the Holy Spirit (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), p. 43.

43 -- in many ways the Paraclete is to Jesus as Jesus is to the Father).²¹

It is not just in the Paraclete's arrival that this similarity occurs. His is a career that parallels the earthly ministry of Jesus in every detail. Jesus was the witness and spokesman for the Father, so the Spirit for the Son. Jesus was a consoler and convicter, so the Spirit. Jesus taught and guided, so does the Spirit. Point for point, every activity that the Spirit does was first done by Christ. Again, Brown captures this concept.

The disciples will be granted the privilege to know or recognize the Paraclete; so also it is a special privilege to know or recognize Jesus (xiv 7, 9). The Paraclete is to be within the disciples and remain with them; so also Jesus is to remain in and with the disciples (xiv 20, 23, xv 4, 5, xvii 23, 26). If the Paraclete is to guide the disciples along the way of all truth, Jesus is both the way and the truth (xiv 6). If the Paraclete is to teach the disciples, Jesus also teaches those who will listen (vi 59, vii 14, 18, viii 20). If the Paraclete declares to the disciples the things to come, Jesus identifies himself as the Messiah to come who announces or declares all things (iv 25-26). If the Paraclete will bear witness, so also Jesus bears witness (viii 14).²²

Finally, the Spirit's work in relation to the world is also distinctively patterned after Christ. Just as the world cannot receive the Paraclete, neither did it receive Christ (John 5:43); or just as the world does not know or recognize the Paraclete, so also it was with Christ (John 16:3; 7:28; 8:14, 19; 14:7); or just as the Paraclete bears

²¹Brown, p. 126.

²²Raymond Brown, The Gospel According to John, The Anchor Bible, vol. 29a (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1970), p. 1141.

witness in the midst of the world's hatred, Jesus did likewise (John 7:7).²³

Consistently, John's use of paraklētōs is unique, patterned after Christ Himself. This leads to the conviction that the methodological starting point for understanding John's use of the title is that the Spirit is another Paraclete. With the Person and work of the first Paraclete, Jesus, as its basis and background, the Spirit is understood in a distinctively Christian way, more than all the Greek meanings and Jewish backgrounds.²⁴

In conclusion, John's use of paraklētōs comes from His Christological concern. To fully appreciate the Paraclete in his Gospel one must view it in that light, rather than simply a word whose origins can't be matched with the author's use of the term. It is also futile to attempt to explain the active use of this passive noun by grammatical analysis. Most likely it has become active simply by virtue of the fact that Jesus is the first Paraclete. Francis Davey comments:

Any noun, however passive in form, that is used to describe any part of the work or purpose of God, must inevitably acquire active significance in the process.²⁵

All this information about the Spirit as another

²³Brown, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," p. 127.

²⁴See pages 17-18 above.

²⁵Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, ed. Francis Noel Davey (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), p. 469.

Paraclete becomes particularly significant when related to the thesis of this study. Since the purpose is to show the extent to which the Spirit's ministry is Christological, an interpretation of the meaning and background of Paraclete that rests on a Christological basis is primary evidence.

Such is the case here. It naturally follows that the Spirit's work is inseparably and intimately bound to Christ's Person and work when a distinctively Christological use of Paraclete in the Upper Room Discourse has been documented. For the Spirit to receive a title whose functions are patterned after Jesus means that Christ Himself defines and determines the content of those activities. Therefore, as the following chapters seek to substantiate that the Spirit's ministry as described in John 14-16 is Christocentric, it does so on the basis that the title given the Holy Spirit finds its origins and pattern of activity in Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER III

I WILL SEND HIM TO YOU

The Spirit's ministry among the human race finds its source in the glorification of Jesus Christ. The Spirit's title, "Paraclete," receives its origin and meaning from the prior Paraclete, Jesus Christ. The goal of the next four chapters is to explore the Christocentricity of the content of His ministry. The expectation is that the striking feature of the Upper Room Discourse Paraclete passages will be the exclusive extent to which the Holy Spirit's work is circumscribed by Jesus Christ. The starting point is the coming of the Spirit.

Considering the disciples' earthly Messianic expectations, Jesus' statement, "it is to your advantage that I go away" (John 16:7), had to come as a shock. Could that be possible? Yes, for Jesus' departure brought the Spirit's arrival, an explanation which Charles K. Barrett sees as identical in thought to John 7:39.¹ Considering and summarizing the previous discussion on this verse, Jesus is simply making the Spirit's arrival in His post-Pentecost

¹Charles K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, 2nd ed. (London: SPCK, 1978), p. 486, "the coming of the Spirit waits upon the glorifying of Jesus."

fullness dependent on His glorification.

Yet care must be exercised to maintain the proper focus in regards to the Spirit's coming to the disciples. This caution is needed because some writers, rather than emphasizing the connection between Jesus' glorification and the Spirit's arrival, attempt to explain the expediency of John 16:7 in terms of the Spirit's omnipresence. For example, Oswald Sanders believes Christ's promise in this passage contrasts His physical presence and the Spirit's omnipresence. Since Jesus could not be in two places at once, he explains, the disciples were only occasionally in contact with Him. He was only a spiritual influence as a historical contemporary, and, when He was absent, they were separated from Him. The Spirit's omnipresence then remedies that situation because His freedom from the limitations of a human body means He is accessible to all God's people. Unlike Jesus' external presence with the disciples, the Spirit can take up residence within them to direct their spiritual lives.²

The major objection to this interpretation is that the Spirit has always been omnipresent and has always been active within all believers. Jesus' departure did not initiate either one of these aspects. In fact, this approach to the Spirit's arrival reflects the "too precise"

²Oswald Sanders, The Holy Spirit and His Gifts (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1940), pp. 21-22. Also see Michael Green, I Believe in the Holy Spirit (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), p. 46.

definition of the change in the Spirit's work mentioned earlier, that is, it denies much of the Spirit's work before Pentecost. In reality, the omnipresent Spirit did not begin His work at Pentecost, although He did begin it in its Pentecostal completeness. Therefore, to maintain the correct perspective in regard to the advantage of the Spirit's coming necessitates the joining of His arrival with the glorification of Christ, not the substitution of the omnipresent Spirit for the time and space bound Jesus.

It is the cross and empty tomb that are pivotal for the sending of the Spirit. The advantage is that now Christ has broken down the wall of sin between God and men. The mission of the Son to bring salvation to the world was successful and is consummated with the coming of the Paraclete who can operate in His post-Pentecost fullness. No longer is the Spirit restricted as He was in the age of the promise of a Savior. Now, to the advantage of His followers, He is present as the post-Pentecostal figure to which the New Testament witnesses. Leon Morris writes:

So now the implication is that the cross is critical. Before Jesus could not send the Spirit. Afterwards, He will send Him (cf. 15:26). It is the divine concern to bring about a full salvation for men. That salvation can be based on nothing but Christ's atoning work. Only when that is accomplished can men receive the Spirit in all His fullness.³

That this is the case is confirmed by the other

³Leon Morris, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), p. 697.

Paraclete passages. In John 14:16 the Spirit is given because Jesus asks the Father to send Him. While this does not mention Christ's death, resurrection and ascension, it does point out that the arrival of the Spirit flows from the Son's activity. In this case, it is His prayer to the Father. But it is a prayer His Father answers because Christ is obedient to His will, which meant going to the cross for the salvation of the world.

In John 14:26 the Spirit is sent in Christ's name, that is, in connection with and on the basis of whom Jesus revealed Himself to be in His life, death, and resurrection. Thus "the mission of the Holy Spirit has for its foundation the historical personality of Christ."⁴

In John 15:26 the Paraclete is sent from the Father by the Son. Like the previous passages, the arrival is intimately tied to the Person and work of Christ. Throughout the Upper Room Discourse, then, the sending of the Paraclete is intertwined with Jesus, particularly His glorification. Because Jesus goes away when He dies, rises from the grave and ascends into heaven, the Spirit will be within Christ's followers in His post-Pentecost totality. The coming of the Spirit flows from and is a consequence of this redemptive activity of Christ.

This description of the coming of the Paraclete

⁴Ernst Hengstenberg, Commentary on the Gospel of John, 2 vols, trans. from the German (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1865; reprint ed., Minneapolis: Klock and Klock in the U. S. A.), 2:228.

further reflects the basic position of this thesis. For the Spirit's ministry to be strictly Christocentric, it must be based on Christ Himself, and it is. John is most clear in both John 7:39 and the coming of the Paraclete that such is true. The Spirit is present as He is only because of the prior presence and purpose of Christ.

CHAPTER IV

SPIRIT OF TRUTH, HOLY SPIRIT

In the Paraclete portion of John's Gospel, The Spirit is identified by two additional titles: Spirit of Truth and Holy Spirit. While it is not surprising that a member of the Godhead is called holy and true, John's use of the title is, for the most part, not a statement about the Spirit's essential being.

Rather, for the Apostle, truth and holiness become primarily functional titles, describing the Spirit's work of revealing the truth and sanctifying sinners. Of particular significance is the Christocentricity of this functional identity of the Spirit. The Spirit reveals the Truth which is Christ and makes men holy by bringing them into a redeemed fellowship with the Son.

Spirit of Truth

John's understanding of truth has been the occasion for much debate. Rudolf Bultmann sees much affinity between John's use of alētheia and Hellenistic dualism.¹ Lester

¹Rudolf Bultmann, "ἀλήθεια," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 2: 245.

Kuyper argues that the background of the term lies in the Old Testament and Judaism.² A more middle ground can be found in Charles K. Barrett and Anthony Thiselton.³ Each view, however, is predicated on the distinction the author sees between the Greek alētheia and the Hebrew emet.

While the nuances "truth" can have are many, generally, the Hebrew denotes stability, faithfulness, trustworthiness, reliability or sureness. The Greek, on the other hand, is truth as opposed to falsehood or reality as opposed to mere appearance. B. H. Jackayya writes:

The Hebrew is moral, and the classic Greek is fundamentally intellectual. In Hebrew the ontological element is stressed, while in the classic Greek word the cognitive element is dominant. The Hebrew word refers to verity, the Greek word to veracity; the Hebrew to that which is ideally true, the classic Greek to that which is factually true. The Hebrew words deal with persons or things as realities that one can lean upon. The classic Greek words deal with ideas or their expression in relation to facts.⁴

Although this distinction is certainly valid, Thiselton shows that writers often overgeneralize. He argues that the contrast between the Greek and Semitic must not be rigid, for usage indicates there is considerable variety in

²Lester J. Kuyper, "Grace and Truth," The Reformed Review 16 (September 1962):12.

³Anthony Thiselton, "Truth," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, 3 vols., ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 3:889; Charles K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, 2nd ed. (London: SPCK, 1978), p. 167.

⁴B. H. Jackayya, "ἀλήθεια in the Johanneine Corpus" Concordia Theological Monthly 41 (March 1970):172.

the meaning of alētheia, especially in Classical Greek. Occasionally, it even approximates the Hebrew idea of reliability. He believes the distinction is to be made but carefully qualified.⁵

This contrast in the background of alētheia helps explain the variety of meanings given the word by John. Thiselton lists five separate categories in which John uses alētheia, and has a sixth section for several passages whose meanings are too broad to be categorized elsewhere. Some of the meanings are: truth in contrast to falsehood, truth in terms of validity, truth which conveys the idea of reality despite the situation, doing the truth, and truth as divine reality.⁶ This variety has led C. K. Barrett to write:

ἀλήθεια is in John a term of variable meaning. Sometimes, in close dependence upon the Hebrew אֱמֶת, it seems to mean not "truth in the common sense, but God's faithful fulfillment of his promises, his acting "like himself." Sometimes again, however, the word does mean "that which is true," "that which corresponds to the facts of existence."⁷

Despite this variety, there is a distinctive thrust in John's use of truth. For the evangelist, it especially denotes "divine reality" or "divine revelation" which comes to men. Important to note in this respect is that such truth or divine reality is not something learned or sought for by sinful men. Rather, it is revealed. It seeks out

⁵Thiselton, pp. 875-877.

⁶Ibid., pp. 889-893.

⁷Charles K. Barrett, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," Journal of Theological Studies 1 (April 1950):8.

and finds men. It can only be received from outside oneself. Rudolf Bultmann writes:

. . . the reception of ἀλήθεια is conditioned neither by rational or esoteric instruction on the one side nor psychical preparation and exercise on the other; it takes place in obedient faith.⁸

However, the locus of this divine reality for John is not some abstract or supra-historical truth but Jesus Christ. He is the Word made flesh, full of grace and truth, who dwelt among men (John 1:14). Grace and truth have come through Him (John 1:17) so that divine reality is revealed in the incarnate Son of God. Christ is the Revealer of truth not so much by teaching truth about God, but by being the Truth Himself (John 14:6). He is God's very Reality revealing Himself. Otto Piper writes:

As the truth Jesus is not simply disclosing what is in God; he is the manifest saving presence of God in this world. As a result all that Jesus says and does and offers is true (e.g., John 7:18; 8:16)--i.e., in accordance with his nature and with God's plan.⁹

This equation of Jesus with truth is especially evident when Pilate asks the question, "What is truth?" (John 18:38). Jesus answers that question not by verbal instruction but by being Himself and proceeding on His mission of going to the cross. In this instance, Jesus demonstrates that truth is found in who He was and what He did, particularly in the Passion activities. Because He is

⁸Bultmann, p. 245; See also Jackayya, p. 173.

⁹Otto Piper, "Truth," International Dictionary of the Bible, 4 vols., ed. George Buttrich (New York: Abingdon, 1962), 4:716.

the redemptive revelation of God, Christ is both divine truth and reality.

With this background into John's understanding of alētheia, his use of the title "Spirit of Truth" takes on an intriguing character. Going beyond ascribing truth to the Third Person of the Trinity as an essential quality, John connects the Spirit with the truth embodied in Christ. The result is that John's emphasis is on the Spirit's task of revealing the truth, that is, making known the saving realities which Christ has brought about.¹⁰ Charles K. Barrett writes:

Of course "that which is true, veracious" is intimately bound up with and indeed is visible only in the life, death, and exaltation of Jesus. But 16:13, for example, means that the church will be led to know all theological truth -- the truth which is in Jesus; and accordingly the phrase ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΗΣ ἀληθείας will mean "the Spirit who communicates truth, who is directly acquainted with all truth and imparts truth to all who receive him."¹¹

Certainly it is true that the Spirit, as a member of the Godhead, is in and of Himself, Truth. But John gives the title, "Spirit of Truth," a decidedly Christocentric thrust. He sees Jesus communicating Himself as the Truth through the work of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is the Spirit of Truth because He reveals the Truth -- Jesus Christ. Thus the Spirit's identification as the Spirit of Truth occurs because of the intimate relation between Him

¹⁰David Holwerda, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959), p. 1.

¹¹Barrett, p. 8.

and the Son. John's use of the title is eminently Christocentric for he portrays the work of the Spirit as bound up with and dependent upon the One who has declared and shown Himself to be the Truth.

Holy Spirit

Unlike alētheia, John's use of hagios -- a second title he gives the Paraclete (John 14:26) -- is infrequent.¹² In spite of this scarcity, certain insights can be gleaned from the occasions in which the term is used. Indeed, a brief survey points out that, when referring to the Spirit, the title reflects a decidedly Christocentric bias.

The concept of holiness in general is not a simple one. John G. Davies points out its complexity.

This complex includes both non-rational and rational features -- Awefulness, Overpoweringness, Wholly-otherness, Creative feeling, Fascination -- the Numinous -- together with that moral content, traces of which were no doubt there from the earliest times, upon which the eighth-century Hebrew prophets laid such stress. Holiness also includes psychical intensity and power-divine potency,¹³ vouchsafed by God, the source of holiness, to man.

Despite this complexity, when referring to God, Scripture uses the term in a fairly uniform sense, that of His divine essence. It is a word that described the innermost nature of God. This is particularly the case in the Trisagion of

¹² Alētheia occurs 25 times in the Gospel, while hagios is found 5 times.

¹³ John G. Davies, "The Concept of Holiness," The London Quarterly and Holborn Review 185 (January 1960):36.

Isaiah 6:3 and Revelation 4:8, where God's essential deity comes to the fore.¹⁴

However, it should be noted that God's hagios is seldom stated in the New Testament in comparison to the Old. Although it is certainly present, explicit affirmation of this attribute is not often found. Otto Procksch says this is because the New Testament presumes God's holiness. When it is used, it finds expression occasionally in the Son, but most often in the Spirit.¹⁵

John's Gospel is no exception. The only occurrence of hagios describing the Father is in Jesus' High Priestly Prayer (John 17:11) where the innermost nature of God is stressed. The Father is the all-glorious One and distinct from the wickedness of the world, although this transcendence is tempered by its combination with "Father."

Likewise, it is used of the Son only once -- in the confession of Peter (John 6:69). But this is a most significant usage, for it sets Jesus at the side of God the Father. By calling Jesus the Holy One of God, Peter ascribes to Christ the deity of the Godhead. Morris writes:

There can be not the slightest doubt that the title is meant to assign to Jesus the highest possible place. It

¹⁴Otto Procksch, "ἅγιος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 1:100-101.

¹⁵Procksch, p. 101. See also Leon Morris, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), p. 726.

stresses His consecration and His purity. It sets Him with God and not with man.¹⁶

Turning to the Spirit, it might be expected from the above discussion that John would stress the power or greatness of the Paraclete when He calls Him hagios. But He doesn't. Rather, his focus is on the Spirit's relationship to the Son. For example, when the title is used at John 1:33, it is Jesus who will baptize with the Holy Spirit. Or at John 20:22, the Holy Spirit is received as Christ breathed on the disciples. And at John 14:26, the Holy Spirit comes because the Father will send Him in Jesus' name. In each case, John's use of this title for the Spirit reflects the Spirit's relationship with Christ.¹⁷

This is not to say that the divine holiness of the Spirit is excluded in John's Gospel. It is indeed there, for that is the meaning of the term, and, as a member of the Godhead, the Spirit is holy in the same sense as the Father and the Son. But that is not John's primary purpose in calling the Spirit hagios. Instead, he is emphasizing that the Spirit's holiness is to be seen in close connection with the holy Son of God.

The result is that this title takes on a more functional role, much like "Spirit of Truth." It becomes an identification of the Spirit's activity. For in the above three passages, the Spirit is active in Christ's Baptism, in

¹⁶Morris, p. 390.

¹⁷Procksch, pp. 103-104; Morris, p. 656.

teaching and guiding Christ's words, and in the disciples being sent forth into the world as the Father sent Christ. The intimation is that the Spirit is holy because He is active in human life on the basis of Christ's work. Richard C. H. Lenski writes:

The Spirit is called "holy," not in comparison with the other two Persons of the Godhead, but because of his divine function and office which is to make holy or sanctify sinners.¹⁸

For John, the Spirit is the Holy Spirit because of His relation to the Son. The Spirit is the Holy Spirit because He performs the Christocentric ministry of sanctifying men. It is the Spirit's connection to the Son and what He does on the basis of that relationship that gives John's use of this title for the Paraclete its full Christological implications.

Summary

John's identification of the Spirit as Spirit of Truth and Holy Spirit shows the same bond between the Paraclete and the Son as had been previously documented. What is particularly striking here is how these identifications take a more functional connotation. The Spirit of Truth is true because He communicates the Truth -- Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit is holy because of His sanctifying activity of bringing sinners into the realm of the Savior.

In both cases, the Christocentricity of the identi-

¹⁸Richard C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1943), p. 1014.

fication comes to the fore. The inescapable conclusion is that John has linked the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity together in such a way that defies separation. This, in turn, is consistent confirmation of the thesis that the Spirit's activity depends on Christ.

CHAPTER V

HE WILL GLORIFY ME

The above examination of the Christocentricity of the source, title, arrival and identity of the Holy Spirit, provides the necessary background for the actual content of His work. Now, a study of the activities assigned to the Spirit in the Upper Room will strive to show how completely the Spirit's ministry among the disciples is Christological. Those activities include: remain and within, teach, bring to remembrance, bear witness, guide, and glorify.

In a sense, this is the heart of this work. Everything up to this point laid the groundwork for this discussion. Everything after this chapter depends on its findings.

Remain and Within

At John 14:17 Jesus promises that the Holy Spirit will remain with and in the disciples.¹ The significance of this aspect of the Paraclete's ministry begins with John's use of menō, which has important theological over-

¹Internal evidence indicates that the textually problematic verb at the end of the passage is ἐσται. While the manuscripts are evenly divided, the future agrees with John 7:39 and 16:7 that the Spirit will be in the disciples in His post-Pentecost fullness after Christ's glorification.

tones. At John 14:10 it expresses the closest possible relationship between the Father and the Son; while John 15:4 depicts a similar intimate relationship between Christ and the believers. In both cases, it is the unbroken fellowship with Jesus that is given prominence.²

This Christological concern of John's use of menō is not absent in John 14:17. Its presence is confirmed by the connection of the promise of the Spirit's abiding with and in the disciples to Christ's declaration that He will come to them and not leave them as orphans. The sequence of thought between verses 17 and 18 joins the promise of the coming of the Spirit to Christ Himself, thereby giving John's use of menō in this context much Christological significance. William Hendriksen captures this idea when, commenting on verse 18, he states:

What Jesus means is: "My departure will not be like that of a father whose children are left as orphans when he dies. In the Spirit I am myself coming back to you." The Spirit reveals the Christ, glorifies him, applies his merits to the hearts of believers, makes his teachings effective in their lives. Hence,³ when the Spirit is poured out, Christ truly returns.

The presence of the Spirit in the disciples, then, is bound up with the close fellowship enjoyed by the believer and Christ, for Jesus describes His coming to them in terms of

²Karlfried Munzer, "Remain," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, 3 vols., ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 3:225.

³William Hendriksen, The Gospel of John (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953), p. 279. However, some see Jesus referring instead to His post-resurrection appearances at verse 18. For example, Leon Morris, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), p. 65.

the coming of the Spirit (John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7).

But Jesus' statement that He is coming in the sending of the Spirit is to be handled with caution. There must not be a confusion of the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity.⁴ Any interpretation which denies this Trinitarian assertion must be rejected. In fact, John himself keeps the two Persons distinct by his use of "Spirit" and "I will come."

However, even though there is not an ontological identity of the Spirit and the Son, Jesus' claim that he comes in the sending of the Spirit does indicate there must be some type of equation or identification of Himself with the Spirit. It is in that identification that the Christological importance of the Spirit's remaining ministry is found.

As to the nature of that equation of the two Persons of the Trinity, David Holwerda entitles it "equivalence of function."⁵ That is, the Spirit's activity among the disciples finds its basis and content from Christ's work. The Spirit is, in effect, doing exactly what the exalted Christ does. Both are present for the single purpose of restoring the broken fellowship between God and man.

This functional identity implies that the Spirit's activity is simply to continue Christ's finished work of

⁴David Holwerda, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1969), pp. 65-66.

⁵Ibid., p. 65.

redemption by placing the disciples into that completed Gospel revelation. He makes it a life-giving reality in their lives. It is His task to make operative what Christ has already effected in his life, death, and resurrection. In other words, the Spirit carries Christ's ministry, begun at His incarnation and to be consummated at His Second Coming, into the individual's life.⁶ Hence, there is an equivalence of function in that no distinction is to be made between the operation of the risen Christ and the Paraclete.⁷

This functional identity between the Spirit and the Son confirms the Christocentricity of the Spirit's work. To find that Jesus states He will come by the Spirit's remaining with and in the disciples is of great consequence. It equates the Spirit's presence (with and in) with Christ in such a way that the circumference of the Spirit's ministry is limited to Christ's words and works. The Christocentricity of the Spirit's presence is that He is there to bring Christ's work into the disciples' lives.

Teach

Two activities of the Paraclete are mentioned in

⁶ Charles K. Barrett, The Gospel According to John, 2nd ed. (London: SPCK, 1978), p. 90.

⁷ But, as mentioned before, a distinction must be maintained between the Spirit and the Son. George Hendry, The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology, rev. and enlarged, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), pp. 22-23, notes, that to avoid modalism, the Spirit's presence must be secondary to and consequent upon the presence of the incarnate Christ.

John 14:26. He teaches all things and brings to remembrance all that Jesus said. The two offices are very similar to each other, but only a few scholars make them synonymous.⁸ Most writers distinguish between them, and treat the verse in that manner.⁹ That is the approach of this work.

In the New Testament didaskō almost always means to teach or to instruct, the purpose and content of which being determined only from each individual context. In and of itself, the word does not have a distinctively religious use, although certain passages may employ didaskō in a theological manner.¹⁰

However, John's use of didaskō has a definite pattern. Regardless of who the subject of the verb is, the "theme of the teaching is always the message of Jesus as the one who reveals God."¹¹ Of the ten times the word is used in the Gospel, seven have Jesus as the subject. The other

⁸For example, Raymond Brown, The Gospel According to John, The Anchor Bible, vol. 29a (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1970), pp. 650-651.

⁹Ernst Hengstenberg, Commentary on the Gospel of John, 2 vols., trans. from the German (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1865; reprint ed., Minneapolis: Klock and Klock in the U. S. A., 1980), 1:228-229. However, he too admits, that the teaching and the reminding offices go hand in hand, and that there is great deal of overlap between the two.

¹⁰Karl Rengstorf, "διδάσκω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 2:140-141.

¹¹Klaus Wegenast, "Teach," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, 3 vols., ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 3:764.

three instances are John 8:28 with the Father instructing Jesus, John 9:34 with Jesus' opponents refusing to accept the blind man's instruction about Jesus, and John 14:26 with the Holy Spirit teaching what Christ Himself taught.¹²

Such a consistent use of the term is not coincidence. It reflects John's purposeful emphasis on Christ. Karl Rengstorf writes:

This distinguishes John from Synoptic usage, but it also shows how in Jn. even sayings which in themselves seem to have no outstanding significance are influenced in content by the central position of Jesus."¹³

This distinctive Johannine use of didaskō gives John 14:26 a certain Christological character. By the simple fact that it is John who has used the word, some connection with Christ is to be expected. True, this conclusion must not necessarily follow, especially when one considers the word's use in the whole New Testament. But it is a safe deduction in light of the manner John uses the word elsewhere. His consistency in relating Christ to didaskō throughout the Gospel indicates that the Spirit's teaching will reflect that Christological emphasis.

Turning to the specific context of Jesus' promise of the Paraclete's instruction, verse 25 provides the impetus for this activity of the Spirit. Jesus intimates He is about to leave the disciples, as He did at John 15:11; 16:1,

¹²The other references are 6:59; 7:14, 28, 35; 8:2(?), 20; 18:20.

¹³Rengstorf, p. 144.

4, 25, and 33, with the words "These things I have spoken to you." No longer would He be visibly present to teach them. It is His departure that makes necessary a new Teacher for the disciples.

Also important contextually is the use of menō in verse 25. As noted above, this is a significant word for John. It describes the close relationship the believer enjoys with the Son, and that the Spirit is intimately involved in that relationship through a functionally equivalent presence.

This understanding of the Spirit's presence (menō) affects His teaching ministry. The Spirit is present to teach as the continuator of Christ's own teaching ministry. Even though Jesus is going to be visibly absent, He will still be present to teach the disciples through the work of the Spirit. Thus, while the content of that teaching will remain the same, the manner in which the disciples receive the instruction will change. What Jesus had taught in His humiliation would now be taught through the Spirit in His exaltation.¹⁴

Verse 26 confirms this when the Paraclete is said to be sent in Christ's name. This indicates that the arrival of the Spirit as Teacher will be in accordance with all Christ's name stands for. That is the same as saying it is in complete harmony with Jesus' self-revelation. Ernst

¹⁴Hendriksen, pp. 285-6.

Hengstenberg writes:

"In My name" indicates that the mission of the Holy Spirit has for its foundation the historical personality of Christ . . . all that comes to mind when we hear the name Christ, all that he did and suffered upon earth, of which the atonement by the Redeemer's suffering and death is the great result.¹⁵

John's emphasis is that Jesus' name, which is simply shorthand for His nature and redemptive activity, is the sphere in which the Spirit acts.¹⁶ This, then, prescribes the boundaries of His instruction to that which comes from and relates to Christ Himself.

Yet that limitation must not be seen in a negative light. For the Spirit still teaches "all things." Even though the content of the teaching is strictly Christological, the instruction itself is comprehensive in that it includes all that the disciples will need to know for their redeemed relationship with Christ. Henry Barclay Swete writes:

He will teach you all things, not universal knowledge, but all that belongs to the sphere of the spiritual truth; nothing that is essential to the knowledge of God or to the guidance of life shall be wanting. But as His teaching will be in Christ's¹⁷ name, it will follow in the lines of Christ's teaching.

Of course, this instruction would include items that Jesus was not able to teach the disciples Himself, but are

¹⁵Hengstenberg, p. 228.

¹⁶Brooke Foss Westcott, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954). p. 183.

¹⁷Henry Barclay Swete, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament (London: Macmillan, 1910; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976), pp. 153-154.

of essential importance for the understanding of the Gospel. Also, the Spirit's teaching would include giving a Christological interpretation to the events surrounding Christ's life. He would, in essence, teach the full redemptive importance of Jesus' words and works.

The conclusion concerning the Spirit's teaching ministry is that it is Christ-centered. Not only does He continue Christ's teaching role, but the content of His instruction is bounded by Christ's revelation of Himself. True, the Spirit may add to what Christ taught in His humiliation, both quantitatively and through interpretation of material. But this added material is never without Christological character. In fact, such additional material only further points out the Christocentricity of the Spirit's teaching office. For the Paraclete to bring out the full meaning of that which relates to Christ reveals His utmost concern to make Christ known in all His glory. The Spirit is not satisfied until He makes manifest all that which needs to be known about Christ. In other words, as a Teacher, the Spirit's presence and activity is exclusively Christocentric.

Bring To Remembrance

As noted earlier, the Spirit's teaching and reminding offices are very similar. Nowhere is this more evident than the context of John 14:26. For the promise of the reminding Spirit follows immediately that of His teaching

office. Thus what is true for one is true for the other.

There is the same need for the Spirit to teach the disciples (Jesus was about to leave them); the significance of menō (the Spirit continues Christ's ministry by His presence in the disciples) carries through to His reminding ministry; and the meaning of the phrase "in My name" (Christ's nature and work is the sphere of the Spirit's instruction) determines all that He will bring to remembrance. Since Jesus is going to leave the disciples, the disciples will need the Spirit's presence to continue Christ's reminding ministry which focuses on Jesus and His saving work. Contextually, then, the Spirit's work of reminding the disciples bears the same Christocentricity as did His work as Teacher.

When examining the content of what the Spirit will bring to remembrance, there is an even more explicit emphasis on Christological material than with His teaching ministry. The Spirit will bring to remembrance all that Jesus said. The focus is on Christ's words, implying that the Spirit will remind the disciples only of the spoken words of Christ. Excluded is any revelation by the Spirit which is not Christological. His efforts are to "recreate and perpetuate the situation of judgment and decision that marked the ministry of Jesus."¹⁸

Additional emphasis on this Christocentric content

¹⁸Barrett, p. 467.

of the Spirit's reminding work comes from the word eme.¹⁹ With this emphatic pronoun, John stresses that these are Christ's words. In effect, the Spirit's reminding work is not independent or supplemental, but Christocentric.²⁰

However, that the Spirit will remind the disciples only of Christ's words does not mean He will simply reproduce the ipsissima verba of Jesus' speech. Rather, this function of the Spirit might best be described as "elucidating repetition."²¹ That is, when He brings to remembrance what Jesus said, He is free to give a creative exposition of the material. As Edwyn Hoskyns notes, "the Spirit will both call to mind and expound all that He had taught."²² He brings about a living re-presentation of a past historical event, including an interpretation of that event to give it its full theological meaning.

Both need and example verify the inclusion of this

¹⁹ Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (London: United Bible Society, 1971), p. 246, notes that the pronoun is omitted in many manuscripts. However, since there are no compelling internal considerations for leaving it out and the external attestation is evenly divided, it was placed in the text in brackets.

²⁰ Barrett, p. 467. Also see Frederick Dale Bruner, A Theology of the Holy Spirit (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), p. 279.

²¹ This phrase come from Heinrich Schlier, "The Holy Spirit as interpreter according to St. John's Gospel," Communio 1 (Summer 1974):136.

²² Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, ed. Francis Noel Davey (London: Faber & Faber, 1947), p. 461.

elucidating aspect of the Spirit's ministry. The disciples needed the Spirit to interpret many of the things Jesus said. Since such significant events as the crucifixion, resurrection and ascension occurred after Jesus spoke these words, the disciples had need of Someone not only to remind them of Jesus' prior instruction but also explain those earlier words in light of these events. Without the impartation of a deeper understanding by the Spirit, the exact meaning of Christ's speech in view of His redemptive work would be lost. Considering the disciple's frequent lack of understanding during Christ's earthly ministry, they would have failed to interpret Christ's words correctly unless the Spirit performed this elucidating work.

John also gives two examples of how the Spirit carried out this reminding office. At John 2:22 Jesus spoke about the destruction and rebuilding of the Temple. The Jews misunderstood Jesus as probably did the disciples. However, after Jesus rose from the dead, the disciples remembered He had said this. Then John gives the Spirit-prompted commentary that Jesus was speaking of His body.

At John 12:16, the disciples did not understand Jesus' entry into Jerusalem until He was glorified. Then they remembered. They now perceived what was going on during this triumphant arrival of Christ. But, remembering John 7:39, Jesus' glorification is what releases the Spirit in His post-Pentecost fullness. Thus, through the fuller expression of the Spirit's reminding office made possible by

Jesus' death, resurrection and ascension, the disciples comprehended the meaning of Jesus' words about the Temple and Palm Sunday.

These examples and the disciples' need demonstrate that the Spirit not only reminds but also expounds and discloses what Jesus said. Heinrich Schlier writes:

The "remembrance" in the Spirit is the interpretation of the events involving Jesus, disclosing and attesting the truth, which causes the earthly Jesus to be seen and understood as he authentically was.²³

In conclusion, the Spirit's reminding work is Christocentric. Both contextually and in content, only a Christological interpretation gives full meaning to His bringing to remembrance all that Jesus said. To have the Spirit remind the disciples only of Christ's words and then elucidate them to give the remembrance its redemptive significance points to a Christ-centered ministry. John focuses the Spirit's reminding office fully on Jesus.

Bear Witness

John 15:26 states that the Spirit will bear witness to Christ, and uses the verb martyreō to describe this aspect of the Spirit's activity. This is a significant word for John. He uses it 43 times in his writings out of a possible 76 New Testament occurrences.²⁴ In nearly every Johannine context, it refers to Jesus, both His Person and

²³Schlier, p. 136.

²⁴Lothar Coenen, "Witness," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, 3 vols., ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 3:1042.

work, thereby giving the term great Christological importance. Although there are occasions in which there is no specific reference to Jesus, these do not negate the distinctive Christ-related emphasis of the majority of passages. Very simply, a specific Christian reference dominates John's use of martyreō.²⁵

A brief study of the word helps to bring out this specific Johannine use. For the most part, the verb has two connotations in the New Testament. First, there is the witness to ascertainable facts. This is the original sense of the word and occurs most often, but not always, in legal proceedings. An individual who bears witness in this sense declares facts which he himself knows to be true.

Second, there is the witness to one's religious convictions. This goes beyond the popular usage of the term and takes on the meaning of making known and confessing what one believes. An individual who gives this evangelistic witness may or may not be able to substantiate it, but he has committed himself to it as a result of a Gospel proclamation.²⁶

Returning to John's use of martyreō, Anthony Harvey persuasively argues that the Fourth Gospel's emphasis on "witness" occurs because the Apostle is presenting Jesus'

²⁵H. Strathmann, "Μάρτυς," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), 4:498-499.

²⁶Ibid.

claims in the form of an extended trial.²⁷ This happens on two levels. First, for those involved in the actual trial against Jesus, Jesus Himself is His own witness. Since He is declaring Himself to be the Son of God, those judging him "had to make up their minds whether or not to believe what He said. No witnesses could be produced that would be acceptable to Jesus' adversaries."²⁸

On the second level, however, a number of witnesses to Jesus' claims are placed before the reader, for the reader now becomes the individual deciding the case. Anthony Harvey writes:

. . . devoting so much of his Gospel to those incidents [Jesus' acts and words filled with legal consequence] would enable him [John] to present the case of Jesus Christ to his readers . . . to reach their own verdict."²⁹

Thus, for the purpose of convincing the reader, John's Gospel places much stress "upon the testimony of those who recognized and acknowledged Jesus to be the Messiah and Son of God."³⁰

This, in turn, dictates the content of the witness that is given. It will be a proclamation pointing to Jesus as the Revealer of God and His salvation.³¹ Whether done

²⁷Anthony Harvey, Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1976), p.17.

²⁸Ibid., pp. 92-93.

²⁹Ibid., 17. See also pp. 41, 88-89, 104, 131.

³⁰Ibid., p. 89.

³¹Coenen, p. 1045.

by the Father (John 5:37), John the Baptist (John 5:33), Jesus' works (John 5:36), Scriptures (John 5:39), Jesus Himself (John 8:14), the Holy Spirit (John 15:26) or the disciples (John 15:27), the content of this witness is "the sonship of Christ, who had come to be the Savior of the world."³² In fact, there can be no other content, for Christ is the One appointed to reveal the Father. All God chose to make known to the world is found in and comes through His Son.

Applying this to the Spirit's bearing witness to Christ, there is an immediate Christocentric testimony to the Spirit's ministry. John's use of the martyreō means that the Spirit, like every other witness in the Gospel, is persuading the hearer of the "justice of Jesus' cause."³³ Or, as Jesus Himself says about the Spirit, "He will bear witness concerning Me."

The specifics of John 15:26-27 give further force to the Christocentricity of this aspect of the Spirit's ministry. Important in these verses is the connection between the Spirit's bearing witness and the disciples' testimony. While grammatically parallel, the two witnesses do not exist independently of each other. Since the disciples receive the Spirit in this context and also receive instruction from Him (John 14:26), their witness cannot be isolated from His.

³²Merrill C. Tenney, "Topics from the Gospel of John, Part III: The Meaning of 'Witness' in John," Bibliotheca Sacra 132 (July 1975):241.

³³Harvey, p. 15

In fact, the Spirit bears witness through the disciples. He is busy testifying to Christ in their proclamation. By means of the disciples' preaching of the Word, He works to communicate effectively the message of Christ. This puts a distinctive Christocentric perspective on the Spirit's witnessing work. He is joined to the disciples' testimony of Christ, working through the Gospel they proclaim so that the listener can respond in faith.

Again, this connection between the Spirit's testimony and the disciples' martyreō merely reflects the above discussion of the Spirit's indwelling of the disciples. Since the Spirit continues Jesus' ministry among the disciples by placing them into the sphere of Christ's redemption, this mandates that it be Christ's words and works that the Spirit gives to the disciples to know and speak. The disciples receive from the Spirit within the Christocentric Gospel message as a living reality so they can bear witness to God's Son.

This in turn explains the world's hatred of the disciples. Not only does the disciples' testimony create animosity because it confronts the world with the truth of the Gospel, but the presence of the Spirit, both within them and through the message they proclaim, heightens that hostile reaction. The world is striking out at Christ by hating the disciples who have Christ's functionally equivalent presence -- the Holy Spirit -- within them. In other words, when Jesus tells the disciples they will be persecuted, He is

simply acknowledging that He Himself will continue to be rejected by the world. But this time it is because of His post-glorification activity through the indwelling Spirit.

Alasdair Heron writes:

. . . the controversy with 'the world' is Jesus' own, not a separate campaign of the Spirit's; it is the reiteration of the krisis, the 'judgment' or 'sifting' of the cosmos which Christ has provoked (3.19; 8.26; 9.39; 12.31), and it is because the cosmos does not know him (1.10) that it is incapable of recognising the Spirit--or indeed Christ's followers (I John 3.1) who are no longer 'of the world' (17.14-16).³⁴

But the Spirit's witnessing presence not only explains the world's hatred of the disciples. It also gives the disciples comfort when persecuted. By stating that the Spirit would witness along with and through the disciples, Jesus gives the disciples the support they need in this activity. The world's reaction will be negative, and so it is important for them to know they are not alone. To that end Jesus promises the Spirit who will strengthen and assist them. Anthony Harvey writes:

. . . the evangelist is clearly building upon the fundamental Christian conviction that a follower of Jesus, when under attack because of his faith, can expect the Holy Spirit to come to his defense.³⁵

But the "Me" of John 15:26 ("He will bear witness to Me") indicates the Spirit's sole weapon in this endeavor to

³⁴Alasdair Heron, The Holy Spirit (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), p. 56.

³⁵Harvey, p. 114.

comfort the disciples is His witness to Christ.³⁶ He will not exercise His omnipotent authority unmasked, but will give His divine help through Christ, specifically the Gospel message concerning Him. When they are persecuted for their testimony to Christ, the Spirit gives them comfort and help by testifying to Christ, thereby bringing them into a closer relationship with their Lord. Thus the disciples receive the comfort of the Spirit's presence through the Gospel message.

John leaves no doubt as to the centrality of Jesus Christ for the Spirit's witnessing office. The presence of the term martyreō displays a Christological emphasis. It is the communication of Christ and His saving deeds that the Spirit gives witness to. Further, the Spirit continues Christ's own witnessing activity by His presence in the disciples' lives. He witnesses through their confession of Christ by both giving them the Christocentric message to proclaim and working through that proclamation to create a faith response in the listener.

Those who reject the disciples' witness, however, are really rejecting Christ, who is active in the post-glorification ministry of the indwelling Spirit. In this regard, the Spirit's comfort for the persecuted disciples is Christocentric. He gives aid to the disciples by drawing them nearer to Jesus through His testimony to Christ.

³⁶W. Boyd Hunt, "John's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," Southwestern Journal of Theology 8 (October 1965):55.

Throughout the whole work of witnessing, the Spirit's role is focused on one central individual -- Jesus Christ.

Guide

The climax of the Upper Room Discourse description of the Spirit's ministry toward the disciples is recorded in John 16:12-15. While this passage in many ways parallels John 14:16-17; 25-26, the activities listed in these verses reveal the Spirit's work in greater detail.

However, the large amount of material in John 16:12-15 presents certain organizational difficulties. Because of the interrelated nature of the various functions, treating each aspect individually would involve much repetition. At the same time, omitting any of them would disrupt the picture John gives of the Spirit. In order to prevent overlap and yet be comprehensive, this work will treat the activities listed in verses 12-13 under the general heading of "Guide." The major activity of verse 14, the Paraclete's glorification of Christ, is the summary-conclusion of the Spirit's work among the disciples.

John 16:12 provides the necessary context for this section on the Spirit's work. It reemphasizes once again the need the disciples will have for the Spirit's guiding presence. Jesus is about to leave them. But, in addition, Jesus also supplies the explanation why He could not teach the disciples before He left. The Spirit's guidance is necessary because they were not able to bear (bastazō) cer-

tain teachings at the time.³⁷ Not only would they have trouble understanding all that had happened up to that time and was about to happen, they also were not ready to take in all that Jesus could tell them.

That this is the case, notice the reactions of the disciples when Jesus does reveal His true work.³⁸ For example, in Matthew 16:21-23, after Jesus announces His upcoming passion, the disciples immediately sought to prevent Him from this redemptive work. They could not "bear" such an ending to Jesus' life, especially with the prevailing Jewish view of an earthly Messiah. The implication is that Jesus must complete His work of redemption before they can receive and respond to the full Christian revelation (see John 2:22; 12:16; 13:7) which the Holy Spirit will bring into their lives.

Once He is glorified, though, then the disciples can bear these teachings, and this necessitates the presence of the Spirit. Working in and through the Spirit, Jesus will impart a fuller understanding of His work of salvation. In other words, the Spirit makes possible a deeper comprehension by continuing Christ's work in the disciples. In the absence of the visible Christ, the Spirit will be their

³⁷ Bastazō is somewhat of an unusual word in this context. This is the only time it refers to bearing words. Elsewhere it is used with stones, a burden or Christ's name. Still, the basic idea is clear. The disciples were not able to bear these words and their implications.

³⁸ Such reactions may be found at Matthew 16:21-26; 17:22-23; 20:17-19 and their respective parallels.

teacher. Working in His post-Pentecost fullness after Christ's glorification, the Spirit will impart to the disciples that material they were unable to bear when Jesus was physically with them.

Further, when the Spirit does arrive, John writes in verse 13 that He will guide them into all the truth.³⁹ Now John's use of alētheia returns to the picture. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the Apostle gives a distinctive Christological meaning to alētheia. He portrays Jesus as the locus of truth because Christ is God's very Reality revealing Himself. In turn, John identifies the Spirit of Truth as the One who makes Christ known as the Truth. By communicating the saving realities of Jesus, which John equates with the truth, the Spirit receives the title, "Spirit of Truth."

Thus for the Spirit of Truth to guide the disciples into all the truth (John 16:13) is evidently Christocentric. The specific truth in this context is the Person of Jesus and the meaning of what he said and did. In fact, John's use of the definite article further highlights this specific Christological content of "truth." Westcott writes:

He leads them not (vaguely) "into all truth," but "into all the truth," into the complete understanding of and

³⁹Hodēgeō is found only here in John's Gospel. There is a possible inference about the Spirit's Christocentricity as Jesus describes Himself as the Way (John 14:6). The implication is that Jesus is the Way in which the Spirit leads the disciples. But the connection should not be pressed on the basis of a single use. See Hoskyns, p. 486.

sympathy with that absolute Truth, which is Christ Himself.⁴⁰

Therefore, the Spirit's guiding office is thoroughly Christocentric in that the truth into which He leads is all the saving realities encompassed in Jesus Christ.

The words, "for He will not speak on His own initiative, but whatever He hears, He will speak" (John 16:13), are powerful confirmation of this Christocentric interpretation of the Spirit's guiding ministry. With that statement, Jesus rules out any interpretations by the Spirit that move beyond the boundaries set by Jesus and His work. Precluded are any private or secret or independent revelations that draw attention to anyone other than the Son of God. The Spirit communicates the Truth, Jesus Christ, and guides the disciples into that specific divine Reality. Thus the Spirit's ministry has one source and one substance -- Jesus Christ. Heinrich Schlier captures the dominant thought here.

Nor does he [the Spirit] interpret him [Jesus] according to some enthusiasm of his own. He "hears." He listens to the earthly Jesus in His authentic reality. What he has heard he then causes to be heard. He "takes" what belongs to Jesus, that is, what Jesus said and did, what Jesus himself, who has gone to the Father,⁴¹ handed down of himself, and announces it in its truth.

A possible objection to this Christocentric interpretation of verses 12-13 is drawn from the phrase "He shall declare to you the things that are to come." Could not such

⁴⁰Westcott, p. 224.

⁴¹Schlier, p. 135.

announcements of future items ("the things that are to come") go beyond Christological material, that the historical Christ and His work are occasionally foregone for the disclosing events that will occur?

But, when the statement is put in its proper time frame, this is not the case. Jesus is speaking these words just before His Passion. While John may be writing from a post-Easter perspective, the words he writes are those Christ spoke on the eve of His death. The "things to come" must be seen in that light.

In that regard, three interpretations are possible. First, from the standpoint of Jesus' night of betrayal, the things to come refer solely to the events of the Passion, with the prime elements being the crucifixion and resurrection. Second, incorporating more of John's perspective, the Spirit would be involved in predictive prophecy -- real future events -- but on the basis of Christ's death and resurrection. Third, bringing both perspectives together, the coming things would be the whole Christian revelation, that is, the new order which results from Christ's going to His Father.⁴²

The third interpretation is probably best. Since the word "all" is present not only in this context but also John 14:26, it is highly unlikely that a sudden limitation, whether in reference to immediate or distant future events,

⁴²Barrett, p. 490.

is introduced at this point. Morris writes:

More likely "the things to come" is a way of referring to the whole Christian system, yet future when Jesus spoke, and to be revealed to the disciples by the Spirit, not by natural insight.⁴³

In other words, the Spirit will announce what happened to Jesus, teaching the redemptive meaning of the Gospel, and interpreting that meaning for the Church. The things to come will have Christ as their basis and content, with the Spirit's work only amplifying and clarifying the details of the revelation by Jesus. Even in this final phrase the Spirit's work contains no new revelations, only the elaboration and impartation of the theological significance of God's self-revelation in Jesus Christ.

In conclusion, the Spirit's guiding ministry parallels His teaching, reminding and witnessing activities. All are Christocentric in their source and content. However, John 16:12-13 does more than merely repeat these earlier functions. They go into greater detail in showing that the Spirit will concentrate His efforts on making known the Truth which is embodied in Christ. John particularly emphasizes that He will not initiate any independent activity, that is, some non-Christological tangent.

Therefore, the connection between the Spirit's work and Christ is explicit in John's use of alētheia and the phrases that follow. The Spirit will make known to the disciples the meaning of Jesus and His redemptive activities.

⁴³Morris, p. 701.

What they were not able to comprehend and bear beforehand about Christ, He would now guide them so that they could understand. While this includes material Christ may not have spoken to them as well as instruction which clarifies, amplifies, and elaborates on what occurred in the life and work of the Incarnate Son of God, this material cannot be considered as new or independent revelation. Even when the Spirit goes beyond the explicit words of Christ, He does so only to make the truth of Christ better understood and better known. Very simply, when the Spirit guides, He has no other point of reference than Jesus Christ and Him alone.

Summary: Glorify

One final aspect of the Spirit's ministry among the disciples is recorded in John 16:14. There John reports that the Paraclete will glorify Christ, an activity that is so comprehensive that it serves well as a summary statement of the Spirit's Christocentric mission. The Spirit's teaching, reminding, witnessing, and guiding offices can be subsumed under this activity.

As mentioned in Chapter one, John has a distinctive theological understanding when he uses doxazō. It refers to God's soteriological revelation of Himself in the Person and work of His Son. This involves not just Jesus' exaltation, but His whole redemptive activity, particularly the cross, resurrection and ascension. By these activities, God makes known His love and will for mankind, and His divine personage is manifested. For John doxazō refers to God's glorious

self-revelation in Christ.

This in turn determines the meaning of the phrase "give glory to God." Since God's glory comes only from His communicating knowledge of Himself, it cannot mean that someone gives additional glory to God. Rather, it signifies a predication in the sense of active acknowledgment or extolling what already is.⁴⁴

This Johannine emphasis forms the basis for understanding the Spirit's glorification of Christ. First, corresponding to John's Christocentric use of doxazō elsewhere, the Spirit is going to glorify Christ and Him alone. He does not come to reveal Himself, but His ministry is self-effacing in that He focuses attention solely on Christ. It is only in this way that Christ is glorified. As in John 14:26 so also here, this is highlighted by the use of the pronoun eme. In both form and position the eme is emphatic, thus reinforcing the Christocentric thrust of the Spirit's work of glorification.⁴⁵

Second, this Christocentricity is stressed in the hoti clause which follows. The Spirit glorifies Christ because He takes what is Christ's and announces it to the disciples. In this context, that which is Christ's refers to all the saving realities which are embodied in Him.⁴⁶

⁴⁴See pp. 9-13 above.

⁴⁵Morris, p. 701, n. 32.

⁴⁶Richard C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1943), p. 1092.

Consequently, this defines the Spirit's work of glorification as centered on the redemptive life and work of Jesus Christ. The Spirit will take all that relates to Christ and convey it to the disciples.

Third, John's use of doxazō prescribes the manner in which the Spirit gives glory to Christ. He does not add anything to the personal glory of Christ in the sense of new, independent revelations. Christ is God's full and complete revelation of himself. Rather, He works to show the disciples that glory of Christ which already is. True, the Spirit may take what is Christ's and elaborate on it, but even then the activity is not adding to Christ's glory. It is merely bringing into focus the deeper knowledge of who Christ is and what He did.

This excellently summarizes the Spirit's work among the disciples. Each and every function previously mentioned contain these same Christocentric emphases, and in actuality are the means by which the Spirit glorifies Christ. Whether He is teaching or guiding or witnessing or reminding, the Spirit is engaged in the one purpose for which He has been sent -- to give glory to Christ. This He does by conveying the truth about and of Jesus to the disciples.⁴⁷

The Spirit in each one of these offices is doing exactly what it means to give glory to Jesus. He is showing the attractiveness of the Incarnate Son of God and giving

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 1092.

Him center stage.⁴⁸ Therefore, when John says the Spirit glorifies Jesus, he has incorporated all the Spirit's activity into one verb and once again defined it to be totally Christocentric. Leon Morris writes:

The work of the Spirit is Christocentric. He will draw attention not to Himself but to Christ. He will glorify Christ. It is the things of Christ that he takes and declares, i. e., His ministry is built upon and is the necessary sequel to that of Christ.⁴⁹

In conclusion, the focal point for the Spirit's work among the disciples is Jesus Christ. The Savior is central to any and all activities the Spirit undertakes. This is certain confirmation of the thesis of this study. The content of the Spirit's ministry is Christocentric. Jesus' words in the Upper Room Discourse define the role of the Paraclete as completely Christological.

⁴⁸Michael Green, I Believe in the Holy Spirit (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), p. 53.

⁴⁹Morris, p. 701.

CHAPTER VI

HE WILL CONVICT THE WORLD

As John relates the Spirit's ministry in the Upper Room Discourse, he gives every aspect a Christological origin, basis and content. Indeed, preceding chapters have demonstrated that His titles, arrival and mission to the disciples are all distinctively and exclusively Christocentric. There remains, however, one topic that needs exploration -- that of the Spirit's relationship to the world. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the Spirit's work among people who are not Christ's followers. Again, the expectation is that John will be consistent in that this Paraclete role is also completely Christocentric.

Kosmos has a variety of meanings in the Gospel of John. For example, William Hendriksen details at least six different categories.

This leads to the following significations, as found in the Fourth Gospel:

(1) the (orderly) universe, 17:5; perhaps, the earth, 21:25.

(2) by metonymy, the human inhabitants of the earth; hence, mankind, human race, theatre of human history, framework of human society, 16:21.

(3) the general public, 7:4; perhaps also 14:22.

(4) ethical sense: mankind alienated from the life of God, sin-laden, exposed to the judgment, in need of salvation, 3:19.

(5) the same as (4) with the additional idea that no distinction is made with respect to race or national-

ity; hence, men from every tribe and nation; not only Jews but Gentiles, 4:42 . . .

(6) the realm of evil. This is really the same as (4) but with the additional idea of open hostility to God, his Christ, and his people 7:7; 8:23; 12:31; 14:30; 15:18; 17:9, 14.¹

For the world's relation to the Spirit, the latter three meanings are prominent.

The two passages where John connects the Spirit and the world, John 14:17; 16:8-11, both report the world in opposition to the Spirit. At John 14:17 the world cannot accept the Paraclete; neither does it see Him; nor can it recognize the Spirit. In John 16:8-11, the world is convicted of sin, righteousness and judgment. Also, John 15:26 hints at this hostility of the world when the Spirit's witnessing activity results in the world's hatred and persecution. In each instance, then, the world is at enmity with the Spirit just as it was with Jesus.

Consequently, John places a heavy emphasis on the distinction between the disciples, who are followers of Christ, and the world, which "is in some sense personified as the great opponent of the Redeemer in salvation history."² This distinction between the world and the disciples is highlighted at John 14:17 by their respective relationships to the Spirit. While the Spirit remains with

¹William Hendriksen, The Gospel of John (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953), p. 79, note 26.

²Hermann Sasse, "Κόσμος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), 3:894.

and in the disciples, the world simply cannot receive Him. This is due to the world's inability to see or recognize the Paraclete. In contrast to the disciples' comprehension of the Spirit of Truth, the world lacks the spiritual insight to do so. The result is that, unlike the disciples, the world does not enter into personal relations with Him.³

At John 16:8-11 this inability to see or recognize the Spirit is determinative for the Spirit's work in relation to the world. However, this portion of Scripture presents a host of exegetical problems. D. A. Carson summarizes the chief, but, according to him, not all, difficulties.

(1) What is the meaning of ἐλέγχειν, or of ἐλέγχειν περί, in this context? Does the Paraclete convict the world, convince the world, prove to the world that it is wrong, or prove to believers that the world is wrong? Or does ἐλέγχειν περί here take on the meaning "to expose in regard to"? (2) How are the ὅτι clauses . . . to be taken? Is this a use of the ὅτι explicative, introducing a noun clause explaining the nature of ἁμαρτία, δικαιοσύνη, and κρίσις respectively? Or is this use causal, introducing adverbial clauses which modify the verb? (3) What explains the second person plural θεωρεῖτε . . . displacing an expected οὗτος θεωρεῖ . . . (4) What do the three nouns ἁμαρτία, δικαιοσύνη, and κρίσις mean in this context? . . . (5) The most difficult question is this: How do the pieces fit together with consistency?⁴

Since this work is concerned with the Christocentricity of the Spirit's work, an in-depth discussion of the

³Leon Morris, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), p. 650.

⁴D. A. Carson, "The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7-11," Journal of Biblical Literature 98 (1979): 548. This chapter is heavily dependent on this article.

best interpretation of this passage would be tangential.⁵ For it is unnecessary to solve all the problems associated with this text in order to detail its Christological aspects. Those Christ-centered emphases are always present regardless of the interpretation suggested. Therefore, the following paragraphs are limited to the Spirit's work of conviction and the Christocentricity of this activity of the Paraclete.

To begin, the Spirit's work in the world is described by the verb elenchō. Translators have difficulty finding an English word which adequately portrays its meaning. This is evident from the variety of translations it receives, for example, convince, convict, rebuke, expose, confute, and others.

Of these "convict and "convince" are the better choices. But even these have limitations in that "convict" is somewhat ambiguous and "convince" is inadequate. The ambiguity of the former lies in the fact that it can mean either the establishment of objective guilt or to convince the party of his guilt. "Convince," on the other hand, usually gives the impression that the whole affair is limited to the intellectual realm; that it is merely a cerebral exercise to convince the world of its error. The meaning in John 16:8, however, includes not only this intellectual aspect but also the idea of a self-conscious

⁵See the Carson article for a helpful summary of the various interpretations, including a convincing solution of his own.

recognition of guilt. Still, either "convince" or "convict" could give the meaning intended by John if properly understood. For this work, "convict" will be used to indicate that the Spirit works in the world, particularly in the consciences of people separated from God, to establish and convince them of their guilt.⁶

More important is the content of the Spirit's convicting work -- sin, righteousness and judgment -- for these items define the Christocentricity of the Spirit's activity. All three are introduced by hoti which, as the earlier quote from D. A. Carson pointed out, is problematic.⁷

Are the hoti clauses explicative, explaining the nature of sin, righteousness and judgment; or are they causal, answering the question of why the Paraclete performs His convicting activity in these ways? But, again, the intent here is not to argue for either. In fact, both are eminently Christological, and, by exploring both options, the Christocentricity of the Spirit's mission to the world is doubly confirmed.

When the Spirit convicts the world of its sin, the hoti clause can only have reference to Christ. If it is

⁶Carson, p. 558.

⁷Ibid., pp. 548, 561. Charles F. D. Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), p. 147 writes: "In John xvi. 9-11 it is a nice point whether the ὅτι -clauses mean in that . . . (i.e. define the sin, the δικαιοσύνη, and the judgment) or are consequential (i.e. indicate that the sin, etc., are the result of the conditions in the ὅτι -clauses)."

explicative, then sin is defined as not believing in Christ. Charles K. Barrett gives a helpful paraphrase of Jesus' words.

He will convict the world (of its error) in regard to sin,⁸ showing it that sin consists in not believing in me.

Thus the essence of sin is unbelief, but unbelief only in reference to Jesus. When the Spirit convicts the world of sin, it is the basic sin of all -- rejection of the Son of God as Savior. The Christological nature of the Spirit's work is obvious. The content of His conviction is not believing in Christ.

But, if the clause is causal, then this Christocentricity is even further emphasized. The reason why the Spirit convicts the world is because it does not believe in Jesus. Here the Spirit's concern is that the world's sin entails eternal damnation because it produces sustained ignorance of personal need for the Savior. Because this results in lack of faith, the Spirit works to lead the world to see its need and to look to Jesus for salvation from sin. D. A. Carson paraphrases it this way.

. . . its sin, because the (people of the world) do not believe in me and are by this unbelief self-excluded (apart from the work of the Paraclete) from ⁹the one source that would reveal their need to them.

⁸Charles K. Barrett, The Gospel According to John, 2nd ed. (London: SPCK, 1978), p. 487.

⁹Carson, p. 566.

Thus the Spirit, seeing the great need of the world due to its unbelief, confronts the world with the fact of its sin to work repentance and faith.

But here, too, the reference point is Christ. The Spirit does this particular work because of the improper response to the Son. It is Jesus, particularly the need for His atoning work, that provides the reason, a thoroughly Christocentric reason, for the Spirit's convicting the world of its sin.

The second focus of the Spirit's work of conviction -- righteousness -- presents an additional problem. Whose righteousness is referred to at this point? The hoti clause seems to indicate that it is Christ's, but this destroys the symmetry of the passage. Both sin and judgment refer to the world, so it would be a sudden thought change if it were Christ's righteousness. But, again, whether the the world's righteousness or Christ's, the Christological implications predominate.

For example, if it is Christ's righteousness, then the hoti clause would read most naturally as an explicative. Christ's righteousness consists of His going to the Father, resulting in the visible absence of Jesus from the disciples. But Jesus' going to the Father, for John, has much the same significance as Jesus' glorification. It is not limited to His ascension, but includes also His death

and resurrection.¹⁰ Jesus' righteousness, since it consists of going to the Father, includes His passion and exaltation, thereby giving it a totally redemptive content. Thus for the Spirit to convict the world of Christ's righteousness, it is a righteousness that is centered on Jesus, particularly His successful completion of the redemption of the world. The Christocentricity of this for the Spirit's work is evident.

However, if it is the world's righteousness, then the hoti clause must be causal. It is impossible to read an explicative. Christ's going to the Father cannot be the nature of the world's righteousness. But as a causal clause, two reasons surface why the Spirit convicts the world of its righteousness.

First, since Jesus is gone, indicated by the statement that the disciples would no longer be able to see Him, someone needs to continue this work. Against the backdrop of Christ's righteousness, the Spirit continues Christ's activity of showing the world that it is in error with its works righteous religious schemes. He brings home the inadequacy of the righteousness advocated by the world so that Christ's righteousness might be accepted for what it is -- the only way to fellowship with God.¹¹

¹⁰David Holwerda, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959), p. 65.

¹¹Carson, p. 562.

Second, because Christ has completed His work of righteousness, indicated by His going to the Father, the Spirit is now able more completely to convict the world of its righteousness. This echoes John 7:39 where the potency of the Spirit's activity was dependent upon Christ's glorification. But its deeper significance is that Christ's fulfillment of the Messianic prophecies means that any other righteousness is unacceptable. Only the righteousness that Christ brought to perfect completion breaks down the barrier of sin between God and man.

Since this is so, the Spirit's great concern is that every man-made righteousness be revealed as false by convicting the people whose belief is misdirected to such false righteousness. Then, responding to that conviction, they would forsake the world's righteousness, turn to Christ in repentance, and grasp Jesus' righteousness in faith. Again, it is Jesus, particularly the world's need for Christ's redemptive work, that provides the reason for the Spirit's convicting the world of its false righteousness. This, in turn, makes His relationship to the world fully Christological.

These two reasons for a causal hoti in regards to the world's righteousness also apply to a causal hoti if it is Christ's righteousness. But, there is one major difference. The convicting of the world of its false righteousness would be merely implied. On the other hand, the Spirit's work to convince the world of the authenticity

of Christ's righteousness becomes the predominate aspect. In other words, the Spirit convicts the world that Christ's righteousness is indeed true for it was validated by Jesus going to the Father. Thus the Spirit's work is Christ-centered whether the clause is explicative or causal, Christ's or the world's righteousness.

The third aspect of the Spirit's convicting work -- judgment -- is connected to the judgment of Satan. At first glance, this makes the hoti clause a little difficult to understand as an explicative. Certainly John does not mean the world's judgment consists of the judgment of Satan. As the prince of this world, Satan would hardly be the focus of the world's judgment.

However, it can still be an explicative if the details of the Passion are filled in. The world displayed the nature of its judgment when it condemned Jesus to the cross. The Spirit, on the other hand, convicts the world of this false judgment of Christ when He shows that it was Satan, not Jesus, who was judged at Calvary. In other words, the content of the world's judgment, executing Jesus, is implied and declared false as the Spirit brings home the fact that the cross, followed by Christ's resurrection and descent into hell, actually condemned Satan.¹² But

¹²This is somewhat forced as an interpretation. Another alternative is to change the explicatives in each clause from content given to what one must think if one is to think aright about these items. Carson, pp. 549-550, objects to this because it is too "coldly cerebral."

notice, it is Christ, particularly His death, which the Spirit is working with, again revealing the exclusively Christocentric nature of His convicting role.

But, if the clause is causal, there is an even greater stress on Christ's victory over Satan at Calvary. It is at that time and place that Satan, the ruler of this world, and therefore his followers, the world itself, are judged. They are condemned because they sent Christ to the cross, which is the apex of their unbelief, and it is a condemnation, according to John 3:16; 36, that is already in effect. The world stands under God's wrathful judgment now.

Thus the Paraclete convicts the world of its judgment because Satan has been judged. That is, because the ruler of this world and also his followers have already been judged, the Spirit is at work trying to change the world's idea of judgment (that Jesus is the One condemned) to that of the correct assessment (that Satan is the one condemned). His work is both crucial and urgent, for without it the world would remain under God's condemnation. Therefore, the Spirit is convicting the world of its errant concept of judgment so that it may believe that Jesus is the true Victor at Calvary.¹³ For the third time, it is Jesus, this time it is His victory over Satan, that provides the reason for the Spirit's convicting the world.

¹³Brooke Foss Westcott, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), p. 223.

In summary, the Spirit's work of conviction is completely Christocentric. If the hoti clauses are definitions, then the Spirit's conviction consists of unbelief in Christ, Christ's going to the Father, and Christ's crucifixion condemning Satan. If the hoti clauses are causal, then the Spirit convicts the world because unbelief in Christ brings God's wrath, the world's righteousness is wrong as Christ's going to the Father demonstrates, and its judgment is wrong because it was Christ who was victorious on the cross.

While this treatment of the Spirit's relation to the world only touched the highlights of this particular passage, it does show how this aspect of the Spirit's work is Christocentric. The basis for and focal point of His convicting activity is Jesus Christ and His saving work. Leon Morris summarizes:

It should not be overlooked that all three aspects of the work of the Holy Spirit dealt with in these verses are interpreted Christologically. Sin, righteousness and judgment are all to be understood because of the way they relate to Christ.¹⁴

As elsewhere in the Upper Room Discourse, so also here, the Spirit's ministry can be interpreted only Christologically.

¹⁴Leon Morris, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), p. 699.

CHAPTER VII

THAT HE MAY BE WITH YOU FOREVER

Even though the Spirit's ministry is exclusively Christocentric according to the Upper Room Discourse, one important question still remains. Do these instructions by Christ about the Paraclete extend beyond the age of the disciples for the entire life of the Church? This question is of consequence because some writers believe that the Paraclete was promised only to the disciples who were in the Upper Room, and point to the historical setting of the Last Supper in which Jesus spoke these words as their documentation.¹ Since Jesus was speaking to just these men, they alone receive the Paraclete in this Christocentric manner.

Thus should the Church look for the Spirit's ministry as Christocentric in every day and age? For if Christ was speaking to just the disciples, then the Spirit's work in a contemporary Christian would not necessarily have to glorify Christ. He could draw attention to some non-Christian experience or subject. But if Christ's words are didactic for the whole Church, then His instructions about

¹Raymond Brown, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," New Testament Studies 13 (1966-1967):130, reports that F. Mussman takes this position. Also, Morris Inch, Saga of the Spirit (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), p. 108.

the Spirit's Christological role are prescriptive for all time. This final chapter seeks to demonstrate that Jesus' words are not limited to the disciples. The Spirit's ministry will always be Christocentric.

There can be no denial that Jesus is speaking to His disciples on this evening. To be sure, Jesus explicit promise is that it is the disciples who will receive the Paraclete. However, this does not mean that the Paraclete is the exclusive privilege of the disciples. There are a number of reasons which mitigate against such a limitation of the Spirit's Christ-centered work, and can be organized under four general headings: the Johannine witness, the Spirit's relation to Christ, justification and sanctification.

Johannine Witness

By far the most important factor in extending the Spirit's Christocentricity is Jesus' own words at John 14:16. There He says that the Spirit will be sent "that He may be with you forever." While the "you" refers to the disciples, the forever indicates this will be a permanent arrangement. The Spirit, once "given" in His post-Pentecost fullness, will not be withdrawn. Richard C. H. Lenski writes:

Moreover, the Father's purpose in giving this other Paraclete is that "he may be with you forever," . . . In this phrase _____ denotes unlimited time and thus eternity, here with _____ eternity a parte post (from

now forward). . . The stay of Jesus was limited, not so the stay of the other Paraclete.²

Therefore, the "you" used throughout the Paraclete passages, while referring originally to the disciples, is comprehensive. The Christocentric ministry of the Paraclete spans the whole age of the Church.

Another reason for extending the Christocentricity of the Spirit's ministry derives from the perspective from which Jesus is speaking. It is the eve of His death, and He is painting with broad strokes what will be the nature of the Spirit's work. Christ wants His most intimate followers to realize that the Spirit's task is making Him the focal point in the believer's life through such activities as teaching, guiding, convicting, witnessing and so on.

But, at the same time, Jesus does not relate the practical aspects of this teaching about the Paraclete. Whether it be due to lack of time or, more probably, the disciples' inability to bear it (John 16:12), the Upper Room Discourse contains few details about the future life of the Church. Eduard Schweizer writes:

Both things must be kept in view: John's profound insight into the real nature of the Spirit, who makes the reality of God become present to us in Jesus, and the limitations of John's teaching, which has little to say about the operation of the Spirit in the mundane spheres of everyday life.³

²Richard C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1943), p. 998.

³Eduard Schweizer, The Holy Spirit, trans. Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), p. 108.

In other words, Jesus lays the necessary theological foundation for the work of the Spirit, but does not go into detail. Rather, He lists in general terms what the Spirit's work will be like after He returns to the Father. In fact, considering the emphasis in John 7:39 on Christ's glorification as the necessary cause for the Spirit's ministry, it follows that Jesus would not fully detail the Spirit's activity in the believer's life. Since, all the redemptive events of Christ's life need to occur before the believer can experience the Spirit's presence and work in a post-Pentecost manner, Jesus hesitates in giving actual details of the future work of the Spirit in the Church.

Instead, the eve of His death is a time of more general instruction. But that is exactly what is called for. The disciples need to have this background material so they can recognize that those activities which have a Christological basis and content belong to the Spirit. As for the actual activities, however, terms such as guide, teach, remind, witness, and so on, will take on detailed characteristics only as the Church lives out its existence.

Hence, the Christocentricity of the Spirit's work is not limited to the Upper Room participants. Due to the setting and circumstances, Jesus describes only in broad strokes what the nature of the Spirit's work in the future will be. This, in turn, gives the disciples the necessary criterion -- the source and content of the Paraclete's work is Christological -- by which to evaluate all claims of the

Spirit's activity in an individual believer or a church.

Thus Jesus' teaching gives to the Church the prescriptive definition of the Spirit's ministry. The Upper Room Discourse becomes the tool by which to judge all Christian experience and doctrine of the Spirit. For example, if a particular teaching leads to Christ, then it is of the Spirit. If it doesn't, then it is not of the Spirit and must be discarded. This mandates that the Spirit's Christocentric ministry extend beyond the disciples, for the standard to evaluate the Spirit's ministry is that very Christocentricity. Because Jesus is going to the Father, all believers, not just the disciples, will forever (John 14:16) need this basic, general knowledge of the Spirit to discern the Spirit within.

The Spirit's Relation to Christ

A further objection against limiting the Paraclete's ministry to the disciples is the manner in which the Spirit's presence and activity is described in the early Church. In fact, some of the most powerful testimony to the fact that the Paraclete's Christocentric activities extend beyond the time of the disciples are those passages which provide details of the Spirit's work. For, in them, what Jesus treated only in broad terms finds specific expression in actuality. Procedurally, this involves an examination of these passages in three areas: the Spirit's relationship to Christ (and therefore to believers), how the Spirit carries out His work in justification, and His role in sanctifica-

tion. The book of Acts and the Epistles will be the primary source material for this study.

For John, the Spirit's relation to Christ was of the most intimate nature. This was seen in John 7:39 where the glorification of Christ was determinative for the Spirit's ministry after Pentecost. It was also evident in the coming of the Spirit in that He was sent by Christ (John 15:26), at Christ's request (John 14:16) and in Christ's name (John 14:26). Another indication of this close relation is John's use of "Paraclete." The Spirit is another Paraclete patterned after Christ. There are other evidences, but these show that John never thought of the Spirit in isolation from Christ.

The most explicit non-Johannine reiteration of this close relationship is 2 Cor. 3:17. There Paul states that "the Lord is the Spirit" and also calls the Spirit "the Spirit of the Lord." In the latter phrase, Paul distinguishes between the two Persons of the Trinity, avoiding any ontological confusion. Yet, in the former, he equates them with an estin, indicative of an equivalence of function.⁴

Thus Paul emphasizes the same pattern of identity and distinction that was present in John. That is, from the

⁴See above, pp. 45-49. Also Yves Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, 2 vols., trans. David Smith (New York: Seabury Press, 1983), 1:39, writes about 2 Cor. 3:16-17: "This means that, from the functional point of view, the Lord and his Spirit perform the same work, but in the duality of their roles."

viewpoint of the believer's life, the Spirit and Christ are so closely associated that their names become interchangeable. To be "in Christ" is to be "in the Spirit" (Rom. 8:1; Phil. 2:1). There is a "dynamic identity" between the two so that in the Christian experience to possess the Spirit is nothing less or nothing more than to possess Jesus.⁵

Christ is the Spirit in the sense that He is present and active by the Spirit's ministry within. The Spirit is the risen Lord at work. Yves Congar gives extensive evidence of this.

It has often been stressed that very many effects have been attributed either to Christ or to the Spirit and that the formulae 'in Christ' and 'in the Spirit' are indiscriminately applied to both. It is not difficult to find a number of examples:

So that in him (Christ) we might become the righteousness of God (2 Cor 5:21)	Righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit (Rom 14:17)
Justified in Christ (Gal 2:17)	Justified in the name of the Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God (1 Cor 6:11)
Those who are in Christ Jesus . . . If Christ is in you (Rom 8:1, 10)	But you are not in the flesh, you are in the Spirit, if the Spirit of God really dwells in you (Rom 8:9)
Rejoice in the Lord (Phil 3:1)	Joy in the Holy Spirit (Rom 14:17)
The love of God in Christ Jesus (Rom 8:39)	Your love in the Spirit (Col 1:8)

⁵George Hendry, The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology, rev. and enlarged ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), pp. 24-25; William Barclay, The Promise of the Spirit (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), p. 68.

The peace of God . . . will keep your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus (Phil 4:7)	Righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit (Rom 14:17)
Sanctified in Christ Jesus (1 Cor 1:2, 30)	An offering . . . sanctified by the Holy Spirit (Rom 15:16; cf. 2 Thess 2:13)
Speaking in Christ (2 Cor 2:17)	Speaking by the Spirit (1 Cor 12:3)
Fullness of life in him (Christ) (Col 2:10)	Filled with the Spirit (Eph 5:18)
One body in Christ (Rom 12:5)--baptized into Christ (Gal 3:27)	By one Spirit we were all baptized into one body (1 Cor 12:13)
In whom (Christ) the whole structure . . . grows into a holy temple in the Lord (Eph 2:21)	Becoming a dwelling place of God ⁶ in the Spirit (Eph 2: 22) ⁶

However, there is a difference in perspective in this functional identity. For John, there is more of a temporal sequence involved. The Spirit comes after Christ's glorification and continues His ministry on earth. For Paul, the idea is more of completion. The Spirit completes Christ's work of redemption by bringing about an inner experience in the individual of what Christ has already accomplished.⁷ Again, Yves Congar gives a helpful description of Paul's perspective.

The Spirit makes it possible for us to know, recognize and experience Christ. This is not simply a doctrinal statement. It is an existential reality which comes from a gift and involves us in our lives.⁸

⁶Congar, pp. 37-38.

⁷Hendry, p. 26.

⁸Congar, p. 37.

This is not to say that the objective reality of Christ's work dissolves into mere subjectivism in Paul, for the Spirit is creating faith in that very redemptive history. But it does mean that the Spirit takes that outward fact and makes it a living reality in the hearts and lives of men. Thus the Pauline "in Christ" is made possible by and is therefore identical to being "in the Spirit."

It is important to note, however, that there is no tension between John and Paul. They are both placing the Spirit in the closest possible relation to Christ, and do so in complementary ways. George Hendry writes:

These two emphases, it is clear, are themselves complementary: the Spirit continues the presence of Christ beyond the brief span of his historical appearance and completes it by effecting its inward apprehension among men. In both emphases, however, the Spirit is present in a purely Christocentric reference. There is no reference in the New Testament to any work of the Spirit apart from Christ. The Spirit is, in an exclusive sense, the Spirit of Christ.

While 2 Cor. 3:17 is most explicit in making this intimate connection between the Son and the Spirit, there are other passages which speak of the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ. For example, Rom. 8:9 states that a necessary condition for being numbered among the sons of God is the possession of the Spirit of Christ. Five verses later, those sons of God are led by the Spirit. Considering Paul's emphasis on Christ and Him crucified (1 Cor. 1-2) as the sole source for entrance into God's family, for him to

⁹Hendry, p. 26.

declare that the indwelling of the Spirit is essential is tantamount to equating the ministry of the Spirit and that of Christ in the believer's life. Other Pauline passages include Gal. 4:6 and Phil. 1:19. In fact, W. H. Griffith Thomas, commenting on that Galatians verse, says "the language about the indwelling of Christ and of the Spirit is practically identical."¹⁰

The only conclusion possible is that the relationship between the Spirit and Christ spoken of in the Upper Room Discourse is not limited to the disciples' lives. In the life of the early Church, the Spirit was seen and experienced as the Spirit of Christ. He is not described as working independently of Christ, but only in perfect tandem with the Lord. Thus the same Christocentricity of the Spirit's relation to Christ spoken of by Jesus to the disciples in the Upper Room is a reality in the life of the Church as a whole.

Justification

Turning from the Spirit's relationship to Christ to His activity in the believer's life, it is well to remember that "the Spirit's work in the Christian is so vast and comprehensive that there can be no hope of covering every aspect."¹¹ In that light, what follows is not a comprehen-

¹⁰W. H. Griffith Thomas, The Holy Spirit of God (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1913 [1963]), p. 142.

¹¹Geoffrey Bromiley, "The Holy Spirit," Christianity Today 12 (Aug. 30, 1968):24t.

sive discussion. Rather, attention is focused on certain general themes concerning the Spirit's work in the realms of justification and sanctification. Still, the limited nature of even this endeavor must be noted. For the most part, the concern is with showing how the Spirit's Christocentric ministry in regard to justification and sanctification finds expression in the continuing life of the Church.

One of the most important passages for the Spirit's role in the justification of the sinner is 1 Cor. 12:3.

Therefore I make known to you, that no one speaking by the Spirit of God says, "Jesus is accursed"; and no one can say, "Jesus is Lord," except by the Holy Spirit.

Here Paul leaves no room for exceptions. If a person makes the basic Christian confession that Jesus is Lord, it is the result of the ministry of the Holy Spirit. He alone brings about the faith needed to make that statement. As Michael Green says, "it is due to the work of the Holy Spirit that we become Christians at all."¹²

However, for this context, the important facet is the content of that faith confession. The Spirit is not interested in effecting a confession about Himself or creating an existential faith apart from objective reality. His concern is that Jesus is confessed as Lord and Savior. In conversion, then, it is indeed the Spirit who conveys the power to repent and believe, but it is faith in Christ

¹²Michael Green, I Believe in the Holy Spirit (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), p. 74.

that He creates. He does not draw attention to Himself, or anyone else for that matter, but gives Jesus center stage and works to unite the believer with Him. J. N. Kildahl writes:

To enable a sinner to see Christ is the Holy Spirit's work. It is therefore not important for the Spirit to present or show Himself. No, there is another whom He wants to present and bring forward, and that is Christ.¹³

This means that the authentic presence of the Spirit is not marked by some special or spectacular spiritual experience, although occasionally that may be the result of the Spirit's arrival. Rather, the first and foremost criterion of the Spirit's work is the unambiguous confession concerning Jesus.¹⁴ Frederick Bruner comments about 1 Cor. 12:3:

Positively, Paul sees the characteristic, perhaps the classic work of the Holy Spirit in the intelligible and simple confession that Jesus is Lord. The man who confesses "Lord Jesus" has experienced the deep work of the Spirit. The Spirit does not exhibit himself supremely in sublimating the ego, in emptying it, removing it, overpowering it, or in ecstasy extinguishing or thrilling it, but in intelligently, intelligibly, christocentrically using it.¹⁵

Luther captured this thought as well in his explanation to the Third Article, where he teaches that belief comes not from oneself but from the Spirit, and that such

¹³J. N. Kildahl, The Spirit and Our Faith, rev. Rolf Aaseng and Grace Gabrielsen (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1937 [1960]), p. 53.

¹⁴Green, p. 116.

¹⁵Frederick Dale Bruner, A Theology of the Holy Spirit (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), p. 287.

belief is in Christ as the Spirit calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies by means of that very Gospel of Jesus Christ.¹⁶ Therefore, while the Spirit is necessary for the creation of spiritual life, the essence of that life is purely Christological. He makes the Son of God a saving reality in a person's life.

Relating I Cor. 12:3 to the Upper Room Discourse, this Spirit wrought confession of Jesus as Lord is nothing else but the practical result of the Spirit's giving glory to the Son. What John wrote at 16:14 about the Paraclete, that He would reveal and communicate Christ's redemptive work, finds expression in the early Church in these words by Paul. The Spirit wants to give glory to Christ, and effects that desire by making Jesus both a present and a saving Personality for the believer. That is, He "takes the crucified and risen Lord out of the remoteness of history and heavenly glory and places him as a living and redeeming reality in the midst of our life with its suffering, inner conflict, and death."¹⁷ That is also the way Paul sees the Spirit at work in Eph. 1:13; Rom. 8:14-17; 1 Cor. 2:2, 10; Gal.3:26-4:6; Gal. 2:20; and 2 Cor. 3:17-18.

The implication is that the Spirit makes the past events which Christ performed on earth for man's redemption

¹⁶"Small Catechism," part II, paragraph 6, Book of Concord, ed. Theodore Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p. 345.

¹⁷Regin Prenter, Spiritus Creator, trans. John Jensen (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1953), pp. 53-54.

real and present. In fact, by the power of the Spirit, the risen Christ Himself becomes a contemporary Person and power in the Christian.¹⁸ Through the Spirit's work, the believer participates in the event of revelation-redemption so that he becomes personally involved in the work and word of Christ. Thus the Spirit imparts Christ to men so that revelation and reconciliation become actualized in the lives of concrete, historical individuals.¹⁹

Again, the continuing Christological nature of the Spirit's activity comes to the fore. He is not present in such a way that He makes Himself or some "other-than-Jesus subject" the center of the Christian life. Nor is His Christ-centered ministry only for the disciples. Rather, the prescriptive testimony of St. Paul is that the Spirit places the Christian into the redemptive sphere of Christ and His work. It is the Spirit who causes each and every Christian to remember (echoes of John 14:26) the historical revelation of God in Christ.

But it is a remembering in the sense of re-presentation or re-creation. The Spirit restores the past situation involving the Incarnate Son of God to a present

¹⁸Paul Harms, Spirit of Power (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964), pp. 26-27.

¹⁹Claude Welch, "The Holy Spirit and the Trinity," Theology Today 8 (April 1951):31,32. Also, Martin Franzmann, Alive with the Spirit (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1973), p. 31, "The Holy Spirit has the power to make vividly present what is long past and to move the distant future into the realm of our present experience."

and actual experience for the Christian.²⁰ This is the Spirit's utmost concern in justification, thereby making His ministry exclusively Christocentric. When the Spirit is at work bringing a person to faith, it is faith in Christ and a faith that apprehends a present redemptive reality -- Christ Himself.

The manner in which the Spirit carries out this activity further stresses the Christocentricity of His role in justification. He does not work immediately, but has chosen to work through the means of grace, that is, the Gospel message of Christ in whatever form it takes.²¹

William Dallmann, in reference to the Holy Spirit and new birth, says that the instrument which the Spirit uses to give life is the living Word. He then goes on to say:

We are born again through the Gospel, which liveth and abideth forever. 1 Cor. 4,15; 2 Cor. 3,6; 1 Pet. 1,23; 2 Pet. 1,4; Jas. 1,18; John 6, 63.68; Eph. 1,13; 5,18. 19; Col. 3,16; Gal. 3,26.²²

On the basis of these and other Scripture references (Rom. 1:16; 2 Cor. 5:19), the Lutheran Confessions likewise speak of the Spirit working through the means of grace. This sentence from the Smalcald articles is characteristic.

²⁰Harms, pp. 36-37.

²¹The specific means of grace are the Word and Sacraments. However, the Word can take many forms, such as, written (Bible, devotional literature) or spoken (abso-
lution, sermon).

²²William Dallmann, The Holy Ghost (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1930), p. 20.

In these matters, which concern the external, spoken Word, we must hold firmly to the conviction that God gives no one His Spirit or grace except²³ through or with the external Word which comes before.

Scripture's explicit witness, then, is that the Gospel message of Christ is the one means by which the Spirit is received and operates.

This again establishes the boundaries of the Spirit's activity as that of the Person and work of Christ. It also extends those boundaries throughout the life of the Church. For Scripture will not have us look anywhere for the reception of the Spirit except to the message of the Savior. The Spirit is found in the Gospel witness of whom Christ is and what He did. Consequently, to talk of the Spirit being bound to Word and Sacraments is appropriate, but only in the sense that the Word and Sacraments embody a witness to Christ.²⁴

This corresponds well with the Spirit's work in justification. As mentioned above, the content of the Spirit-led confession is Jesus Christ and His work of atonement. In addition, the Spirit makes this Christological content a living, present reality in the person's life. A proper understanding of the means of grace encompasses that twofold activity, for there is a dual power within them.

²³"Smalcald Articles," part 8, paragraph 3, The Book of Concord, ed. Theodore Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p. 312.

²⁴Carl Michalson, "The Holy Spirit and the Church," Theology Today 8 (April 1951):46-47.

Francis Pieper explains:

According to Scripture, a twofold power inheres in these means: first, an exhibiting and conferring, or imparting, power . . . and, secondly, as a result of this, an efficacious, or operative, power . . . The conferring, or imparting, power consists in this, that these means offer men the forgiveness of sins, supplied through Christ's work of reconciliation, hence God's grace . . . The efficacious, or operative, power of the means of grace consists in this, that through them the Holy Spirit works and strengthens faith, faith in the very forgiveness, God's love and grace, which these means declare and reveal.²⁵

Thus the exhibiting power corresponds to the content of the Spirit-led confession. Through the means of grace, the Spirit works to place Christ before men's eyes. The conferring power corresponds to the Spirit's making Christ and His work present in the lives of men. Through the means of grace, the Spirit effects the faith that apprehends the life-giving presence of Christ. While the correspondence is not exact, the parallel and interdependence is striking. This makes for powerful confirmation that the Spirit's continuing ministry in the Church is entirely Christocentric.

It also has much to say about two topics related to justification -- ecumenism and evangelism. The logical conclusion from the above discussion is that the Spirit is found exclusively in Christianity. Since He is not accessible apart from Christ, to say that He is present in some other religion, for example, Islam or Hinduism, is not permitted on the basis of the New Testament witness. The

²⁵Francis Pieper, Christian Dogmatics, 3 vols., (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953), p. 103.

Spirit is the Spirit of Christ and, regardless of the overtures of contemporary ecumenism, is not at work creating and/or perpetuating some other religious system. In fact, they are at enmity with the Spirit and His work. For the Christological content and basis of His work would be absent as would the means by which He operates.

Thus when the Spirit is active among people of other faiths, it is always to effect faith in Christ, not to inspire or engender the doctrine of some non-Christian thought scheme. The Spirit always leads toward Jesus and there is no evading this scandal of particularity. Michael Green writes:

If God really has disclosed himself in a Son; and if that Son was characterised by his possession of the Holy Spirit which he has passed onto his followers, then we cannot without denying Christ maintain that God has revealed himself as much in Buddhism as in Christianity; we cannot make an amalgam of religions as if we were all honest seekers after a God who hides himself. I think it is of the utmost significance that the New Testament writers do not assign to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit the noble elements in pagan ethics or in other religions. For the task of the Holy Spirit is to bear witness to Jesus. He is the Spirit of Christ.²⁶

Yet this exclusivity should not be an excuse for the Church to become a closed circle.²⁷ Even though the Spirit is recognized in Christianity alone, this does not mean believers are to withdraw from the world in some sort of spiritual elitism. Rather, this privileged presence of

²⁶Green, p. 49.

²⁷C. F. D. Moule, The Holy Spirit (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), p. 20.

the Spirit should have an evangelistic effect. The Spirit is at work in the Church empowering the saints therein to open themselves up and display responsible concern for all, particularly for their spiritual welfare. This leads to a final topic to be discussed in connection with justification -- the Spirit's role in mission work.

That the Spirit is involved in the missionary activities of the early Church is indisputable. The Book of Acts is particularly emphatic on this point. At Acts 13:1-4 the Spirit calls certain missionaries and sends them out. Acts 16:6-7 reports that the Spirit selected the location of the work. According to Acts 8:29 the Spirit leads the missionaries to strategic converts. Satanic opposition is exposed and overruled when the Spirit empowers His workers at Acts 13:9-11. That He encouraged and sustained the missionaries is implied at Acts 13:52. In other words, the Spirit is the Executor of the Great Commission.²⁸

But the Spirit did not do this by Himself. Reflecting John 15:26-27, the Spirit accomplishes this evangelistic task through the witness of the members of the Church. Acts 1:8 is crucial here.

. . . but you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be My witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the remotest part of the earth.

That this witnessing declaration involves more

²⁸Elaboration of these points can be found in Oswald Sanders, The Holy Spirit and His Gifts (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1940), pp. 85-89.

people than just the disciples is seen at Acts 8:1 where the Apostles are specifically excluded. Further, this combined witnessing activity -- the Spirit witnessing through the Christian's witness -- has Christ as its content, for the "My" in Acts 1:8 dictates that the witness' work and message center on Christ (see also, Acts 8:4-8; 8:26-40; and 11:19-26). But it is still the power of the Spirit that enables these believers to carry the message of Christ to the unsaved. Just as the disciples had to wait for Pentecost and the arrival of the Spirit in His post-Pentecost manner before they could boldly proclaim the Good News concerning Christ (Acts 4:8, 13), so also every Christian needs that strengthening of the Spirit to witness to his Savior.

Again, the Christocentricity of this continuing activity of the Spirit is evident. The Spirit works to lead every Christian to witness to Christ. He wants the Word to get out, and therefore empowers and makes effective the evangelistic efforts of the Church. Without the Spirit, mission work would be impossible; with Him it goes to the remotest part of the earth.

Thus the Spirit's role in justification is Christological. He initiates, guides and sustains the witnessing activity which brings a person into contact with the Gospel. Then, having empowered the evangelistic proclamation of Christ, He uses the Gospel as His instrument to effect the justification of the sinner. This results in the faith confession that Jesus is Lord. In the realm of justi-

fication, then, the Spirit's ministry, reflecting the teaching of the Upper Room Discourse, is focused completely and continually on Christ.

Sanctification

Flowing out of justification is the Spirit's role in sanctification. Indeed, a basic assumption is that sanctification occurs because of Christ's work of redemption. It is a direct result of His Person and work, and a necessary consequence of faith (Eph. 2:10; John 15:2, 4-5; Heb. 11:6).²⁹ Thus justification is the basis and source for a life of sanctification if the latter is to be considered Christian.

A further assumption is that, as with justification, sanctification occurs because the Spirit works through the Gospel message to effect it. Just as justification was not an immediate action of the Spirit, neither is His work in leading an individual in the Christian life. John 17:17; 2 Tim. 3:16-17; 1 Pet. 2:2; Titus 3:5; 1 Cor. 10:16-17 all indicate that it is through the means of Word and Sacrament that the Spirit sanctifies the believer.³⁰

²⁹Otto Procksch, "ἁγιάζω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 1:112.

³⁰While these assumptions about justification and the means of grace are indeed essential elements for the Christian life, they have been discussed earlier. They will not be treated here except to say that the connection sanctification has with these assumptions already supplies the Spirit's sanctifying ministry with a decidedly Christocentric composition.

At this point, a brief study of the word hagiazō is helpful. Lorenz Wunderlich notes three basic meanings: 1. the Levitical purification fundamentally associated with ceremonial sacrifices (Heb. 9:13); 2. the separation of objects and people from profane use and their consecration to God, implying a dedication for a sanctified mission and holy purpose; 3. to make, render, or declare holy, similar in meaning to Luther's "I believe that the Holy Ghost makes me holy as His name implies."³¹ In the New Testament, it is the latter two meanings that take precedence in regards to the Christian life. The Christian is set apart for the service of Christ and the glorification of God.

The idea, however, is not one of progressive holiness or perfectionism; nor one of ritual separation. Rather, the sanctified Christian is characterized by, as C. F. D. Moule writes,

. . . intense dedication to the mercy and compassion of God which had led Jesus to touch lepers and fraternise with the more unsavory members of the community. Holiness was turned inside out: instead of meaning 'holier than thou,' it meant 'dedicated for thee'.³²

Thus sanctification is related intimately to Christ. Through the Spirit's work, Christians are set apart, dedicated to Him. But this sanctification takes place in a specific manner, which Paul summarizes at 2 Cor. 3:18.

³¹Lorenz Wunderlich, "The Holy Spirit and the Christian Life," Concordia Theological Monthly 27 (October 1956):762.

³²Moule, p. 23.

But we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory, just as from the Lord, the Spirit.

Christians are being transformed into Christ's image in the life of sanctification. Imparted to each believer is both Christ's character and attitude so that the life of the regenerate is renewed in conformity with Jesus Christ. True holiness is nothing other than Christlikeness, being changed into the image of the Savior. Martin Franzmann writes about this passage.

We are living men, alive by the Breath of God, and so are influenced by what we reflect as no mirror can be. We are constantly "being changed" into the likeness of our Lord; and such is the greatness of the Spirit's bounty, such the exuberance of His beneficial vitality, and such the limitless range of His creative power that this "being changed into His likeness" cannot ever come to rest.³³

Perhaps the best commentary on this transformation into the likeness of Christ is Paul's own words at Rom. 12:2. There he writes that such transformation consists of doing away with conformity to this world and renewing one's mind to what is good, acceptable, and perfect, that is, the will of God. Or, more concretely, the Christian is being conformed to the very image of Jesus Christ.³⁴

This means that in sanctification, there is both mortification and renewal, death and life, the killing of the old man and the arising of the new. The Christian is

³³Franzmann, p. 47.

³⁴Corresponding statements are at 1 Pet. 1:4; Gal. 4:19; Gal. 2:20.

refashioned on the basis of Christ's vicarious death and resurrection. Just as Jesus died and rose again, so also Christians are to put to death the old Adam and put on the new Man (Rom. 8:13; Gal. 5:16, 24, 25; Rom. 8:1-4).

According to 2 Cor. 3:18, this work of sanctification is accomplished by the Spirit. In fact, the whole New Testament reports that the Christian's transformation is the work of the Lord in and by and through the Holy Spirit.³⁵ He enables the believer constantly to behold the glory of the Lord so that Christ's image is imparted to him.³⁶

John Stott writes:

Once he [the Holy Spirit] has come to us and taken up residence within us, making our body his temple (I Cor. 6:19, 20), his work of sanctification begins. In brief, his ministry is both to reveal Christ to us and to form Christ in us, so that we grow steadily in our knowledge of Christ and in our likeness to Christ (see, e.g., Eph. 1:17; Gal. 4:19; 2 Cor. 3:18). It is by the power of the indwelling Spirit that the evil desires of our fallen nature are restrained and the good fruit³⁷ of Christian character is produced (Gal. 5:16-25).

The Christocentricity of this sanctifying work of the Spirit is obvious. The Spirit does not lead the Christian into a life that centers on ecstatic or exceptional

³⁵ Richard C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of I and II Corinthians (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1937), p. 951. Also, C. E. B. Cranfield, The Epistle to the Romans, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975), 1:394, "The Spirit of God -- and only the Spirit of God -- is to be the means of the destruction of the flesh and its activities."

³⁶ Philip Hughes, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), p. 120.

³⁷ John R. W. Stott, Baptism and Fullness, 2nd ed. (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1978), p. 20.

experiences of Himself, but reproduces the Servant character of Christ within the believer. He works to nail the old egotistical self to the cross of Christ. His passion for glorifying Christ leads Him to raise up in every believer a life conformed to Christ's image. Very simply, it is Christ who is the center of attention when it comes to the Spirit's role in sanctification.

That this Christocentric sanctifying mission of the Spirit includes all Christians is confirmed in the 2 Cor. 3:18 passage. There Paul says "we all" are transformed into the same image of Christ. Every believer of every age without exception is the recipient of this activity of the Spirit. Beyond the disciples in the Upper Room, the Church catholic is made holy by the Spirit's work to conform its members to Christ's image.

However, as stated above, this sanctification is not some type of perfectionism. While it is indeed true that the Spirit is at work bringing about the transformation of the believer, He still has sinful human beings as subjects. Romans 7 is explicit about human sinfulness as Paul depicts the civil war waging between his old Adam and the Spirit-led life of godliness. Galatians 5 expressed this same antithesis as a mortal struggle between the flesh and the Spirit. In view of these passages, the fullness of victory over sin is not yet.³⁸ It awaits the day of eschatological glori-

³⁸Bromiley, p. 24v.

fication.

But this does not mean that certain practical results have not already been wrought in all Christians. The Spirit overcomes the believers' sinfulness, and begins to produce certain God-pleasing virtues in the Christian's life, commonly called "the fruit of the Spirit." Gal. 5:22-23 lists these nine fruit, and they are often called the highest traits of Christian character, constituting both the purpose and effect of sanctification.³⁹ Needless to say, considering the Christocentricity of the Spirit's ministry elsewhere, the production of these fruit should display a continuing Christological nature.

That they do. This is seen in the fact that all nine were lived out to perfection by Jesus, and present a flawless portrait of the Savior. For example, consider the following description. John 3:16 and John 15:9, 13 present the love of God as embodied in Christ in its full redemptive significance, and Eph. 3:19 has Christ's love surpassing all knowledge; Heb. 1:9 has Jesus anointed with the oil of gladness above all His companions, and John 15:11 speaks of Jesus giving His joy to the disciples so that their joy may be full; John 14:27 tells of Jesus giving His peace to the disciples, a peace in Phil. 4:4-8 that guards one's heart and minds; 1 Pet. 2:23 reports of His long-suffering while

³⁹Wunderlich, p. 763. The fruit of the Spirit are love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control.

being reviled and 1 Tim. 1:16 says Jesus' patience is unlimited; Titus 3:4 and 2 Cor. 10:1 speak of the strong and helpful gentleness of Christ; Acts 10:38 implies Jesus' goodness when it mentions His doing good works in the power of the Spirit, and Jesus calls Himself the Good Shepherd in John 10; Christ's faithfulness is noted at Heb. 3:2 and 2 Thess. 5:24; Paul writes of Jesus' meekness at 1 Cor. 10:1, and Jesus' self-description at Matt. 11:29 includes meekness. Only self-control lacks an explicit reference, but that characteristic was exhibited throughout His life. This is especially true during His arrest. Rather than call down power from heaven, in perfect self-control He lets the hour of His death come. Paul's listing of this attractive Christian fruit, then, can be considered a description of Christ, for He alone displayed these qualities in perfect balance and degree.

Thus the Spirit's production of these nine fruit in the Christian is nothing other than His work of conforming the believer to Christ. When the Spirit refashions the believer into Christ's image, He does so by effecting a manifestation of these fruit. Again, the emphasis is Christological. The specific results of the Spirit's work of sanctification are dependent on Christ. The perfect embodiment of these fruit in His life determines the nature of the qualities the Spirit wants and works to be present in the Christian's life.

In summary, the Spirit's role in sanctification is

thoroughly and continually Christocentric. The following observations support that conclusion. 1. Sanctification is dependent on Christ and the redemption He worked. 2. Sanctification comes through the Gospel message. 3. Sanctification consists of dedication to Christ, involving a refashioning of the Christian's life in His image. 4. Sanctification results in fruit of which Christ is the perfect portrait. This is well stated by D. Kluepfel.

It is the work of the Spirit to form the living Christ within us. In Christ on the Cross, making an atoning sacrifice for sin, bearing the curse of the broken law in our place, we have Christ for us. But by the power of the Holy Spirit bestowed upon us by the risen Christ we have Christ in us. Herein lies the secret of a Christ-like life. . . In the Spirit-filled believer Christ will be formed by the power of the Spirit, and such believers will be found to have the mind which was also in⁴⁰ Christ Jesus and will be found walking in His steps.

Summary

The early Church knew of the Spirit only in Christological terms. That is the inevitable conclusion from an examination of the New Testament as it speaks of Him in both doctrine and experience. From His relationship to Christ to justification to sanctification, the pattern is consistent. The Spirit glorifies Christ by making Him known and communicating Him as a saving reality to people in need of forgiveness. Further, there can be no restricting this activity to any particular time span. It extends throughout the life of

⁴⁰D. Kluepfel, The Holy Spirit in the Life and Teaching of Jesus and the Early Christian Church (Columbus: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1930), p. 92.

the Church. The Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, and that is how He wishes to be known.

In fact, knowledge about the Spirit comes only indirectly as He is revealed through His witness to Christ. There is a Christological "filter" through which knowledge of Him enters our lives. James Daane concludes:

It is not given to us to know the Spirit in isolation, to know the Spirit simply as the Spirit. We can know him only indirectly, in and from our knowledge of Christ. To know Christ is to know the Spirit; to know the Spirit is to know Christ. The one does not occur without the other. Our quest to know the Spirit cannot circumvent the fact that God has given his Spirit to Christ, nor the fact that the Spirit so accepts this being-given-to-Christ that he makes Christ known but not himself.⁴¹

The Spirit is exclusively Christocentric in His activity and, as a result, that is how He is known by every generation of the Church.

⁴¹James Daane, "The Christ-centered Spirit," Christianity Today 7 (Jan. 4, 1963):4.

Excursis: Filioque

An excellent testimony to the Spirit's continuing Christocentricity is the addition of the Filioque clause to the Creed. However, the focus in this excursis is not on the controversy sparked by the addition of the phrase "and the Son" to the Creed. The double procession of the Spirit is accepted as theologically correct by this work. Rather, what the phrase stands for is germane to the discussion of the Spirit's Christocentricity. It, too, states that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ and never to be thought of in isolation from the Son.

In the early Church, the doctrine of the Spirit was not developed to the degree the doctrine of Christ had been. While the Creeds went into detail about Christ's Person and work, the Spirit, at first, received little more than the confession "and in the Holy Spirit." Although this was expanded in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed to include the procession from the Father, His inspiring the Old Testament prophets, and that he was Lord and Life-giver who was to be worshipped and glorified, the Christocentricity of His Presence and work was still absent. Unlike the witness of the New Testament, the Creed lacked any statement about the Spirit's relationship to Christ and His distinctively post-Pentecost work of glorifying Christ. In this sense the Creed was inadequate. Without some mention of this intimate relationship, a major New Testament teaching about the Spirit was missing.

In response, an addition was made to express the distinctively Christian apprehension of the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ. Thus the Filioque can be seen as attempt to protect the Church from any doctrine of the Spirit which runs counter to the New Testament witness. That this is the purpose of the clause is well stated by Claude Welch.

For the doctrine of filioque stands at the outset for precisely that which distinguishes the Christian conception of the Holy Spirit from all other notions of Spirit, viz., the assertion that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ. When the Christian speaks of the Holy Spirit, he does not refer to just any spirit or spirituality, certainly not to the spirit of man, or merely to a general immanence of God, but to a Holy Spirit consequent upon the event of objective revelation and reconciliation in Jesus Christ the Son.⁴²

Whether or not this was the best way to resolve the inadequacy of the Creed is not essential to the discussion here. The Filioque rectified a situation that needed to be addressed, and did so in a manner that at least reflected the New Testament emphasis of the close relation between the Spirit and Christ. No longer was it possible to think of the Spirit as independent of the Son, which could be implied from the single procession statement of the original draft of the Creed.⁴³ Rather, the Spirit's presence, since He proceeds from the Son, is defined as Christocentric.

⁴²Welch, p. 29.

⁴³Dietrich Ritschl, "The History of the Filioque Controversy," In Conflicts About the Holy Spirit, eds. Hans Kung and Jurgen Moltmann (New York: The Seabury Press, 1979), p. 11.

This, in turn, reemphasizes that the Spirit does not bring some new and different ministry than Christ's. He will not move beyond the circumference that Jesus Himself set. Implied in the Filioque is the fact that to have the Spirit is to have, not something other or more than Christ, but Christ Himself.

By the phrase, the Church defined its understanding of the way the Spirit is present and thereby defended Herself against interpretations and practices that deviate from this confession.⁴⁴ The result is that the Filioque is an expression of the New Testament witness concerning the Spirit, and, once again, the Christocentricity of the Spirit's presence and work is reaffirmed.

⁴⁴Ibid.

CONCLUSION

The stated purposes for this study were personal and academic in that answers were sought to two basic questions. Am I missing anything in my Christian life when it comes to the Holy Spirit? What is the work of the Holy Spirit in light of Jesus' instruction in the Upper Room Discourse?

But, in reality, they are the same question, both answered by the thesis: the work of the Holy Spirit is exclusively and continually Christocentric. Thus I am not lacking some experience of the Holy Spirit that will somehow make me a "fuller" Christian. Rather, the Holy Spirit by bringing me to the Savior has made me a "full" Christian from the very beginning. To be sure, growth in faith is to occur, but that will happen with the already present Spirit leading me closer to Christ through the Gospel, not by some later, more powerful spiritual experience. Frederick Bruner writes:

I think this means that if you and I are Christians who want to believe and obey the Jesus Christ of Scripture in the world of today, and if you and I are seriously discontented with our faith and obedience and long to be better Christians, we are not devoid of the Spirit, but we are actually filled with the Spirit. . . . simply

wanting to serve Christ well was itself the great evidence of the filling of the Spirit.¹

Therefore, my relationship with Christ is the assurance that the Spirit is present and active in my life. As William Hordern says, "If people believe in Jesus Christ, that is itself evidence that they are Spirit-filled."²

The study of Jesus' instruction in John 14-16 confirms this Christological understanding of the Spirit's ministry. It is the glorification of Jesus Christ, which includes Jesus' whole event of salvation -- particularly the cross, resurrection, and ascension, that provides the source, content, purpose, and means by which the Spirit is present and active in human life. Every aspect of the Spirit's ministry finds its basis in the redemptive work of Christ.

This Christocentricity is further demonstrated by the title "Paraclete." The Spirit is another Paraclete, who is patterned after the prior Paraclete -- Jesus Christ. This, in turn, means that the content of any and all activities of the Spirit are defined and determined by the Son of God. Whether it is His teaching, reminding, guiding, witnessing, or convicting offices, the Spirit is active glori-

¹Frederick Dale Bruner, "The Shy Member of the Trinity," in Frederick Dale Bruner and William Hordern, The Holy Spirit-Shy Member of the Trinity (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984), p. 13.

²William Hordern, "The Holy Spirit and the Theology of the Cross," in Frederick Dale Bruner and William Hordern, The Holy Spirit-Shy Member of the Trinity (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984), p. 91.

ifying Christ and no one else. All of these roles are exclusively Christocentric, for in each the Spirit as the Spirit of Truth is conveying the truth about and of Jesus. By doing so, the Spirit as the Holy Spirit sanctifies sinners. His arrival into the world is for the express purpose of making Christ known by bringing individuals into a saving relationship with the Messiah.

This Christocentric ministry continues throughout every age of the church. At no time will He deviate into some non-Christological emphasis or tangent. His ministry will always be directed to Jesus Christ, and circumscribed by the Son. Thus every doctrine, every teaching, every word spoken about the Spirit must be done so from a Christological perspective. Very simply, He is known when Christ is known. His one goal is to communicate Jesus Christ as a present Reality.

All this has far-reaching consequences for the life of the Church. Many clamor for revival, for a new reformation, a new vitality, a new something. The implication is that the Church is lifeless. If it is, then it is because Christ has been neglected, not the Spirit. It is because the proclamation of the Gospel is absent, not words about the Spirit. It is because Jesus is no longer the center of attention, not the lack of a Spirit-centeredness. Bruner writes:

I do not honestly believe that a new Spirit-centeredness is what our churches need. I do believe, however, that the Spirit's sign, desire, and work is that we be over-

come again, thrilled again, excited, impressed, and gripped again by the wonder, the majesty, the earthiness, and the relevance of Jesus and his Word to our world.³

In other words, the church will be revived when Jesus is emphasized, for then the Spirit is at work. The Church will be alive when the Gospel is proclaimed loud and clear, for then the Spirit is present in His full Pentecost power. The Church will have vitality when Jesus is the focus of attention, for then the Spirit is known in all His glory, that is, Christ's glory. Again Bruner is helpful:

We are not necessarily in the presence of the Holy Spirit when we are in the presence of a great deal of talk about the Holy Spirit. But wherever a church or a person centers thoughtfully (that is, biblically and evangelically) on honoring the person, teaching, and work of Jesus Christ, there, we may be quite sure, we are in the presence of the Holy Spirit. For the Spirit's work is the thoughtful honoring of Christ. The Holy Spirit does not center on the Holy Spirit. That is the clear teaching of Jesus in John's gospel and elsewhere.⁴

Therefore, whether it is the Church's preaching, teaching, counseling, witnessing, visiting, or whatever activity it is involved in, it is to be distinctively Christocentric. Then, and only then can the Church be certain that the Spirit is guiding its mission and ministry, for the work of the Holy Spirit is exclusively and continually Christocentric. Or, as Jesus instructs in the Upper Room Discourse, "He will glorify Me."

³Bruner, p. 16.

⁴Ibid., p. 15.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Source

The Holy Bible, New International Version. New York:
American Bible Society, 1978.

Exegetical Aids and Commentaries

Aalen, Sverre. "Glory." In The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. 3 vols. Edited by Colin Brown. 2:44-52. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.

Barrett, Charles K. The Gospel According to John, 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1978.

Behm, Johannes. "Παράκλητος." In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. 5:800-814. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.

Bertram, Georg. "ὕψος." In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. 8:606-613. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

Beyer, Herman. "ἕτερος." In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. 2:702-704. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Brown, Raymond. The Gospel According to John. The Anchor Bible, vol. 29a. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1970.

Buchsel, Friedrich. "ἄλλος." In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. 1:264-267. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "ἀλήθεια." In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. 1:230-251. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Coenen, Lothar. "Witness." In The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. 3 vols. Edited by Colin Brown. 3:1038-1047. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.

- Cranfield, C. E. B. The Epistle to the Romans. 2 Volumes. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975.
- Hendriksen, William. The Gospel of John. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978.
- Hengstenberg, Ernst. Commentary on the Gospel of John. 2 Volumes. Translated from the German. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1865; reprint ed., Minneapolis: Klock and Klock in the U. S. A., 1980.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn Clement. The Fourth Gospel. Edited by Francis Noel Davey. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1947.
- Hughes, Philip. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962.
- Kittel, Gerhard. "δοξα." In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. 2:232-255. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Lenski, Richard C. H. The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1943.
- Lenski, Richard C. H. The Interpretation of I and II Corinthians. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1937.
- Lightfoot, J. B. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. London: Macmillan, 1910.
- Metzger, Bruce M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. London: United Bible Society, 1971.
- Morris, Leon. The Gospel According to St. John. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- Moule, Charles F. D. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.
- Munzer, Karlfried. "Remain." In The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. 3 vols. Edited by Colin Brown. 3:223-226. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
- Piper, Otto. "Truth." In International Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Edited by George Buttrich. 4:716. New York: Abingdon, 1962.

- Procksch, Otto. "αγιος ^{c/}." In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. 1:88-115. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Rengstorf, Karl. "διδάσκω." In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. 2:135-148. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Sasse, Hermann. "κόσμος." In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. 3:868-898. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.
- Strathmann, H. "μαρτυς." In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. 4:474-514. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Thiselton, Anthony. "Truth." In The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. 3 vols. Edited by Colin Brown. 3:874-901. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
- Wegenast, Klaus. "Teach." In The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. 3 vols. Edited by Colin Brown. 3:759-772. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. The Gospel According to John. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.

Secondary Sources

- Barclay, William. The Promise of the Spirit. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- Book of Concord. Edited by Theodore Tappert. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959.
- Bruner, Frederick Dale. A Theology of the Holy Spirit. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.
- Bruner, Frederick, and Hordern, William. The Holy Spirit-Shy Member of the Trinity. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984.
- Congar, Yves. I Believe in the Holy Spirit. 2 vols. Translated by David Smith. New York: The Seabury Press, 1983.

- Dallmann, William. The Holy Ghost. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1930.
- Erdman, Charles. The Spirit of Christ. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1929.
- Erickson, Millard. Christian Theology. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985.
- Franzmann, Martin. Alive With the Spirit. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1973.
- Green, Michael. I Believe in the Holy Spirit. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Harms, Paul. Spirit of Power. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964.
- Harvey, Anthony. Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1976.
- Hendry, George. The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology. Revised and enlarged ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.
- Heron, Alasdair. The Holy Spirit. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.
- Hoekema, Anthony. Tongues and Spirit-Baptism. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981.
- Holwerda, David. The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1969.
- Inch, Morris. Saga Of the Spirit. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985.
- Kildahl, J. N. The Spirit and Our Faith. Revised by Rolf Aaseng and Grace Gabrielsen. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1937 [1960].
- Kluepfel, D. The Holy Spirit in the Life and Teaching of Jesus and the Early Christian Church. Columbus: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1930.
- Ladd, George Eldon. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Morris, Leon. Spirit of the Living God. Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1960.
- Moule, Charles F. D. The Holy Spirit. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

- Mueller, J. T. Christian Dogmatics. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955.
- Pache, Rene. The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit. Translated by J. D. Emerson. Chicago: Moody Press, 1954.
- Pieper, Francis. Christian Dogmatics. 3 vols. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953.
- Prenter, Reginald. Spiritus Creator. Translated by John Jensen. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1953.
- Ritschl, Dietrich. "The History of the Filioque Controversy." In Conflicts About the Holy Spirit. Edited by Hans Kung and Jurgen Moltmann. New York: The Seabury Press, 1979.
- Sanders, Oswald. The Holy Spirit and His Gifts. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1940.
- Schweizer, Eduard. The Holy Spirit. Translated by Reginald and Ilse Fuller. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.
- Stott, John. Baptism and Fullness. Revised ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1978.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. The Holy Spirit in the New Testament. London: Macmillan, 1910; reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976.
- Thomas, W. H. Griffith. The Holy Spirit of God. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1913 [1963].
- Walvoord, John. The Holy Spirit. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1954.
- Williams, John. The Holy Spirit: Lord and Life-Giver. Neptune, New Jersey: Lorizeaux Brothers, 1980.
- Wunderlich, Lorenz. The Half-Known God. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1963.

Articles

- Barrett, Charles K. "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel." Journal of Theological Studies 1 (April 1950):1-15.
- Bouman, Herbert. "The Baptism of Christ with Special Reference to the Gift of the Spirit." Concordia Theological Monthly 28 (January 1957):1-14.

- Bromiley, Geoffrey. "The Holy Spirit." Christianity Today 12 (August 30, 1968):24b-24w.
- Brown, Raymond. "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel." New Testament Studies 13 (1966-67):113-132.
- Carr, Wesley. "Towards A Contemporary Theology of the Holy Spirit." Scottish Journal of Theology 28 (December 1975): 501-516.
- Carson, D. A. "The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7-11." Journal of Biblical Literature 98 (1979):547-566.
- The Charismatic Movement and Lutheran Theology. A Report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. January, 1972.
- Daane, James. "The Christ-centered Spirit." Christianity Today 7 (January 4, 1963):4-5.
- Davies, John G. "The Concept of Holiness." The London Quarterly and Holborn Review 185 (January 1960):36-44.
- Davies, John G. "The Primary Meaning of ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ." The Journal of Theological Studies. 4 (April 1953): 35-38.
- Froelich, Karlfried. "Charismatic Manifestations and the Lutheran Incarnational Stance." In The Holy Spirit in the Life of the Church. Edited by Paul Opsahl. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1978.
- Gaffin, Richard. "The Holy Spirit." Westminster Theological Journal 43 (Fall 1980):58-78.
- Hoferkamp, Robert. "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel from the Viewpoint of Christ's Glorification." Concordia Theological Monthly 33 (September 1962):517-529.
- Hunt, W. Boyd. "John's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit." Southwestern Journal of Theology 8 (October 1965):55.
- Hunt, W. Boyd. "The Holy Spirit in the Gospels." Christianity Today 1 (April 1, 1957):3-5.
- Jackayya, B. H. " ἀλήθεια in the Johannine Corpus." Concordia Theological Monthly 41 (March 1970):171-175.
- Kuyper, Lester. "Grace and Truth." The Reformed Review 16 (September 1962):1-16.

- Lampe, G. W. H. "Spirit-Baptism or Baptism into Jesus Christ." Church Quarterly Review 156 (January-March 1955):82-87.
- Michalson, Carl. "The Holy Spirit and the Church." Theology Today 8 (April 1951):41-54.
- Morgan-Wynne, J. E. "A Note on John 14:17b." Biblische Zeitschrift 23 (1979):93-96.
- Scaer, David. "Formula of Concord, Article VI: The Third Use of the Law." Concordia Theological Quarterly 42 (April 1978):145-155.
- Schlier, Heinrich. "The Holy Spirit as interpreter according to St. John's Gospel." Communio 1 (Summer 1974):128-141.
- Snaith, Norman. "The Meaning of the 'Paraclete.'" The Expository Times 57 (October 1945):47-51.
- Tenney, Merrill. "Topics from the Gospel of John, Part III: The Meaning of 'Witness' in John." Bibliotheca Sacra 132 (July 1975):229-242.
- Welch, Claude. "The Holy Spirit and the Trinity." Theology Today 8 (April 1951):290-40.
- Wunderlich, Lorenz. "The Holy Spirit and the Christian Life." Concordia Theological Monthly 27 (October 1956):753-764.