



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2015

"He Has Given Us of His Spirit": A Search for Pneumatological Precedents to 1 John

Lauren O'connell
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

O'connell, Lauren, "'He Has Given Us of His Spirit': A Search for Pneumatological Precedents to 1 John" (2015). *Dissertations*. 1960.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1960

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 2015 Lauren O'connell

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

“HE HAS GIVEN US OF HIS SPIRIT”: A SEARCH FOR PNEUMATOLOGICAL
PRECEDENTS TO 1 JOHN

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PROGRAM IN THEOLOGY

BY

LAUREN T. O’CONNELL

CHICAGO, IL

DECEMBER 2015

Copyright by Lauren T. O'Connell, 2015
All rights reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take the opportunity here to say a heart-felt thank you to all of the institutions and individuals who have made this work possible. First and foremost, to the Graduate School and Department of Theology at Loyola University-Chicago: it has been my great pleasure and privilege to work in such a supportive and collaborative establishment over the course of my doctoral studies. I would like to extend my gratitude for the years of funding and the continuous opportunities to fulfill my passion for teaching as I worked to complete my dissertation. If not for Loyola's commitment to the financial support and professional training of its doctoral students, I could not pursue the career that I love, in the city that I love, and for that I will be forever grateful.

I would particularly like to thank Dr. Jon Nilson, a long-time family friend and the person whom I credit with introducing me to the Theology Department that I am so proud to call 'home.' There is no place I would have rather spent this time, no colleagues with whom I would have rather spent it; and it all started with a conversation with Jon. I would also like to thank the best administrator any department could ever ask for, Mrs. Catherine Wolf, whose knowledge, support, and near constant help is invaluable to all of us. To my committee members along the way, Dr. Edmondo Lupieri and Fr. Tom Tobin, your guidance and feedback on both my comprehensive exams and the present work are greatly appreciated. And especially to my director and mentor, Dr. Urban C. von Wahlde, who has made me not only a better scholar, but also a better teacher and whose enthusiasm for research and instruction is contagious. I could not have done this without

you. Your encouragement and confidence in me has meant the world to me, and it is hard to put into words how much gratitude I feel for all of your time and effort on my behalf.

Further acknowledgment must include those who have gone through this process with me. Many thanks go out to those members of my cohort who have supported me along the way. Specifically, I would like to thank Tara Flanagan, Dr. Silas Morgan, and John Crowley-Buck for their companionship and encouragement during the writing process. The importance of true friends throughout this time cannot be underestimated. Also to Dr. Teresa Calpino, who has not only been an amazing friend and confidante, but who is also my go-to for all things ‘crisis.’ Thank you for always thinking of solutions, for ensuring me it would be alright, and for helping me make it alright when it could have gone otherwise. Each of you in your own way has contributed to my success, and it has been so very, very appreciated.

And finally, I want to thank my family, who has stood by me and supported me emotionally (and sometimes financially) as I worked to fulfill this goal. To my dad, Dr. Denis O’Connell, who was my inspiration for pursuing a degree in Theology, I thank you for telling me to always question, to never just believe what they tell you. You instilled in me a love of knowledge and a desire to find truth, whatever that might mean. To my mom Christine Loveless and stepdad Dave Loveless, who always cheered me on even when they had no idea what I was talking about, I thank you for your love and support. And finally, to Jeff, my partner in crime and in life, thank you so very much for putting up with me through all of this. Your patience throughout this process has been saintly, and your gentle pushing has gotten me to the finish line. I do not think I could be more

grateful or that I could love you more. Thank you for agreeing to spend your life beside me, especially after seeing what this academic life entails.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
CHAPTER ONE: SURVEY OF SCHOLARSHIP	1
Pre-Modern Understandings of the Spirit in 1Jn	3
Early Historical-Critical Scholarship and the Theory of Gnostic-Docetic Influence	15
Rhetorical-Critical Perspectives on 1Jn	29
Internal Opposition Based on Alternative Readings of GJn	35
Conclusion to Chapter One	44
Excursus on the Sequence of Johannine Literature	44
Arguments for Post-Dating the Letter	46
Issues Presented	48
The Conundrum of the Paraclete Passages	49
Conclusion to Excursus	52
CHAPTER TWO: ABUNDANT GIFT, TOTAL TRANSFORMATION: EXPECTATIONS OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL SPIRIT OF GOD IN JEWISH PROPHETIC LITERATURE	53
The Spirit of God in the Prophets of Jewish Scripture	53
The Spirit Given at a Future Time	57
The Spirit Given in Abundance to God's People	59
The Gift of the Spirit Results in a Transformation of Reality	60
The Gift of the Eschatological Spirit of God to God's Chosen People	62
Isaiah 32:14-17	62
Isaiah 44:3-5	65
Ezekiel 39:29	67
Heb. Joel 3:1-2	70
Ezekiel 11:19-20, 36:26-27 and Jeremiah 31:33-34	72
Ezekiel 37:14	80
Conclusion	82
CHAPTER THREE: ABUNDANT GIFT, PARTIAL TRANSFORMATION: THE INTERPRETATION OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL GIFT OF GOD'S SPIRIT IN JEWISH APOCALYPTIC AND EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE	84
Methodology and Choice of Comparative Literature	85
The Spirit in the Dead Sea Scrolls	87
The Future Spirit of Holiness in the Dead Sea Scrolls	89
The Spirit of Holiness in the Present Community	92
Conclusion to the Spirit in the Dead Sea Scrolls	97
The Spirit of God in Non-Johannine New Testament Literature	99
The Spirit in the Pauline Corpus	100
The Spirit in the Undisputed Letters of Paul	102

The Spirit in the Disputed and Deutero-Pauline Letters	115
The Gift of the Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels	123
The Gift of the Spirit in Luke-Acts	124
Conclusion to the Spirit in the Non-Johannine New Testament literature	137
The Spirit in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs	139
Conclusion to the Spirit in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs	147
Conclusion to Chapter Three	147
CHAPTER FOUR: PARTIAL GIFT, PARTIAL TRANSFORMATION: THE CONCEPTION OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL GIFT OF GOD’S SPIRIT IN 1JN	150
The Spirit of God in 1Jn	150
The Spirit in 1Jn is the Eschatological Spirit of God	152
The Bestowal of the Spirit as Understood by the Author of 1Jn	157
The Transformative Effects of the Spirit as Understood by the Author of 1Jn	163
The Opponents’ Understanding of the Bestowal of the Spirit and Its Transformative Effects	176
1Jn 2:18-23	177
1Jn 4:1-6	179
1Jn 1:6-10	180
1Jn 5:6-8	182
Conclusion to Chapter Four	185
CHAPTER FIVE: EXPLANATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	188
BIBLIOGRAPHY	199
VITA	212

ABBREVIATIONS

ABC	Anchor Bible Commentary
ACCS	Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
<i>BETL</i>	<i>Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium</i>
CBSC	The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CEC	Catena in Epistolas Catholicas
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad novum testamentum
<i>DBSJ</i>	<i>Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal</i>
ECC	Eerdmans Critical Commentary Series
EKK	Evangelisch-katolischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologiae lovanieses</i>
GCS	Griechischen christlichen Schriftstelle
HBM	Hebrew Bible Monographs
IBT	Interpreting Biblical Texts
ICC	International Critical Commentary Series
IVP	InterVarsity Press
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JBPR</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical and Pneumatological Research</i>
<i>JBQ</i>	<i>Jewish Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JPS</i>	<i>Journal of Philosophy and Scripture</i>
<i>JPT</i>	<i>Journal of Pentecostal Theology</i>
JPTSupp	Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
LHB/OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LXX	The Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
NCCS	New Covenant Commentary Series
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIV	New International Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTC	New Testament in Context Commentaries

NTG	New Testament Guides
NTL	New Testament Library
NTM	New Testament Message Series
NTOA	<i>Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus</i>
NTR	New Testament Readings
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTT	New Testament Theology
PG	Patrologia graecae (Migne)
PL	Patrologia latina (Migne)
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
<i>STDJ</i>	<i>Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah</i>
SVTP	<i>Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha</i>
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament; eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich
TDOT	Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament; eds. G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren
THNTC	Two Horizons New Testament Commentary
TI	Theological Inquiries
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentary
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum, Supplements
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZEC	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary

CHAPTER ONE

SURVEY OF SCHOLARSHIP

Rarely do scholars of New Testament come across a text with such diversity in its history of interpretation as the First Epistle of John (1Jn). From its genre to its dating to the identification of its opponents,¹ scholars have long debated the most central characteristics of the document. One aspect, however, that has received relatively little attention is the systematic pneumatology of the letter.² Instead, when considering 1Jn, commentators have often noted the importance of the Christological, ethical, or soteriological concerns highlighted therein.³ The question of the pneumatology,

¹ I use ‘opponents’ as a designation for those who the author of the letter describes as having “gone out from us.” (2:19) Scholars use various terms to describe these opponents, including schismatics and secessionists. Each of these presumably refers to the same group of people.

² The debate about the genre of the text rages on. I use ‘letter’ in this context as a convenient designation, not as a statement of literary genre.

³ For various viewpoints on the central issues of the letter see F.F. Bruce, *The Epistles of John* (Old Tappan: Fleming H. Revell, 1970); I. Howard Marshall, *The Epistles of John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978); PHEME PERKINS, *The Johannine Epistles* (NTM 21; Wilmington: Michale Glazier, Inc., 1979); John Painter, “The Opponents in 1 John” *NTS* 32 (1986): 48-71; D. Moody Smith, *First, Second, and Third John* (Interpretation; Louisville: John Knox, 1990); William Loader, *The Johannine Epistles* (EC; London: Epworth Press, 1992); Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Johannine Epistles: A Commentary* (Freiburg: Herder, 1992); Gerard S. Sloyan, *Walking in the Truth: Perseverers and Deserters The First, Second, and Third Letters of John* (NTC; Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995); Georg Strecker, *The Johannine Letters* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996); R. Alan Culpepper, *The Gospel and Letters of John* (IBT; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998); Colin G. Kruse, *The Letters of John* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000); Ben Witherington III, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians Volume 1: A Social Rhetorical Commentary on Titus, 1-2 Timothy and 1-3 John* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2006); Stephen S. Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John* (WBC 51; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2007); Judith Lieu, *I, II & III John* (NTL; Louisville: John Knox, 2008). See also, Raymond E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (ABC 30; New York: Doubleday, 1982). However, Brown does mention the Spirit as being a point of contention.

especially in any systematic analysis, has largely taken a back seat.⁴ In particular, few scholars have sought to explain the origin of the concept found in the text of a partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit of God. While some acknowledge this characterization of the gift of the Spirit to the Johannine believers based on their readings of “he has given us *of his* Spirit” in 4:13,⁵ only one, to my knowledge, has attempted to find a precedent for this understanding.⁶ The impetus for such a search comes out of the seeming break that this concept makes from the concept of a full outpouring of the divine Spirit during the eschaton that is common in the prophetic literature of Jewish Scripture, an outpouring that is often observed to be the background for notions of the gift of the Spirit in New Testament writings.⁷ If it is the case that it is actually the letter’s opponents that interpret the Gospel of John (GJn) in light of this more

⁴ An exception to this is J. C. Coetzee’s 1979 article, “The Holy Spirit in 1 John” *Neotestamentica* 13: Studies in the Johannine Letters (1979): 43-67, in which he points to the previous lack of attention to the systematic pneumatology of the letter. Twenty years later, Donald W. Mills makes a similar statement in his article of the same title. Donald W. Mills, “The Holy Spirit in 1 John” *DBSJ* 4 (Fall 1999): 33-50. There are also a few treatments of the overall pneumatology of the letter that exist in monographs or collections on the topic of Biblical conceptions of the Holy Spirit. These treatments include George T. Montague, S.M., *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition* (New York: Pauline Press, 1976); John R. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); and Trevor J. Burke and Keith Warrington, eds., *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2014).

⁵ See Alfred Plummer, *The Epistles of St. John*, (CBSC; London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1890), 150; Hans-Josef Klauck, *Der Erste Johannesbrief*, (EKK 23.1; Zurich: Benzger, 1991), 256; Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John, Volume 3*, (ECC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 161-162. Cf. Levison, *Filled*, 413, who translates similarly “given us *from* his Spirit.”

⁶ While Levison does attempt an explanation for the partial bestowal of the Spirit that fits into his understanding of the overall pneumatology of the letter, his explanation is one that I reject. He proposes that the partitive genitive in 1Jn 4:13 has its roots in the text of Numbers 25, an argument that I refute in the final chapters of this dissertation. Levison, *Filled*, 413-415.

⁷ Most commonly, scholars point to notions of the outpouring of the Spirit in The Books of Ezekiel, Isaiah, and sometimes Joel. For these prophetic texts as background to 1Jn see Marshall, *Epistles*, 50, 180-184; Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 175, 258-260; Brown, *Epistles*, 349; Loader, *Epistles*, 30; Smalley, *1 John*, 165; Culpepper, *Letters*, 48, 53; and Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Johannine Commandments: 1 John and the Struggle for the Johannine Tradition*, (TI; New York: Paulist Press, 1990), 122-125 and 3:365. Cf. Ruth Edwards, *The Johannine Epistles*, (NTG; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1996), 76.

typical prophetic background,⁸ then the question at hand is why believers would break from this thoroughly Jewish reading. In short, the question becomes: is there a precedent for understanding the gift of the eschatological Spirit as being given in only a partial way or is this conception unique to 1Jn? As I will show by a survey of the history of scholarship, the background for such a concept has yet to be thoroughly explored.

The goal of this chapter is to situate my own understanding of the conception of the Spirit in 1Jn within previous scholarship on the divine Spirit in 1Jn and to show the lack of attention to the systematic pneumatology, generally, and to, more particularly, the establishment of a background for the partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit. This survey begins with an overview of the earliest citations and commentaries on 1Jn from the fathers of the Church and goes up through current assessments of the pneumatology of the letter. It takes into account the various interpretations of the Spirit passages of the text, represented here by 2:20, 27; 3:9, 24; 4:1-6, 13; and 5:6-8,⁹ and seeks to show the pneumatological positions of scholars throughout the centuries.

Pre-Modern Understandings of the Spirit in 1Jn

While it is perhaps anachronistic to speak of the pneumatology of the individual fathers of the Church, the information that modern scholars can glean from their understandings of the New Testament texts can often be invaluable. Given their

⁸ Evidence for this reading will be explained in Chapter Four. For a discussion of this possibility see von Wahlde, *Commandments*, 114-115.

⁹ Because very few scholars spell out a pneumatology of the text systematically, it becomes necessary to gain an understanding of their pneumatological positions based on their treatments of individual passages. At times their comments revolve around an overall assessment of the Spirit's main function in the letter, but rarely do scholars treat all the Spirit passages side by side or offer a view of the systematic pneumatology of the letter. Exceptions can be found in Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 191-195; Kruse, *Letters*, 152-155; and von Wahlde, 3:365, as well as in Coetzee, "Holy Spirit," Mills, "Holy Spirit"; Montague, *Holy Spirit*, 333-338; Levison, *Filled*, 407-421; and Burke and Warrington, eds., *Theology*, 250-256.

proximity in history and culture to the New Testament writers, these early commentators (although certainly influenced by their own particular contexts) offer insights that sometimes escape the modern exegete. The earliest quotations of 1Jn come from second century Church fathers like Polycarp of Smyrna,¹⁰ Irenaeus of Lyons,¹¹ Tertullian,¹² and Clement of Alexandria.¹³ While each makes use of quotations from the letter in an attempt to either oppose what they deem to be unorthodox notions or to uphold Christian values with respect to the mainstream Church, none makes direct comment on the notion of the Spirit therein.¹⁴

Apart from mere quotation, a variety of partial or full commentaries on 1Jn and the other Catholic Epistles have been passed down from the pre-modern era. Given the manner by which many of these comments have been collected and transmitted, however,

¹⁰ Polycarp of Smyrna, *The Letter to the Philippians*, VII.i. Both a Greek text and English translation can be found in Michael W. Holmes, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999), 212-215.

¹¹ Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, 3.16. 5, 8. The Latin text can be found in W. Wigan Harvey, STB, ed., *Libros quinque Adversus Haereses Vol. 2* (Cambridge: Typis Academicis, 1857), 86-87 and 89-90.

¹² Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean*, XXVIII. The Latin text can be found in Ernest Evans, ed., *Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Adversus Praxean Liber* (London: SPCK, 1948), 125-126.

¹³ Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, III.11 and *Stromata*, IV.16. See Otto Stahlin, ed., *Clemens Alexandrinus I: Protrepticus und Paedagogus* (GCS; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1905), 94-95 and *Clemens Alexandrinus II: Stromata Buch I-VI* (GCS; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), 292.

¹⁴ Polycarp is the first to seem aware of 1Jn 4:3 in his opposition of the Docetae. Irenaeus and Tertullian both continue use of 1Jn's content in their own defenses against those beliefs they deem unorthodox. Irenaeus uses 2:18-22, 4:1-4, and 5:1 in an attempt to combat notions that some separation existed between the human person Jesus and the divine person of Christ and to confirm that the apostle John predicted the 'antichrists' who would make such claims. Tertullian likewise uses 2:22 and 5:1 in combination with 1:3 to rebut the claim of Praxeas that Christ and God the Father are one in the same. Clement, however, uses 5:3 in an attempt to clarify understandings of Christian love in *Paedagogus* (love, according to Clement, means to follow God's commandments, not to "stroke each other on the mouth") and again uses 3:18-19 and 5:3 in his praise of the love the martyrs have shown in *Stromata*.

it is difficult to ascribe dates or authors to some of them.¹⁵ While there exist quite a few of these kinds of commentaries,¹⁶ the earliest fragmentary analysis of 1Jn is ascribed to Clement of Alexandria in the second century, although the text is extant only in the sixth century Latin translation of Cassiodorus.¹⁷ While there still exist comments on many of the verses, others, it would seem, have been abridged or deleted by the translator.

Clement seems to understand the letter for the most part in an allegorical way. For instance, the world for Clement does not refer in the letter to the created world, but rather to the lust and ambition that this world embodies.¹⁸ The opponents of the letter are not, for Clement, members of a specific group historically opposed to the author of 1Jn, but rather those in his own time who live their lives in pursuit of worldly pleasures, thus denying the truth that comes from God and faith in Jesus Christ.¹⁹ On the whole, Clement comments very little on the conception of the Spirit in the letter and in no way can be described as espousing a systematic pneumatology. In fact, there are only three very brief

¹⁵ While some commentaries on the letter have been assembled (more or less) in full in critical editions such as PL and PG, others are collected in catenae like CEC and exist in a more fragmented way. Because the extant copies of these texts often have not come down to us in their original languages nor from their original authors, it is sometimes difficult to be sure whose comment, and thus from what exact time period, we are reading.

¹⁶ Among these fragmented or full commentaries are works ascribed to Clement of Alexandria (150-215), Didymus the Blind (313-398), Augustine (354-430), Hilary of Arles (401-449), Severus of Antioch (465-538), Bede the Venerable (672-735), Oecumenius Bishop of Tricca (10th-11th c.), and Theophylact of Ohrid (1050/60-1126). Some of these texts, particularly those of Didymus and Oecumenius, are highly disputed in their authorship. I will not address all of these commentaries separately, but will highlight those parts of their commentaries that shed special light on the Spirit passages of the letter.

¹⁷ These fragments are preserved in the third chapter of the Latin translation of Cassiodorus entitled, *Adumbrationes Clementis Alexandrini in epistolas canonicas*. The Latin text of Cassiodorus can be found in Otto Stahlin and L. Fruchtel eds., *Clemens Alexandrinus III* (GCS 3; Berlin: Akademik-Verlag, 1970), 203-215.

¹⁸ Clement of Alexandria, *Adumbrationes*, III.ii.16 (GCS 3:213).

¹⁹ *Ibid*, III.iii.1 (GCS 3:214).

references to the Spirit in Clement's commentary. He comments on 3:24, "In this we know that he abides in us, from the Spirit which he gave us," simply by saying "that is, certainty from direction and foresight of the future (future things)," relating the text to some foreknowledge of his current situation.²⁰ His reference to the Spirit as one of three witnesses in 5:8 is also brief. After likening the Spirit to life, water to regeneration and faith, and blood to knowledge, Clement writes, "in the Savior, of course, are these healing strengths, and life itself exists in the Son."²¹ Finally, in the last existing verse of the commentary, Clement equates the Holy Spirit with understanding, but does not elaborate further.²² As is obvious from these very brief references, Clement does not set out to explain the letter's overall notion regarding the divine Spirit, but rather seems to concern himself with those verses that might be pertinent to his own time.²³ This is a common exegetical strategy in such pre-modern commentaries and is also seen in the much more developed commentary of Augustine of Hippo.

The first fully extant commentary on the text is Augustine's *Homilies on the Epistle of John to the Parthians* in the fifth century.²⁴ As most pre-modern Scripture commentaries, Augustine interprets 1Jn in his *Homilies* by appealing to other New

²⁰ Ibid, III.xxiv.24 (GCS 3:214). The Latin text reads: *In hoc cognoscimus, quia manet in nobis, de spiritu quem dedit nobis...secundum episcopatum scilicet et providentiam futurorum*. All English translations are my own.

²¹ Ibid, III.v.8 (GCS 3:214). The Latin text reads: *in salvatore quipped istae sunt virtutes salutiferae et vita ipsa in ipso filio eius exsistit*.

²² Ibid, III.v.20 (GCS 3:214).

²³ Of course, it is impossible to say exactly what Clement's full commentary may have said regarding the Spirit, given the fragmentary nature of the extant Latin translation.

²⁴ There is, as stated previously, a fragmented commentary on the Catholic Epistles purportedly written by Didymus the Blind in the 4th century. Its authenticity, though, is questionable.

Testament documents. In particular, he reads the passages about the Spirit with an eye towards Pauline literature.²⁵ Furthermore, Augustine reads the text in reference to his own situation without much consideration for its historical context.²⁶ Therefore, the opposing views railed against in the letter were understood to be a defense against dissenting Christological claims that Augustine himself faced. Because of presuppositions about the eternal truth claims embodied in Scripture, the historical situation behind 1Jn was not considered by the majority of pre-modern commentators to be the most relevant point of interpretation, but the issues reflected in the letter were read as anticipated and ongoing.²⁷ Any interpretation of the pneumatological aspects of the letter, therefore, was also done through this lens.

While the extant fragments of Clement's work have little to say concerning the passages about the divine Spirit, Augustine's homilies elaborate a bit further on the conception of the Spirit in 1Jn. Specific examples include his comments on 2:20, "And you have an unction from the holy one, so that you may be disclosed to your own selves."²⁸ For Augustine, this unction in a physical sense refers to baptism but in the

²⁵ For instance, Augustine reads 1Jn 3:24 and 4:13 with reference to Rom. 5:5 in *Ten Homilies on the First Epistle of John* VI.8-10 and VIII.12 (PL 35:2024-26, 2043). This practice of interpreting the Spirit passages of 1Jn alongside Pauline texts, while it has decreased in popularity somewhat, can still be found in a number of modern commentaries. Cf. Bruce, *Epistles*, 76; Marshall, *Epistles*, 153, 202; Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 191; Smalley, *Epistles*, 100, 200; Loader, *Epistles*, xxiv, 38, 47; Sloyan, *Truth*, 28; Kruse, *Letters*, 103; and Smith, *1 John*, 95, 105. See also, John Painter, *1, 2, and 3 John* (ed. Daniel J. Harrington, S.J.; Sacra Pagina 18; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2002), 252.

²⁶ Augustine, *Homilies*, III. 7 (PL 35:2001). Being that Augustine writes *homilies* on 1Jn, such an approach makes sense. His purpose is not to draw conclusions about the historical situation of the letter community, but rather to instruct his audience on how the words of the letter might be applicable to their own lives.

²⁷ For an overview of this kind of assessment of 1Jn by the Church Fathers, see Gerald L. Bray ed., *James, 1-2 Peter, 1-3 John, Jude* (ACCS New Testament 11; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000), xxii.

²⁸ Augustine, *Homilies*, III.5. The Latin text reads, Et vos unctionem habetis a sancto, ut ipsi vobis manifesti sitis, and can be found in PL 35:2000. It seems noteworthy that Augustine's Latin is not an exact

spiritual sense refers to the Holy Spirit itself.²⁹ Through baptism, the Holy Spirit is received and enables those who receive it to know their opponents, even when those opponents are still within their midst. Augustine seeks through comment on this verse to instruct true believers (those who confess Christ in their deeds, not just in their words) as to how they might identify imposters who confess Christ in word alone. Having possession of the divine Spirit aids the believer in identifying right from wrong and provides that they no longer have need of teaching.³⁰ Commenting further on 2:27, Augustine explains this notion vis-à-vis the fact that he is currently, through the present homily, teaching. Only those who have the unction of the Holy Spirit within them will be capable of understanding this teaching, because true teaching comes not from any outside entity, but from the teacher within (the Holy Spirit). Those who do not have the Spirit, conversely, are unable to hear or understand any outside teaching, because they do not have the true teacher within.³¹ He supports this reading by referencing Mt. 23:8-9 and 1 Cor 3:6-7.³² Although his reading is specific to the situation he observes among Christians of his own time, with respect to the transformative effect of the Spirit on the

translation of the New Testament Greek, καὶ ὑμεῖς χρίσμα ἔχετε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου, καὶ οἴδατε πάντα. The second part of this Greek verse has a long history of puzzling interpreters; see Smalley, *1 John*, 99-102. Perhaps this is the reason for Augustine's variation.

²⁹ Augustine, *Homilies*, III.5 (PL 35:2000).

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ In an attempt to explain the dispensation of the need for teaching in light of the letter's clear purpose as an edifying document for believers, many modern scholars will take a similar approach to the issue. See Marshall, *Epistles*, 163 and Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 161.

³² Augustine, *Homilies* III.13 (PL 35:2004-2005).

knowledge of the believer, modern commentators often agree with Augustine's interpretation.³³

Another example of Augustine's comments concerning the Spirit in 1Jn is his interpretation of 3:24. This is the first verse in the letter to mention explicitly the Spirit, although Augustine understands the unction in 2:20 and 2:27 as metaphorically referring to it.³⁴ He here reads the Spirit as being manifest through brotherly love, explaining that the verse can be understood in light of Rom. 5:5: "The love of God is poured out into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us."³⁵ It is in this same way that he explains the very similar verse, "he has given us of his Spirit," in 1Jn 4:13. Accordingly, the Holy Spirit that has been given to believers enables them to follow the commandment of love that is so important to the Johannine tradition, and it is in this way that Christians in Augustine's own time can know that the Spirit of God is within them.³⁶ He goes on to explain that unlike in the apostolic era when the Holy Spirit manifested through

³³ See Marshall, *Epistles*, 156; Strecker, *Letters*, 129; Smith, *I John*, 72; and Kruse, *Letters*, 128. Cf. Wilhelm Thüsing, *The Three Epistles of John* (trans. David Smith; New York: Herder, 1971), 72 and Robert Kysar, *I, II, III John*, (ACNT; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986), 61, 65.

³⁴ This reading has a long following of scholarly support. See B. F. Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John* (Cambridge: MacMillan, 1892), 74; Robert Law, *The Tests of Life: A Study of the First Epistle of John*, (Thornapple Commentaries; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968), 114-115; A. E. Brooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*, (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912), 63; Plummer, *Epistles*, 116; Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 151-154; Brown, *Epistles*, 346; Strecker, *Letters*, 64-65; Kruse, *Letters*, 103; Culpepper, *Letters*, 47; Edwards, *Epistles*, 75; Witherington, *Letters*, 490; Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 172; von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John Vol. 1*, (ECC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 88, among others. Perhaps the most plausible and accepted opposing views come from Dodd, who understands the *χρῖσμα* as referring to the Word of God, in C. H. Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles* (New York: Harper, 1946), 58-64. For a view that combines these two readings, see I. de la Potterie "Anointing of the Christian Faith," in *The Christian Lives by the Spirit* (eds. I. de la Potterie and Stanislaw Lyonnet; New York: Alba House, 1971), 114-115.

³⁵ The translation of the Greek, ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν, is my own.

³⁶ Augustine, *Homilies* VI.9 (PL 35:2025).

glossolalia, in his own time showing charity and love for one another is the earmark of possession of the Spirit.³⁷

Similarly, Augustine reads 4:1-6 on the testing of the spirits by referring to other texts. In particular, he understands the false spirits as the strange waters of which he says, “Solomon spoke.”³⁸ While there is no clear Biblical parallel, Augustine’s point about the Spirit is evident. He warns against understanding these false spirits as only those who do not confess that Jesus came in the flesh.³⁹ As he states in his third homily, it is important to assess the deeds of a person who claims to be Christian and not just the words that he proclaims. He supports this notion by referencing Titus 1:16, “They claim to know God, but they deny him through their deeds.”⁴⁰ He further reasons that Christ’s purpose for coming in the flesh can be traced back to the virtue of charity, as he came to lay down his life for the love of his friends. As with his exegesis of 3:24, “And in this we know that he remains in us, from the Spirit that he gave us,” not only possession of the Spirit but the proper *kind* of Spirit can be seen only through outward displays of loving deeds.⁴¹

Augustine explains,

Therefore, it is the Spirit of God that affirms that Jesus has come in the flesh: which affirms it not with the tongue, but with the deed; which affirms it not by making noise, but by loving. Moreover, one is not a Spirit of God if he denies that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh. The Spirit itself also denies it: not in speech,

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid, VI.11 (PL 35:2026).

³⁹ Modern commentators will conversely cling to this confession as the center of the conflict presented in the letter, especially those scholars that see the influence of Docetism as the reason for the split. Cf. Marshall, *Epistles*, 52; Strecker, *Letters*, 15; Bruce, *Epistles*, 71; Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 17-24; Brown, *Epistles*, 72; and Smalley (as one of multiple opposing groups), *1 John*, xxi.

⁴⁰ Augustine, *Homilies* VI.13 (PL 35:2027).

⁴¹ Augustine, *Homilies* (PL 35:2028).

but in life; not with words, but with deeds. Therefore it is clear how we know our brothers. Many inside are as though they are inside; but none is outside, if he is not in fact outside.⁴²

It can be concluded, therefore, that Augustine understands the divine Spirit in the letter to provide believers with the ability to live charitably and love one another and that displays of this kind are the way that Christians of his own time could assess those around them. The Spirit is not looked upon by Augustine as an eschatological Spirit per se, but rather as the gift of love that each Christian received at baptism.

In the century following Augustine's *Homilies*, Severus of Antioch produced his own commentary on the Catholic Epistles, much of which is transmitted in the Greek Catena to the Catholic Epistles.⁴³ While not all of the Spirit passages are addressed by the collected comments of Severus, his contributions regarding 2:20 and 3:9 prove insightful. When commenting on the anointing of 2:20, Severus makes a distinction between all those who have received this anointing in the past (like prophets and holy men) and the present (like later believers) and the anointing of the object of that belief, Christ, who is "the *only true* anointed one."⁴⁴ He writes that in baptism believers are symbolically anointed and that they thereby receive the inheritance of the Holy Spirit along with

⁴² Ibid. The Latin reads, "Ergo ipse est Spiritus Dei, qui dicit Iesum in carne venisse: qui dicit non lingua, sed factis; qui dicit non sonando, sed amando. Ille autem non est spiritus Dei, qui negat Iesum Christum in carne venisse: negat et ipse non lingua, sed vita; non verbis, sed factis. Manifestum est ergo unde cognoscamus fratres. Multi intus, quasi intus sunt; nemo autem foris, nisi vere foris." The English translation above is my own.

⁴³ See Karl Staab, "Die griechischen Katenenkommentare zu den katholischen Briefen," *Biblica* 5 no. 3-4 (1924): 296-353.

⁴⁴ Severus of Antioch, CEC 119. The Greek reads: χριστοί εισιν, οὐχ οἱ προφηῖται μόνον, καὶ ἅγιοι κατ' ἐκείνους καὶ πρὸ ἐκείνων ἄνδρες, ἀλλ' ἐξαίρετως καὶ πάντες οἱ εἰς τὸν μέγαν καὶ μόνον καὶ ἀληθῆ Χριστὸν καὶ Σωτῆρα Θεὸν πιστεύσαντες ὕστερον, καὶ νῦν ἔτι πιστεύοντες·

Christ.⁴⁵ While this interpretation of the anointing does not necessarily show a difference in the amount of Spirit received by believers versus that of Christ, Severus does seem to emphasize the uniqueness of Jesus in this anointing, a distinction that is helpful in understanding the partial bestowal of the Spirit in 1Jn.

Severus also attempts to explain the often puzzled over connection in 3:9 between the seed of God and the inability to sin.⁴⁶ He equates God's seed with the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, which begins in believers once they are born again and of God.⁴⁷ Those believers who are born of God, insofar as they retain the grace of this new birth, which has been effected by the Holy Spirit, cannot sin.⁴⁸ Severus seems here to be highlighting the transformative effects of the Spirit on the behavior of believers. While he does not understand the verse as denying the natural existence of sin in the lives of believers, he sees the gift of the Holy Spirit as the guiding force that, when followed, allows believers to turn away from sin.

While Severus' fragmentary comments are certainly insightful, we do not have extant versions of any full commentaries on 1Jn from earlier than the Middle Ages, as part of Bede the Venerable's *Commentary on the Seven Catholic Epistles*. Much like

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ As the variety of explanations of this verse by modern commentators shows, understanding the statement, "Those who have been born of God do not sin, because God's seed abides in them; they cannot sin, because they have been born of God" in 3:9 in light of the seemingly opposite statement in 1:8, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," has led to a great deal of difficulty. For an overview of various modern explanations, see Smalley, *1 John*, 162-166.

⁴⁷ Severus of Antioch, CEC 119.

⁴⁸ Severus of Antioch, CEC 124. In the commentary attributed to Didymus the Blind, the explanation of 3:9 is similar. For the author of the Didymus commentary, the seed of God only provides the *ability* to refrain from sin. Any actual avoidance of sin is entirely dependent upon the power of God and spirit of adoption that believers receive from God. See PG 39:1791.

Augustine, Bede reads the letter as applicable to dissenting views in his own time, with little interest in speculating about the historical situation of its author and addressees. For Bede, the antichrists are “those who confess catholic faith but destroy it by their perverse deeds” or “those opposed to Christ.”⁴⁹ The denial of Christ for Bede, as for other pre-modern commentators,⁵⁰ occurs not only when there is an actual denial of this confession of faith, but also when there is a metaphorical denial of this confession, represented by improper behavior and a lack of brotherly love.⁵¹

When addressing the issue of the divine Spirit in the letter, he often appeals to the words of Augustine’s *Homilies*, agreeing, for instance, that $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ in 2:20 is a reference to the Holy Spirit itself and that those who do not receive it are deprived of the “gifts of the Spirit.”⁵² Likewise, he reads 2:27 in combination with Rom. 5:5 and 1Thes. 5:19 and sees the discontinuation of the need for teaching as a result of the “grace of God” that the Spirit brings and that “so quickly excites the heart, which he fills towards observing God’s commands.”⁵³ It would seem that he too acknowledges the transformative effect of the Spirit on the hearts of believers in inciting them to obedience to God. Bede also cites 1Cor. 3:6 to explain the continued benefit of outside teaching, even once the Christian is

⁴⁹ Venerable Bede, *In Prima Epistolam S. Joannis* (PL 93:94). The Latin reads: illi qui fidem catholicam quam confitentur perversis actibus destruunt... Christo contrarii iure vocantur.

⁵⁰ In the commentary attributed to Didymus the Blind, false prophets are not only those that deny Jesus through what they profess to believe, but also those who profess proper belief while not acting justly in their deeds, PG 39:1795. In the Greek Catena a similar sentiment is attributed to Andreas, where the denial of Christ coming in the flesh refers not only to the denial of the actual, bodily coming of Jesus, but also to the denial that Christ dwells in the flesh of the believer of his own day, CEC 130.

⁵¹ Venerable Bede, *In Prima Epistolam S. Joannis* (PL 93:106-107).

⁵² Ibid (PL 93:95).

⁵³ Ibid (PL 93:96). The Latin reads: citissime ad observanda Dei mandata cor quod implet inflammat.

anointed with the Spirit.⁵⁴ As in Augustine, Bede distinguishes the demonstration of the Spirit in the Christian of his time referred to in 3:24 from those apostolic Christians speaking in tongues and points instead to acts of charity as the earmark of (proper) possession of the Spirit.⁵⁵

Bede also attempts to shed light on the difficult passages concerning the three witnesses in 5:6-8. He explains that the coming of Christ must be in both water, which cleanses of sin, and blood, which redeems believers through Christ's suffering.⁵⁶ He goes on to explain that it is through Christ's own sinlessness that he is able to remove sin from the believer and that this truth is witnessed to by the Spirit, the water, and the blood.⁵⁷ The Spirit, he contends, witnesses to Jesus at his baptism, and the water and blood that spill from his side witness to him at his crucifixion, none of which would be possible if he had not come in the flesh.⁵⁸ He then connects these three witnesses to believers, explaining that the Spirit makes them children of God through adoption, the water cleanses them, and the blood redeems them; this occurs mystically through union with Christ and visibly through the sacraments.⁵⁹

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid (PL 93:105-106, 110).

⁵⁶ Ibid (PL 93:114).

⁵⁷ Ibid. An analogous interpretation can also be found in the commentary attributed to Oecumenius, in which the believer is understood to be made a child of God through Jesus who came in water and blood: the water of baptism and the blood of the crucifixion. See PG 119:677.

⁵⁸ Ibid (PL 93:114-115).

⁵⁹ Ibid. Interestingly, Bede seems to incorporate in this one interpretation a number of the most popular interpretations of 5:8 by modern commentators. See Chapter Four, note 99.

As might be evident from the high degree of dependence during this time period, traditional readings of 1Jn beginning with the early Church fathers continued up until the modern era of commentary. Given the concern of their authors, these commentaries largely focused on how the text could and should be applied to the time period in which they were written.⁶⁰ As a result, there is little said about the *system* of pneumatology espoused by the author of the letter. However, this does not mean that they do not impart important insights or espouse similar interpretations to the modern exegete. In particular, they broaden the understanding of what it means to deny Christ come in the flesh (namely, that this is not necessarily confined to a literal denial of Christ's humanity), provide interpretations of difficult passages like 3:9 and 5:6-8, and emphasize distinctions between the anointing and sonship of Jesus and those of believers.

Early Historical-Critical Scholarship and the Theory of Gnostic-Docetic Influence

It was not until the turn of the twentieth-century that more modern waves of interpretation flooded Johannine studies. In the modern era, assessments of the letter began to focus more on filling out the historical situation of the letter's composition. These commentators took great pains in explicating the language of the text and with cross-referencing passages with similar verses found elsewhere in the New Testament. It is also at this time that scholars began to acknowledge a sense of polemic in the letter and to attribute that polemic to rival groups contemporary to the letter's composition.⁶¹ Few,

⁶⁰ The commentary attributed to Oecumenius is a possible exception. While there are certainly places throughout the text that apply the words of the letter to the commentator's own time, he also takes care to attempt to explain what 'John' means to say to his own readers. See PG 119:644 as an example of this contextual interpretation.

⁶¹ The majority of modern commentators note some degree of polemic in the letter, most making an attempt to reconstruct the nature of the opposition. Exceptions to this include those rhetorical critics who are more

however, focus on the issues of the pneumatology of the letter and its integral role in the crisis faced by the author.

As reconstructing the historical situation of the crisis became more popular as a means of interpreting the letter, it became evident that the variations in scholars' conclusions about the nature of that crisis and the identity of the opponents of the letter affected their interpretations of individual verses. The Spirit passages of the letter were, of course, not immune to this phenomenon. While a few scholars from the early days of historical criticism acknowledge the partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit to believers,⁶² most focus rather on the Spirit in its capacity as witness and read the passages in parallel with the Paraclete passages of GJn or pneumatological passages found in the Pauline corpus.⁶³ The emphasis on the Spirit as witness is certainly warranted given the statement in 5:6, "and the Spirit is the witness, because the Spirit is the truth," but it may also be a function of the scholars' interpretive lens. Because a popular view at this time was that there existed a strong polemic in the letter that was aimed against groups of believers influenced by Gnostic ideas and the alternative Christologies stemming from them, the role of the Spirit in combatting such heresy moved to the fore. As a result, systematic pneumatologies of the letter itself during this period were often incredibly brief (or nonexistent), and there was little attempt to explain a possible background for

reserved in making conclusions about the opponents based upon the rhetoric of the letter writer and the purpose of that rhetoric. See Perkins, *Epistles*; Lieu, *1 John*; Edwards, *Epistles*; and Witherington, *Letters*.

⁶² Plummer, for instance, is one of the first to note the contrast between the way in which the community receives the Spirit and the way in which Jesus receives it in the Johannine writings. Plummer, *Epistles*, 105.

⁶³ This is true of Law, *Tests*; Brooke, *Critical*; and Westcott, *Epistles*. Very often, the Spirit passages are interpreted as being similar or the same as GJn 14:17, 15:26, and 16:13 or 2 Cor. 1:22, 5:5; Eph. 1:14; and Heb. 6:4. This kind of approach follows closely some pre-modern interpretations of the letter.

the type of Spirit bestowal found in the letter beyond likening it to GJn or the Pauline corpus. The focus was rather on the Christological viewpoint that the Spirit aids the believer in understanding.

Beginning with the 1883 commentary of Brooke F. Westcott, the question of the crisis started to unveil itself.⁶⁴ Although the polemic is understood by Westcott to be general and not the main purpose of the letter, he does note two major offenses addressed by the letter: the denial of the incarnation and, as a consequence of that denial, a failure to adequately love.⁶⁵ For Westcott, it is clear that the opponents of the letter community, whoever they might be, espouse flawed Christological views and that therein lay the points of contention with the group. He does not spell out any systematic understanding of the pneumatology of the letter, but rather treats the Spirit passages in relation to his Christological and ethical concerns.

The affect that this reading has on his assessment of the Spirit passages in the letter can be seen in his comments on 2:20 and 2:27. While he agrees with earlier comments on the unction as the physical representation of the gift of the Holy Spirit to baptized Christians⁶⁶ and likens the knowledge provided by it to the knowledge given in the last days described by the Jewish Prophetic Literature, he takes the statement about no longer needing anyone to teach them as specifically concerning the attempts by the antichrists to spread false doctrine about Jesus.⁶⁷ Specifically, they no longer need anyone

⁶⁴ Westcott, *Epistles*, xxxix.

⁶⁵ Ibid, 143. The notion that one of the main concerns of the letter is the opponents' inability to properly love is also found in Augustine.

⁶⁶ Ibid, 74.

⁶⁷ Ibid, 79.

to teach them anything about the incarnated Christ. Westcott also identifies the Spirit with the Spirit of Truth and Paraclete in GJn, noting that there, too, it is the instrument of internal guidance that makes “the meaning of the Incarnation fully known.”⁶⁸

Furthermore, because Westcott understands a major flaw of the opponents to be a failure to love adequately, he reads the antecedent of “in this we know” in 3:24 as referring to the love that Christians feel propelling them towards right actions.⁶⁹ It is therefore the gift of the Spirit that results in the ability to feel this love. Incidentally, Westcott also notes the surprising lack of the epithet ‘Holy’ in describing the Spirit throughout the letter.⁷⁰

Breaking from pre-modern comment on 4:1-6, Westcott understands the mark of the antichrist not in some metaphorical sense of denying Christ through disobedient actions, but in the literal sense of denying what is confessed in the Incarnation.⁷¹ Such a claim is in keeping with his concern for historical exposition of the author’s situation, and in doing so he reads this passage quite literally. The test for the proper spirit is not, therefore, some litmus test for Christians of his own day, but rather refers specifically to those who have historically been included as Johannine believers but no longer confess Jesus as the Christ.⁷² In addition, Westcott notes the difference between the *ἐκ* in 4:13 and the lack thereof in 3:24, explaining, “Under different aspects it can be said that God

⁶⁸ Ibid, 80.

⁶⁹ Ibid, 121.

⁷⁰ Ibid. This omission is especially striking given his contention that the Spirit has so many affinities with the Paraclete/Holy Spirit of GJn. It seems curious that if that terminology were already in use by the Johannine believers, the author of the letter would not use it.

⁷¹ Ibid, 140.

⁷² Ibid.

gives Christians ‘His Spirit’ or ‘of His Spirit’.”⁷³ While he does not elaborate further on what these different aspects might be, he does seem to acknowledge here that the two verses have a grammatical difference that somehow changes the way they should be read.⁷⁴ Westcott does not take the further step that some scholars will take, however, of explicating the consequences of the use of the partitive genitive in 4:13, nor does he make a connection with the description of Jesus receiving the Spirit “without measure” in GJn 3:34b. He also lacks a full statement concerning the overall pneumatology of the letter, something that many commentators, even current ones,⁷⁵ also tend to leave out.

Following and expanding on Westcott’s view is Alfred Plummer in 1890, who is among the first modern scholars to fix a specific, historical group to the opposition. He sees the opposing views of privileging supernatural knowledge and relegating material to the realm of evil as two distinctly Gnostic tendencies that are being addressed by the letter.⁷⁶ Given his understanding of the conflict, Plummer reads the Spirit passages in a way that highlights the polemic against these particular Gnostic views. For instance, he contends that the teaching of the Spirit given over in the anointing in 2:20 and 2:27 does

⁷³ Ibid, 153.

⁷⁴ While this may seem obvious, a large number of scholars read the verses as nearly or completely meaningfully identical. Cf. Brooke, *Critical*, 106; Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 190; Perkins, *Epistles*, 48; Loader, *Epistles*, 56; Sloyan, *Truth*, 50; Kysar, *1 John*, 99; Painter, *1 John*, 247; Culpepper, *Letters*, 90-91; and Kenneth Grayston, *The Johannine Epistles* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 127.

⁷⁵ Very few commentaries and articles written in the past 15 years parse out a systematic view of the overall pneumatology of the letter, opting instead to treat the Spirit passages on an individual basis (and not necessarily relating them to one another). There are a few exceptions, however, many of which will be discussed in Section 1.5. In addition to those highlighted in this chapter, Kruse, too, has a short section on the overall function of the Spirit in the letter. Kruse concludes that the main function of the Spirit as evinced by exegesis of each Spirit passage is as witness, to give testimony to the gospel tradition. See Kruse, *Letters*, 152-155.

⁷⁶ Plummer, *Epistles*, 19.

not lead to a negation of the need for teaching in general, but rather only applies to the superfluous teachings of Gnostic groups, which he argues should not supersede the already full and true teachings of the Gospel.⁷⁷ Furthermore, he notes that the σπέρμα in 3:9 is closely akin to notions of the Spirit in a Johannine context.⁷⁸ It is with an eye towards this context that he also understands the final Spirit passage in the letter, 5:6-8, as referring to the Holy Spirit or Johannine Paraclete, who takes on the function of witness-bearer to the truth about Christ.⁷⁹ Such a function is also evident in GJn 15:26.

Perhaps Plummer's most valuable insight for this particular study, however, comes in his assessment of the preposition ἐκ in 4:13. Plummer explicitly raises the issue of the partitive genitive. He contrasts the Christian's partial possession of the Spirit with that of Christ as described in GJn 3:34b, that is, "without measure."⁸⁰ He is the first to point out the possibility that the receipt of the Spirit as it is given to believers is quantitatively different than the gift of that same Spirit to Christ. Highlighting this contrast brings forward the question of what it means for anointed believers to receive only a partial share in the eschatological Spirit.

Building upon the work of Westcott and Plummer, Robert Law published his monograph on 1Jn in 1909, in which he describes the letter as a defense against specifically Gnostic misinterpretation of the ethical and Christological claims of early

⁷⁷ Ibid, 116.

⁷⁸ Ibid, 127.

⁷⁹ Ibid, 160.

⁸⁰ Plummer, *Epistles*, 150. Cf. von Wahlde, 3:131.

Christianity.⁸¹ In making such claims, Law brings the overtly polemical nature of the letter to the fore and, like Plummer, confines the Christological and ethical errors found in the letter to one group. In line with those that preceded him, Law understands the *χρῖσμα* of 2:20 and 2:27 as referring to the Spirit.⁸² This Spirit, according to Law, enables believers not to live lives of infallibility without instruction, but to instead discern the “real character of the antichristian doctrine,”⁸³ hereby referring to the “esoteric pretensions of Gnosticism.”⁸⁴ Law finds that this understanding about the teaching ability of the Spirit goes hand-in-hand with GJn. In this way, the Spirit not only teaches, but also gives testimony.⁸⁵ Everything that the Spirit teaches internally confirms what has already been taught externally in the Gospels, what believers already know to be true. The Spirit for Law, as it was for Westcott, is none other than the Paraclete of GJn.⁸⁶ Law defends against various critiques that the Spirit in the letter is impersonal and divisible⁸⁷ (and, therefore, differs from GJn’s Paraclete) by pointing the reader to similar passages about the Spirit in GJn. In particular, while discussing the partiality of “he has given us of his Spirit” in 4:13, Law points to GJn 3:34b in which Jesus receives the Spirit “without

⁸¹ Law, *Tests*, 35.

⁸² Ibid, 114-15.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid, n. 2.

⁸⁵ Ibid, 115.

⁸⁶ Law, *Tests*, 117.

⁸⁷ This acknowledgment, however, points to other readings of the text that would see the Spirit in a less personal way.

measure.”⁸⁸ While Law’s point here is simply to show there are no pneumatological inconsistencies between the letter and the gospel, he does open the door to similar questions as those raised by Plummer’s comments on 4:13, questions that future scholars will ask of the text.⁸⁹

Around this same time the trend of ascribing the polemical views addressed by the letter to Gnostic groups was quite popular, with some scholars narrowing their identification of the opponents’ group even further. Scholars such as A. E. Brooke in 1912 note a polemic against false teachers who represented a combination of Jewish-Gnosticism like Cerinthians.⁹⁰ This ‘Cerinthian hypothesis’ found a fair amount of popularity in the early twentieth century and still retained some modified scholarly attestation in later years.⁹¹ Brooke’s position ushered in an era of scholars who more specifically identified the heresies of the Gnostic group being addressed by the letter.

In spite of his more specific notion about the identity of the opponents, his claims about the conception of the Spirit in the letter are actually somewhat similar to those of Plummer and Law. For instance, he agrees with Plummer and Law about the transformative effect of the anointing in 2:20 and 2:27 in that he denies that the verses support claims of infallibility of believers, but rather that they make reference to the need to deny the doctrines of the Cerinthians.⁹² He, too, sees σπέρμα in 3:9 as parallel to

⁸⁸ Law, *Tests*, 352.

⁸⁹ See von Wahlde, 3:131.

⁹⁰ Brooke, *Critical*, lii.

⁹¹ See Marshall, *Epistles*, 15, who holds this group as possible opponents among other Gnostics, and Culpepper, *Letters*, 101, who sees the opposition as a group of pre-Cerinthians.

⁹² Brooke, *Critical*, 63.

notions of the Spirit in the larger Johannine context.⁹³ With respect to his analysis of 4:13, Brooke somewhat more generically refers the reader to Mt. 25:8, “Give us (some) of your oil,” in an attempt to explain the giving over of some of the Spirit in 4:13.⁹⁴ While, he does not, like Plummer, make any connection between the partial bestowal of the Spirit to Christians and the complete gift of the Spirit to Christ as indicated by the “without measure” of GJn 3:34b, his comparison of the “of his Spirit” in 4:13 with Mt.25:8 indicates that he understands the gift as partial.

Identification of the opponents as belonging to specific groups of believers continued as the interpretative norm in the decades between the 1950s and 1970s. These designations of the opponents, in fact, seem to have gotten more specific over time. While in the early years of the twentieth century, the opponents were generally termed ‘Gnostics,’ from the middle to the end of the century they were relegated to particular kinds of Gnostics. In particular, many modern scholars have attempted to identify Christological tendencies of the opponents of the letter as stemming from Docetic influences. Similar to earlier historical critics, the Spirit passages have consistently been read with an eye towards the Christological, and not pneumatological, positions of the author and the opponents.

A particularly influential commentary of this time period is that of Rudolf Schnackenburg in 1953. While Schnackenburg identifies the opponents as being Docetically-influenced believers, his commentary draws attention not only to the Christological issues between the two groups, but also brings the soteriological function

⁹³ Ibid, 89.

⁹⁴ Ibid, 121.

of the Spirit in the letter to the fore.⁹⁵ Unlike most of his predecessors, Schnackenburg carves out a separate section of his commentary to address the pneumatology of the letter.⁹⁶ He not only notes parallels between the gift of the eschatological Spirit in 1Jn and Jewish Prophetic Literature,⁹⁷ but also highlights positions of the opponents that are of particular interest. For instance, Schnackenburg emphasizes the differences between the son-ship that the opponents claim to possess and that which believers actually possess and highlights the author's "confession of the unique son-ship" of Jesus.⁹⁸ This is an important insight when it is linked to the varying degrees of Spirit possession that seem to be indicated by the partitive genitive in 1Jn 4:13 and the notion in GJn 3:34b that Jesus receives the Spirit "without measure." This is particularly interesting if believers become children of God through their gift of the Spirit, because it increases the plausibility that their differing son-ship is the result of their different endowment of the Spirit.

Furthermore, he notes the opponents' devaluation of the soteriological significance of the crucifixion event in lieu of a salvation based on their own receipt of the Spirit in baptism and concludes that the interest of the author of 1Jn is largely to dismiss the idea of the purely pneumatic role of Jesus, as the opponents understood it.⁹⁹ According to Schnackenburg, the opponents claim that their own possession of the Spirit,

⁹⁵ Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 191.

⁹⁶ Ibid, 191-195.

⁹⁷ Ibid, 175. Schnackenburg points to the seeming claim of infallibility once they have received the πνεῦμα in 3:9 as an example of a hold-over from prophetic literature.

⁹⁸ Ibid, 19.

⁹⁹ Ibid, 233.

like that of Jesus, makes them superior to sin.¹⁰⁰ He also notes that the possible background for such thoughts comes from a common understanding of the eschatology of Jewish Prophetic Literature, that is, that a prerogative of those receiving the eschatological Spirit in Jewish Scripture is purity from sin.¹⁰¹ Even though Schnackenburg identifies the opponents as Docetic Christians, and not as coming from inside the group of Johannine believers, his insights serve to bolster my overall argument. In particular, these assertions support the notion that the opponents' pneumatology stems from conceptions of the Spirit coming out of the Jewish Prophetic tradition.

Like Schnackenburg, F.F. Bruce in 1970 commentary and I. Howard Marshall in his 1978 commentary identify the opponents with believers persuaded away from the author's understanding of Christ by Docetic influences. Examining the interpretation of the Spirit passages in their commentaries, however, it becomes evident that neither looks for a specific pneumatology in the letter, as Schnackenburg does, but rather look consistently to notions of the Spirit elsewhere in the New Testament, more specifically, in the Pauline corpus and in GJn.¹⁰² Bruce understands the *χρῖσμα* of 2:20 and 2:27 to be the gift of the Holy Spirit that Paul also writes about in 1Cor. 2:6-3:3 and 2Cor. 1:21-22.¹⁰³ This gift in Bruce's estimation confirms to believers that they have true knowledge, in spite of what their Docetic opponents might lead them to believe.¹⁰⁴ He also likens the

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, 23.

¹⁰¹ Ibid, 258-260.

¹⁰² This, as we have seen, has been a common interpretive practice since the earliest commentaries.

¹⁰³ Bruce, *Epistles*, 71.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

“Holy One” and its ability to divulge knowledge to the Spirit of Truth/Paraclete in GJn 14-16.¹⁰⁵ When discussing the discontinuation of the necessity for teaching in 2:27, Bruce again reads this as an assurance to believers about their opponents. While those among believers who undertake the ministry of teaching must be in fellowship with the Spirit, i.e. have received the anointing from it, outsiders have no business attempting to teach anything to those who have already been anointed.¹⁰⁶ In making these claims, Bruce again appeals to the Pauline corpus (Eph. 3:18), to GJn (14:26), and to 1 Peter (1Pet. 1:10-12).¹⁰⁷ Likewise, he reads 3:24 in light of the gift of the Spirit by the Father and the Son in GJn 14:26 and 15:26 and says nothing of the partitive genitive in 4:13, but rather sees this gift as the fulfillment of Christ’s promise in GJn 15:26-27.¹⁰⁸ The same is true of his assessment of the witness-bearing Spirit in 5:6-7.¹⁰⁹

Marshall, while he agrees with Bruce about the kinds of influences faced by the opponents of the author, is one of the few scholars during this time period to support a “thoroughly Jewish” atmosphere in which the letter was produced.¹¹⁰ He traces the notion of sin in the letter back to the prophetic texts of Jewish Scripture¹¹¹ and reads the *χρῖσμα* passages in 2:20 and 2:27 in an eschatological way in order to avoid issues of the reality

¹⁰⁵ Ibid, 72.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, 76.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, 76-77.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, 100-101, 110-111.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, 119-121.

¹¹⁰ Marshall, *Epistles*, 50.

¹¹¹ Ibid. Specifically, he points to the Book of Jeremiah.

of sinlessness.¹¹² In order to explain the ‘already now, but not yet’ mentality behind the reception of the eschatological Spirit, Marshall, like Schnackenburg, appeals to various texts from the Jewish Prophetic and Apocalyptic traditions, including Ezek. 36:27, Jer. 31:33f, and 1 Enoch 5:8.¹¹³ In this way, Marshall follows Schnackenburg in moving the conversation further in the direction of establishing background for some of the pneumatological concepts found in the letter, but does not go so far as to link this to the partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit in 4:13. While he does note the partitive genitive, he does not remark further on its meaning for the overall pneumatology of the letter.¹¹⁴ And like Bruce, he reads 5:6-10 alongside what is said about the Paraclete in GJn 15:26.¹¹⁵

Georg Strecker holds a very similar position to those expressed by Schnackenburg, Bruce, and Marshall. In his 1996 commentary, he identifies the opponents as specifically Docetic and not as outsiders, but as converted believers who were once considered insiders by the author. As is the case with the majority of commentators from earlier decades, the pneumatology of the letter is considered only in its connection to Christological concerns in Strecker’s view, specifically those that have to do with the material person of Christ. As a result, when dealing with the Spirit passages of the text, Strecker, much like Westcott, has little to say that does not harken back to the issue of the incarnation. While he understands the *χρῖσμα* in 2:20 and 2:27 as

¹¹² Ibid, 164.

¹¹³ Ibid, 180-184.

¹¹⁴ Ibid, 219.

¹¹⁵ Ibid, 232.

a reference to the bestowal of the Spirit, he equates this Spirit with the Holy Spirit/Paraclete in GJn, more specifically, in its capacity as teacher (of all things).¹¹⁶ In spite of the baptismal ritual that the former believers have undergone, Strecker sees a distinction being made in this passage between those that have received the Spirit of Truth and those that threaten remaining believers with false teachings.¹¹⁷ Given his conclusions about the identity of the opponents, these false teachings are thought to focus almost exclusively on their denial of the incarnated Christ.¹¹⁸

Furthermore, Strecker acknowledges the eschatological aspects of the letter, but reads the gift of the Spirit as functioning differently than the gift of the eschatological Spirit in Jewish Prophetic Literature. For him, the Spirit is the very thing that alerts believers to the salvation that awaits them because of the anointing they have received. It is the Spirit that gives the believer this special knowledge.¹¹⁹ He notes the difference between 3:24 and 4:13 in the latter's addition of the partitive genitive, but sees this not in opposition to Jesus' full possession of the Spirit evident in the "without measure" designation of GJn 3:34b, but as an indication of the partial knowledge that believers receive from the fullness of the Spirit of Truth.¹²⁰ The content of this knowledge once again has to do with the incarnational elements that are necessary for the believer's

¹¹⁶ Ibid, 65. In reading 2:27 with an eye towards the Paraclete in GJn, any connection between the Spirit bestowed to believers and the eschatological Spirit referenced in the Jewish Prophetic Literature is overlooked. As we have seen, this is an extremely common practice.

¹¹⁷ Ibid, 76.

¹¹⁸ Ibid, 69-70

¹¹⁹ Ibid, 129.

¹²⁰ Ibid, 158. This seems, however, to contradict the notion that because of their anointing the believers "know all things" (2:27).

salvation, which Strecker sees as affirmed by the sacramental underpinnings of 5:6-8.¹²¹

The references to “the water and the blood” serve to remind believers of the baptism and death of Christ as historical realities that are necessary for the process of the salvation, and it is the job of the Spirit to reveal such eschatological truths within them.¹²²

Scholars who see the opponents as Christians with Gnostic or Docetic leanings focus on the anti-incarnation passages of the letter, often concluding that the major concern of the author regards an alternative understanding of Johannine Christology. Approaches that see the conflict between the author and Gnostics (of various sorts) tend to be concerned mainly with the Christological issue of Jesus’ incarnation. While they certainly highlight an important distinction made in the letter, namely that Jesus came “in flesh” (4:2), they largely (with the exception of Schnackenburg) ignore any separate pneumatological issues or subsume them into their Christological concerns, which have already been interpreted through a Gnostic lens. They also tend towards readings that interpret the Spirit passages in relation to the Paraclete passages of GJn. While there are certainly parallels between the two documents, there is still much debate about the direction of influence based on the dating of 1Jn.¹²³

Rhetorical-Critical Perspectives on 1Jn

By contrast, some scholars have eased off the task of trying to situate the letter in the context of a historical crisis in order to avoid issues of speculation. Among the first to take this approach was PHEME PERKINS in 1979. Perkins reduces the polemical language

¹²¹ Ibid, 182-185.

¹²² Ibid, 185-186.

¹²³ See Excursus on the Sequence of Johannine Literature.

to an element of oral cultures, which affect the rhetoric of the author of the letter, and therefore makes less of an attempt to enumerate the beliefs of the historical opponents.¹²⁴

The language of the letter that seemingly takes on certain Christological views that are opposed to the views of the author, then, tells us little about the actual beliefs of the opposition.¹²⁵ Rather, these passages are used mainly in an attempt to vilify them and solidify the beliefs of the author himself.¹²⁶

Given her approach, Perkins reads the Spirit passages of the letter as having more to do with the beliefs of the letter's author, and she does not understand the pneumatology of the group to be a major contributor to the historical schism. She does suggest, however, that the group described as having "gone out from us" is not one made up of outsiders with Gnostic-Docetic tendencies, but former members of this group of believers who no longer accept Christ's death as sacrificial.¹²⁷ When the author writes about the anointing in 2:20 and 2:27, according to Perkins, he writes simply about the "activity of the divine in the community," a guide received by the community as a whole that leads them back to what they were taught "from the beginning."¹²⁸ Perkins understands 3:24 and 4:13 as being essentially the same, a well-known rhetorical formulation that denotes God's spiritual indwelling with the community and ensures

¹²⁴ Perkins, *Epistles*, xxiii.

¹²⁵ Ibid, 4-5.

¹²⁶ Ibid, 6.

¹²⁷ Ibid. She does not, however, give a historical scenario as to how such a denial might have come about.

¹²⁸ Ibid, 36.

proper, ongoing testimony about Jesus.¹²⁹ The gift of God's Spirit should not, according to Perkins, be understood in the prophetic-eschatological sense of ushering in a new age.¹³⁰ The Spirit's function is rather to testify among believers to both the baptism and the death of Christ, as is evident from 5:6-8.¹³¹

Later scholars that follow this approach include Ruth Edwards and Judith Lieu, who focus on the internal addressees of the letter and make little attempt to precisely reconstruct the historical beliefs of the 'them' that the author sets his 'we/us' against.¹³² Ben Witherington, too, takes a rhetorical approach when interpreting the letter, but leaves more room for claims about the opponents.¹³³ Lieu in particular sees very little gain from such reconstructions and instead opts to understand the opposition presented in the letter as a possible reading of GJn.¹³⁴ As a result, she focuses heavily on the possible Christological implications of GJn that appear in the letter and very little on those passages that more typically convey the letter's pneumatology.

For instance, she does not read the anointing in 2:20 and 2:27 as a reference to the gift of the divine Spirit, but instead to the knowledge and teaching that abides in

¹²⁹ Ibid, 48

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Ibid, 61.

¹³² Edwards, *Epistles*, 53 and Lieu, *I John*, 12.

¹³³ Witherington, *Letters*, 431-436.

¹³⁴ Judith Lieu, *The Theology of the Johannine Epistles* (NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 16. While it is partially the task of this dissertation to acknowledge a certain reconstruction of the schism, Lieu's insight here is particularly helpful. The fact that the opposing viewpoint depicted in the letter represents a possible reading of GJn at some point in its composition is indispensable to the overall argument here.

believers, the tradition that they have received.¹³⁵ In fact, Lieu does not see the Spirit as a key theme in the letter and states, “little is said about it.”¹³⁶ She does note, however, that the Spirit is said to have been given to believers, possibly in some partial way, but also that the believers’ confidence in the gift of the Spirit seems to be at the moment “shaken.”¹³⁷ “The only mark of the spirit,” Lieu concludes, “and the only concern of the author is true confession.”¹³⁸ Lieu goes on to reject that there is present in the letter any unambiguous reference to the Spirit as allowing some participation in the divine life, and ends her section on the Spirit thus:

The experience of the spirit, while an aspect of religious experience for 1 John, does not stand at its centre and is only cautiously articulated. This is not because the opposition have ‘hijacked’ the theme, preventing the author from adopting it, for any polemical interpretation of the letter has to assume that the author is well able to cite, remould and forge into weapons his opponent’s rallying cries. That the spirit poses something of a problem is true, but even if this were not so, it is likely that the author would not present a more sophisticated understanding of the spirit’s work.¹³⁹

Writing in the same rhetorical vein, Edwards gives more credence to the possibility of extracting a kind of pneumatology from the letter. Unlike Lieu, she accepts the typical reading of the $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ as referring to the Spirit, but even more concretely as referring to the Spirit (Paraclete) as teacher of truth.¹⁴⁰ She even explains the

¹³⁵ Lieu, *Theology*, 29-30. Lieu makes a similar assessment of the term $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$ (3:9). Lieu, *Theology*, 34-35.

¹³⁶ Ibid, 45.

¹³⁷ Ibid, 46.

¹³⁸ Ibid, 47.

¹³⁹ Ibid, 49.

¹⁴⁰ Edwards, *Epistles*, 75. Edwards also sees the most plausible referent of the $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$ in 3:9 as being the Holy Spirit.

discontinuation of the need for teaching as having a possible connection with the eschaton and the ethical purification predicted in Jer. 33:33-34 and Isa. 54:13.¹⁴¹ In a statement nearly opposite that of Lieu, Edwards notes that the “use of the terms *chrisma* and *sperma* suggests a vital role of the Spirit.”¹⁴² Given her rhetorical reading, however, she does not go so far as to make claims about the spirit possession of any opponent group. In contrast to Schnackenburg, she denies assertions that 1Jn seeks to attack a group of what she calls “charismatic ‘pneumatics’ who profess to be sinless.”¹⁴³ The Spirit for the author is both witness-bearer and truth, given 5:6-8.¹⁴⁴

Likewise, Witherington takes a rhetorical-analytical approach, seeing the letter as a sermon and analyzing it as such.¹⁴⁵ He sees the text not as a theological treatise, but as an exhortation to proper ethical behavior.¹⁴⁶ As such, he does not articulate any possible systematic pneumatology, but sees the Spirit passages of the letter as promoting the overall goal of paraenesis, a common rhetorical practice that he notes in first century Jewish preaching of a sapiential character.¹⁴⁷ While he reads the letter with a specific focus on the author’s aim to do damage control after the departure of the secessionists, he does put forth the hypothesis (given his acceptance of 2:22 as an admissible belief of the

¹⁴¹ Ibid, 76.

¹⁴² Ibid, 81.

¹⁴³ Ibid, 59.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid, 60.

¹⁴⁵ Witherington, *Letters*, 410.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid, 424.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, 424-425.

secessionists) that this group must have been Jews who followed Jesus in some respect, but not to the point of accepting him as Messiah.¹⁴⁸

As a result, he reads all of the Spirit passages in light of this Christological opposition. The *χρῖσμα* in 2:20 and 2:27 in his view leads to knowledge of all things only insofar as they pertain to Christology, but he does eventually equate this anointing with the gift of the Spirit.¹⁴⁹ His comment on 3:24 is extremely brief, concluding as some other scholars have, that the verse can only be fully understood if the reader has prior knowledge of GJn 14-17.¹⁵⁰ In this respect, the Spirit is again being equated with the Paraclete/Holy Spirit. He takes more time, however, addressing the partitive genitive in 4:13. Even after examination of possible explanations of this grammatical construction, though, he concludes that the verse is only slightly different in sense from 3:24 and that the *ἐκ* here is meant to convey not a measured receipt of the divine Spirit, but rather “something received from the Spirit: knowledge, spiritual awareness, assurance.”¹⁵¹ The variation in the wording then, according to Witherington, is only indicative of the author’s stylistic choice and not of difference in meaning. Furthermore, because he does not see 5:6-8 as a refutation of the ideas of the schismatics and sets the letter firmly within a Jewish context, the significance of the water pertains to the physical birth of Christ and the blood to his physical death. Each of these in turn has soteriological significance for believers, significance, according to Witherington, that the schismatics

¹⁴⁸ Ibid, 431. How Jews who denied Jesus’ Messiahship could ever have been considered part of the Johannine community in the first place, however, is unclear.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid, 487, 490. Witherington does, however, note parallels with Jer. 31:34.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid, 517.

¹⁵¹ Ibid, 533-534.

rejected.¹⁵² The Spirit in this passage is again equated with the Holy Spirit/Paraclete in GJn 14-17, in this instance highlighting its capacity as witness.¹⁵³

While rhetorical approaches may fall short of the detailed reconstructions that some historical critics desire, they do offer invaluable insights (and checks and balances) to scholars of that persuasion. Analyses of this type are a good reminder of how much certainty one can actually have when it comes to reconstructing historical events based on one-sided, purpose-driven texts. While it is difficult to fully agree with some of the assertions made by this group of scholars, they are nonetheless essential contributors. Particularly helpful are Lieu's insight that the rhetoric of the text suggests that its purpose is to guard against alternative readings of GJn, Edward's note about the parallel in ethical purification found in Jer. 33 and Isa. 54, and Witherington's assertion that the letter should be set firmly within a Jewish context.

Internal Opposition Based on Alternative Readings of GJn

While rhetorical approaches avoid issues of undue speculation, they also do little to advance the scholarly conversation about the beliefs that led to the schism that so many scholars throughout the centuries have noted in the letter, and scholars who stand firmly in the historical-critical tradition of Biblical interpretation may find them somewhat lacking. Rather than seeing the crisis as an alternative interpretation due to the influence of groups outside the tradition or avoiding enumerating their beliefs in light of rhetorical concerns, another approach attempts to identify the opponents by situating their beliefs inside the Johannine tradition. Acknowledging that those who have "gone out

¹⁵² Ibid, 545.

¹⁵³ Ibid, 547.

from us” simply have a different reading of GJn is indispensable when it comes to understanding the pneumatological concerns of the letter. Given the centrality of ideas about the Spirit in GJn, an alternative understanding of those pneumatological passages in the gospel seems a likely contributor to the crisis that the letter addresses.

Raymond Brown in his 1982 commentary was one of the most influential scholars in making this a common interpretive lens. For Brown, the main purpose of the letter was to deal with the aftermath of an internal schism that took place because one group of Johannine believers (under the influence of Docetic ideas) had a different interpretation of GJn.¹⁵⁴ Brown, following Schnackenburg, is also among the first to note the tendency in the letter to downplay the role of the Spirit-Paraclete, theorizing that the opponents of the letter must have in some way exaggerated their own possession of the it.¹⁵⁵ As a result, his reading of the Spirit passages in the letter highlight those pneumatological aspects that seem to have come under some scrutiny.¹⁵⁶

Brown finds more support for the position that the *πνεῦμα* in 2:20 refers to the Spirit than to the Word. Like many others, he notes the parallels between the function of the anointing here and that of the Paraclete/Holy Spirit in GJn.¹⁵⁷ The capacity not only to teach, but to “teach all,” Brown likens to parallel statements in Jer. 31:34.¹⁵⁸ For Brown, the teaching of the Spirit is assumed by the author to affirm his own interpretation of GJn

¹⁵⁴ Brown, *Epistles*, 72.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid, 346-347.

¹⁵⁶ This idea that the opponents come from within the group of Johannine believers and that the pneumatology of the author of 1Jn had come under some scrutiny by these opponents has influenced many scholars writing after him.

¹⁵⁷ Brown, 346.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, 349.

and in turn allow himself and his addressees to stand firm against the alternative interpretation of their secessionist counterparts. It is, for believers, an interpretation inspired by the Spirit they have been given.¹⁵⁹ The knowledge that the *χρῖσμα* affords believers for Brown rivals that of Jesus as it is presented in GJn. He states, “In other words, the Christians who have been anointed or consecrated in truth have the privileges of God’s consecrated Son because their anointing was through his Spirit.”¹⁶⁰ Furthermore, in explaining the dispensation of the need for teaching in 2:27, Brown appeals again to Jeremiah and even more so to the Paraclete passages in GJn, contending that this represents the closest description of the Spirit in the New Testament to that of the letter.¹⁶¹ In this same vein, Brown reads the gift of the Spirit in 3:24 as manifesting itself mainly in confessions about Jesus as the Christ. Likewise, the Spirit as witness in 5:6-8 is read in conjunction with the GJn Paraclete passages.¹⁶²

Interestingly, Brown reads a possible partitive meaning in both 3:24 and 4:13, something that very few scholars do. He points out that while *ἐκ* plus the genitive *τοῦ πνεύματος* in 3:24d is typically read with the verb *γινώσκουμεν* as “we can know *from* the Spirit,” that the *ἐκ* phrase here might also anticipate the partitive *ἐκ* phrase in 4:13b.¹⁶³ He argues that because the relative *οὗ* in 3:24d is also a genitive by attraction that

¹⁵⁹ Ibid, 369.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, 370. This view provides helpful insight, but should possibly be mediated by the partiality of the gift of the Spirit in 4:13.

¹⁶¹ Ibid, 375, 466. While this is certainly true by way of parallels, the direction of influence of these passages is not entirely clear.

¹⁶² Ibid, 483.

¹⁶³ Ibid, 466.

perhaps the author means to highlight the genitive τοῦ πνεύματος.¹⁶⁴ While Brown does mention a contrast here with Jesus' receipt of the Spirit without measure in GJn 3:34b,¹⁶⁵ he sees this not necessarily as a partial gift of the Spirit, but takes it to mean that the knowledge received by believers is not directly from the Spirit, but from God's sharing part of God's own Spirit with believers.¹⁶⁶ Furthermore, because God has given them this gift, the Paraclete, they are able to carry on the judgment and witness that were once functions of Christ himself. As long as the Spirit is with them, they have the capacity to do these things.¹⁶⁷

Building off Brown's approach is Kenneth Grayston in his 1984 commentary on the Johannine Epistles. Grayston, too, sees the crisis as a schism from within and notes the centrality of pneumatological issues in contributing to the break.¹⁶⁸ He posits that the opponents are former Johannine believers who "misinterpret" portions of the Johannine tradition that refer to the bestowal of the Spirit.¹⁶⁹ By accepting the chronological priority of the Epistle, Grayston is able to hypothesize a group of believers who understand themselves as receiving the Spirit of God in an altogether complete way, making them each christs indistinguishable from *the* Christ, at least in their possession of the divine Spirit.¹⁷⁰ This contention also allows him to read the Spirit passages of the letter as

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid, 557, n. 43.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid, 557.

¹⁶⁸ Grayston, *Epistles*, 20.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid, 19.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

precursors to the Paraclete passages of GJn and not as dependent upon them. The passages, therefore, are not simply understood as reinforcing the functions of the Paraclete as they are presented in GJn, but as a step in the development towards those notions found in the gospel.

Rather than being a gloss of the Paraclete passages of GJn, he reads the Spirit passages of the letter as highlighting the main issue of contention between the author and his opponents. To begin, Grayston notes the lack of Spirit passages in the letter as compared to their proportion in GJn as peculiar, given their shared community of thought. This is so, according to Grayston, because of the overzealous spiritual claims of the opponents enumerated above.¹⁷¹ For instance, he does not see the transformative effects of the *χρῖσμα* in 2:20 and 2:27 as having roots in the Jewish Prophetic tradition, but rather as a word introduced into the community by the opponents who claim that their possession of the Spirit is equivalent to that of Jesus, resulting in little need for the continued role of Christ in their salvation.¹⁷² Their reception of the Spirit, in Grayston's view, makes them claim to be *christs*¹⁷³ in their own right, making the death of Jesus obsolete insofar as it relates to their soteriological concerns and creating the need for the author of the letter to emphasize the incarnational aspects of the community's Christology.¹⁷⁴ It is not, therefore, Docetic influences that the author writes against when he emphasizes the importance of belief in Christ come "in flesh" in 4:1-6 or when he

¹⁷¹ Ibid, 8.

¹⁷² Ibid, 84-86.

¹⁷³ Interestingly, however, Grayston does not connect the partitive genitive in 4:13 in any way to his theory about the complete Spirit possession being claimed by the opponents.

¹⁷⁴ Grayston, *Epistles*, 86.

enumerates the roles of the Spirit, water, and blood in 5:6-8, but instead the opponents' downplaying of the role of Christ's salvific life and death.¹⁷⁵ The alternative reading of GJn that the author of 1Jn seeks to warn against and rebut has everything to do with differing views that arise from the opponents' understanding of the way in which they possess the Spirit.

While Grayston sees this alternative understanding of the Spirit bestowal as an attraction that the opponents have towards the promises of John the Baptist,¹⁷⁶ Burge advances the discussion by situating the community's Christology/pneumatology firmly within the Jewish tradition.¹⁷⁷ Even though Burge's *Anointed Community* focuses mainly on the pneumatology of GJn, he does address some of the Spirit passages of the letter, offering helpful insights and connections between the two texts, particularly when it comes to the *χρῖσμα* passages. His explanation of the term *σφραγίζω* in GJn 6:27 gives evidence that the Johannine believers considered their own receipt of the Spirit to be in some way connected to the seal placed on Jesus.¹⁷⁸ Their *χρῖσμα*, while similar to that of *the* Christ, must, however, be somewhat lesser. According to Burge, it can be gleaned from the letter that the believers expect a "spiritual union with Christ" that will ensure their loyalty to proper confession and action.¹⁷⁹ The *χρῖσμα* is necessary, because the

¹⁷⁵ Ibid, 121, 137.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid, 19.

¹⁷⁷ Burge, *Anointed*, 109-110. Burge, however, is not the first to situate the Johannine believers and literature in this way. John C. O'Neil, although his overall theory is generally rejected, brought to light as early as 1966 the idea that a sectarian Jew wrote 1 John and that the letter displays many parallels with the texts found at Qumran. See John O'Neil, *The Puzzle of 1 John: A New Examination of Origins* (London: SPCK, 1966).

¹⁷⁸ Burge, *Anointed*, 85.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid, 172.

Spirit is the “mark of Christ and thus should be the mark of the Christian as well.”¹⁸⁰ If Burge is correct that from GJn believers expect to share the same Spirit that seals Christ as God’s Son, it is fairly easy to see how believers reading the gospel might overestimate their own possession of this Spirit, understanding it to be on par with that of Jesus. Furthermore, if it is through this spiritual union with Christ that believers are able to attain proper belief and action, an overestimation of the possession of this Spirit could lead to a lesser emphasis on the sin-absolving effects of Christ’s death. Burge asserts that the schism presented in the letter is based largely on the two sides claiming correct (but differing) interpretations of GJn and holds that each side can claim this by virtue of the power they receive from their *χρῖσμα*.¹⁸¹

Furthermore, Burge, like many before him, notes the nuances of the text in 3:24 and 4:13. He reads 4:13 as enhancing the “personal nature” of the indwelling of the Spirit, as God is said to give “of his own Spirit.”¹⁸² While he does not note the partitive genitive as being indicative of some lesser degree of Spirit endowment between believers and Christ, he does offer some suggestions regarding the difference in the verb tense of *δίδωμι*. He sees the use of the perfect in 4:13 to have a “theological meaning pointing to the present significance of Christ.”¹⁸³ Again, the need for this type of emphasis among believers is striking and could very well indicate some issue pertaining to Christ’s continued significance among them.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid, 175.

¹⁸¹ Ibid, 173.

¹⁸² Ibid, 174.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

In light of the placement of the schism as coming from within the author's group and in light of the apparent background in Jewish Scripture of Johannine believers, Urban C. von Wahlde proposes a theory in the same vein as Grayston and Burge. Von Wahlde places pneumatological concerns at the center of the crisis between the author and those who have "gone out."¹⁸⁴ He, like Grayston, theorizes that the opponents logically interpret the Johannine tradition concerning the bestowal of the Spirit. However, given his argument about the multi-stage composition of the gospel, he is able to situate the letter between the second and third editions of that text.¹⁸⁵ In doing so, he can provide an argument about the opponents' alternative understanding of portions of the gospel itself (not just proposed traditions tied to John the Baptist) and demonstrate rather convincingly that the pneumatological error of the opponents is in fact a quite logical reading of the promises of Spirit bestowal in the Jewish Prophetic Literature.¹⁸⁶ This would mean, however as counterintuitive as it might seem, that the opponents and not the author have a more traditional or canonical (Jewish) interpretation of the Spirit passages in the version of the gospel to which they are privy.

Given this theory, the Spirit passages in the letter, although they are scarce, are central to reconstructing the issues at the heart of the crisis. They are also read in light of those passages that pertain to the gift of the eschatological Spirit in Jewish Scripture. Von Wahlde understands the $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ of 2:20 and 2:27 that leads to the dispensation of the need

¹⁸⁴ Von Wahlde, 3:363.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid, 366.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

for teaching altogether is understood to have its background in Jer. 31:33-34.¹⁸⁷ The Spirit they have received in this *χρῖσμα* teaches them what they need to know about Jesus as the Christ in order for them to stand firm against the opponents, in particular, that the anointing that they have received is distinct from the anointing that Jesus received as *the* (unique) Christ.¹⁸⁸

Furthermore, von Wahlde contends that the genitive in 3:24 “of which he gave us” should be read, as in 4:13, as a partitive genitive and not as a genitive of attraction.¹⁸⁹ Here at 3:24, then, there is another instance of the comparison between the way believers receive the divine Spirit and the way that Christ received the Spirit of God (without measure) in GJn 3:34b. Given that von Wahlde holds the understanding of believers’ possession of the Spirit to be at the center of the controversy, such a reading makes sense in this context. The emphasis on this partiality is so important to the author, according to von Wahlde, because the opponents understand themselves to have received the Spirit in a full and complete way, which made sense to them given their understanding of how the eschatological Spirit would be bestowed upon them in the last days.¹⁹⁰ This difference in the bestowal and possession of the Spirit between Jesus and the believer, as von Wahlde puts it, “explains how a group that believed that the outpouring of the Spirit had taken place, and that had believed that this outpouring resulted in both an anointing and in a

¹⁸⁷ Ibid, 88.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, 89.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid, 131.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid, 161.

rebirth could, upon later reflection, derive conclusions from those prerogatives that challenged the conviction of a unique role for Jesus.”¹⁹¹

Conclusion to Chapter One

It is squarely within this final interpretive trend that my own argument comes. It is my contention that the opponents of the author have understood the bestowal of the divine Spirit in a way that conforms to precedents set forth in the prophetic literature of Jewish Scripture. The author and his addressees, in contrast, have broken from this more traditional and canonical Jewish understanding and reinterpreted the bestowal of the eschatological Spirit to have occurred in a partial way, so that believers possess the divine Spirit in a lesser way than does Jesus, the unique Son and Christ. It is my goal, then, to explore possible precedents in the Jewish and early Christian tradition on which the author draws and to conclude whether such an understanding is unique to the Johannine believers. It is the purpose of the following chapter to interpret and explore the possible backgrounds of the conception of the eschatological Spirit in 1Jn in Jewish Prophetic Literature.

Excursus on the Sequence of Johannine Literature

While it is not necessary here to determine exactly the composition date of 1 John, it is important to the overall argument to establish a general sequence of composition for the letter and gospel text as it currently exists, particularly with regards to the gospel’s Paraclete passages.¹⁹² Historically, the majority of scholars have

¹⁹¹ Ibid, 163.

¹⁹² While it is not essential to the overall argument here that the addition of the Paraclete passages to GJn proceeded 1Jn chronologically, it does aid in explaining the opponents’ alternative understanding of the Spirit as it is presented in GJn (as reflected in 1Jn). If it is the case that the Paraclete passages were present in the version of GJn that the opponents were privy to, it is more difficult to explain why they would need

contended that 1Jn post-dates the gospel in its entirety;¹⁹³ however, dissenting opinions have shed light on problems with this proposed sequence of composition.¹⁹⁴ In fact, even those scholars that defend the position that the letter was composed after the completed (or at least nearly completed) gospel admit that there remain unresolved tensions in this theory.¹⁹⁵ An analysis of and conclusion about these varying positions is, therefore, necessary before moving to a characterization of the concept of the Spirit in 1Jn.

the kind of clarification concerning the functions of the Spirit and those of Jesus that can be found in 1Jn. Furthermore, as shown in Chapter 1, too much reliance on the Paraclete passages in explaining the background for the conception of the Spirit in 1Jn tends to result in overlooking its more general background in Jewish Prophetic Literature.

¹⁹³ Brown, *Epistles*, 35; Smith, *First John*, 28; Brooke, *Epistles*, xxiii; Smalley, *I John*, xxix; Loader, *Epistles*, xxiii; Kysar, *I John*, xxi; Marshall, *Epistles*, 40; J. L. Houlden, *A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), 18.

¹⁹⁴ Grayston, *Epistles*, 12-14; von Wahlde 1:448-452. Schnackenburg sees the question of priority as unanswerable, but thinks that the letter's composition likely occurred between the oral transmission of the tradition and the completed writing of the gospel. Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 39.

¹⁹⁵ Brown, in particular, points to the difference between the less personified depiction of the Spirit in 1Jn when compared to the Holy Spirit, Spirit of Truth, and Paraclete in GJn. However, Brown argues that vagueness in the presentation of the Spirit as a personal being in 1Jn can be attributed to the author's reaction to the "overemphasis...on the activity of the Paraclete-Spirit as teacher..." in GJn. Brown, *Epistles*, 26-27, 35. While this is a possible explanation, the emphasis in GJn concerning the Spirit does *not* seem to be on the Spirit's function as teacher. In fact, most of the references to the Spirit in GJn focus on the ability of the Spirit to give life or the need to be born of the Spirit (3:5, 6, 8; 4:14; 6:63; 7:38-39; 20:22), while comparatively few emphasize the Spirit-Paraclete's role as teacher or witness (14:26; 15:26; 16:13). Furthermore, all of these references are present in the same unit of GJn (in the Farewell Discourses), while the others are distributed throughout the gospel. Perhaps Brown's argument is more plausible if Johannine believers were focusing exclusively on the Farewell Discourses for their conception of the Spirit and generally ignoring the rest of the Spirit passages in the gospel. The idea, though, that the author of 1Jn, who all but eliminates the function of the Spirit in giving life (giving that ability to Jesus) and depicts the Spirit as witnessing and teaching (albeit using less explicit terms like anointing and seed), is reacting to an overemphasis on exactly those functions that nearly all scholars attribute to the Spirit in 1Jn is difficult to accept. It is also difficult to see how the passages about the teaching of the Spirit-Paraclete in the Farewell Discourses could allow for an overestimation of the Spirit's ability to teach anything novel. The purpose of these passages seems rather to be a way for the author to *specify* and *reaffirm* the content of the true Spirit's teaching, that it, the Spirit only teaches those things that Jesus himself taught during his ministry and does not speak on its own authority. The function of the Spirit-Paraclete in the Farewell Discourses is explicitly one of reminding and reassuring believers of what has already been taught to them. As a result, it seems unlikely that believers would interpret these passages otherwise and develop conflict over an overemphasis on the Spirit-Paraclete's role as teacher.

Arguments for Post-Dating the Letter

There are perhaps two most commonly presented arguments in favor of the priority of the gospel. The first is an appeal to the chronology of the situations in which the Johannine believers find themselves based upon evidence gleaned from the gospel and the letter. The gospel, as the argument goes, displays an earlier stage in the community's¹⁹⁶ history, one in which its members were at odds with the larger Jewish community. The conflict, therefore, is understood to have been an *external* one between members of the Johannine community who still desired to remain part of the Jewish synagogue and the Jewish members of the synagogue (especially, perhaps, the leadership) who did not accept the Messiahship of Jesus. This historical situation has been posited by many scholars¹⁹⁷ and seems well supported by the narrative surrounding GJn 9:22 (cf. GJn 12:42; 16:2).

1 John, on the other hand, has long been thought to display a historical situation wrought with *internal* conflict. As shown in Chapter 1, a majority of scholars over the years have found in the letter a crisis, in which one group within the larger group of Johannine believers has formed its own beliefs (beliefs that oppose those of the author of 1Jn) based on an alternative reading of the gospel and claims to offer new teachings apart from what has been taught "from the beginning" (1Jn 1:1).¹⁹⁸ While scholars differ

¹⁹⁶ I use the term community here to refer to various groups of believers that held GJn as their authoritative text concerning the life of Jesus and subscribed to the kind of beliefs found therein. See Kruse, *Letters*, 4-5, who explains what is meant by the term in Johannine scholarship.

¹⁹⁷ Most of this scholarship seems to follow Brown in this regard. Brown, *Epistles*, 35; Smalley, *1 John*, xxi-xxii; Culpepper, *1 John*, 2-3; Kruse, *Letters*, 6, 152-153; Painter, *1 John*, 74; Loader, *Epistles*, xxii-xxiii; Kysar, *1 John*, 19; von Wahlde 1:51-53.

¹⁹⁸ For a review of the literature concerning the conflict addressed by 1Jn, see Chapter One of this dissertation.

greatly on what influences have led to this crisis, most agree that these disagreements are taking place in an already established group of Johannine believers, displaying a later stage in development from that represented by the gospel's conflict with Jewish counterparts.¹⁹⁹ In short, the thinking is that Johannine believers would have first been concerned with breaking away from their Jewish parent group and only after that have had occasion for conflict among themselves.

The other most commonly cited support for the gospel's priority is the contention that the letter presupposes major theological concepts found in the gospel.²⁰⁰ This argument asserts that the conceptions in the letter display a more advanced theological position, and where this does not ring true, the simpler concepts found in the letter can be explained away as reactionary.²⁰¹ An example of this is the rather sparing use of references to the Spirit throughout the letter. Furthermore, nowhere in the letter is the Spirit referred to in the particularly Johannine nomenclature of the Paraclete, and in only a few places does the author use the term πνεῦμα outright. The author, therefore, would seem to be downplaying the functions of the Spirit in reaction to the crisis believers face from within.²⁰² For example, as a reaction to opposition that uses certain terminology for the Spirit and overemphasizes the role of the Spirit-Paraclete in instructing believers, the

¹⁹⁹ See note 194 above.

²⁰⁰ Westcott, *Epistles*, xxxi; Brooke, *Epistles*, xxii-xxiii; Culpepper, *1 John*, 3; Smith, *First John*, 28-29; con. Schnackenburg, who sees no necessary foreknowledge of the gospel reflected in the letter.

²⁰¹ As Brown puts it, "the thrust of GJn is exaggerated in the letter" as a result of the alternative and progressive views of dissenting members of the Johannine believers concerning high Christology and the activity of the Spirit-Paraclete. Brown, *Epistles*, 35.

²⁰² Brown, *Epistles*, 346-347 and von Wahlde, 3:100. Other scholars point towards the overestimation of Spirit possession by the opponents, but do not make an explicit connection between this fact and the scarcity of Spirit passages (explicit and implicit) in the letter. See Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 195; Culpepper, *1 John*, 2-3; Grayston, *Epistles*, 13-14.

author confines the use of the title *Paraclete* to Jesus and only occasionally even mentions the work of the Spirit.²⁰³ Given this theory of reaction to opposition, it would stand to reason that the letter displays the situation of Johannine believers as it exists after the gospel text has been read (and alternatively interpreted) by various members.

Issues Presented

While there is a strong degree of plausibility in these arguments, especially those pertaining to the chronology of the historical situation of the Johannine believers that is evident in the text, certain tensions must be explained in order to settle the issue of chronological priority. For instance, the contention that the conceptions of Christology and pneumatology in the letter are more advanced or presuppose those of the gospel does not always bear out. In fact, scholars often point out that aspects of the Christology, atonement, and final eschatology found in the letter are actually less advanced or from an earlier time period of Christian thought.²⁰⁴ Therefore, there needs to be a sufficient explanation as to why, if the gospel in its completed (or nearly completed) form existed prior to the letter, so much of it seems to belong to an earlier time. Examples of this are the less advanced, lower Christology of the letter, the early and Jewish motifs found

²⁰³ Brown, *Epistles*, 35.

²⁰⁴ Arguments concerning the lower Christology of the letter often point to the lack of logos theology that seems to be present in the letter and the focus placed time and again on the human aspect of Jesus' incarnation (that he has come "in flesh"). Those concerning atonement point to the fact that there is very little appeal in GJn to the redemptive function of Jesus' death. Scholars contend that while Jesus' glorification in GJn leads to the gift of the Spirit and eternal life in GJn 20:22, only his title as Lamb of God points explicitly to the redemptive function of his blood. In 1Jn, however, the atoning nature of Jesus' death is central. Finally, concerning final eschatology, the bulk of GJn's eschatological focus seems to be on the realized aspect of salvation, while 1Jn presents a much more apocalyptic view and a focus on future eschatology. See Dodd, *Epistles*, lvi; Brown, *Epistles*, 26-28. Other scholars who point to one or more of these themes as more closely related to traditional New Testament understandings include Brooke, *Epistles*, xxi-xxii and Loader, *Epistles*, xxi-xxii.

therein,²⁰⁵ and most importantly here, a conception of Jesus and the Spirit that would seem to predate the Paraclete passages of the gospel.²⁰⁶ It should be stressed, however, that development of theological concepts does not always follow in a linear trajectory from less advanced to more advanced over time. Therefore, any argument for sequence that appeals solely to the more or less ‘advanced’ theology of either 1Jn or GJn is not sufficient.

The Conundrum of the Paraclete Passages

Arguments in favor of the post-dating of the letter run into particularly difficult opposition when it comes to dealing with the Paraclete passages in the gospel. In fact, this is one place where the theory of advanced theological conceptions does not seem to hold true. The Spirit as conceived in the letter is arguably less advanced theologically, an opinion that is admitted even by some scholars that defend a sequence of literature that places the letter’s composition after the completion of the gospel.²⁰⁷ First off, the Spirit in the letter most often is referred to in the very general sense τὸ πνεῦμα or τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ when referring to the Spirit of God,²⁰⁸ whereas in the gospel the Spirit at times takes on the more particular titles τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, and most interestingly, παράκλητος. While the use of specific titles for the Spirit does not

²⁰⁵ Brown, *Epistles*, 26; Grayston, *Epistles*, 13.

²⁰⁶ Grayston, *Epistles*, 13-14; von Wahlde, 1:360.

²⁰⁷ Brown, *Epistles*, 26-27.

²⁰⁸ An exception, of course, occurs in the Testing of the Spirits passage in 1Jn 4:1-6. Here, the Spirit of God (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ) is also referred to as τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας once believers have received it. This predication is set in the context of the apocalyptic opposition between truth and falsehood, but does not seem to be a title for the Spirit, per se, in the whole of the letter. As Brown notes, “The treatment of the Spirit of Truth alongside the Spirit of Deceit in I John 4:1-6 is strangely vague about the personal quality of the Spirit.” Brown, *Epistles*, 27.

necessarily denote an advance in the theological concept of the Spirit, it does denote a step forward in the perceived personhood of the Spirit. It is also noteworthy, however, that these more personal titles occur not throughout the whole of the gospel, which more often than not (24 times) uses the simple, unqualified πνεῦμα when referring to the Spirit, but are confined mainly to the Farewell Discourses in GJn 14-16. So, while there is certainly an argument to be made that the letter by and large shows a lesser level of theological advancement when it comes to the personhood of the Spirit, there are many places in which the gospel shows parallels to the less personal conception of the Spirit found in the letter (Jn 1:32; 3:5, 6, 8, 34; 4:23, 24; 6:63; 7:39).

In addition, the title παράκλητος is used in the letter to refer not to the Spirit, but to Jesus. This fact becomes problematic for those who contend that 1Jn presupposes the pneumatology of GJn. In GJn 14:16, Jesus (directly after making reference to himself) promises to send the disciples *another* Paraclete. The text states, “And I will ask the Father, and he will send to you another Paraclete, so that he might be with you forever...” (Jn 14:16). While it is certainly possible that the title was traditionally ascribed to Jesus or is simply implied by the text²⁰⁹ and so believers would understand the reference to *another* Paraclete as a shift in title, in this case it would appear that it is the gospel that presupposes a theological concept found in the letter. Nowhere in GJn is the term Paraclete used as a title for Jesus; it is only in the letter (1Jn 2:1) that it is explicitly used, and it would seem that the functions of the Jesus-Paraclete and the Spirit-Paraclete are

²⁰⁹ Kruse holds that the context of the passage leads to the implication that Jesus is the first Paraclete in GJn 14:15-16. Kruse, *1 John*, 6. This assertion is certainly possible given that Jesus speaks about “another Paraclete” in a conversation with the disciples in which he largely discusses himself. However, given that the author of 1Jn fails to link his conception of the Spirit with the Spirit-Paraclete of the gospel, especially when it would appear so advantageous for his argument leads me away from this conclusion.

quite different.²¹⁰ Furthermore, while arguments from silence are never devoid of conjecture, it does seem curious that the author of the letter knows this specific Johannine title for the Spirit yet uses it instead to describe Jesus, particularly because many of the functions carved out for the Spirit in the Paraclete passages would lend support for his interpretation of the gospel's pneumatology.²¹¹

Furthermore, the crisis addressed in the letter in itself lends credence to the position that at the time the letter was written the Paraclete passages had not previously been part of GJn. If so many scholars are correct in their position that Johannine believers have met with an internal conflict that centers largely around an alternative interpretation of the gospel, in large part where the Spirit is concerned,²¹² what would explain the opponents' blatant disregard for these passages, which are evident in their apparent claims about ethical perfectionism and novel prophecies that go beyond what has been said from the

²¹⁰ Even if the text of GJn 14:16 implies that Jesus is the Paraclete, his work in 1Jn 2:1 differs considerably from that described in the Farewell Discourses. While the main function of the Spirit-Paraclete in GJn 14:26 and 15:26 is to witness to and remind believers of Jesus' teachings, in 1Jn 2:1 the work of the Jesus-Paraclete is to aid in the atonement of sin before the Father. Therefore, it is difficult to make a direct link between the explicit Jesus-Paraclete in 1Jn and the implicit Jesus-Paraclete/Spirit-Paraclete in the Farewell Discourses. See Brooke, *Critical*, xx-xxi.

²¹¹ For instance, if (as I argue in Chapter 4) the opponents of the author claim a complete possession of the eschatological Spirit of God such that they are elevated to a level similar as Jesus and able to receive revelation and knowledge directly from God, passages like GJn 14:26 and 15:26 in which Jesus assures the disciples that the Paraclete that will come will help them to remember what *Jesus* has said and witness to *Jesus* would seem easy evidence of the author's claims. Presumably, they would have heard that "The Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name will teach you all things and will remind you everything that I said to you" (GJn 14:26) and "When I have gone, the Paraclete whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth who comes from the Father, will testify about me. And you, too, testify about me, because you were with me from the beginning" (GJn 15:26-27). Such passages (or at least references to the Spirit as the Paraclete who acts in this way) would lend great support to the author's contention that believers must hold strong to the teachings that are "from the beginning" and not be swayed by those claiming the Spirit has revealed to them something different. It is certainly curious, if he had access to this tradition why he would not use it.

²¹² Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 192; Brown, *Epistles*, 346-347; Grayston, *Epistles*, 20; von Wahlde, 3:363-364.

beginning? In addition, it seems strange that when combatting this opposition, the author, being aware of the strong connection the Paraclete passages make between Jesus' message and that of the Spirit, would not use these to show just how wrongly the opponents are reading the text. Again, arguments from what the text *does not* say are always open to serious criticism, but it is difficult to conceive of a crisis even occurring over an alternate interpretation of the gospel's conception of the Spirit if the opponents were privy to the Paraclete passages and their statements of the Spirit's function as a reminder of and witness to Jesus' own words in the lives of believers.

Conclusion to Excursus

Given both the strengths of some of the arguments for post-dating the letter (the situation of the Johannine believers and the theologically advanced/secondary aspects of the letter) and the issues that remain unexplained by these arguments (most notably, the Paraclete passages of the gospel), it would seem that the most logical explanation would be that the letter was written sometime during, not before or after, the gospel's composition, and therefore presents a conception of the Spirit that pre-dates that found in the Farewell Discourses of the gospel.

CHAPTER TWO

ABUNDANT GIFT, TOTAL TRANSFORMATION: EXPECTATIONS OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL SPIRIT OF GOD IN JEWISH PROPHETIC LITERATURE

As stated in the previous chapter, I begin this study from the position that the first Johannine letter was produced within a group of Christ believers that had a background in Judaism and represents a time in the history of that group of believers in which a schism had taken place over (among other things) a discrepancy in belief concerning the gift of the Spirit. Having established the state of scholarship with regard to the concept of the Spirit in 1Jn, I turn in this chapter to the task of establishing possible backgrounds for that conception in Jewish Prophetic Literature. Throughout this chapter, I will explore a variety of texts in an attempt to understand the expectations surrounding the gift of God's eschatological Spirit to God's chosen people. As it is from these texts that the author of 1Jn likely forms some of his own conception of the Spirit, it is necessary before attempting to explicate the pneumatology of 1Jn that I undertake a survey of these background texts. The goal of this chapter is to enumerate the expectations concerning the gift of God's Spirit in order to lay the groundwork for later comparison and analysis of the ways in which the author of 1Jn understands his and his audience's own receipt of God's eschatological Spirit.

The Spirit of God in the Prophets of Jewish Scripture

A number of scholars have shown that the concept of the Spirit of God, across the texts of Jewish Scripture generally, varies widely based on where in the text it is found

and what theological significance it carries in that particular text.¹ When considering Jewish Scripture as a whole,² it becomes evident that no single concept of the Spirit (רוּחַ) is presented throughout all texts in all cases. The Spirit is dispensed in different ways, is possessed by different persons, and results in different powers or attributes at different points in time. How God's Spirit functions in each case is largely a matter of literary context. One function of the Spirit of God is as an active and necessary element in the creative process and the giving of life (Gen. 1:3; 6:3, 17; 7:15, 22; Job 33:4; Ps. 104:30; Eccl. 12:7). In other texts, the Spirit of God³ comes upon the leading men of Israel and functions to inspire them to great power or knowledge, effectively endowing them with attributes of the divine (Ex. 31:3//35:31; Deut. 34:9; Jdg. 3:10, 6:34, 11:29, 14:6, 19, 15:14; 1Sa. 10:6, 10, 11:6, 16:13; 2Chr. 15:1; Isa. 11:2, 42:1, 61:1; Dan. 4:8, 18, 5:11, 12, 14; 6:3; 1Enoch 49:3, 62:2). In still others, the Spirit is poured out over the whole of the people of God at some future time and leads to the restoration of the people, either geographically or ethically (Isa. 32:15, 44:3; Ezek. 39:39; Heb. Joel 3:1-2).

¹ See Wilf Hildebrandt, *An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995); James M. Hamilton, Jr., *God's Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old and New Testaments* (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2006); and David G. Firth and Paul D. Wegner, eds. *Presence, Power and Promise: The Role of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011).

² In the first paragraph of this section, examples are cited from all Jewish Scripture, both canonical and non-canonical (apocalyptic) in order to give a general overview of the functions ascribed to the Spirit of God in a wide variety of texts. While I realize that these texts span large periods of time and a multitude of genre, my point here is to give a sense of just how varied portrayals of the Spirit can be. My intention here is not to suggest that the non-canonical or apocalyptic Jewish Literature is any less influential on later groups of believers or is derivative of the canonical texts.

³ In the case of the instances found in Daniel, the text describes the Spirit as "the spirit of the (holy) gods" rather than the Spirit of God. However, this can be explained from the literary context and should be understood as referring to the Spirit of God. As Bob Becking points out, these descriptions of Daniel's spirit come from the non-Israelites in the text, before any type of conversion to worship of the God of Israel takes place. Readers of the text, according to Becking, would have understood Daniel's spirit as one coming not from "the gods," but from the LORD, the God of Israel. See Bob Becking, "'A Divine Spirit Is in You' Notes on the Translation of the Phrase *ruah elahin* in Daniel 5, 14 and Related Texts," in *The Book of Daniel in Light of New Findings*, (BETL 106; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 515-519.

Within the Prophetic texts⁴ specifically, the functions of the Spirit of God are similarly varied. For instance, the Spirit of God in Ezekiel 37 animates the dead, which is an example of its role in creating and giving life (Ezek. 37:5-6, 10). In addition, the Spirit of God in Zechariah 4 is credited with leading human beings to victory in their battles with enemies, exemplifying its function of enabling divine power (Zech. 4:6). Perhaps the most prominent roles of the Spirit throughout these texts, however, are its role in inspiring the leaders and people of Israel to prophecy and revelation (Isa. 10:10, 19:20, 48:16; Ezek. 11:5; Heb. Joel 3:1; Mic. 3:8) and its role in transforming the people of God through wisdom and instruction into beings worthy of God's presence and ultimate salvation (Isa. 59:21, 63:11; Ezek. 11:19, 36:26-27; Hag. 2:5; Zech. 7:12). Both of these functions are also related to the notion found throughout the texts of the Jewish Scriptures more generally that with the gift of God's Spirit comes some form of immediacy or renewal in relationship to God.⁵ It is no wonder, then, that discrepancies arise in understanding the expected time and fashion in which this Spirit will manifest itself. Perhaps even more complicated was the task of the early Christ believers, whose job it was to understand the gift of this Spirit in light of the perceived coming of God's promised Messiah.

⁴ While each of these texts has its own historical context to which it applies and those contexts will be noted throughout this chapter, I examine them from the standpoint of their reception by a later group of Christ believers. I acknowledge that the authors of these texts wrote for their own specific audiences in order to address situations prior to, during, and after the exile, however, my main concern is in understanding how later groups interpreted and utilized these texts in applying them to their own historical situations, particularly those groups that seem to have read them as predictions of events taking place in their own lifetimes with regard to their own reception of the eschatological Spirit of God.

⁵ While most of these instances are confined to the Prophetic texts, these notions of the Spirit can be found in a variety of places throughout the other books of Jewish Scripture. Cf. Num. 11:25, 26; Neh. 9:20, 30; and Ps. 139:7, 143:10.

It seems evident in many New Testament documents that the Spirit of God given to Jesus himself and to his followers through him was understood to fulfill some of the promises of God made in Jewish Scripture.⁶ The Messiah had now been sent, in part, to transmit God's Spirit and to inaugurate the spiritual gifts of the eschaton. For those believers tied especially tightly to their Jewish roots, this prophetic conception of the Spirit of God brought with it certain assumptions and prerogatives. In the following sections, I enumerate these assumptions and prerogatives as they are found in the Prophetic books of Jewish Scripture and seek to show how the conceptions of God's Spirit therein form both a basis for the understanding of God's Spirit held by the author of 1Jn and a point of divergence between his understanding and those whom he describes as gone "out from us" in the letter (1Jn 2:19).

In order to establish these points of overlap and difference, the sections that follow address three aspects of the gift of God's Spirit that set it apart as specifically the *eschatological* gift of the Spirit in particular texts, the necessity of which is due to the aforementioned variation in the function of the term Spirit (רוּחַ) throughout Jewish Scripture. These aspects include: 1) the *time* (both in relation to the author and in relation to human history more generally) that the Spirit is bestowed upon the people of God, 2) the *amount* of the Spirit that is given to the *whole* of God's people, and 3) the *results* of that gift for whomever receives it. After a general explanation of each aspect of the eschatological Spirit and its divergence from other instances of reception of God's Spirit,

⁶ Von Wahlde, 1:444. Cf. von Wahlde, *Commandments*, 123ff.

I will analyze individual passages from Jewish Prophetic texts in which the gift of the Spirit displays these aspects.⁷

The Spirit Given at a Future Time

Unlike in other places in Jewish Scripture where the Spirit of God comes upon (הִיָּה, לְבַשׁ, or צִלָּה) an individual human being for some indeterminate amount of time during his or her life,⁸ the Spirit in the Prophetic texts is largely understood to be a gift of the future, reserved for those days in which God will intervene in history to bring redemption or restoration to the suffering people of Israel.⁹ While this may technically be the same Spirit of God that has fallen intermittently upon the past leaders and kings of Israel, it would seem that the effects on human beings of the Spirit that will be poured out on (הִפֵּשׁ, עָרָה, or יִצָּק) or put within (נָתַן + קָרַב) them during God's anticipated intervention in history on behalf of the whole remnant of Israel are markedly different, particularly in the degree of their effects. For this reason, it is important to identify this Spirit of God as particularly the *eschatological* Spirit of God; its different place in time leads directly to its different effects on human beings. While defining what constitutes a text or time

⁷ For a similar methodological approach to these texts, see Finny Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology: The Eschatological Bestowal of the Spirit upon Gentiles in Judaism and in the Early Development of Paul's Theology* (WUNT 2/194; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 32-76. In the second chapter of the book, Philip explores some of the same Prophetic Literature as a background to Paul's understanding of the receipt of the eschatological Spirit of God by Gentile converts. While the focus of that study utilizes different categories to assess the passages, those of expectation of the Spirit and recipients, the results of Philip's analysis are similarly used to provide background for the later Pauline conception of Spirit bestowal.

⁸ This is the common description of the gift of the Spirit of God to the leaders and kings of Israel. This Spirit, particularly in the narratives of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets, is given to various individuals intermittently. See David G. Firth, "The Spirit and Leadership: Testimony, Empowerment and Purpose," in *Presence, Power and Promise: The Role of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011), 263-280.

⁹ Robin Routledge, "The Spirit and the Future in the Old Testament: Restoration and Renewal," in *Presence, Power and Promise: The Role of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011), 348-349 and Van Gemeren, "The Spirit of Restoration," *WTJ* 50 (1988): 81-102.

period as eschatological has been a difficult task for scholars, I use the term here in a somewhat broad sense to indicate the time of God's expected intervention in human history, an intervention that will result either in a full transformation of life on earth or a transformation from the old, earthly reality to a new, heavenly one.¹⁰

While it might seem self-evident that the Spirit of God discussed in texts that claim prophetic insight refers to God's eschatological Spirit, it is necessary to make this distinction given the variation that exists in the conception of the Spirit of God throughout the Jewish Scriptures in general and within the Jewish Prophetic Literature more particularly. In cases where the Spirit is understood to be one yet to be given, authors typically utilize time markers that point towards the future. Eschatological periods of time are many times indicated in Jewish Scripture by phrases that refer to the future Day of the Lord,¹¹ which describe God's intervention in history on behalf of God's people.¹² These phrases range from the more specific 'day of the LORD,' 'day of vengeance,' or 'day of judgment,' to the rather general 'on that day' or 'in those days.'

However, each is used to describe the time at which God will in some way enter into the

¹⁰ For a helpful discussion of this definition of the term 'eschatological', see D.E. Gowan's Preface in *Eschatology in the Old Testament* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2000), especially viii-ix. Cf. Willem VanGemeren and Andrew Abernethy, "The Spirit and the Future: A Canonical Approach" in *Presence, Power and Promise: The Role of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011), 323-324.

¹¹ Of course, not all instances of these phrases definitively refer to future events or need be considered eschatological. As pointed out by A. Joseph Everson, there are times when phrases related to the Day of the Lord refer to past or imminent events. See A. Joseph Everson, "The Days of Yahweh," *JBL* 93 no. 3 (1974): 330. However, Yair Hoffman asserts that *most* occurrences of the phrase Day of the Lord do refer to future events and that even if the phrase was not always eschatological in nature (in the case of Amos 5:18-20, for example), later prophecies (particularly after 587BCE) have a clear eschatological meaning. See Yair Hoffman, "The Day of the Lord As a Concept and a Term in the Prophetic Literature," *ZAW* 93 no. 1 (1981): 46. As a result, I will treat each instance separately when reviewing individual passages in the sections that follow.

¹² See Shimon Bakon, "The Day of the Lord," *JBQ* 38 no. 3 (July, 2010): 149. Cf. Everson, "Days," 330 n. 6.

earthly realm to aid God's people in the judgment and destruction of their enemies and to ensure their own redemption.¹³ While such phrases are certainly not the sole indicators of the aspect of future time or an eschatological context, passages concerning the reception of God's Spirit that open with or lie in close proximity to these phrases are of particular interest here.

The Spirit Given in Abundance to God's People

The future bestowal of the Spirit of God to Israel not only marks a definite break between present/past and future realities, but is also described as being given in rather specific ways. The most common description of *how* and *to whom* this Spirit is transmitted is that it is poured out upon (הִפָּשׁ, עָרָה, or יָצַק)¹⁴ or put or placed within (קָרַב + נָתַן) someone or some group. While in many places in Jewish Scripture outside the Prophetic texts the Spirit of God comes upon (הָיָה, לָבַשׁ, or צָלַח) its recipients (Judg. 6:34, 11:29, 14:6, 19, 15:14; 1Sam. 10:6, 10, 11:6, 16:13, 18:10, 19:9, 20, 23; 2Chron. 15:1, 20:14, 24:20), the Spirit of God in Jewish Prophetic Literature (particularly when it is the eschatological Spirit of God) is more often poured out on or put within the whole people of Israel.¹⁵

Linguistically, then, a case can be made that the use of these specific terms are meant to depict a gift that is given in a quantitatively different way than God's bestowal of the Spirit in periods of time outside the eschaton, that is, times in which God lends

¹³ Bakon, "Day," 149.

¹⁴ While the Hebrew verbs for pour out vary, each is understood to be similar in meaning. See Routledge, "The Spirit and the Future," 353 n. 17 or Block, "Prophet," 47.

¹⁵ The exception here is Isa. 11:2, which uses the verb נָתַן to describe the gift of the eschatological Spirit of God. However, the Spirit is in this case not bestowed upon the community as a whole but is confined to the ideal, Davidic king that is described in the text and therefore will not be discussed here.

God's power to the kings or prophets for the purposes of battle strength or revelatory ability. While the descriptions of the Spirit as poured out denote movement with great force or abundance,¹⁶ the description of the Spirit being placed or put within seems to imply a gift of interiority, one that is not simply coming upon a person (only to later depart), but rather one that has been ingrained *within* that person. It is helpful here to note not just the use of the verb נָתַן (to put or place), but its accompanying קָרַב (inside). The term קָרַב, when it is used in the construction בְּקִרְבָּנָם, has the implication of being within something or someone. The noun קָרַב on its own refers typically to inward parts, often to the seat of thoughts, emotions or dispositions.¹⁷ If it is to be understood from the texts that it is God's Spirit that is being put inside (of the most inward parts) of the people of Israel, then the implication would seem to be one of a total takeover of their thoughts and dispositions.¹⁸

The Gift of the Spirit Results in a Transformation of Reality

Just as the time and manner of the reception of the Spirit is described differently in various texts of the Jewish Prophetic Literature, the effects that the Spirit has on those who receive it are similarly varied. While some texts emphasize the Spirit's effects on the Messianic figure alone, more frequently the Spirit is poured out upon or put within the

¹⁶See R. Liwak, "סַפַּק (sapak)," *TDOT* 15:431-435; B. Johnson, "יָצַק (yasq)," *TDOT* 6:254-259; H. Niehr, "עָרָה (ara)," *TDOT* 11:344-351.

¹⁷See S. Rattray and J. Milgrom, "קֶרֶב (qereb)," *TDOT* 13:148-151.

¹⁸ There is, however, an alternate position held by Hamilton, particularly with reference to the New Covenant texts in the Books of Ezekiel and Jeremiah, that this construction refers to God putting God's Spirit not *within* the people individually, but simply "in their midst," that is, back into the restored Temple. While this is certainly grammatically possible, given the placement of the new heart that parallels the gift of the Spirit in these passages, this understanding seems unconvincing. See Hamilton, *Indwelling*, 41-54.

whole of God's chosen people.¹⁹ In every instance, the receipt of God's Spirit marks a transformation of reality (from past/present to future) for the people of Israel and/or their environment. This restoration typically is conceived of as occurring after a single event, in which God intervenes in human history through the gift of the Spirit.²⁰

While the effects of the gift of the Spirit vary, each can be traced back in some respect to the covenant promises of God to Israel.²¹ In the Prophetic tradition the receipt of God's eschatological Spirit produces marked changes in Israel's political standing in which enemies are defeated and an anointed savior leads the people into peace and prosperity in their own land and in their relationship with God, which includes a closeness never before seen. In respect to this latter transformation, the people are able to know what God expects of them and can carry out these commandments with little to no exerted effort. They display a new knowledge of God's teachings due to the immediacy of this new relationship.²² While in some texts the emphasis is on the new leader and his advancement of justice, others depict a whole people changed, able to know and accept God's law without the need for coercion of any kind by virtue of the Spirit that God pours out upon them. What they all have in common, however, is the degree to which that transformation is enacted. In each case, once the Spirit of God has been received, there is a complete and total transformation of reality.

¹⁹ The focus of this chapter will be exclusively with the latter. Because my concern is with exploring the background of the conception of the gift of the eschatological Spirit of God in 1Jn, I limit my discussion in this chapter to depictions of the gift of the Spirit to the whole people of Israel.

²⁰ Routledge, "The Spirit and the Future," 349-356

²¹ Ibid, 348-48.

²² Ibid, 357.

The Gift of the Eschatological Spirit of God to God's Chosen People

More often than not, passages describe the gift of the eschatological Spirit of God to the people of Israel in Jewish Prophetic Literature, and they typically depict it as occurring in one of two ways. While the descriptions of the eschatological Spirit given to individual agents of God vary somewhat widely (the Spirit rests/settles upon, is placed upon, dwells within, or is poured out upon), the eschatological Spirit of God, when it is bestowed upon God's people as a whole, is in each case either *poured out upon* or *put within* the people of Israel. In the subsections that follow, I analyze individual passages depicting the eschatological gift of the Spirit to God's people, first addressing those that use terminology of outpouring, then turning to those that use terminology of indwelling.

Isaiah 32:14-17

*14 For the citadel will be abandoned, the multitude of the city forsaken; the hill and the tower will become caves forever, the joy of the wild asses, a pasture for the flocks; 15 until a Spirit from on high is **poured out** on us, and the wilderness becomes a fruitful field, the fruitful field becomes a forest. 16 Then judgment will dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness will remain in the fruitful field. 17 The work of righteousness will be peace, and the result of righteousness, quiet and trust forever.*²³

First Isaiah's account of the gift of the eschatological Spirit of God to God's people in Isaiah 32:15 is a prime example of an abundant gift that results in a total transformation of reality following its receipt. Chapter 32 falls towards the end of the larger literary unit made up of chapters 28-33, a string of oracles concerning the divine plan of punishment (followed by restoration) for the previous foolishness of Israel.²⁴ Isaiah 32, like Isaiah 33, displays the pattern of recounting Israel's current problems,

²³ Translations of the Hebrew text are from the MT and are my own. The LXX texts will not be noted unless they differ significantly from the Hebrew.

²⁴ Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (Louisville: John Knox, 2001), 237-238.

predicting the destruction of its enemies, and describing its future restoration.²⁵ Isa.

32:15-20 constitutes the literary subunit that depicts the final stage of this three-stage pattern.²⁶ It follows the prediction of the reign of the ideal king in vv. 1-8, a reign that is placed in opposition to the current reign of fools and villains, and a warning to the complacent daughters of Jerusalem in vv. 9-14, whose formerly comfortable lives will be thrown into turmoil. It is only then that the Spirit of God will overturn this desolation.²⁷

While it is unclear whether the intention of the author of First Isaiah (or any redactor of the text that came after him) was originally to depict Messianic rulers in vv. 1-2,²⁸ there are a number of indicators that point to the gift of the Spirit in v. 15 as eschatological in nature. First of all, Isa. 32:15 comes closely behind an “on that day” proclamation in 31:7 and not very far ahead of a declaration about the Lord’s “day of vengeance” at 34:8, both of which have been directly associated with the day of the Lord.²⁹ It also marks the turning point after which the current reality will be transformed into an entirely new one. Given its future place in time and its transformational nature, it would seem that this instance of God’s gift of the Spirit should be understood as the

²⁵ Ibid, 238. Cf. Philip, *Origins*, 51. Philip describes the context as within a *Heilsorakel* (salvation oracle) in which the prediction of a coming king is followed by judgment and, finally, an ideal future for Israel.

²⁶ Ibid, 241.

²⁷ Philip, *Origins*, 51.

²⁸ There is quite a bit of controversy regarding the composition history of the text of Isaiah that I will not address here. For an overview of the history of the discussion see Ulrich Berges, *The Book of Isaiah: Its Composition and Final Form* (trans. Millard C. Lind; HBM 46; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012). While it is certainly possible that vv. 1-8 are a product of the Wisdom tradition and did not originally provide the opening for an eschatological scenario, once they were grouped with vv. 15-20 (even if done by a later, post-exilic redactor), those verses too take on an eschatological tone. See Childs, *Isaiah*, 237.

²⁹ Everson, “Days,” 330.

eschatological Spirit of God, an eschatological Spirit not reserved only for a Messianic figure, but given over to the faithful of Israel.

The gift of the Spirit is not only eschatological, but also given in abundance and results in a total transformation of reality. Isaiah 32:15 depicts the gift of God's Spirit received by Israel as a whole.³⁰ This passage describes a time of desolation and forsakenness, after which justice, righteousness, and peace will fill the land and its people. The text reads, "For the citadel will be abandoned, the multitude of the city forsaken...until a Spirit from on high is *poured out* (פָּזַח) upon us" (Isa. 32:14-15). The turning point in the quality of these eras is the abundant outpouring of God's Spirit, the Spirit from on high that is poured out over all of God's chosen people.³¹

Isaiah 32:15 portrays what constitutes the eschatological Spirit of God, as its bestowal ushers in an entirely new way of being and entirely new environment for Israel. It depicts a future time in which Israel will be ruled by a righteous king and just princes, a total upheaval of the previous state of corrupted affairs. The outpouring of God's Spirit here is directly related to the transformation of a corrupt, desolate city into one marked by peace. There seems to be a chain of effects, all stemming from the receipt of God's eschatological Spirit: the wilderness will become fruitful and a home for justice and righteousness and that righteousness will in turn create peace and rest throughout the formerly tumultuous land (Isa. 32:16-18).³²

³⁰ Although it is not specifically the Spirit of God in this passage, but rather "the Spirit from on high (the high place)", it is largely understood as referring to this same Spirit. See Routledge, "The Spirit and the Future," 353; Philip, *Origins*, 54.

³¹ Routledge, "The Spirit and the Future," 354.

³² Philip, *Origins*, 55-56. Philip adds that the fruitfulness of the land can be understood also as a moral renewal of the nation, without which the peace and security that result would not be possible.

Isaiah 44:3-5

*3 For I will pour water on the thirsty, and floods on the dry ground; I will **pour** my Spirit upon your descendants, and my blessing on your offspring. 4 They shall spring up between the grass, like willows by flowing streams. 5 This one will say, "I am the Lord's," another will call himself by the name Jacob, yet another will write on his hand, "The Lord's," and adopt the name of Israel.*

Second Isaiah, too, depicts the gift of God's eschatological Spirit to God's chosen people in a rather similar way in Isaiah 44. The context of this description in Isa. 44:3-5 closely follows the pattern of sin, punishment, and restoration found in other texts that prophesy the coming of God's eschatological Spirit (Isa. 43:22-44:23).³³ The passage comes directly after an account of Israel's punishment and suffering due to its own sin in Isa. 43:22-28, during which God continues to defend against Israel's claims of injustice (Cf. Isa. 40:27).³⁴ Following the bestowal of the Spirit, God explains the foolishness of idol worship and then promises once again to redeem Israel and forgive its sin (Isa. 44:9-23). This process of restoration begins with the outpouring of God's Spirit.³⁵

The gift of the Spirit in Isa. 44:3 is also one that God will give in the future, one that will not drastically change the environment in which Israel lives, but rather will seal the descendants of Israel in their covenant with God and make them the Lord's once again.³⁶ When God speaks in Isa. 44:7c, God refers to God's announcements of the "things arriving and that will come" (וְאֵתֵיכֶם וְאֵשֶׁר תִּבְאֶנָּה), in contrast to what has been. Presumably, part of these events that have yet to take place has just been predicted in the

³³ Childs, *Isaiah*, 340-341; Philip, *Origins*, 57.

³⁴ The *Heilsorakel* in 44:1-5 follows God's case against Israel and for exile in 43:22-28. Philip, *Origins*, 57.

³⁵ Ibid, 57-58.

³⁶ Daniel I. Block, "Gog and the Pouring Out of the Spirit," *Vetus Testamentum* 37 no. 3 (1987): 268; Philip, *Origins*, 58.

previous verses, in which God has promised future blessings on the descendants to whom God speaks (Isa. 44:3c). The gift of the Spirit is also connected here with the total transformation of those descendants, who instead of sinning against God as did their ancestors (Isa. 43:22-28), will declare their fidelity to the one, true Lord.³⁷

As in the passage from First Isaiah, Second Isaiah describes the gift of the Spirit as an abundant outpouring, writing, “I will pour (עָרַה) my Spirit upon you” (Isa. 44:3c). While the verbs used in these passages differ (יָצַק and עָרַה, respectively), they each connote emptying, or a full transfer from one entity to another.³⁸ And along with each abundant gift comes a total change from present/past to future reality. For Second Isaiah, the transformation is shown through the increase of the descendants of Israel³⁹ and their renewed relationship with God that develops after the receipt of God’s eschatological Spirit. The people of Israel, previously separated from direct contact with God and God’s presence, will have God’s promised closeness and immediacy restored when the Spirit of God is poured out upon them.⁴⁰ This closeness is described as a kind of entitlement in Isaiah 44, in which the Spirit of God is poured out unto the people and results in the proclamation “I am the LORD’s”; those who receive this Spirit will renew their membership in God’s chosen people, Israel (Isa. 44:5). Once this outpouring occurs and those who have received the Spirit definitively belong to God, God promises to sweep

³⁷ Philip, *Origins*, 59.

³⁸ Johnson, *TDOT* 6:254 and Niehr, *TDOT* 11:344.

³⁹ Philip notes that the “they” in v. 4 should be understood as the descendants and not as vegetation, arguing that the result of the outpouring of the Spirit represents a fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise of blessing and descendants. Philip convincingly points to the antecedent “descendants” in the previous verse. Philip, *Origins*, 59-60.

⁴⁰ Block, “View,” 202-203.

away their sin so that they might be brought back into right relationship with God (Isa.

44:21-22).⁴¹ From the abundance of the gift of the Spirit comes the totality of this transformation in relationship to God.

Ezekiel 39:29

*29 And I will never again conceal my face from them, when I **pour out** my Spirit upon the house of Israel, says the Lord God.*

In Ezek. 39:29, the depiction of Israel's restoration is capped off with God's promise of the gift of God's eschatological Spirit⁴² on the house of Israel, following the defeat of the armies of Gog. This particular verse falls within the larger literary unit in Ezekiel 38-39, which describes a battle with Gog and his eventual defeat.⁴³ The account of this battle is situated between two sections devoted to Israel's restoration, Ezekiel 37

⁴¹ While the redemption of Israel and forgiveness of its sin are not directly related to the outpouring of the Spirit in this passage, this transformation does seem to be connected to the renewal of the people described in Isa. 44:5. It is those who call themselves Jacob and Israel whom God will remember for redemption in Isa. 44:21-22.

⁴² It is interesting to note that the MT and the LXX texts differ here. The LXX reads, "when I pour out my *wrath* upon the house of Israel," while the MT reads, "when I pour out my *spirit* upon the house of Israel." For an in-depth discussion of which is more original, see Johan Lust's "The Spirit of the Lord, or the Wrath of the Lord? Ezekiel 39,29," *ETL* 78 no. 1 (April 2002): 148-155. While Lust argues that the LXX represents an earlier version that was deliberately changed in the MT after chapters 37 and 39 were rearranged, I tend towards acceptance of those scholars who hold the primacy of the MT version. Lust's argument is based on the arrangement of chapters in P. 967, in which chapter 37 directly following chapter 39, and he contends that when chapter 39 was moved to its current position in the book, it was only then that the language of the text changed from an outpouring of wrath to an outpouring of the Spirit. See Johan Lust, "The Final Text and Textual Criticism: Ezekiel 39," in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*, (ed. Johan Lust; BETL 74; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peters, 1986), 52 n. 2. It seems more plausible, however, that the language of the LXX was changed in order to conform to the expression used more frequently in the book, the outpouring of wrath. Given the context of the passage, it makes less sense that an outpouring of God's wrath would result immediately in the restoration of God's presence to Israel than that this would be accomplished through an outpouring of the Spirit. For a defense of this position, see Daniel I Block, *The Book of Ezekiel Chapters 25-48* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 479; Cf. Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48* (WBC 29; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990), 202 and Ka Leung Wong, "The Masoretic and Septuagint Texts of Ezekiel 39, 21-29," *ETL* 78 no. 1 (Apr. 2002): 142-145. Philip also notes that the Targum supports the language of the MT. Philip, *Origins*, 47 n. 66.

⁴³ Paul M. Joyce, *Ezekiel: A Commentary* (eds. Claudia V. Camp and Andrew Mein; LHB/OTS 482; New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 213.

and 40-48.⁴⁴ In a pattern similar to that found in the eschatological Spirit passages of Isaiah, the gift of the Spirit proceeds a time of turmoil for Israel and precedes its redemption by God. While there is some suggestion that vv. 21-29 are a later addition to the text by a redactor, the unit in its current state closes with the hope of restoration.⁴⁵

The gift of the Spirit is again in Ezekiel 39 a gift that has yet to be bestowed, one that will be received only in the future, after the final eschatological battle of Gog.⁴⁶ The battle is described as taking place “on that day” in v. 11 and “on the day that I show my glory” in v. 13, phrases that mark the time of the event as eschatological in nature.⁴⁷ Furthermore, the battle scene in Ezekiel 37-39 depicts a kind of eschatological holy war in which God intervenes to defeat Israel’s enemies.⁴⁸ Together, the chapters that make up the battle scene and surrounding material can be understood as proto-apocalyptic⁴⁹ and contain many eschatological features that support the conclusion that the gift of the Spirit in Ezek. 39:29 should be considered the eschatological bestowal of God’s Spirit.

As in the passages from First and Second Isaiah, the Spirit of God is again bestowed vigorously upon all the people of Israel, who here have been gathered together

⁴⁴ As stated above, the earliest Greek text of Ezekiel found in P. 967 does not follow this sequence. P. 967 has chapters 38-39 preceding chapter 37, which in turn is followed directly by chapter 40. While there has been a small amount of support in scholarship for the primacy of this arrangement, see Johan Lust, “Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript,” *CBQ* 43 (1981): 517-533, the majority hold that the MT arrangement is older or that the P. 967 sequence is part of a separate restoration tradition. Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 212. Cf. Ashley Crane, *Israel’s Restoration: A Textual-Comparative Exploration of Ezekiel 36-39* (VTSupp 122; Boston: Brill, 2008).

⁴⁵ Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 217.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 213.

⁴⁷ *Ibid*, 217.

⁴⁸ Sverre Boe, *Gog and Magog: Ezekiel 38-39 as Pretext for Revelation 19, 17-21 and 20, 7-10* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 122-125.

⁴⁹ *Ibid*, 139. Cf. Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 213.

by God into their promised land. God describes the gift God will give, saying “I will pour out (יִפְּשׁוּ) my Spirit upon them,” here too emphasizing the abundance of the gift. The effects of this full outpouring of the Spirit will also be totally transformative. The outpouring of the Spirit takes place after the great battle of Gog, again depicting a time of turmoil before the restoration of Israel and the Temple can occur. God explains that because of their transgressions, God has hidden God’s face from Israel in this former era, but assures the people that the presence and relationship promised to them in times past will be granted to them and that their sins will be mercifully forgiven and their shame forgotten (Ezek. 39:23, 26).⁵⁰ This transformation will come to fruition only when God pours out God’s Spirit on the people, at which point God solemnly swears never again to “hide my face from them” (Ezek. 39:29). This promise marks a new relationship between Israel and God, one in which God is immediately available to all God’s people in a kind of face-to-face interaction.⁵¹ The Spirit will transform Israel’s ability to obey God, so that this relationship can once again be restored, and they may once again settle in their land.⁵² Such a relationship implies a closeness to and knowledge of God that was not formerly available to Israel due to their transgressions and estrangement and due to their lack of understanding of and commitment to God. Once again, God’s eschatological Spirit, outpoured on Israel, effects a total transformation in the way that it relates to God.

⁵⁰ Readings of this verse vary, and there has been much debate over which represents the earlier text. The variant reading, “they shall *bear* their shame” changes the meaning of the text rather significantly. For discussion and argument in favor of the reading chosen here, see Wong, “Masoretic,” 130-147.

⁵¹ Block, “Gog,” 37.

⁵² Philip, *Origins*, 48-49. Philip argues that because God’s face has been hidden based on Israel’s previous disobedience, the statement made by God concerning *never again* hiding God’s face from them must imply a kind of permanent obedience once the Spirit has been received.

Heb. Joel 3:1-2⁵³

*1 And afterward I will **pour out** my Spirit on all flesh; your sons and your daughters will prophecy, your old men will dream dreams, and your young men will see visions. 2 And also on the male and female slaves, in those days, I will pour out my Spirit.*

The Book of Joel also contains a similar description of the gift of God's eschatological Spirit to the people of Israel. The passage comes in the larger literary unit that describes the eschatological Day of the Lord in Joel 3:1-4:17.⁵⁴ It stands as a prediction about the coming political restoration of Israel after the plague of the locusts described in Joel 1:1-2:11 and the agricultural restoration in 2:18-27.⁵⁵ As in the other Prophetic texts that have been reviewed in this section, the process of restoration moves from a depiction of Israel's past sin and punishment, to a call for repentance, to God's eventual salvation.⁵⁶ The outpouring of God's Spirit on the whole of the people of Israel follows their previous turmoil and marks the turning point after which political renewal begins.

The gift is one that is yet to come to the people of Israel, one that will mark a sharp distinction between past/present and future realities.⁵⁷ The text begins by depicting the current turmoil faced by Israel and the prophet calling the people to repentance

⁵³ It is interesting to note that in the LXX version of Joel 2:28-29 the verbs for outpouring are rendered with a partitive genitive, even though there is no indication from the Hebrew text that this should be the case. I will further explore this possible instance of the partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit in the following chapter when I review the use of LXX Joel 2:28-29 in Acts 2:17-18.

⁵⁴ Elie Assis, *The Book of Joel: A Prophet Between Calamity and Hope* (eds. Claudia V. Camp and Andrew Mein; LHB/OTS 581; New York: T&T Clark, 2013), 198.

⁵⁵ Ibid. Cf. Philip, *Origins*, 65.

⁵⁶ Philip describes this section as a salvation announcement. Philip, *Origins*, 65.

⁵⁷ Erika Moore, "Joel's Promise of the Spirit," in *Presence, Power and Promise: The Role of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011), 249.

(twice) (Heb. Joel 1:1-2:27). God, answering the calls of Israel, gives God's Spirit to all people (Heb. Joel 3:1), after which the destruction of Israel's enemies and beginning of a new future of glory for Israel is predicted to take place (Heb. Joel 4:1 ff.). The prophet also makes multiple references to the nearness of the day of the Lord (Heb. Joel 1:15; 2:1, 11; 3:4; 4:14), indicating the Spirit here should be understood in an eschatological context.⁵⁸

The gift of Spirit here is also bestowed upon the people in an abundant way. Joel 3:1-2 states that God will pour out (יִפְּשׁ) God's eschatological Spirit on the future people of Israel. The verb not only denotes the abundance of this gift,⁵⁹ but also is presented as coming upon "all flesh" (3:1). The fact that the Spirit here is poured out upon *all* people displays a marked contrast to the way the Spirit of God is shown to be given to the leaders and prophets in other places in Jewish Scripture, namely, in the Torah and Former Prophets.⁶⁰ In these books, when the Spirit rests upon a prophet or king of Israel, the divine power associated with that Spirit belongs solely to God's agent on whom it intermittently is set.⁶¹ God's Spirit as it is given in this case, however, belongs to all those who ask for it, to "all who call upon the name of the Lord" (3:5). Not only is God's Spirit being vigorously handed over, but there are also a great number of recipients of that Spirit as well.

⁵⁸ The phrase "in that day" is also used at the end of the book in 4:18. Philip notes that this passage displays the typical features of eschatological outpouring, the first person singular "my Spirit" along with the verb יִפְּשׁ. Philip, *Origins*, 65.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Moore, "Promise," 250.

⁶¹ Ibid.

The transformative effects that take place in Joel 3:1-2 are also enacted in a complete way. One of these effects is a new knowledge of and relationship to God made possible through the outpouring of the Spirit. While the text itself refers to the ability of all to prophecy (Heb. Joel 3:1), the implications of this now universal ability are perhaps farther reaching.⁶² The outpouring of God's Spirit in this case is said to be on all flesh and results in a transformation of connection between all of Israel (your sons and your daughters, your old men, and your young men) and God,⁶³ enabling each to have knowledge of God's plans for Israel previously possessed by only a few among them. An obvious privilege of the prophets in past times was that of being in direct contact with God.⁶⁴ Therefore, the extension of this privilege to all of Israel, regardless of gender, age, or social standing, is no small change. It marks a transformation from bystander or inactive listener to direct recipient of God's revelation.⁶⁵ After the outpouring of God's Spirit, it would seem that *any* member of the community could claim access to direct knowledge of God and God's work. This new, implied equality of access after the abundant reception of the eschatological Spirit is a complete reversal of the former reality, a total transformation.

Ezekiel 11:19-20, 36:26-27 and Jeremiah 31:33-34

While the abundance of the gift of the eschatological Spirit of God is most often conveyed by the use of verbs of outpouring (עָרַה, דָּפַשׁ, or יָצַק), it is also frequently

⁶² Moore, "Promise," 250.

⁶³ Philip, *Origins*, 66-67.

⁶⁴ Moore, "Promise," 250.

⁶⁵ *Ibid*, 251.

described as being *put within*. Two very similar passages that describe the gift of the eschatological Spirit in this way are Ezekiel 11:19-20 and Ezekiel 36:26-27. While Jeremiah 31:33-34 does not deal with the bestowal of the Spirit directly, its similarity to the two passages from Ezekiel also warrants some discussion.

Ezekiel 11:19-20

*19 I will give them one heart, and **put** a new Spirit **within you**; I will take away the heart of stone from their flesh and give them a heart of flesh, 20 so that they may walk in my statutes and observe my ordinances and do them. And they shall be my people, and I will be their God.*

This passage from Ezekiel 11 shows the gift of the eschatological Spirit given in the midst of scenes devoted to descriptions of judgment. Ezek. 11:14-21 makes up a literary unit in the form of an oracle of hope.⁶⁶ The passage marks a small section of positive prophesy surrounded by the condemnation of the house of Israel and the prediction of its punishment in Ezek. 11:1-13 and chapters 12-13. On the whole, the chapters that surround this short and abrupt insertion of hopefulness for Israel predict the turmoil that it will face at the time of God's judgment.⁶⁷ It is in this context of predicted punishment that God assures Israel of its ultimate salvation and restoration through the gift of God's Spirit, promising a new ability to overcome the sins of the past that warranted such punishment.

The Book of Ezekiel in many places states that the day of the Lord draws near⁶⁸ (Ezek. 7:7, 12, 19; 13:5; 30:3, 9; 36:33).⁶⁹ In several passages God's voice describes

⁶⁶ Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 109-110.

⁶⁷ Ibid, 111.

⁶⁸ While the exact phrase "day of the Lord" is not always used, variations of the title are used that connote the same place in time. See Everson, "Days," 330 n. 6.

actions of God that will take place at a future time, particularly a time marked by battle (Ezek. 13:5), the destruction of Israel's enemies (Ezek. 7:1-27, 30:1-9), or the restoration of Israel's land or integrity (Ezek. 36:33). The voice of God goes further, however, in describing this time of tribulation and restoration by explicitly identifying it with the end (קץ). At the beginning of chapter 7, the voice of God is heard warning Israel not only that the "day of the Lord" is at hand, but also that "the end has come" (Ezek. 7:2, 6) and that "the end is upon you" (Ezek. 7:3). This end that the voice of God describes is a time of doom and punishment in which Israel's iniquities will be judged and reality as it has formerly existed will draw to a halt (Ezek. 7:1-27).

While the gift of the Spirit comes at a future time in this passage as it does in the passages previously discussed in this section, the description here is not one of outpouring. Rather, the Spirit in Ezekiel 11:19 is put or placed within the people of Israel. Although this may seem to downplay the abundance of the gift denoted by the use of

⁶⁹ While these passages make the eschatological context of the Book of Ezekiel as a whole seem obvious, the function of the Spirit of God as it is portrayed in the text varies considerably. The assumption might be made that because the text itself is so clearly eschatological that any mention of God's Spirit therein would likewise be deemed the *eschatological* Spirit of God. However, the term רוּחַ does not function in the text in only one way. See Daniel I. Block, "The Prophet of the Spirit: The Use of *rwħ* in the Book of Ezekiel," *JETS* 32 no. 1 (1989): 27-49; James Robson, *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*, (LHBO 447; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 92. The book itself, in fact, is a good example of why it is important to make a distinction between the eschatological רוּחַ of God and God's Spirit as it acts upon kings and prophets at other points in history. Of the multiple references to the רוּחַ in the text, only four should be considered as the *eschatological* רוּחַ of God. These are the texts that describe the Spirit as being put within or poured out onto the people of Israel in an effort to restore life (Ezek. 37:14) or produce behavior proper to God's designated covenant partners (Ezek. 11:19; 36:26-27; 39:29). The majority of the references are to the Spirit as it works in the inspiration of Ezekiel's prophecy (3:12-14, 24; 8:3; 11:1, 5, 24; 37:1; 43:5). Of these references, 8:3, 11:1, and 43:5 could also be translated simply as 'wind' (one used for transporting the prophet between visions), when read in combination with other descriptions of this 'wind' in 11:24 and 37:1. There seems to be little doubt, though, that these references are at least to an angelic Spirit and at most to the Spirit of the Lord. See Block, "View," 182-183. However, even when the language used looks very similar, the function of the רוּחַ varies even within the text of Ezekiel. The passages concerning God's Spirit under consideration here, therefore, are confined to those four passages (11:19, 36:26-27, 37:14, 39:29) that describe the Spirit as being given to the whole remnant of Israel and marking a stark contrast between present/past and future realities, that is, those passages that present the Spirit as it is given at the eschaton. See Van Gemeren and Abernethy, "The Spirit and the Future," 338-341.

verbs of outpouring, the Spirit here is described as an entirely “new Spirit”⁷⁰ (11:19). It stands to reason, then that the Spirit being put within the people is a spirit other than the spirit that existed within the people of Israel previously.⁷¹ The Spirit of God here is not necessarily described as given in abundance or with vigor, but given as a replacement of some former spirit, as implied by the otherness of the modifiers new and my.⁷² The totality of the gift, therefore, is implied in that it functionally removes the old and inserts the new.

As this new Spirit replaces the old, it ensures an entirely transformed pattern of behavior for the people of Israel that is connected to a better knowledge of and relationship to God.⁷³ Once the people of Israel have access to the mind of God, they are also, seemingly automatically, able to follow God’s commands. The proper knowledge of and response to God’s commands by Israel as God’s chosen people are assured when God’s Spirit is put within them in Ezek. 11:19; God then states that Israel will once again be able to obey God’s statutes in Ezek. 11:20. Israel’s relationship to God is changed once this new Spirit is put into them, and they are able to (Ezek. 11:19) follow God’s ordinances. This new ability leads to an ethical purity in Israel with respect to their acting

⁷⁰ Ezekiel 18:31 also speaks of Israel’s need for a new spirit, but here it is not God who promises to put the spirit within them. Instead, it is God who calls on Israel to get themselves a new heart and new spirit through repentance and avoidance of transgressions.

⁷¹ Klein describes this as a “complete renewal of the human interior.” See Anja Klein, “Prophecy Continued: Reflections on Innerbiblical Exegesis in the Book of Ezekiel,” *Vetus Testamentum* 60 (2010): 581.

⁷² It is an entirely new spirit, the Spirit of *God*, that exists within them. This totality of difference becomes even more obvious when the total transformation of behavior that is described as taking place or the renewal of life that occurs as a result of this gift are considered. That is, behavior and life that is fitting for God’s covenant partners. See Routledge, “The Spirit and the Future,” 357.

⁷³ Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 115.

in accordance with what God has taught them.⁷⁴ Because the heart and the spirit are the seats of the moral will and mark the inner realities of those in whom they reside, the replacement of the old, sinful versions of them with new, God-like capacities ensures a total transformation of Israel's behavior.⁷⁵

Ezekiel 36:26-27

*26 And I will give to you a new heart, and a new spirit I will **put within** you; and I will take away the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. 27 I will **put my Spirit within** you, and make you walk in my statutes, and you will observe my ordinances and do them.*

A very similar presentation of the gift of the eschatological Spirit to Israel is found in Ezekiel 36. Unlike the instance in Ezekiel 11, this passage is not surrounded by multiple depictions of Israel's judgment. Rather, it follows directly after a blessing on Israel and vow by God to turn on the nations (Ezek. 36:1-13). In fact, chapter 36 represents the parallel to chapter 6, reversing the judgment placed upon the "mountains of Israel" in that chapter.⁷⁶ While the immediate context differs somewhat from the process of sin, punishment, and renewal seen in other accounts of the bestowal of the eschatological Spirit of God, the gift of the Spirit here too brings about a reversal of God's former condemnation of Israel.⁷⁷ The larger section from Ezek. 36:16-32 both reviews the past and looks forward to the future.⁷⁸ In addition, the well-known Valley of the Dry Bones passage that follows in Ezek. 37:1-14 and reunification of Israel and Judah

⁷⁴ Ibid, 358-359.

⁷⁵ Ibid, 115-116.

⁷⁶ Ibid, 43.

⁷⁷ Philip notes that the restoration takes place in order to protect God's reputation. Philip, *Origins*, 37.

⁷⁸ Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 203.

in 37:15-28 act as a kind of climax to this and other previous accounts of Israel's renewal.⁷⁹

The language here is very similar to that of Ezek. 11:19-20 and also describes a new heart and new Spirit being placed within Israel. Ezek. 36:26-27, however, makes specific what can only be inferred from Ezekiel 11. That is, that the new Spirit that will be placed within the people of Israel is, in fact, God's own Spirit (my Spirit) (Ezek. 36:27).⁸⁰ Furthermore, the previous Spirit is once again described as being removed and replaced. This removal and replacement is made clear by the parallel with the new heart in 36:26, in which God promises to make Israel's heart of stone *depart* and give it instead a heart of flesh. The new heart and new spirit may even constitute a "recreated humanity,"⁸¹ one that has been completely internally possessed by these gifts from God. The totality of these gifts is seen here, as in Ezek. 11:19-20, in the departure of the old moral inclinations and arrival of the new.⁸²

The result of this transformation in heart and Spirit is Israel's total cleansing from iniquities (Ezek. 36:29) and complete observance of God's commands (Ezek. 36:27//11:20). The following of the commands in Ezekiel 11, however, seems less automatic than in Ezekiel 36. While Ezek. 11:20 states that the placement of the Spirit into the people is so that they *may* walk in God's commands, the placement of the Spirit

⁷⁹ Ibid, 208.

⁸⁰ Philip, *Origins*, 40. Philip explains that "my Spirit" here has a theological and not simply anthropological connotation.

⁸¹ David M. Morgan, "Ezekiel and the Twelve: Similar Concerns as an Indication of a Shared Tradition," *BBR* 20 no. 3 (2010): 381.

⁸² Philip, *Origins*, 40.

into the people in Ezek. 36:27 will *make* Israel obey, seemingly through no effort of its own.⁸³ Again, the seats of moral inclination (the heart and Spirit) once renewed change Israel's ability to behave. The gift of the Spirit will also result in a return to the land (Ezek. 36:28) and salvation from all their uncleanness (Ezek. 36:27, 29). Not only are the previous internal workings of Israel completely replaced through the overtaking of God's Spirit, but also the past reality of Israel's punishment and condemnation is totally transformed into a reality in which God's covenant promises have been fulfilled.

Jeremiah 31:33-34

*33 But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will **put** my law **within** them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they will be my people. 34 And they will no longer teach one another, or say to each other, "Know the Lord," for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin I will remember no more.*

While Jeremiah 31 does not explicitly mention the Spirit, it seems evident from the similarities between this text and that of Ezekiel 11 and 36 that the authors envision the restoration of Israel in much the same way.⁸⁴ The passage is part of the block of material made up of a collection of oracles of consolation in Jeremiah 30-33 that are positive in tone when compared to the surrounding text in the larger literary section

⁸³ Ibid, 41.

⁸⁴ Morgan, "Ezekiel and the Twelve," 381. Cf. Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 37-39. While it is uncertain whether any direct literary dependence exists between the two books, some influence (perhaps mutual influence) seems probable.

marked by Jeremiah 26-45.⁸⁵ Ezek. 31:31-34 describes the height of eschatological blessing and hopes after chapters of material depicting Israel's error and punishment.⁸⁶

As in the passages from the Book of Ezekiel regarding the Spirit, the implantation of the law will come at a future time, after a time of turmoil when God will at last offer salvation to God's chosen people. In Jer. 31:27 and 31:31, the author introduces his predictions for the future writing, "The days are surely coming when" and then describes God's forthcoming plans. He also describes the time of God's new covenant as taking place "after *those days*" (Jer. 31:33a). Each of these time markers indicate that this new covenant has yet to be enacted and is still a prospect of the future, and that once it is given this covenant will result in the total transformation of those who receive it.

Both the passages in Ezekiel and in Jeremiah describe the transformation of the hearts of the people of Israel, which enables them to know the laws and commands of God in a directly accessible way, without any human teaching.⁸⁷ Jeremiah 31:33-34 takes this a step further, however, explaining that Israel will have the law put in their inward parts (בְּקִרְבָּם) and "written on their hearts (לִבָּם)," as in the texts from Ezekiel, implying a complete takeover of the seat of moral inclination by the law of God (Jer. 31:33). As a result, they will no longer teach each other because they will all know the LORD "from the least of them to the greatest" (Jer. 31:34). Knowing the LORD in this case is not reserved for the leaders of Israel or those learned in the Torah. Similar to Joel's

⁸⁵ For an overview of the macrostructure of the Book of Jeremiah, see Leslie C. Allen, *Jeremiah* (Louisville: John Knox, 2008), 12-14. Cf. J. A. Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 27-29.

⁸⁶ Allen, *Jeremiah*, 355.

⁸⁷ David Rhymer, "Jeremiah 31:31-34," *Interpretation* 59 (July 1, 2005): 294-297.

prediction of a universal prophetic ability, Jeremiah's text depicts knowledge of God's Torah commands as being inherent to *all* of Israel.⁸⁸

Jeremiah's text also points to two other transformative aspects of the restored Israel: they will once again be declared God's people, and God will forgive their sins and forget their iniquities (Jer. 31:34). While in the case of Jeremiah it is putting the *law* within that causes this transformation, the effects of the eschatological transformation of God's people are very similar to those resulting from the gift of the eschatological Spirit. Due to these overlaps in language and effects, it seems probable that the expectations of the gift of the Spirit to the people of Israel described in Ezekiel 11 and 36 would be associated with the expectations of Jeremiah's New Covenant. In each case there is a total possession by God of the inward parts of the people followed by a complete transformation of their understanding, behavior, and overall relationship to God.

Ezekiel 37:14

*14 I will **put** my Spirit **in** you, and you will live, and I will place you on your own land; then you will know that I, the Lord, have spoken and will act, says the Lord.*

There is one other description of the eschatological gift of the Spirit in the Book of Ezekiel. Ezek. 37:14 comes at the end of the passage commonly referred to as the Valley of the Dried Bones, which spans Ezek. 37:1-14.⁸⁹ This prediction about the implantation of the Spirit is part of the larger series of restoration oracles found in chapters 33-39, which marks a hopeful turn for Israel's future.⁹⁰ The Valley of the Dried Bones vision is its own unit, directly followed by the Two Sticks prophesy, which

⁸⁸ Ibid, 295.

⁸⁹ Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 208.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

predicts the reunification of Israel and Judah (the Northern and Southern kingdoms) under one king. Together, the two metaphorical visions in Ezekiel 37 express the total restoration of God's people, in their relationship with God and each other.

Such restoration will take place at a point in the future, when the bestowal of the eschatological Spirit of God will create an entirely new life for Israel in relation to God and the land.⁹¹ As depicted in Ezek. 37:1-14, the Spirit of God can reanimate what was once dead when it is put within (נָתַן בְּרִכָּם) the people. In this passage, the dried up bones (עֲצָם), a representation of the house of Israel, are redressed with flesh and sinews and brought out of their graves (Ezek. 37:8-11). These breathless bodies then emerge from their graves and once again live, but only once the Spirit of God has been put within⁹² them (Ezek. 37:12-14). Furthermore, as a result of this release from the grave and implantation of God's Spirit, those who were once dead will now "know the LORD" (Ezek. 37:13). The passage is thought by most scholars not to depict actual, bodily resurrection, but to represent a metaphor of the formerly dead house of Israel.⁹³ This spiritual death can be understood as a time in which Israel has been estranged from God, and the gift of the Spirit marks a renewal of its life, since God's Spirit has been put within it.⁹⁴

⁹¹ Philip, *Origins*, 45.

⁹² Hamilton makes a distinction here between putting within and putting in their midst, arguing that only in Ezekiel 37:14 should we understand the Spirit of God to be infused into the inward parts of these reanimated human beings. See Hamilton, *Indwelling*, 50. For the reasons given previously, I reject this distinction.

⁹³ Hildebrandt, *Theology*, 96-97; Block, "View," 195; Routledge, "The Spirit and the Future," 351.

⁹⁴ Routledge, "The Spirit and the Future," 349-352.

In this case, the implantation of God's Spirit leads to an entirely new life for the previously dead people of God, a total transformation from the once dried up, lifeless bones to living, breathing human beings covered in new flesh.⁹⁵ They have been brought back, through the life force that is the Spirit of God, and now possess a newness of knowledge concerning who the LORD is and what the LORD is capable of. They will also be restored politically/geographically in their own land. The results of the gift of the Spirit here mark the fulfillment of a number of God's eschatological promises, including new life, a new understanding of God, and restoration in the promised land.⁹⁶

Conclusion

All of these texts that describe the gift of God's eschatological Spirit to the whole people of Israel depict this gift as taking place some time in the future, during God's intervention in history. After establishing that these texts present a particular endowment of the Spirit of God to be received at a future, eschatological time, either on the "day of judgment," "day of the Lord," or simply "on/in those days," it is possible to move towards an understanding of what a future group of believers that considers themselves to be living in that time might expect of this gift of the Spirit.

Furthermore, if these groups built their understandings of Spirit bestowal on those instances predicted in the texts reviewed in this section, then the expectation would be that certain characteristics from these depictions would inform those understandings. Since the Spirit of God is depicted in these texts as being poured out or put within the people of God, it stands to reason that the expectations of later groups would be of an

⁹⁵ Philip, *Origins*, 44.

⁹⁶ Ibid, 45-46.

abundant gift or total replacement of their own spirit by God's. The expectation would likely be that *all* of reality would be transformed at this future time in ways that relate to the fulfillment of certain promises of God's past covenants. As predicted by these texts, all of Israel would be able through the bestowal of the eschatological Spirit to come into more direct contact with God and in turn be able to better know and follow God's covenant commands, regardless of their standing in society. This knowledge and ability would also lead to the restoration of justice and peace for Israel and make right their relationship with God as God's people.

In the next chapter, I will explore how these predictions from Jewish Prophetic Literature seem to have affected the expectations of Spirit bestowal in later groups that understand themselves to be living in the end times and to have already received God's eschatological Spirit. As in this chapter, I will analyze the aspects of time, quantity, and result in each passage depicting the eschatological bestowal of God's Spirit in the Dead Sea Scrolls, non-Johannine New Testament, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Conclusions from that analysis will then be used as a basis for comparison with these three aspects of Spirit bestowal depicted in 1Jn.

CHAPTER THREE

ABUNDANT GIFT, PARTIAL TRANSFORMATION: THE INTERPRETATION OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL GIFT OF GOD'S SPIRIT IN JEWISH APOCALYPTIC AND EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

Now that the general expectations for the gift of the eschatological Spirit of God in Jewish Prophetic Literature are established, I turn to an exploration of the ways in which later groups of believers interpreted and understood those texts. Before determining if the author of 1Jn portrays the gift of the eschatological Spirit in a way that is unique, it is necessary to review other sets of literature in order to obtain a further standard for comparison. Because a number of groups seem to have utilized the texts of the Jewish Prophets in an effort to understand their own positions in God's plan for history, how those groups interpret and apply these texts for and to themselves is of great interest here. In this chapter, I look to examine how believers who see themselves as already having received the eschatological Spirit of God understand the quantity and effects of that reception based on their interpretations of the predictions in the Jewish Prophetic Literature reviewed in the last chapter. The results of this study will then be used as a basis for comparison with the conception of the Spirit in 1Jn, with the goal of ascertaining whether that conception fits in with or breaks from these other

Interpretations of how the eschatological Spirit will be received by God's people¹ and how those who receive it will transform as a result.

Methodology and Choice of Comparative Literature

Before surveying the relevant texts, it is necessary to explain both the methodology of this chapter and the reasons for choosing certain texts rather than others.² To start, the method used in this chapter is one focused on comparative literature, utilizing word studies (particularly searches for instances of the terms *πνεῦμα* and *רוּחַ*) to find texts that address the notion of the Spirit. Once these instances are uncovered, a full reading and exegesis of the surrounding material is performed, in order to ascertain whether or not the Spirit in question is meant to be understood as the eschatological Spirit of God and how it is being presented in terms of the quantity of the Spirit given and its transformative effects. I do not seek to argue here for any kind of literary dependence of these texts, but rather seek to use them in order to compare *ideas*³ about the eschatological Spirit in the texts.

¹ As in the previous chapter, my focus here is on the gift of the eschatological Spirit to groups of believers and not to Messianic figures, except where those figures are the conduit of that Spirit to believers.

² Given the length and scope of this treatment, it is impossible to exhaust all possible backgrounds for the notion of a partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit. For this reason, texts chosen for comparison are limited to those that are perceived to contain the most parallels to the Johannine material. Furthermore, I limit these texts to those that depict the bestowal or possession of the eschatological Spirit of God to believers at large. As in Chapter Two, I will not treat passages that describe the gift of the eschatological Spirit to individuals or Messianic figures. As a result, some Jewish Apocalyptic Literature, while it may have certainly been known and had influence on the pneumatology of early groups of Christ believers, will not be examined here. For example, I do not include passages from apocalyptic literature that do not specifically depict the bestowal of the *eschatological* Spirit (Dan. 4:8, 18; 5:11, 12, 14; 6:3) or that do not depict the gift of the Spirit to believers (1 Enoch 49:3; 62:2).

³ Because I consider here the ideas that lie behind the texts and not necessarily the author's knowledge of the texts themselves, the dates of composition of texts under consideration need not be earlier than the composition of 1Jn. The purpose of this chapter is to determine how other early Christ believers or apocalyptic Jewish groups understood the bestowal of the Spirit of God and whether those ideas about the Spirit are similar to the notion of bestowal in 1Jn, particularly, whether the partial bestowal of the

In the interest of limiting the scope of this comparison, texts under consideration must meet two criteria. First, the texts must be determined to be the work of authors who consider themselves to be living in the eschatological age and who understand themselves and their fellow believers to be somehow endowed with the Spirit of God. Typically the texts stemming from these groups bear obvious marks of apocalypticism or apocalyptic eschatology,⁴ and therefore I also look for these features in choosing literature for comparison. Second, each text under consideration for comparison must come from a group that is in some way interpreting the texts of the Jewish Prophetic Literature as applicable to itself, particularly those texts that address expectations concerning the gift of the divine Spirit. Given these criteria, the texts that will be reviewed in this chapter are confined to early Christian and Apocalyptic Jewish works that display notions of the bestowal of the Spirit of God that stem from the depiction of that bestowal found in the texts of the Jewish Prophetic Literature. I begin with an examination of interpretation in the chronologically earliest Jewish Apocalyptic Literature, the Dead Sea Scrolls, then move to those interpretations found in the (non-Johannine) New Testament, and end with works belonging to later Christianized Jewish literature, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.⁵

eschatological Spirit resulting in incomplete transformative effects can be understood as a common or unique reading of the eschatological gift of the Spirit depicted in Jewish Prophetic Literature.

⁴ In defining what constitutes apocalypticism, I accept the proposals of John J. Collins in his very influential work *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). Collins notes the distinction between apocalypticism as a movement (or, more accurately, movements) and apocalypse as a genre.

⁵ There has been a great deal of controversy in scholarship over the origins of The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (from here forward, T12P). In an effort to minimize speculation regarding a Semitic version of the text (in Hebrew or Aramaic) that pre-dates the extant Greek versions, I choose for the purposes of this project to accept the hypothesis of Marinus de Jonge. According to de Jonge, we are unable to get back to the text in any pre-Christian form, and therefore must understand the text as one that

The Spirit in the Dead Sea Scrolls

One set of documents produced by a group that meets my specific criteria is the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁶ As in the Jewish Prophetic Literature, the conception of רוח in the Dead Sea Scrolls is quite varied.⁷ The majority of instances of the term throughout the

is Christianized, but as one that is an incorporation and assimilation of traditional material that is *both* Jewish and Christian. See de Jonge, “The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the ‘Two Ways,’” in *Biblical Traditions and Transmission: Essays in Honor of Michael A. Knibb* (Brill: Boston, 2006), 194. Although I understand this text in its extant version to already be a Christianized text, it is important to note that the majority of scholars throughout history have concluded that there is evidence of a Hellenistic-Jewish background (or a pre-Christian version) of the text. Most important for my purposes, however, is what seems to be going on in the text is an interpretation of Jewish Prophetic texts. For an extremely convincing argument to this effect and a review of scholarship concerning the question of origin, see Robert A. Kugler, “The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Not So Ambiguous Witness to Early Jewish Interpretation Practices,” in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 349-355.

⁶ John J. Collins, “The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 74-90. While Collins notes the variety of documents in the Dead Sea Scrolls, he maintains the general eschatological nature of the sectarian community.

⁷ As in the Jewish Scriptures, the term is also used in reference to breath and wind. See A. E. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran*, (SBL DS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) and H.-J. Fabry, ‘רוח’ (*ruah*), *TDOT* 13:396. There is no paucity of scholarship that discusses the various conceptions of the Spirit in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The current section relies mainly on the following treatments: Jörg Frey, “Paul’s View of the Spirit in Light of Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature* (ed. Jean-Sebastian; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 237-260; Mladen Popović, “Anthropology, Pneumatology & Demonology in Early Judaism: The Two Spirits Treatise (1QS iii 13-iv 26) & Other Texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls” in *And God Breathed into Man the Breath of Life’ – Dust of the Ground and Breath of Life (Gen 2.7): The Development of a Dualistic Anthropology in Early Judaism and Christianity, and Their Umwelts*, (eds. J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten and G.H. van Kooten; Themes in Biblical Narrative; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming), accessed through Academia.edu 7/22/14; Eibert Tigchelaar, *Historical Origins of the Early Christian Concept of the Holy Spirit: Perspectives from the Dead Sea Scrolls*, forthcoming: <https://lirias.kuleuven.be/bitstream/123456789/427820/1/Paper+Volume+ruah+qodesh+Qumran.pdf>; Geert W. Lorein, “The Holy Spirit at Qumran,” in *Presence, Power and Promise: The Role of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (eds. David Firth and Paul D. Wegner; Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011), 371-395; Mladen Popović, “Light and Darkness in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* (1QS III 13-IV 26) and in 4Q186” in *Dualism in Qumran* (ed. Géza Xeravits; London: T&T Clark, 2010); Daniel Timmer, “Variegated Nomism Indeed: Multiphase Eschatology and Soteriology in the Qumranite *Community Rule* (1QS) and the New Perspective on Paul,” *JETS* 52 no. 2 (June, 2009); Martha Himmelfarb, “Impurity and Sin in 4QD, 1QS, and 4Q512,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8 no. 1 (2001); Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); George T. Monague, S.M., “Chapter 11: The Spirit in the Community at Qumran,” in *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition* (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), 116-124; A. A. Anderson, “The Use of ‘Ruah’ in 1QS, 1QH, and 1QM,” *JSS* 7 no. 2 (1962); Menahem Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns*, (STDJ 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961); James Philip Hyatt, “The View of Man in the Qumran ‘Hodayot’” *NTS* 2 no. 4 (1956); Levison, *Filled*.

documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls refer either to the human spirit⁸ or to the otherworldly spirits that influence human behavior.⁹ Instances of רִיחַ more often than not take a modifier in the scrolls, a number of spirits are spirits *of* something: of light, of darkness, of injustice, of righteousness, of purification, or of lust.¹⁰ From context, I gather that these represent a variety of spiritual inclinations, which, in spite of being outside of human beings themselves, have very real influence on the behavior of the people upon whom they act. The human spirit and spirits of various inclinations are in this way inextricably connected to one another,¹¹ making the task of interpreting any single conception of רִיחַ in the scrolls as impossible as uncovering one, standardized understanding of the term in the Jewish Prophetic Literature. Each document (and sometimes individual sections of documents) must therefore be examined in its own right, considering each passage containing the term רִיחַ in the context in which it is found.¹²

In order, therefore, to choose instances of the term spirit that can be compared to its usage in 1Jn, it must be determined which instances of רִיחַ refer to the gift of the Spirit

⁸ Fabry, *TDOT* 13:397.

⁹ Ibid, 398-399. While it can certainly be argued that the spirit of holiness, too, should be considered among these ‘good’ spirits of inclination, the spirit of holiness when it is connected directly to the Spirit of God or when its effects mimic those of the eschatological Spirit predicted by the Jewish Prophetic Literature should be set apart, particularly if evidence in the text suggests that it is the Spirit given in the eschatological age and not simply a description of the inclining spirits that the community sees working throughout the everyday lives of human beings.

¹⁰ Fabry, *TDOT* 13:397. Instances include 1QS 3.25, 4.3, 8.3, 10.18-19; 1QH 1.22, 3.21, 13.13, 17.25 and 4Q183 fr. 1 2.6.

¹¹ See Mladen Popović, “Anthropology,” accessed through Academia.edu 7/22/14.

¹² Frey makes the suggestion that because the meaning of the term רִיחַ varies so greatly throughout the documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is necessary to focus on instances of the term *holy* spirit when searching for the community’s notions about the Spirit of God. Frey, “Paul’s View,” 249.

of God,¹³ particularly if that Spirit is understood as being bestowed at a future time or when the text reflects the notion that the community itself is at present experiencing or approaching God's intervention in history.¹⁴ To this end, I begin by analyzing those passages that describe the gift of the spirit that is predicted to occur at the time of visitation, an indication that this spirit should be understood as a reference to the eschatological Spirit of God.¹⁵ I then move to passages in which the gift of the spirit of holiness or, less often, *his* or *my* Spirit (where the possessor is God) is expressed as already active in the community.¹⁶

The Future Spirit of Holiness in the Dead Sea Scrolls

When discussing the conception of the spirit in the Dead Sea Scrolls, particularly in those documents considered sectarian,¹⁷ one of the first passages to which scholars typically turn is the so-called Two Spirits Treatise in 1QS 3.13-4.26. While this portion of the document has much to say about the spirits of light and darkness that incline

¹³ There are very few passages in which a form of the word רוח follows אל as an indication of possession. More frequently (although still relatively rarely), the term takes a form of the possessive pronouns 'י' or 'יְ' when God is the intended subject of the possession. Furthermore, when reference is made to the Spirit that comes from God (or that God possesses), the modifier קודשכה is often used. See Frey, "Paul's View," 249. Cf. Anderson, "Use of 'Ruah'," 293-294.

¹⁴ I exclude in this section instances of God's spirit that are applied to figures of the past. For instance, a number of passages make reference to God's spirit as informing the words of the prophets, including 1QS 8.16//4Q259 6.8-9; 4Q381 fr. 69.4; and CD 2.14. While these passages certainly have parallels in the Jewish Prophetic Literature, I look to compare those instances that are connected to eschatological transformation and not the prophetic inspiration that has formerly taken place.

¹⁵ For an extremely helpful overview of the various stages of eschatology espoused in 1QS and the terms used to express these stages, see Timmer, "Variegated Nomism," 354-356.

¹⁶ Because the community at Qumran is likely one that considers itself to be living in the final age before God's intervention, I consider these passages to represent the eschatological spirit, particularly when they are found in documents understood to be sectarian. For an overview of the eschatology reflected in these documents see Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 52-54. Cf. Timmer, "Variegated Nomism," 344.

¹⁷ My understanding of which documents should be considered sectarian comes from Boccaccini, *Hypothesis*, 59.

human behavior and is often used to paint a picture of the anthropology of the Qumran sectarians,¹⁸ it also describes what will happen to those spirits in the time of visitation. Because the time of visitation is conceived of as a point of time in the future, the time of God's eschatological intervention in history, it would seem that when the Two Spirits Treatise was produced the bestowal of the eschatological Spirit was still a prospect of the future. Because it depicts the effects of the spirit(s) at the eschaton, it seems a logical place to begin assessing the conception of the eschatological Spirit as depicted in the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁹

The expectation for the future action of the spirit of holiness is depicted throughout the Two Spirits Treatise, at first vaguely and then with increasing detail. In 1QS 3.13-19, the author explains that at the time of visitation human beings will *no longer* be ruled by the two competing spirits. The passage does not, however, explain what will replace these dueling spirits in the hearts of human beings. It is not until the longer passage in 1QS 4.9-26 that this question is answered. Here we read that "God has sorted them into equal parts until the last day and set an everlasting hatred between their divisions,"²⁰ at which point "God will purify all human deeds by his truth and will refine the frame of man for himself, ripping out the spirit of injustice from the innermost part of

¹⁸ Popović, "Light and Darkness," 149.

¹⁹ In addition to the predictions about the community's receipt of the spirit of holiness in 1QS, there are also passages concerning the gift of the God's Spirit to Messianic figures in both 4Q161 fr. 8+ 3.11ff. and 11Q13 fr. 1+ 2.18. However, neither of these passages depicts the Messiah figure as passing on this spirit to the community at large and therefore will not be addressed here.

²⁰ 1QS 4.16-17. This portion of the passage has historically been understood in conjunction with the division of the spirits described in 4Q186. While there does seem to be a common contention that the spirit of a human being is inclined to either good or evil behavior based on the proportion of light or darkness in that particular spirit, it is not entirely convincing that the two documents should be read in conjunction with one another. For an argument against interpreting the Two Spirits Treatise in light of 4Q186, see Popović, "Light and Darkness," 157-162.

his flesh and purifying every wicked deed by the spirit of holiness.”²¹ It is as a result of this removal and obliteration that the two opposing spirits no longer fight to influence the behavior of human beings. The implication here, then, is that at the time when God intervenes in human history, human beings will no longer be inclined (even partially) towards evil actions.²² Instead, the spirit of holiness will cleanse their deeds, and they will be granted wisdom from the Most High, the wisdom of the “sons of heaven,” which will manifest itself in them following the “perfect way.”²³ The transformation of knowledge and behavior predicted to occur through the efficacy of the spirit of holiness in 1QS looks very similar to the transformation predicted in the Jewish Prophetic Literature previously examined, and there seems to be a kind of ethical perfectionism suggested in 1QS 4.22.²⁴

There might be an argument to be made that the conception of the spirit(s) here points to some form of partialness, given the appeal to the “equal parts”²⁵ of each spirit that will rule over humanity. However, it is more likely that this statement refers to the equal parts of humanity that will fully possess *either* the spirit of truth or the spirit of injustice. Furthermore, if a partial bestowal of the spirit of holiness does take place before the eschaton or if only part of humanity receives that spirit, it would seem that this is not

²¹ 1QS 4.20-21.

²² Timmer, “Variegated Nomism,” 343. Cf. Himmelfarb, “Impurity,” 31, on the connection between purification and the spirit of holiness in 1QS. This connection is also noted by Eibert Tigchelaar, *Origins*, 13.

²³ 1QS 4.21-22.

²⁴ Timmer points to the Qal of קצד in 1QS 4.24 as an indication of the enjoyment of benefits of members of the community such as “moral perfection, cleanness, purity, and holiness.” Timmer, “Variegated Nomism,” 349.

²⁵ 1QS 3.18.

the case once the final gift of the spirit of holiness has been granted at the time of visitation. As a result of God “ripping out the spirit of injustice from the innermost part of his flesh and purifying every wicked deed by the spirit of holiness”²⁶ in the last days, there will no longer be a place for the spirit of injustice (or for those who possess it) in the future. The effects of knowledge and perfect behavior have not yet been realized at the time the treatise was written, but are still a prospect of a time to come. And while it might be helpful to examine the idea of proportions of spirits, particularly as it is represented in 4Q186,²⁷ this instance seems to pertain largely to the makeup of the *human* spirit (or to the outside inclinations that affect human spirits) and not to the quantitative way in which God grants *God’s* Spirit at the eschaton.

The Spirit of Holiness in the Present Community

The effects of the spirit of holiness predicted in 1QS are reflected in other documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Particularly in the community’s hymns, the spirit of holiness is depicted as having cleansed and replaced the previous “spirit of falsehood” in the members of the community. Rather than being mere expectation, passages from these other documents suggest a present possession of the spirit of holiness, or at least its present effect. Particularly in texts like the Hodayot (1QH), Incantation (4Q444), and Words of the Luminaries (4Q504-506), the spirit of holiness is depicted as currently active (or able to be active) in the life of the community. The two major effects of this

²⁶ 1QS 4.20-21.

²⁷ The Horoscopes of 4Q186 point towards an understanding of human spirits that are inclined based on the portions of those spirits that exist in the houses of light or houses of darkness. Whatever houses means here, the text supports the view that the community understood individuals to behave in accordance with the proportional makeup of their spirits, in this case based on the star sign under which they were born.

action are purification and knowledge, both of which result in (or at least make possible) proper behavior before God.²⁸

The spirit of holiness is described in a number of instances as affecting a decrease in the sinfulness of those that have received it, recalling the cleansing that was predicted in 1QS.²⁹ The spirit of holiness in the Hodayot is said to strengthen the resolve of or atone for the guilt of its recipient. In 1QH 15.6-7 the author gives thanks to God for having sustained him with God's strength, writing: "I give thanks to You, Lord, for You have sustained me with Your strength, You have sprinkled Your spirit of holiness so that I may not be shaken." The spirit of holiness also strengthens him against wickedness and allows him to remain faithful to God's covenant.³⁰ Similarly, in 1QH 8.15, the author attributes the work of the spirit of holiness to strengthening him and as a result he states that he is "clinging to the truth of Your (God's) covenant, serving You (God) in truth with a perfect heart."³¹ In both cases, the author understands the gift of the spirit of

²⁸ A similar idea also exists in a more fragmented text that is sometimes reconstructed to include the cleansing aspects of the spirit of holiness. While the term רוח קודשכה is not apparent in 4Q436 fr. 1 ii 1, Geza Vermes reconstructs the text in his *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* to read: "And thou hast placed [the spirit of holiness]ss into my heart and hast taken away from me the eyes of fornication." This reconstruction seems to be based in the װ that appears at the start of column two of the fragment. While this is certainly not an implausible reconstruction, my more conservative approach relies on the Hebrew text of Florentino Garcia Martinez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar's *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition Volume 2 (4Q274-11Q31)*. For the two versions see Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English: Revised Edition* (London: Penguin Books, 2011), 447 and Florentino Garcia Martinez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition Volume 2 (4Q274-11Q31)* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 916.

²⁹ The author of 4Q393 fr. 1-2 ii.4-11 also prays for such a cleansing. Although the text does not contain the term רוח קודשכה, the author does ask God to create a new spirit in the members of the community, which will cleanse them of their sins. The passage recalls the gift of the new spirit promised by God in the eschaton in Ezek. 11:19 and 36:26. However, the spirit here is not expressed as specifically being *God's* spirit.

³⁰ 1QH 15.7-8.

³¹ 1QH 8.15.

holiness as strengthening his ability to act as God wants him to act, keeping him from transgressing the laws of the covenant and enabling him to avoid evil ways. Such ethical improvements recall the prediction in 1QS that there will come a time when all iniquity will be obliterated and the spirit of holiness will solely incline the behavior of human beings. However, there does not seem to be any assertion of total perfection on the part of the author, given the generally negative anthropology that he seems to espouse.³²

There is also a fragment of 1QH, though, that indicates the spirit of holiness atones for human guilt when it is spread (or sprinkled)³³ upon the lowly “dust” that is humanity. Although quite fragmentary and difficult to reconstruct, 1QH fr. 2 1.9-13 seems to suggest that once “You have sprinkled your spirit of holiness”³⁴ onto this former dust, it will be united with the “sons of heaven.”³⁵ The spirit here seems to affect a drastic change in the human beings who receive it, transforming them from mere dust to members of the heavenly realm.³⁶ Furthermore, the spirit of holiness that God has sprinkled upon the community is described in 1QH fr. 2 1.13 as atoning for guilt.³⁷ The

³² For an overview of the general anthropology of the Hodayot, see Hyatt, “View of Man,” 256-284. Cf. Mansoor, *Thanksgiving*, 58-62.

³³ Tigchelaar makes a convincing argument for translating נָזַף as ‘sprinkle’ in 1QH 4:38. Pointing to its use in Prov. 7:17 and Ps. 68:10, he argues that the word when used in relation to liquid (an oft used metaphor for the gift of spirit) should be translated in this way. Using the same line of argumentation, I translate here. Particularly since in this instance the spirit is being spread upon the ‘dust’, the translation ‘sprinkle’ (as rain) seems to fit better the broader nature metaphor. See Tigchelaar, “Origins,” 18, 24-25.

³⁴ The subject of the second-person, singular verb being God in this case.

³⁵ 1QH fr. 2 1.9-10.

³⁶ Mansoor, *Thanksgiving*, 44.

³⁷ The spirit of holiness is similarly connected to atonement in 1QS 9.1-6. While the connection is not direct, the passage does suggest that once the community establishes itself in the spirit of holiness, it will no longer have need for blood sacrifice, due to the perfection of the behavior of its members. The spirit of holiness that pervades the community can be understood as instrumental in this behavior, given what is written elsewhere in 1QS.

text states, “You have spread out Your holy Spirit, to atone for guilt...with your army and those who walk...before You, for they are established in Your truth.” Not only, then, does the spirit of holiness act upon the members of the community in order to strengthen them in behaving properly in the eyes of God, but it also aids in atoning for the guilt that the community has previously amassed. Such effects recall those predicted not only in the sectarian document 1QS, but also in the Jewish Prophetic Literature previously reviewed.

In addition to those passages in 1QH, the spirit of holiness also appears in the Words of the Luminaries in 4Q504 fr. 1-2 5.15-16. The text refers to God, stating, “You have poured out Your spirit of holiness on us, filling us with Your blessings.”³⁸ Rather than the spirit being sprinkled upon people, as typical of 1QH, the verb used here more closely mimics the Jewish Prophetic Literature. The spirit of holiness is connected in this text with the reception of God’s blessings, which are depicted as a gift from God to an undeserving Israel.³⁹ While purity from sin is not addressed directly in this fragment, what follows in fr. 1-2 6.2-3 is the statement, “You have thrown off all of our transgressions and have purified us from our sin for Yourself.” It seems likely that this purification and forgiveness can be counted among the blessings that have taken effect as a result of the gift of the spirit, particularly because the author laments the iniquities of Israel prior to the bestowal of the spirit and sees an opportunity for turning back to God.

In addition to purification and atonement, the spirit of holiness in some documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls is also represented at times as resulting in special

³⁸ 4Q504 fr. 1-2 5.15-16

³⁹ Lorein, “Holy Spirit,” 373. Tigchelaar also notes the similarity to Isa. 44:3b, in which God’s Spirit is poured out onto Israel’s descendants and lead to blessings upon the offspring. Tigchelaar, “Origins,” 34.

knowledge or understanding of God or God's commands.⁴⁰ This connection is loosely made in the Incantation and the Words of the Luminaries. In the Incantation, 4Q444 fr. 1 reads, "And I am among those who fear God, who opens his mouth aided by His (God's) true knowledge, and from His (God's) spirit of holiness..." Although the verse does not reveal what comes from God's spirit of holiness, it does seem to connect the author's ability to speak (presumably for God) special knowledge that he has received, which here seems to be in parallel with his reception of the spirit of holiness.⁴¹ A more direct connection is made in 4Q506 fr. 131-132 10-14. Here, the author has special knowledge of "these things" because "You have graciously given us the spirit of holiness."⁴² While the content of this special knowledge is not clear due to the fragmentary nature of the text, God is called the "God of knowledge," and the group is described as knowing things because of the gift of the spirit of holiness.⁴³

Similarly, we find the idea of knowledge resulting from the gift of the spirit in 1QH 6.12-15, where according to God's kindness towards individuals, God "multiplies his portion" in God's spirit of holiness.⁴⁴ This increase of an individual's portion of God's spirit of holiness directly increases that person's ability to get closer to the knowledge of God, and according to the text, "in this way You draw him nearer to

⁴⁰Mansoor notes this trend in 1QH. Knowledge is reserved for the elect who are guided by God's gift of the spirit of holiness, which discloses God's will. Mansoor, *Thanksgiving*, 65-74.

⁴¹ Tigchelaar notes this connection, "Origins," 35.

⁴² 4Q506 fr. 131-132 10-11. Again, the second-person, singular here refers to God. Even though the spirit of holiness here is not described as belonging to God with the possessive pronoun, it nonetheless comes directly from God and is given to the people.

⁴³ Lorein, "Holy Spirit," 374. While the content of the knowledge is not specifically stated, the connection here is evident.

⁴⁴ 1QH 6.13. Again here, the second person singular pronoun modifying spirit of holiness refers to God.

understanding.”⁴⁵ The greater a person’s possession of God’s spirit of holiness in this case, the more he is privy to understanding God and the less likely he is to sin against God. While this passage credits the spirit of holiness with affecting both knowledge and sinful behavior,⁴⁶ perhaps the most interesting piece of the verse for our purposes is the suggestion in 1QH 6.13 that God can increase a human being’s portion of God’s spirit of holiness. Depending on how the verse is interpreted,⁴⁷ this enlargement could suggest that human beings can receive varying portions of God’s spirit of holiness.⁴⁸

Conclusion to the Spirit in the Dead Sea Scrolls

This survey of instances of the term רוח in the Dead Sea Scrolls has shown the variety of meanings and resulting effects that the term can convey. It would seem that depending on whether the author of a text is referring to the future gift of the spirit of holiness or the current possession of the spirit of holiness, two different pictures emerge. In the case of instances in which the eschatological gift of the Spirit to God’s people is understood as a promise of the future, such as those appearing in 1QS 3.13-4.26, both the gift of and effects of the Spirit look almost identical to those predictions found in the

⁴⁵ 1QH 6.14

⁴⁶ Particularly when read in conjunction with 1QH 8.30, the spirit’s connection to both purification and knowledge becomes evident. See Tigchelaar, “Origins,” 22. This notion is not only specific to this passage, but 1QH in general can be read as depicting the spirit of holiness as affecting both purity and knowledge. See Anderson, “Use of Ruah,” 302.

⁴⁷ For different interpretations of 1QH 6.12-15 see Frey, “Paul’s View,” 256; Lorein, “Holy Spirit,” 377; Tigchelaar, “Origins,” 19-20.

⁴⁸ Frey suggests that the text here might indicate that the Qumran sectarians, although they consider themselves to have been recipients of God’s Spirit, are possibly unsure about the “portion given or the ‘totality’ of the gift.” Frey, “Paul’s View,” 256. Tigchelaar notes the uniqueness of the concept of receiving a portion of God’s spirit of holiness, but relates this concept to the notions in 1QS that the spiritual life of a person ebbs and flows and that individual’s can have more or less understanding of the perfect way based on their lot in life. Tigchelaar, “Origins,” 19-20. Each of these assessments is particularly interesting when compared to the conception of the Spirit bestowal in 1Jn.

Jewish Prophetic Literature. The spirit of holiness is depicted in the Two Spirits Treatise as *predicted* to overtake completely the once dueling spirits of human beings at the time of visitation. The old spirit(s) of human beings will be removed, and they will be cleansed by God's spirit of holiness, rendering them able to behave perfectly in the eyes of God.

Interestingly, though, once the eschatological spirit of holiness is depicted in various texts as being a present endowment, such as in 1QH, 4Q444, and 4Q504-506, the effects that spirit has on individuals does not seem to be entirely complete. There is evidence, particularly in 1QH, that the author still worries about backsliding and behavior inconsistent with the commands of God, given that human beings are incapable of avoiding sin but for the grace of God.⁴⁹ If the total transformation into perfectionism that had been predicted in 1QS and the Jewish Prophetic Literature had taken full effect, we would expect the author of 1QH to have a more favorable view of the abilities of human beings to know and follow God. However, this is not to say that there is no evidence of these affects having already begun in these documents; the spirit of holiness is in each case connected with purification, proper behavior, and knowledge of God.

Furthermore, in the Dead Sea Scrolls there seems to be some indication of a conception of the gift of the spirit of holiness as being partial. There is evidence in 1QH (which is considered a sectarian document) that humans receive portions of certain types of spirits. Particularly in 1QH 6.12-15 these portions pertain to the spirit of holiness, which is represented as God's gift to human beings. If we read 1QH 6 as describing the eschatological Spirit, then there may be an indication in the Dead Sea Scrolls that God's

⁴⁹ Mansoor, *Thanksgiving*, 58-60.

holy spirit could be received in a partial way. It is interesting to note, however, that when the community *predicts* the bestowal of God's eschatological Spirit in 1QS there is no sense of partialness in the gift. There, the author describes the bestowal of God's Spirit at the time of the visitation as enacting a total takeover of the spirit of holiness after a full removal of whatever spirit(s) previously existed. It would seem, then, that when the gift of the eschatological Spirit of God is not yet a present reality, the author predicts a total and complete bestowal. In contrast, there is an indication that Spirit bestowal is in some way partial when believers possess it in the present. This partialness, however, is only evident in 1QH 6.12-15.

The Spirit of God in Non-Johannine New Testament Literature

Just as depictions of the Spirit of God vary in function and effect in the Jewish Prophetic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls, depictions of the Spirit of God and its bestowal on early Christ believers also vary based on the purpose of the literature in which they are found. As is the case with Christological notions, the pneumatology of texts in the New Testament is far from uniform.⁵⁰ Behind these various texts, lie different communities and authors that write to their own specific audiences, for their own specific purposes. As a result, it is difficult to say what the early Christ believers as a whole thought about any theological element, except in a very general sense.⁵¹ It seems worthwhile, then, to review other notions of the gift of the Spirit across the New

⁵⁰ See Levison, *Filled*, especially "Prescript to Part III: Herman Gunkel, the Spirit, and Diversity in Early Christian Literature," 225-235.

⁵¹ For instance, it seems fair to say that *every* group of Christ believers understood Jesus to be the hoped for Messiah, but it does not follow from this fact that each understood Jesus' Messiahship in the same way. The same can be said of the gift of the Spirit. While arguably *all* groups of believers understood themselves to have received the divine Spirit, the effects that the divine Spirit had on that group was not universally agreed upon at this early stage.

Testament to determine whether a similar understanding of the bestowal of the Spirit of God can be found apart from that in the Johannine Literature.⁵² I begin by addressing the instances of Spirit bestowal in the Pauline Literature, both the undisputed and pseudo-Pauline letters and then move to the Synoptic gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.

The Spirit in the Pauline Corpus

Perhaps the most closely related and most commonly discussed conception of the Spirit in the New Testament to that found in the Johannine Literature can be found in the Pauline corpus of literature.⁵³ In the following sections, I review the presentation of the

⁵² The conception of the eschatological bestowal of the Spirit of God as it is presented in 1Jn has its roots in GJn, but there remains a question as to whether this interpretation of the gift of the Spirit is unique to this group or represents a more widely held notion among early believers.

⁵³ Levison notes that “John walks many of the same paths as Paul” in terms of pneumatology, but with “his own peculiar gait.” Levison, *Filled*, 366. Academic literature concerning the Spirit in the Pauline corpus is perhaps the most widely produced; commentaries and other treatments of the Spirit in the letters of Paul are numerous. Those used here include: Trevor J. Burke and Keith Harrington eds. *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2014); Douglas J. Moo, *Galatians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013); Simo Frestadius, “The Spirit and Wisdom in 1 Corinthians 2:1-13,” *JBPR* 3 (2011): 52-70; Stephen Kerry, “An Exegetical Analysis of Galatians 3:1-5 with Particular Reference to Pneumatological Themes That Relate to the Onset and Continuation of Christian Identity with Respect to the Law and Gospel,” *JBPR* 2 (2010): 57-74; Frank Thielman, *Ephesians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010); Lynn H. Cohick, *Ephesians* (NCCS; Eugene: Cascade Books, 2010); Robert W. Wall, *1 & 2 Timothy and Titus* (THNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010); Peter T. O’Brien, *The Letter to the Hebrew* (PNTC; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010); Craig S. Keener, *Romans* (NCCS 6; Eugene: Cascade Books, 2009); Colin G. Kruse, *2 Corinthians* (TNTC 8; Grand Rapids: IVP Academic, 2008); Günther H. Juncker, “‘Children of Promise’: Spiritual Paternity and Patriarch Typology in Galatians and Romans,” *BBR* 17 no. 1 (2007): 131-160; John Paul Heil, “Ephesians 5:18b ‘But Be Filled in the Spirit,’ *CBQ* 69 (July 1, 2007): 506-516; Charles H. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians* (PCNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007); Benjamin Fiore, S. J., *The Pastoral Epistles* (Sacra Pagina 12; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2007); Craig S. Keener, *1-2 Corinthians* (NCBC; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Thomas H. Tobin, SJ, *Paul’s Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004); Ben Witherington III, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004); Martin Emmrich, “Hebrews 6:4-6...Again! A Pneumatological Inquiry,” *WTJ* 65 no. 1 (Spring 2003): 83-95; Harold Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Publishing, 2002); Rodney Thomas, “The Seal of the Spirit and the Religious Climate of Ephesus,” *Restoration Quarterly* 43 no. 3 (2001): 155-166; Craig R. Koester, *Hebrews* (ABC 36; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001); Jan Lambrecht, S.J., *Second Corinthians* (Sacra Pagina 8; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999); John A. Bertone, “The Function of the Spirit in the Dialectic Between God’s Soteriological Plan Enacted But Not Yet Culminated: Romans 8:1-27,” *JPT* 15 (October, 1999): 75-97; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (Sacra Pagina 7; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999); Dave Mathewson, “Reading Hebrews 6:4-6 in Light of the Old Testament,” *WTJ* 61 (1999): 209-225; Eldon

gift of the Spirit to God's people in the Pauline and Pseudo-Pauline letters.⁵⁴ In the interest of organization, I begin this larger exploration of Pauline literature by examining the undisputed⁵⁵ letters of Paul. It is important to acknowledge the difficulty, however, in identifying anything like a systematic pneumatology in Paul's letters, as each passage concerning the Spirit must be interpreted in its own situational context.⁵⁶ It stands to reason, then, that we may not find one cohesive presentation of the gift of the Spirit

Woodcock, "The Seal of the Holy Spirit," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 155 (April-June 1998):139-163; Philip H. Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus* (IVP 14; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1994); Gordon D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishing, Inc., 1994); Maarten J. J. Menken, *2 Thessalonians* (NTR; New York, NY: Routledge, 1994); Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville: John Knox, 1993); Enrique Nardoni, "The Concept of Charism in Paul," *CBQ* 55 (1993): 68-80; Jerome D. Quinn, *The Letter to Titus* (ABC 35; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990); F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Revised Edition*, (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990); Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Hermenia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989); Charles H. Cosgrove, *The Cross and the Spirit: A Study in the Argument and Theology of Galatians* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988); Roger L. Hahn, "Pneumatology in Romans 8: Its Historical and Theological Contexts," *WTJ* 21 no. 1-2 (Spring-Fall 1986): 74-90; F. F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians* (WBC 45; Waco: Word Books, 1982); William L. Lane, *Hebrews 1-8* (WBC 47A; Dallas: Word Books, 1982); Ernst Kasemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980); Paul W. Meyer, "The Holy Spirit in the Pauline Letters: A Contextual Exploration," *Interpretation* 33 no. 1 (Jan, 1979): 3-18; also Levison, *Filled*; Phillip, *Origins*; Montague, *Holy Spirit*; and Gunkel, *Influence*.

⁵⁴ This section will consider all material traditionally attributed to Paul, categorized here under the moniker Pauline Literature. Of course, this is not to say that all of the material under examination in this section is understood to be *written* by Paul himself. Because I seek to track *ideas* about the gift of God's Spirit in contexts similar to that of 1Jn (namely, in an eschatological context and based, at least in part, on the Jewish Prophetic tradition), any pertinent material stemming from early believing groups who understand themselves to have already received the eschatological Spirit in some fashion will be considered, in spite of whether that material is thought to be genuinely the product of the apostle Paul or not.

⁵⁵ The undisputed letters of Paul are Romans, Galatians, 1 & 2 Corinthians, 1 Thessalonians, Philippians and Philemon. For a discussion of the letters generally accepted and rejected by scholars as genuinely Pauline, see Mark Harding, "Disputed and Undisputed Letters of Paul," in ed. Stanley Porter *The Pauline Canon* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 129-168. While there is some dissent among scholars pertaining to Ephesians and Colossians, for the reasons stated in note 94, authenticity is not a major concern here.

⁵⁶ Although for a time in scholarship Paul's letter to the Romans was understood as a reflection of his overall theology, this is not the understanding that I accept. I therefore treat each letter on its own individual terms and interpret each with an eye towards the situation that it seeks to address. For a discussion of the problems with the former understanding of Romans and a defense of the latter position see Hahn, "Pneumatology," 74. See also Tobin, SJ, *Rhetoric*, 2, who notes this necessity particularly in the case of Galatians and Romans.

throughout the whole Pauline corpus, particularly because some of the letters that will be examined in the following subsections fall into the categories of disputed or pseudo-Pauline letters.

The Spirit in the Undisputed Letters of Paul

Of the undisputed letters of Paul, those that contain the most references to the Spirit are the Letter to the Galatians, the First and Second Letters to the Corinthians, and the Letter to the Romans.⁵⁷ Because the Letter to the Galatians is the first chronologically, I begin there in order to trace any development in Paul's pneumatology with the passing of time. The importance of the Spirit's role in the process of adoption is of major concern in Galatians. In the letter, Paul writes to believers in the midst of a divisive debate, one that requires (at least in Paul's opinion) a lesson concerning what now defines the members of the chosen people of God.⁵⁸ For this reason, Paul seeks to make explicit his teaching concerning the prerequisites for being considered children of God. To this end, much of Galatians 4 centers on the adoption of believers through the Spirit and faith,

⁵⁷ The six references to the πνεῦμα in the First Letter to the Thessalonians and the eight in the Letter to the Philippians will be addressed as applicable in this larger section, but not in the detail of those passages in Galatians, 1 & 2 Corinthians, and Romans.

⁵⁸ Many of the Spirit references in Galatians pertain to the opposition between the Spirit and the flesh. Because the main thrust of the letter is Paul's condemnation of the Judaizers who are attempting to argue for the necessity of Gentile circumcision, these passages must be understood in that historical context. The polemical thrust of Paul's Spirit/flesh argument is likely a product of his frustration with what he understands to be the back-sliding Galatian believers. They have at this point received the Spirit and should therefore exist beyond practices of demarcation that divide them from other believers. It is with these fleshly concerns that Paul contrasts their present life in the Spirit. For a discussion of the polemic of Spirit and flesh or Law in Galatians, see Kerry, "Exegetical Analysis," 78. Cf. Tobin, *Rhetoric*, 286-287, in which he draws contrasts between the understandings of adoption in Romans and Galatians due to the increased polemic of the latter.

rather than through actual, Abrahamic descent.⁵⁹ In this chapter, Paul makes most explicit his understanding of how one attains the inheritance of salvation and eternal life, stating “But when the time had fully come, God sent forth His son...to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons. And *because* you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of His son into our hearts, crying out, ‘Abba, Father!’ So through God you are no longer a slave but a son, and if a son, an heir” (Gal. 4:4-7). Here, it is part of the work of the Spirit (in the case of Galatians, the Spirit of Christ), received through faith (Gal. 3:2-3), to ensure the believer’s adoption and ability to call God “Father” in his or her heart. Through this process, the believer also becomes both son and heir to God.⁶⁰

Paul goes on later in Galatians 4 to use the allegory of Sarah and Hagar (4:22-31) to solidify his argument concerning the means by which believers become members of the new covenant, the *true* Israel that is now possible after the coming of Christ.⁶¹ In his allegory, Paul likens the Galatian Christians to the son born to Abraham not by the slave woman Hagar, but by his free wife Sarah: Isaac, who would become the father of Israel (Jacob). Paul makes a connection between those who remain under the Law and those

⁵⁹ Juncker, “Promise,” 134. Tobin makes the case that the adoption process in Galatians goes so far as to exclude those following the Law (i.e., Israel itself). Tobin, *Rhetoric*, 277-279. Cf. Cosgrove, *Cross*, 72. Cosgrove, too, contends that those under the law are cut off from any salvific inheritance.

⁶⁰ Reading these verses with Rom. 8:16 in mind, Cosgrove notes that sonship is very closely related to the reception of the Spirit, arguing that the fact that believers have received the Spirit leads to the reality of their sonship and that God continues to supply the Spirit because they are sons, affording them access to the inheritance of the Spirit. Cosgrove, *Cross*, 74-75. Douglas J. Moo understands 4:6 a bit differently, arguing that because the ὅτι here is causal, it is not the Spirit that is described as conferring sonship, but rather *because* they are sons that believers have the Spirit. While he acknowledges that there is no strict temporal or sequential relationship between the Spirit and sonship, he notes that there exists a definite association between the gift of the Spirit and the reality of a believers’ sonship. Moo, *Galatians*, 268-269.

⁶¹ Juncker, “Promise,” 135-141.

born into slavery and contrasts this with those born⁶² into the freedom of life in the Spirit. He writes, “but just as then, the one born according to the flesh persecuted the one born according to the Spirit, so also it is this way now” (4:29). Here, too, only the one who has received the gift of the Spirit and lives according to it is able to become an heir of God’s promise (4:30).⁶³

In addition to the focus in Galatians on the Spirit’s work in the process of adoption as children of God, a number of passages in the letter connect the receipt of the Spirit with proper behavior.⁶⁴ Because Paul is so concerned with the issue of following the Law (or at least one particular part of the Law—circumcision⁶⁵) in Galatians, he spends much of chapter 5 of the letter explaining the new standard for proper behavior in light of the coming of Christ and the receipt of his Spirit. Paul explains in 5:16-18 that if believers “walk in the Spirit,” they will no longer struggle with the desires of the flesh. It is the gift of the Spirit that makes this new kind of life apart from the restrictions of the Law possible.⁶⁶ According to Paul, “if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the

⁶² While the idea of believers born κατὰ πνεῦμα in 4:29 might look similar to being born ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος in the Johannine literature, Paul’s phrase here is both grammatically and meaningfully different. Elsewhere in Galatians and his other letters, believers become sons of God through a process of adoption, not through a rebirth, and the phrase as it is used here seems to have more to do with parallels (being born, literally, to a slave woman versus a freewoman) in his allegory.

⁶³ As with the similar passages to be discussed in Romans, the promise of the Spirit or inheritance that believers are to receive through faith seems to refer here to the promise of eternal life and salvation.

⁶⁴ This concern, like that with adoption, is likely due in large part to Paul’s concern that the Galatian believers are being coaxed into wrong behavior given the altered reality that the gift of the Spirit has inaugurated. Kerry, “Exegetical Analysis,” 59-61.

⁶⁵ In Phil. 3:3, Paul also connects circumcision and the Spirit, writing, “for we have the circumcision, worshipping God in the Spirit.” In other words, the true members of the people of Israel are not those who have been physically circumcised, but those who have received and worship in the Spirit of God.

⁶⁶ As Moo explains, the Spirit in this instance determines the behavior of believers and aids in overcoming earthly impulses. Moo, *Galatians*, 353-354.

Law” (5:18). Gentile believers, because they have received the Spirit through faith (3:2-3), are able to walk in the Spirit and no longer need to be confined to behaviors outlined in the Law. Rather, Paul assures them, “you will reap eternal life from the Spirit” (6:8). Again, while the Galatian believers currently possess the Spirit and thus should not be concerned with matters of the flesh, there is still a reward for them to reap in the future if they live according to the Spirit in the present. This reward is resurrection to eternal life, which cannot be fully achieved until the second coming of Christ.⁶⁷

To a lesser degree, Paul also describes the gift of the Spirit in his First and Second Letters to the Corinthians (hereafter, 1 & 2 Corinthians). Because the historical situations for which he writes the letters differ from that of his Letters to the Romans and Galatians, I do not assume total uniformity in his presentation of the Spirit. In fact, the focus of his pneumatological concerns in 1 & 2 Corinthians is varied. In 1 Corinthians, Paul addresses a group of believers that is divided over the issue of spiritual gifts.⁶⁸ Paul makes it clear in 1 Cor. 12 that although these gifts vary, they all stem from “the same Spirit” (12:4). This same Spirit from which all these gifts come should be understood as the Spirit of

⁶⁷ Donald Francois Tolmie, “Living in Hope ‘in the Fullness of Time,’” in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents*, (ed. Jan G. van der Watt; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 249-251. Moo, likewise, points to this reaping as occurring in the day of judgment, and explains that what is reaped is eternal life. Moo, *Galatians*, 386-387.

⁶⁸ Paul’s explanation of unity and diversity here lies in the fact that the Spirit exists in the community as a whole, not just in individuals who possess the Spirit. Levison, *Filled*, 288. Cf. R. Collins, *Corinthians*, 20. According to Collins, a major issue in the Corinthian community and addressed in chapter 12 is that of unity in the face of diversity. Paul intends here to bring together the various members within the community by likening them to the parts of the body in an effort to explain how they can be unified in spite of their diverse spiritual talents and how this diversity in spiritual talents is actually beneficial to the whole. Margaret M. Mitchell argues similarly that the entirety of 1 Corinthians is an argument meant to refute factionalism among the Corinthian believers. As a result, she too sees the individual gifts of the Spirit as merely manifestations of the one Spirit that all believers in Corinth share. Mitchell, *Reconciliation*, 268.

God (12:3-4).⁶⁹ The manifestations of this Spirit include wisdom, knowledge, healing, prophecy and glossolalia, among others, but all result from possession of “one and the same Spirit” (12:8-11). While some of these gifts, including prophecy, wisdom, and knowledge have been shown to be part of the expected transformative effects of the eschatological Spirit in the Jewish Prophetic Literature, others go beyond these expectations. It would seem, though, that Paul understands the gift of the Spirit to have been received by all of the Corinthian believers and simply seeks to assure them that no matter how the Spirit manifests itself in each of them, all are equal in its (full) possession and offer important benefits to the community in their own ways.⁷⁰

Perhaps the most important function of the Spirit for Paul in this letter, however, is stated more clearly in 1 Cor. 2, the Spirit’s role in the revelation of God’s will. For it is the Spirit of God alone that “searches all things, even the depths of God” and is therefore able to know the thoughts of God (2:10).⁷¹ Furthermore, only through the teaching of the

⁶⁹ Nardoni, “Charism,” 72. As Keener explains, God is the one who gives the Spirit, and thus the Spirit here should be understood as the Spirit of God. Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 100-101. Collins, similarly, points to God as the common source of these gifts through God’s one Spirit. Therefore any disdain for individual spiritual gifts or those possessing them is also disdain for the Spirit itself (God’s Spirit) and, in turn, disdain for God. Collins, *Corinthians*, 450-451.

⁷⁰ Meyer, “Holy Spirit,” 15-16. Cf. Narconi, “Charism,” 72; Collins, *Corinthians*, 20; and Mitchell, *Reconciliation*, 268.

⁷¹ See Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 387, who contends that divine wisdom is only available through God’s Spirit and that access to the mind of God is also only possible through the Spirit. Cf. Collins, *Corinthians*, 123-124, who notes the contrast here between the human spirit and God’s Spirit. Frestadius, “Spirit and Wisdom,” 57-58, helpfully explains that the implication is not that the Spirit is searching for knowledge, but rather that it *fathoms* all things. He translates ἐρᾶνῃ here as having a similar meaning to the use of the verb in Romans 8:27, where God is said to *search* the heart of man. The implication being not that God searches human hearts to find knowledge, which God would presumably already have, but that God understands the internal workings of each human being. Furthermore, the Spirit’s understanding of all things here reaches its culmination in the “depths of God,” God’s innermost heart, which is beyond any human comprehension.

Spirit can true wisdom and knowledge be attained (2:12-13).⁷² The importance of this knowledge is in the case of 1 Corinthians strongly connected to speaking God's word in 2:13, where knowledge (through the teaching of the Spirit) of the spiritual thoughts of God comes together with spiritual words.⁷³ While the idea that it is the Spirit of God that conveys knowledge of God and God's will has also been shown to be a prominent role of the eschatological Spirit in the Jewish Prophetic Literature, this is a role given to the Spirit (or Sophia) in the Wisdom tradition as well, and may not be meant here as a demonstration of the Spirit's work in the eschatological age.⁷⁴ Most importantly, however, the receipt of the Spirit here does not in itself totally transform those who receive it. Instead, Paul notes a difference even in those who have received the Spirit, some being spiritually "mature" (2:6) and others being "infants in Christ" (3:1). While all are believers and therefore have received the Spirit of God, not all have received the message of Christ crucified in a way that has transformed their lives into lives of all-encompassing, self-sacrificing love.⁷⁵ Therefore, while the reception of the Spirit is by no

⁷² Frestadius explains that the content of this teaching should be understood as the knowledge of Christ crucified, not some other esoteric knowledge, as it is the subject of the previous passages (1:18-2:5). This event is only intelligible with the help of the Spirit. Frestadius, "Spirit and Wisdom," 63.

⁷³ Collins, *Corinthians*, 124, states that the Spirit provides the content of the teaching and aids believers in knowing what to say when they speak.

⁷⁴ Keener points to similarities with Sir. 1:6-9 in which it states that wisdom must come through revelation due to the fact that only God is wise. As Keener sees it, Paul must have this in mind here, as he uses the phrase "those who love him" from Sir. 1:10 in 1 Cor. 2:9. Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 38-39. While it seems apparent that Paul is making connections to Wisdom Literature here, it is not altogether clear based on this usage that he means to separate the gift of the Spirit from the eschatological age. Collins, in contrast to Keener, sees here an apocalyptic worldview, which coupled with the gift of the Spirit, leads to wisdom in the eschatological age. Collins, *Corinthians*, 124-125.

⁷⁵ Frestadius, "Spirit and Wisdom," 64-65. The situation to which Paul writes in this instance is helpful in understanding these distinctions. It would appear that among the Corinthians, some are boasting about possessing knowledge beyond that of their fellow believers causing divisions in the community. Paul seeks here to show them that human knowledge is not what is most important and is certainly nothing to boast

means partial, only those who truly understand the message and gifts of the Spirit (“foolishness” to some, 2:14) show themselves to be spiritually mature.

The Spirit of God presented in 2 Corinthians bears greater resemblance to conception of the Spirit in Romans. Paul writes in 2 Corinthians about the Spirit in both its capacity to give life and to transform the hearts of human beings (3:3, 6, 18). He also describes the gift of the Spirit as being a precursor to a greater transformation that will take place at a future time (1:22, 5:5).⁷⁶ In 2 Cor. 3:3 Paul writes that it is the “Spirit of the living God” that writes the “letter of Christ” upon the hearts of believers. This letter of Christ is connected in the following verses with being “ministers of the new covenant,” a covenant not of the letter, but of the Spirit, which “gives life” (3:6). The ability to be good servants of this new covenant and receive life does not come from the will of human beings, but rather stems from the Spirit of God that has written the covenant on their hearts.⁷⁷ In these verses, Paul expresses to the Corinthians that their ability to participate in and conform to the new covenant is a result of the action of the

about. The only knowledge that really matters is that of Christ crucified, which God reveals through the Spirit. Cf. Mitchell, *Reconciliation*, 212-213.

⁷⁶ As Colin G. Kruse points out, the Spirit here represents a guarantee to believers that they will fully participate in God’s blessings in the age to come, a guarantee of the resurrection. Just as the Spirit raised Christ from the dead, so too will it raise believers in the eschaton. Kruse, *2 Corinthians*, 77.

⁷⁷ Here, as in Rom. 8:4, there are parallels with the new covenant in Jeremiah 31 and Ezekiel 36, which is said to be written in the hearts of the remnant of Israel. Paul’s use of the tradition here seems to conflate the two, taking the writing of the covenant on the hearts from Jeremiah and the connection with the Spirit from Ezekiel. Both Keener, *Corinthians*, 167, and Kruse, *2 Corinthians*, 91, make the connection between this passage and those from the Prophetic Literature. Jan Lambrecht, S.J., too, points to the connection here with Ezekiel 11:19-20//36:25-26 and Jeremiah 31:31-34 and refers to the community as “no less than the realization of the eschatological renewal announced by the prophets.” Lambrecht, S.J., *Second Corinthians*, 46.

Spirit of God within them and that the ability to conform to this new covenant is necessary for them to receive life.⁷⁸

Finally, there are two places in 2 Corinthians that reinforce the notion that the Spirit of God is not understood by Paul to be given in a partial way, but rather that the effects of that Spirit have not yet been fulfilled. In 2 Cor. 1:22, Paul refers to the Spirit as a “down payment” given to believers by God. The word ἀρραβών is translated variously into English as pledge, guarantee, or down payment. Whichever English word is used, the connotation here is that the gift of the Spirit is only the initial promise of the fullness that is to come later.⁷⁹ The term is used once more at 2 Cor. 5:5, and here the idea is further elaborated. There is a connection made at 2 Cor. 5:5 between the ἀρραβών and eternal life. In 2 Cor. 5:4, we read about the desire of believers to be clothed in order that “the mortal will be swallowed up by life.” This statement is directly followed by the assertion that “but the one who has prepared us for this is God, who gave us the down payment of the Spirit” (5:5). The very purpose for which believers have been prepared with the down payment of the Spirit is the receipt of life (presumably, eternal life).⁸⁰ The fullness of the payment, then, for believers is the possession of resurrected life, which is still a prerogative of the future.

⁷⁸ Meyer, “Holy Spirit,” 18. Cf. Keener, who notes that although there is a full gift of the Spirit, only at the second coming are believers fully transformed into the image of Christ. Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 167-170.

⁷⁹ Meyer, “Holy Spirit,” 12, also Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians*, 30, where he notes that the Spirit here is the a guarantee of final salvation and points to the similarity between the use of this term and the use of the “first fruits” metaphor in Rom. 8:23. Cf. Kruse, *2 Corinthians*, 77, and Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 160.

⁸⁰ Hahn, “Pneumatology,” 77, also Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 181; Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians*, 84; and Kruse, *2 Corinthians*, 115.

In the Letter to the Romans (hereafter, Romans), the word πνεῦμα appears 35 times, and 21 of those instances can be found in Romans 8.⁸¹ Given this large concentration of references within the text, it stands to reason that in order to understand the conception of the Spirit that Paul wishes to convey to the Roman believers, Romans 8 is a worthwhile starting point. Exegesis of the Spirit passages of this chapter reveals functions of the Spirit that are also present in the Jewish Prophetic Literature: the Spirit's ability to give life in Christ and thus ensure right behavior through indwelling the believer, and its role in achieving divine sonship for those in whom it dwells.⁸²

The Spirit's role in giving life and ensuring a life lived in Christ is particularly pronounced in Rom. 8:1-11, in which Paul connects the indwelling of the Spirit to life, the Law, and proper behavior. At the start of this section of the letter, Paul writes, "For the law of the Spirit of life in Jesus Christ has released you from the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8:2). It can be interpreted from the first part of this statement that Paul writes to a community that he understands to have already received the Spirit in some capacity. The Spirit at this point has set them free.⁸³ His description of the Spirit in this passage is of further interest here given the connection that is made with life (τῆς ζωῆς) and the law (νόμος).⁸⁴ The string of genitives and the following prepositional construct can be

⁸¹ Hahn, "Pneumatology," 74.

⁸² See Meyer, "Holy Spirit," 7-10. Both Tobin and Craig Keener note a connection between the Spirit in Romans and in the Jewish Prophetic Literature. Tobin, *Rhetoric*, 275; Keener, *Romans*, 99.

⁸³ ἐλευθερώω here is in the aorist tense, indicating that the Spirit has already been received and caused the freedom of its recipients at a moment now in the past. Ben Witherington notes that this is a one-time event, completed in the past at conversion. Witherington III, *Paul's Letter*, 212.

⁸⁴ References to the Law in Romans should not be understood as negative in the same way that references to the Law might be in a letter like Galatians. The community to whom Paul writes in Rome is likely made up of both Jewish and Gentile believers, and the purpose of the letter seems to be to address a conflict

rendered, “the law of the Spirit of life in Jesus Christ” (Rom. 8:2). Unpacked, it would seem that the meaning here is that the Spirit is the Spirit who gives life through the person of Jesus Christ (reading the τῆς ζωῆς as a genitive of identity and ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ as a modifying prepositional phrase) and that the law belongs to (reading τοῦ πνεύματος as a genitive of possession) that life-giving Spirit.⁸⁵

The notion that the Spirit is not in opposition to the Law is further supported by 8:4, in which Paul shows the Law has not been superseded but “fulfilled in you.” This fulfillment is only possible, however, because believers are now living in a time after the receipt of the Spirit, the indwelling of which is necessary so that believers might walk⁸⁶ according to the Spirit. Living as God desired, however, was previously not possible because before the coming of Christ all persons were living according to the flesh.⁸⁷ After the gift of the Spirit, though, it is possible to walk in the Spirit as Jesus did. The ability to behave properly as a result of the gift of the Spirit is somewhat common in Jewish

among them, a conflict that Paul is urging them to solve. For a discussion of the historical context of the Letter to the Romans, see Hahn, “Pneumatology,” 75-76.

⁸⁵ For a similar exegesis of this phrase, see Bertone, “Function,” 78-82. Bertone explains that the law in this case is most likely figurative and does not refer to the Torah as such, and that the Spirit here is the life-giving, eschatological Spirit of God. Furthermore, the law of sin and death in 8:2 should not simply be equated to the Mosaic Law. Rather, the two laws reflected in this verse are likely meant to represent two opposing realities, one in which the Spirit has overcome sin and death through the gift of life in Christ and the other in which sin and death still enslaves. See Tobin, *Rhetoric*, 281 and Witherington, *Paul’s Letter*, 211. Kasemann translates differently: “the law of life given with the Spirit in Jesus Christ.” Based on the fact that life giving does not seem anywhere in Romans to be a prerogative of the law but of the Spirit (8:6), I reject this translation. Kasemann, *Commentary*, 214.

⁸⁶ The meaning of the verb to walk here is well established as a euphemism for behaving in a certain way. For a discussion of the verb at its connections to behavior, see H. Seesemann, ‘περιπατέω’ *TDNT: Abridged in One Volume* (eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 804-805.

⁸⁷ Tobin, *Rhetoric*, 281 and Keener, *Romans*, 100. As Keener explains, the flesh is unable to accomplish righteousness, so it must be accomplished through the Spirit being placed within believers. He appeals here to the Jewish Prophetic traditions of Ezekiel and Jeremiah. Witherington notes that living according to God’s will is not necessarily living according to the Mosaic Law. Witherington, *Paul’s Letter*, 214-215.

Prophetic Literature, as shown in the previous chapter.⁸⁸ Paul, it seems, builds off of these traditions in his understanding of the effects of the gift of the Spirit on believers.

The indwelling of the Spirit (8:9, 11), however, not only enables behavior according to the Spirit (behavior like Christ's behavior), but also enables those who possess it to have new life in Christ. In 8:6 Paul writes, "to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace." Those believers who have their minds set on the Spirit (because that Spirit is within them) have life and peace.⁸⁹ The life that they possess, however, is not at this point the fullness of eternal life.⁹⁰ There is still more life to come. While Paul writes to the Romans that "the Spirit of God dwells in you" (8:9), he also indicates that a part of the life that results from the indwelling of God's (or Christ's) Spirit has not yet been accomplished. He writes, "the one who raised Christ from the dead will also make your mortal bodies live, because his Spirit dwells in you" (8:11). The future tense of the verb here (ζωοποιήσει) indicates that there is still life to be given (at a later time) to the mortal bodies of believers in whom the Spirit dwells.⁹¹ They, like Christ, will be resurrected to

⁸⁸ It is, of course, Jeremiah 31 that demonstrates most clearly the idea that the Law in particular has been internalized, but ethical behavior resulting in the gift of the Spirit is a feature of various passages in Ezekiel as well. Keener also notes allusions to these texts in Romans. Keener, *Romans*, 100. Contra Kasemann, who only accepts that Paul echoes Jeremiah. Kasemann, *Commentary*, 216.

⁸⁹ Keener, *Romans*, 100-102, explains that as the Spirit indwells the believer, the mind of that believer is set towards righteous living. This makes a great deal of sense, particularly if the mind here is understood to function similarly to the heart in the Jewish Prophetic tradition, as the seat of moral contemplation and inclination.

⁹⁰ While Witherington points to the indwelling of the Spirit as making righteousness possible (as opposed to the Law), he notes bodily resurrection here as a *future* gift of life. Witherington, *Paul's Letter*, 215-216. Keener, too, accepts this as a future hope of final bodily resurrection. Keener, *Romans*, 101-102.

⁹¹ Bertone, "Function," 82. Kasemann makes a connection here to the future pledge of resurrection and links the Spirit to the promise of life, not the present life of the believer. Kasemann, *Commentary*, 224-225. Cf. Tobin, who notes that the change from the present to future tense here indicates that Paul's focus is on the eschatological function of the Spirit, which he will develop in 8:18-30. Tobin, *Rhetoric*, 285.

new life (possibly in a new body) at a future time due to their possession of the divine Spirit.

The next section of the letter, 8:12-17, focuses less on the role of the Spirit in giving life and more on its role in assuring divine sonship. While this section begins with Paul's promise, "You will live" (8:13), to those who are in the Spirit and avoid fleshly deeds, he goes on to connect abstaining from such deeds to being children of God. He writes, "for whoever is led by the Spirit of God, those ones are sons of God" (8:14). While it is certainly an effect of the indwelling of the Spirit that believers become children of God, this sonship is manifest through their actions, the condition of sonship in this case is being led by the Spirit to certain behaviors.⁹² Believers have, according to Paul, received a "spirit of adoption"⁹³ that allows them to call God "Abba, Father" (8:15), but this ability does not constitute the fullest kind of sonship, one that parallels the sonship of Christ.⁹⁴ In addition, it is the Spirit that assures believers through its testimony that they are "children of God" (8:16), but they remain children through adoption, a

⁹² As Tobin explains, Paul first makes the statement that those who turn away from fleshly deeds and follow the Spirit are God's sons, and then gives the reason for this possibility, that is, the reception of the Spirit. Tobin, *Rhetoric*, 286.

⁹³ It is not universally agreed upon whether Paul means to identify the spirit of adoption in this case with the Spirit of God or to reference another kind of spirit as a parallel to the spirit of slavery with which it is contrasted. For the arguments supporting each of these, see Hahn, "Pneumatology," 83. Given the contrasts Paul makes throughout this section (between the spirit and flesh, the spirit of life and the spirit of death and sin, and the spirit and the body), it seems likely that the spirit of adoption here is meant as a contrast to the spirit of slavery and does not necessarily equate to the Spirit of God as such. However, the verses that surround this statement (8:14 and 16) seem to inextricably connect the Spirit of God with the believers' ability to be considered God's children, as being led by the Spirit seems to be a condition of their sonship. Cf. Bertone, "Function," 83-84 and Tobin, *Rhetoric*, 287.

⁹⁴ Meyer, "Holy Spirit," 10.

reality that can only be achieved through Christ and cannot fully benefit believers until they receive their future inheritance.⁹⁵

The incomplete nature of this adoption process is further supported by what Paul writes in 8:23: “And not only (creation), but also we ourselves, having the first fruits of the Spirit, grumble in ourselves as we await adoption, the deliverance of our bodies.” It becomes evident from this verse that believers do not yet have the full prerogatives of the Spirit. Instead, they have received the “*first* fruits of the Spirit” and still *await* the fullness of adoption that is the redemption of their bodies.⁹⁶ It is important to note that the Spirit here is not given in a partial way, but in its fullness, it is rather its full *effects* that have not yet been realized. The *first fruits* of the Spirit here does not refer to an initial or partial gift of the Spirit, but to the initial and partial *effects* of the gift of the Spirit that have begun to take place but have not resulted in their ultimate manifestation, which will be bodily resurrection.⁹⁷ As Paul writes in the verses that follow, there is still the outstanding hope (8:24-25) of becoming children of God in a way that surpasses the

⁹⁵ Kasemann understands this promise of sonship as an eschatological reality in which believers become heirs to an anticipated future glory, and Keener sees the inheritance and knowledge of God as Father as a “foretaste” of their destined resurrection. Kasemann, *Commentary*, 228; Keener, *Romans*, 102-103. Fee, too, highlights the eschatological tension between the already realized adoption of believers and the future promise of inheriting God’s glory that has yet to be realized. Fee, *Presence*, 567.

⁹⁶ The first fruits (ἀπαρχή) refers to the first part of a production offered to God or to something set apart by God before the remainder could be used, often thought to be the best of the product. See Delling, ‘ἀπαρχή’, *TDNT* 1:484. It would seem, then, that Paul means to indicate that the Spirit has been offered to believers as the first (and best?) portion of their overall salvation experience. Meyer, “Holy Spirit,” 10; Hahn, “Pneumatology,” 82; Fee, *Presence*, 518-519.

⁹⁷ The genitive τοῦ πνεύματος here is not a partitive genitive but a subjective one, where Paul describes the gift of the Spirit *as* the first fruits of the promises that God is yet to fulfill in eschatological resurrection. Cf. Tobin, *Rhetoric*, 293.

believer's current state, namely through "sharing the same form of likeness of His son" (8:29).⁹⁸

While even in the undisputed letters there does not exist a completely uniform pneumatology, there are some common notions about the Spirit that can be attributed to Paul. From the Letter to the Romans, the Letter to the Galatians, and 1 & 2 Corinthians, it seems safe to say that Paul understands the gift of the Spirit to result in various prerogatives, some that bear a striking resemblance to what is found in the Jewish Prophetic Literature discussed in Chapter Two and some that go beyond the scope of those texts. The clearest parallels are in the roles of the Spirit in giving life and in producing children of God. While it may seem that there are places in these letters (Rom. 8:23; 2 Cor. 1:24, 5:5) that present a partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit, such an interpretation is off base. It is not a partial bestowal of the Spirit that is referred to in these texts, but rather a promise of *effects* that awaits a later *fullness of effect*, that effect being resurrection to eternal life and in turn full adoption as children of God.

The Spirit in the Disputed and Deutero-Pauline Letters

Of the three disputed⁹⁹ letters of Paul, the Letter to the Ephesians (Ephesians) affords us with the most instances of the term πνεῦμα with which to work.¹⁰⁰ With the

⁹⁸ Rom. 1:4b supports this reading of the verse. Referring to the Sonship of Jesus, he is described as, "the appointed Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead." Here, Jesus is declared the Son of God based on the power he receives and because of his resurrection from the dead, which seems here to be enacted by the Spirit of holiness. Therefore, until believers too are raised from the dead through the power of the Spirit, they cannot be children of God in the way that Jesus is. It is not until their resurrection in the age to come that believers can share fully in the image of the crucified and resurrected Christ. Keener, *Romans*, 107.

⁹⁹ Again, it is not a concern here to ascertain authorship of each of the letters in the Pauline corpus. It is enough to conclude that these letters were written to early believers who understood themselves as having already received the gift of God's eschatological Spirit.

14 references to πνεῦμα in the text, it is possible to understand something of the conception of the Spirit of God that the author wishes to convey. The first reference to the Spirit in 1:13 recalls the description of the Spirit in 2 Cor. 1:22, where God is the one who “sealed us.” The act of sealing in this verse is connected to the gift of the Spirit in the parallel construction: “the one who sealed us also gave us the down payment of the Spirit” (2 Cor. 1:22). Similarly, the text of Ephesians expresses to all those that believe that “You were sealed with the Holy Spirit of the promise” (Eph. 1:13). In this case, the gift of the Spirit is not parallel to the act of sealing, but rather the Spirit is that with which the believer is sealed.¹⁰¹

Furthermore, the sealing with the Holy Spirit is here connected to the promise (ἐπαγγελία) and in 1:14 referred to as the “down payment of our inheritance,” which (like τὸν ἀρραβῶνα in 2 Cor. 1:22) conveys a sense of something still to come, of a future element stemming from the Spirit that has not yet been fulfilled.¹⁰² The quantity of Spirit transmitted here, as in the text of 2 Corinthians is also not partial in nature, but the effects of that Spirit have not yet fully been realized. There is still an outstanding promise that awaits fulfillment, and the Spirit is understood by the author to have been given as a guarantee that that promise will at some future point be enacted.¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ There are only two instances of the term πνεῦμα in the Second Letter to the Thessalonians and two instances in the Letter to the Colossians. These instances will be incorporated into the argument where they are applicable, but will not receive treatment in great detail.

¹⁰¹ Woodcock suggests that the τῷ πνεύματι here is a dative of means, meaning that the Spirit itself is the means by which believers are sealed (sealed *by* the Spirit). Woodcock, “Seal,” 149. It seems more likely, though, that it is God doing the sealing, through the Spirit, marking off believers who will receive the balance of the promise in the future.

¹⁰² Heil, “Ephesians 5:18b,” 511. Cf. Thielman, *Ephesians*, 80, and Talbert, *Ephesians*, 49.

¹⁰³ Thielman, *Ephesians*, 82. The promise, Thielman notes, is a reference to the prophetic promise of eschatological restoration in Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Joel.

While reading the text of Ephesians alongside the similar passage in 2 Corinthians illuminates the future aspect of the effects of the Spirit, I must also address what exactly the author means to say about what those effects hold in store for the believer. In other words, how would believers understand this seal with the Holy Spirit to transform them? In the Greco-Roman world, seals were used in a variety of ways.¹⁰⁴ The most common, and arguably most applicable to the context of the letter, is sealing to ensure ownership of something.¹⁰⁵ As in texts like Ezek. 9:4-6, it is likely that the author means to convey that through this seal God has placed a kind of sign on believers that they are now God's own possession.¹⁰⁶ In addition, sealing as a means of protection against enemies might also be in view here.¹⁰⁷ Because believers have been marked as belonging to God through this seal, they also receive God's protection from harm.¹⁰⁸ Sealing with the gift of the Spirit, then, makes sense within the context of early Christianity. As is evident in the Jewish Prophetic Literature examined in the previous chapter, one role of the eschatological

¹⁰⁴ See Thomas, "Seal," 156-162, for possibilities. Cf. G. Fitzer, "σφραγίς," *TDNT* 7:943-948.

¹⁰⁵ Thomas, "Seal," 156-157; also Talbert, *Ephesians*, 48. Thomas asserts that the significance of sealing in this manner likely goes back to the custom of branding animals or slaves to mark ownership.

¹⁰⁶ Thomas, "Seal," 161.

¹⁰⁷ Thomas, "Seal," 156. The suggestion that the seal is meant as a form of protection in this context has been questioned. See Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 239. While Hoehner's point is well taken that the literary context does not entirely support this suggestion, it does not seem implausible that Ephesian believers would understand protection as being a prerogative of this seal. Furthermore, this protection fits well into the understanding of inheritance and redemption that are assured by the seal of the Holy Spirit in 2:14. If the protection is understood to be a protection from eschatological judgment, then the seal of the Holy Spirit not only works to mark off believers for their future inheritance of redemption (eternal life), but also keeps them from the wrath that non-believers will face at the end of the age. See Thielman, *Ephesians*, 81, and Talbert, *Ephesians*, 49.

¹⁰⁸ Thomas contends that this connection between sealing as a sign of ownership and sealing for protection is logical when understanding the religious background of Ephesus as grounded in magic and a belief in the influence of evil spirits. Seals served as legal protection that guaranteed ownership of an object, animal, or person. They were also by extension thought to have amuletic powers that protected the owner or wearer of the sealed item from harmful spirits. Thomas, "Seal," 156.

Spirit of God was to define those who received it as belonging to God (Isa. 44:3-5; Ezek. 11:19-20). There is also a sense in this literature that the eschatological gift of the Spirit will bring peace and justice to the remnant of Israel, in essence protecting them against their enemies, who will ultimately be defeated by God (Isa. 32:14-17).¹⁰⁹ The promise in Ephesians 1:13 is one of future inheritance (κληρονομία) and redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις)¹¹⁰ of those who belong to God.

Apart from its role in sealing the believer for inheritance and redemption, the Spirit presented in Ephesians also has the task of unifying all believers and giving them equal access to God.¹¹¹ Ephesians 2 contains two references to the Spirit of God, and in both cases the author depicts it in the role of unifier, enabling Jewish and Gentile believers alike to come together as one body.¹¹² In 2:18, the author states, “for through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father.” While it is through Jesus (who is the ultimate revelation of God) and not the Spirit, that access to the Father comes, it is in one

¹⁰⁹ For literary parallels that might be read as a background to sealing as a means of protection, see Woodcock, “Seal,” 146-147.

¹¹⁰ The Ephesian believers are also said to be sealed for redemption once again in Eph. 4:30. The inheritance and the redemption of believers go hand-in-hand. Once they are sealed by the Spirit, they have an assurance that they will receive their inheritance and be redeemed by God. Both are future prospects, and while the gift of the Holy Spirit is the sign of the inheritance, the content of that inheritance is redemption. Particularly when interpreted in light of the metaphor of the Spirit as a down payment, the inheritance of the believer is the assurance that God will collect on that down payment, redeeming those believers as God’s own. Thielman, *Ephesians*, 80-82; Talbert, *Ephesians*, 49; and Cohick, *Ephesians*, 53-55.

¹¹¹ Here, the focus is on how both Gentile and Jewish believers can come together in Christ, in a new sphere of reality in which God’s promised blessings are fulfilled. The answer the author gives to the Ephesian believers is that this unity is made possible because of the one Spirit that they all share, the seal of the Holy Spirit that has been placed upon them all. Thielman, *Ephesians*, 174; Talbert, *Ephesians*, 82; Cohick, *Ephesians*, 76.

¹¹² The idea of there now being ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεῦμα, is reiterated in Eph. 4:4.

Spirit that both Jewish and Gentile believers must live in order to have such access.¹¹³

And again in Eph. 2:22 it states, “You are built together into a house of God in the Spirit.”¹¹⁴ The receipt of the gift of the Spirit fundamentally changes the reality in which the believers are living, so much so that the ethical and religious categories formerly separating them no longer exist.¹¹⁵ Once believers possess the Spirit, they are able to come together in one body (2:16) through the same Spirit that they all share. As a group they have now been brought together as the eschatological temple, the new ναός where God’s Spirit now resides.¹¹⁶

Outside of Ephesians, the disputed and pseudo-Pauline letters seldom mention the Spirit of God, and when they do, the conceptions therein typically reiterate the roles and results of the Spirit in ways similar to those already mentioned. In the Second Letter to the Thessalonians, it is written “God chose you all from the beginning for salvation by the sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth” (2 Thes. 2:13). The sanctification that the Spirit enacts is here connected not just with making believers holy, but also with

¹¹³ As Thielman explains, it is not by means of the one Spirit that the two groups have been united, but rather by means of Christ’s death. He argues that the focus here is on the unity itself, given the use of the word ‘one’ twice in vv. 15-16 and that the access comes through Jesus. Therefore, ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι here simply serves to explain the state of the believers, a state of unification based on their possession of the Spirit. Thielman, *Ephesians*, 175.

¹¹⁴ Just how to interpret the ἐν πνεύματι here is important to understanding exactly what this passage means. While it seems apparent that the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ is a genitive of possession indicating that the house in question belongs to God (it is where God lives), it is less obvious what it means that believers are built together into this house “in the Spirit.” First, because in the previous verse ἐν κυρίῳ modifies ναὸν, the parallel construction indicates that ἐν πνεύματι modifies κατοικητήριον. So, believers are built into the house of God, either through or by the Spirit. If the dative here is understood as an instrumental dative, then it is the Spirit that is active in producing this house of God. More likely, however, is that the “in Spirit” here refers to the way in which God dwells in the house, that is, God is present in this temple of believers through God’s Spirit. Thielman, *Ephesians*, 184-185.

¹¹⁵ Cohick, *Ephesians*, 79. Previously, there has been a “dividing wall” between Jews and Gentiles (2:14), which has now been brought down by Christ’s coming and the reception of the Spirit by believers.

¹¹⁶ Thielman, *Ephesians*, 184-185 and Talbert, *Ephesians*, 84-85.

the fact that they have been deemed chosen by God for salvation.¹¹⁷ In this way, their redemption can be understood as coming about in part because they have received the sanctification of the Spirit.

The renewing and salvific power of the gift of the Spirit is also displayed in the Letter to Titus, in which the author writes, “not because of works that we did in righteousness, but according to his mercy he saved us through the bath of rebirth and renewal of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out abundantly through Jesus Christ, our Savior in order that, being justified by his grace, we might become heirs according to the hope of eternal life” (Tit. 3:5-7).¹¹⁸ The Spirit here is the origin of rebirth and renewal for believers who have received this bath.¹¹⁹ Believers are both born again (or recreated) and cleansed of impurities as a result of the washing, two prerogatives of the eschaton in

¹¹⁷ I understand the genitive here as subjective, so that the Spirit is the one enacting the sanctification. If the genitive is understood as the object of the sanctification, it would need to be a reference not to the divine Spirit, but to the human spirit that is being sanctified. While technically the genitive can be read either way, it seems a more logical choice given that God’s gift of the Holy Spirit in 1 Thes. 4:7-8 is also connected with the holiness of believers. See Menken, *2 Thessalonians*, 120-121 and Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 190-191.

¹¹⁸ The latter part of 3:5 in particular calls for some exegetical attention. A decision must be made as to how to read the genitive construction διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου. The first issue that arises is whether to read *both* rebirth and renewal as modifying the bath, or whether to read only rebirth as modifying bath and renewal as being modified by the Holy Spirit. As Quinn argues, reading the two as separate “through a washing of regeneration and a renewal of the Holy Spirit” seems rhetorically forced, but cannot be entirely excluded. Quinn, *Titus*, 220. It seems more likely, given that the clause is introduced by a single διὰ, that the washing is meant here as one that *effects* both a rebirth and renewal. The next exegetical issue is how to understand the incorporation of the Holy Spirit. While alternatives exist, the most convincing reading is that the rebirth and renewal that are the effect of the “washing” *originate* from the Holy Spirit. For a list of alternative understandings, see Quinn, *Titus*, 218-219. However, Quinn, along with Wall, *1 & 2 Timothy*, 362; Towner, *1-2 Timothy*, 255-265; and Fiore, S. J., *Pastoral*, 220, all understand the passage similarly in this way.

¹¹⁹ There is some debate as to whether the bath (or washing) refers to the actual ritual of baptism or whether the reference here is to a spiritual bath. While Fiore argues the former based on the typical connection between baptism and the Holy Spirit and what he sees as a mention of the Trinity here, this argument is not altogether convincing. Fiore, *Pastoral*, 219. As Wall notes, the verb used is commonly used in Spirit baptism and a Trinitarian understanding is anachronistic, even if coherent. Wall, *1 & 2 Timothy*, 364.

Jewish Prophetic Literature (Ezek. 37:14; Jer. 31:31-33).¹²⁰ This assertion is further supported by the description of the Spirit as having been *poured out* through Jesus on believers.¹²¹ This outpouring results in their salvation, but also in their *inheritance*, which is here connected to the hope of eternal life. All of these effects are prospects of the future for which believers have been set up through the gift of the Holy Spirit.¹²²

Perhaps the only place in which there is an explicit reference to partaking in the Spirit is Heb. 6:4b, where the audience is warned against being like those who have formerly been “partakers of holy spirit”¹²³ but have fallen away from the faith. According to the text, it is impossible for these former believers to regain salvation through repentance.¹²⁴ While referring to these apostates as μέτοχοι could indicate some partialness in their possession of the Spirit, most scholars understand this partaking not as

¹²⁰ Towner understands rebirth as ensuring a new life after death through participation in the death and resurrection of Christ and the renewal as the recreation promised in the age of salvation. Towner, *1-2 Timothy*, 257. Wall, too, understands these realities as a fulfillment and reception of eschatological blessings. Wall, *1 & 2 Timothy*, 365.

¹²¹ While Fiore and Quinn only see reminiscences of Pentecost and the promises of the prophets here, likely because of their contention that the pouring out here is another reference to ritual baptism, Fiore, *Pastoral*, 219 and Quinn, *Titus*, 225, both Wall and Towner see a specific reference to the Pentecost event and Peter’s use of Joel 3:1-2 in Acts. Wall, *1 & 2 Timothy*, 363 and Towner, *1-2 Timothy*, 257. While either is possible, I side here with the latter commentators. Because water imagery is typical of Spirit bestowal and the links with the Pentecost seem more than mere reminiscences here, it does not seem necessary to understand an actual baptism rite.

¹²² See Quinn, *Titus*, 224; Wall, *1 & 2 Timothy*, 365-366; Towner, *1-2 Timothy*, 257; and Fiore, *Pastoral*, 221.

¹²³ As in Lk. 11:13, there is no definite article before πνεύματος ἁγίου here. While such a construction does not exclude a possible translation “the Holy Spirit”, I choose here the more literal translation. Cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 170. Regardless of whether or not the definite article is supplied in the translation, a holy spirit would nonetheless seem to indicate a spirit given by God to believers. Furthermore, this spirit is strongly connected in the rest of the passage to redemption (or lack thereof), a prerogative of the Spirit of God.

¹²⁴ While some commentators in the past have sought to downplay the finality and harshness of this statement, most modern scholars agree that the author does mean to convey the complete impossibility of repentance for those who have experienced life as believers and yet turned away from belief. See O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 216-217; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 144; Koester, *Hebrews*, 311; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 167-168.

a partial bestowal of God's Spirit but rather as a description of the previous *participation* in the Spirit-guided life that these believers have enjoyed.¹²⁵ It does not seem in this verse that the author describes how the gift of the Spirit is given, however, but how these particular people at one time "took part" in the Spirit but currently do not.

In addition, a few scholars have emphasized the Old Testament background that may lie behind this verse. Reading Hebrews as alluding in multiple instances to the Exodus narrative, the idea of partaking in God's holy Spirit finds precedent in the distribution of Moses spirit to the seventy elders in the text of Numbers 11.¹²⁶ Furthermore, if the Spirit in this case is understood as present with believers in a way that is similar to how God's presence remained with God's people in the wilderness, it is easier to understand how participation in this holy spirit might be contingent upon the behavior of believers. God's Spirit, just as God's presence, can be removed at any point, particularly if the 'pilgrimage' of belief is abandoned.¹²⁷ Such an interpretation of the gift of God's Spirit, however, moves away from that found in the Jewish Prophetic Literature.

¹²⁵ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 170; O'Brien, *Hebrews*, 221. Attridge and O'Brien both base their interpretations on other instances in the letter in which believers are called μέτοχοι. For example, in Heb. 3:1 and 3:14, believers are said to be partakers of the heavenly calling and partakers of Christ, respectively. Neither of these passages would seem to indicate that individual believers do not fully participate in the heavenly life or in Christ, but rather that they are individual participants in realities that exist beyond them for more than just themselves. Partaking of holy spirit, then, should also be read similarly as participation by individuals in a reality greater than themselves. Cf. Bruce, *Hebrews*, 141; Koester, *Hebrews*, 314; Emmrich, "Hebrews 6:4-6...again," 85.

¹²⁶ Both Martin Emmrich and Dave Mathewson point to the wilderness narrative of Numbers 11 as a possible background for Heb. 6:4-6, noting that the "heavenly gift" of Heb. 6:4a and the "partakers of holy spirit" in 6:4b allude respectively to the manna from heaven given to people in Num. 11:4-9 and to Moses' distribution of the spirit in Num. 11:16-29. See Emmrich, "Hebrews 6:4-6...again," 85 and Mathewson, "Hebrews 6:4-6," 216-217.

¹²⁷ Emmrich, "Hebrews 6:4-6...again," 90.

The gift of holy spirit in Hebrews is not, apparently, a once and for all outpouring to the people, but rather is available for them to participate in if they choose to accept the faith.

The Gift of the Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels

While it might seem logical to look for notions of the bestowal of the eschatological Spirit of God first and foremost in the gospel texts, a review of those texts leaves us with few parallels. While the Synoptic gospels each contain multiple instances of the word πνεῦμα, comparatively few of those instances seem to refer to the gift of the eschatological Spirit to believers at large. Typically, the word is used in the gospels in reference to an internal life force or human inclination (Mt. 5:3, 27:50; Mk. 2:8, 8:12, 14:38; Lk. 1:47, 80; 8:55; 9:55; 23:46) or to a demonic or divine being (Mt. 12:43; Mk. 1:23, 26; 3:30; 5:2, 8; 7:25; 9:17, 20, 25; Lk. 4:33; 8:29; 9:39, 42; 11:24; 13:11).¹²⁸ Another common use is in the description of those who receive the Spirit of prophecy or revelation, allowing them to speak the words of God (Mt. 10:20, 22:43; Mk. 12:36, 13:11; Lk. 1:17, 67; 2:25-27; 12:12). The term is also used in the infancy narratives of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke (Mt. 1:18, 20; Lk. 1:15) and in the three descriptions of Jesus' baptism (Mt. 3:16; Mk. 1:10; Lk. 3:22) to show when and how *Jesus* is endowed with the Holy Spirit.

There are comparatively few passages that describe the Spirit being bestowed upon believers. These descriptions of Spirit bestowal are often connected to baptism. The first instances come in the words of John the Baptist concerning Jesus' anticipated baptism with the Spirit (and fire) in the parallel texts of Mt. 3:11, Mk. 1:8, and Lk. 3:16.

¹²⁸ Lk. 24:37-39 in a similar way uses the term to reflect the disciples concern that the risen Jesus is a ghost or phantasm.

While it is apparent from these passages that believers will receive the Spirit through the act of Jesus baptizing them, there is no indication as to the quantity of that Spirit or the nature of its effects. The Holy Spirit is also linked to baptism in the text of Mt. 28:19 when the disciples are commissioned by Jesus to make disciples of all the nations “in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.” However, the reference to the Holy Spirit in this case is likely part of a liturgical formula and does not *describe* the way that God bestows the Spirit on God’s people. Only two references to the Spirit in the Synoptic gospels give more detailed information about how the Spirit is bestowed upon believers, and each appears in the Gospel of Luke.¹²⁹

While one might expect to find more content concerning the gift of the Spirit in the Synoptic gospels, there is perhaps an obvious reason as to why there seems to be such a paucity of references therein. The gospel narratives have the general purpose of conveying information about the life and Spirit possession of *Jesus*, not of believers at large. While the gospels tell of the *fact* of the gift of God’s Spirit, they do not go the farther step of explaining how exactly that gift affects the believers that receive it. The full endowment and experience of the Spirit by believers is a later development than the life and ministry of Christ.

The Gift of the Spirit in Luke-Acts

Of the two references to the gift of the Spirit to believers in the Gospel of Luke, one of those passages specifically uses the term holy spirit (πνεῦμα ἅγιον) (Lk. 11:13), while the other only alludes to the gift of the Spirit as “the promise of my Father” (Lk.

¹²⁹ Because the Luke’s gospel is typically understood as the first part of the two-volume work Luke-Acts, these passages will be treated in greater detail in the following section. While I do not wish to make claims about the common authorship of Luke-Acts here, I do consider the two to be strongly connected theologically, and particularly to show similarities in their depictions of the Spirit.

24:49).¹³⁰ In the first of these verses, Lk. 11:13, Jesus is speaking to his disciples about the generosity of God the Father. He informs them that all they need to do in order to receive the gift of holy spirit from God is to ask God to give it to them. Jesus asks, “If, then, you who are evil know to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the Father from heaven give holy spirit¹³¹ to those who ask him?” (Lk. 11:13) While the verse itself does not explain *how* exactly God will bestow this spirit upon them, it does indicate that possession of holy spirit will be open to all believers.¹³² Possession of this holy spirit from God in this case is not reserved for Jesus alone, but is given to all those who ask for it.

Whereas Lk. 11:13 is somewhat ambiguous as to the personal nature of the spirit being given, Lk. 24:49 more definitively points to *the* Holy Spirit as God’s gift to

¹³⁰ Because the two most applicable occurrences of Spirit bestowal in the Synoptic Gospels are found in Luke, this section makes use of the following texts: Riku P. Tuppurainen, “The Contribution of Socio-Rhetorical Criticism to Spirit-Sensitive Hermeneutics: A Contextual Example—Luke 11:13,” *JBPR* 4 (September, 2012): 38-66; Judith Lieu, *The Gospel of Luke* (Epworth Commentaries; Peterborough, UK: Epworth Press, 1997); Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (NAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996); Michael Mullins, *The Gospel of Luke* (Dublin: Columbia Press, 2010); Jack Dean Kingsbury, “Luke 24:44-49,” *Interpretation* 35 no. 2 (April 1, 1981): 170-174.

¹³¹ While nearly all English translations of the text render δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον as “will give *the* Holy Spirit” (cf. NRSV, NIV, NAB, NKJV, NLT, and ESV), the Greek text does not contain the definite article. Although the absence of the definite article does not exclude the possibility that the author means to convey the gift of *the* Holy Spirit, the textual variant in P⁴⁵ may actually support translating the text as *a* holy spirit (or simply ‘holy spirit’) instead of *the* Holy Spirit. The text of that manuscript reads, δώσει πνεῦμα ἀγαθόν (“he will give a good/upright spirit), which more closely resembles the gift of “*a* holy spirit” and also creates an almost perfect parallel with the beginning of the verse, οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν (you know to give *good* gifts to your children). It may be the case, however, that this variant is a result of attempted continuity with the text of Matt. 7:11 (and with the first half of the verse in Lk. 11:13a-b). For these reasons, I have chosen here to preserve the ambiguity of the Greek by leaving out the article. However, even when translating the text more literally without the definite article this holy spirit must still come as a gift from God, a gift that then acts within any person who asks for and receives it.

¹³² While this verse is commonly understood as focusing more on prayer than on the gift of the Spirit, it is important to note that the verse in Luke’s gospel differs from its parallel in Matthew’s gospel, which reads ἀγαθὰ instead of πνεῦμα ἅγιον. This difference in God’s gift seems to indicate that the author of Luke’s gospel does not seek to focus only on the exhortation to prayer. The gift of the Spirit in particular here seems to be highlighted as a result of the inauguration of God’s kingdom. See Tuppurainen, “Luke 11:13,” 60-64.

believers at Pentecost. While the word πνεῦμα does not appear in this verse, it is understood from the context that this is what is meant by the term ἐπαγγελία.¹³³ The verse reads, “And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you, but settle down in the city until you are clothed with power from heaven” (Lk. 24:49). At the time that Jesus speaks these words, the promise is yet unfulfilled.¹³⁴ The result of the gift of the Spirit, therefore, can be understood to have the effect of endowing the recipients with divine power, but how exactly this power will manifest itself does not become clear until the Acts of the Apostles.

Of all the New Testament texts, the Acts of the Apostles (Acts) contains the most reported instances of believers receiving the gift of the Spirit.¹³⁵ Throughout the whole

¹³³ See Mullins, *Luke*, 518; Kingsbury, “Luke 24:44-49,” 170-174; and F.F. Bruce, “The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles,” *Interpretation* 27 no. 2 (April, 1973): 170, each of whom understand the promise here as referring to the Holy Spirit which will empower the disciples. Cf. Lieu, *Luke*, 209. While Lieu does not explicitly identify the promise as the Spirit, she does point to the outpouring of the Spirit in Isa. 32:15 as a comparative text.

¹³⁴ This is indicated by the conjunction ἕως and the future passive ἐνδύσῃσθε. The future event to which this verse points is likely the spiritual endowment at Pentecost described in Acts 1:8. Acts 1:8 can be linked to Lk. 24:49 through the depiction of the gift as δόναμα in both instances, and in Acts the root of that power is explicitly stated to be the Holy Spirit. The endowment itself is then carried out in Acts 2:1-11. See Bock, *Luke*, 621.

¹³⁵ Treatments of Spirit bestowal in Acts, therefore, are numerous. See Matthias Wenk, “Acts” in *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*, eds. Trevor J. Burke and Keith Warrington (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2014): 116-128; Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Acts* (ZEC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012); Aaron J. Kuecker, *The Spirit and the ‘Other’: Social Identity, Ethnicity and Intergroup Reconciliation in Luke-Acts* (LNTS 444; London: T&T Clark, 2011); David G. Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007); C. K. Barrett, *Acts: A Shorter Commentary* (New York: T&T Clark, 2002); Robert W. Wall, “‘Purity and Power’ According to the Acts of the Apostles,” *WTJ* 34 no. 1 (Spring, 1999): 64-82; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (ABC 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998); James D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit Volume 2 Pneumatology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); John Squires, “The Plan of God in the Acts of the Apostles,” in eds. Howard I. Marshall and David Peterson *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998): 19-39; Max M. B. Turner, “The ‘Spirit of Prophecy’ as the Power of Israel’s Restoration and Witness,” in eds. Howard I. Marshall and David Peterson *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998): 327-348; Craig S. Keener, *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997); Max M. B. Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (JPTSup 9; Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); William L. Larkin Jr., *Acts* (IVP New Testament Commentary Series; Downers Grove: IVP

narrative of Acts, individual persons and groups of persons receive the gift of the Spirit in various ways and to varying effects, so that the category of Israel or God's people is widely expanded.¹³⁶ The Spirit in Acts is given first to the apostles (Acts 2:4ff.), then to a group of Samaritans (8:16-19), to Saul following his revelatory experience (9:17), to the centurion Cornelius and his household (10:44ff.), and finally to a group of disciples in Ephesus (19:6ff). Also throughout the text individuals or groups are *filled with* the Spirit on multiple occasions (2:4; 4:8, 31; 6:3, 5; 7:55; 9:17; 11:24; 13:9, 52), but this seems generally to take place after the initial gift of the Spirit is received.¹³⁷ This *filling* would seem to rule out any understanding of the Spirit as only partially received. The Spirit in Acts is also strongly connected to the gift of past prophets and their prophetic utterances (1:16; 4:25; 28:25) and represents the driving force behind nearly all actions (or inactions) of the disciples (11:2; 13:4; 15:28; 16:6). In addition to the various functions of the Spirit and groups to whom it is presented, the text describes *how* the Spirit is received in a variety of ways. There does not seem to be a set sequence of events prior to receiving the Spirit nor do the groups that receive it follow a typical pattern of belief, baptism, or

Academic, 1995); C. K. Barrett, *Acts: Volume 1: 1-14* (ICC; New York: T&T Clark, 1994); Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Sacra Pagina 5; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992); F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990); Hermann Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit: The Popular Views of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979); also Bruce, "Holy Spirit;" Levison, *Filled*; and Montague, *Holy Spirit*.

¹³⁶ Wall, "Purity," 69. Also Barrett, *Acts*, liii and Schnabel, *Acts*, 86.

¹³⁷ For instance, in 4:8 Peter is described as filled with the Spirit, *after* having initially received the Spirit during Pentecost in 2:4. Similarly, Paul (in 13:9), Stephen (in 7:55), and Barnabas (in 11:24) are all described as being full of or filled with the Holy Spirit after their initial reception of the Spirit as a group in 4:31 and 6:3-5. Furthermore, the disciples are described as "filled with joy and the Holy Spirit" in 13:52, long after they initially received the Spirit at Pentecost.

repentance.¹³⁸ The Spirit, it would seem, acts always as it (or God) pleases, without dependence on human action. Given the multitude of instances of the term πνεῦμα in the text, the focus here will be on those passages that portray the gift of the Spirit to groups of believers, as these passages should give the most insight into how the author understands the receipt of the eschatological Spirit by the people of God.

That the Spirit inspires power and prophecy stands out as one of the most prominent functions of the gift of the Spirit in Acts.¹³⁹ In fact, the initial gift of the Spirit to the apostles is directly connected to the prophecy concerning the receipt of the eschatological Spirit in the Book of Joel, using a modified version of the LXX translation of the text. In the passage of the text that describes the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost (Acts 2:1ff.), the apostles receive the Spirit that has previously been promised to them by the risen Christ (Acts 1:4-5, 8; cf. Lk. 24:49). With this Spirit is said to come a certain power (δύναμις) that will enable those who receive it to become witnesses to Jesus (Acts 1:8). On the day of Pentecost, the text describes the apostles, saying “And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit,” after which they are endowed with the power to speak in multiple languages (Acts 2:4). The power to speak in tongues is necessary to the missionary work

¹³⁸ Bruce, “Holy Spirit,” 176. Larkin also notes the lack of pattern in the conversion narratives and the outward effects of those conversions. See Larkin, *Acts*, 31.

¹³⁹ Levison, *Filled*, 342-344. Barrett, *Acts*, liv. Barrett explains that this function is likely the focus, rather than any kind of ethical renewal or restoration, because these outward displays were more impressive to the author. While this might be the case, the ability of the apostles to perform miracles and speak in foreign languages does seem the most appropriate given the importance of Christian origins in Acts and the need for the ability to convert unbelievers and spread the gospel message as far and wide as possible. Schnabel notes that the gift of speaking in foreign languages would also be particularly useful at the time of Pentecost since Diaspora Jews would have likely been present in Jerusalem for the festival and have spoken different languages. And as he points out, this gift of xenolalia is understood to fall under the category of prophetic utterance, given Peter’s explanation of the event in 2:15-21. Schnabel, *Acts*, 115-116, 122. Cf. Dunn, *Pneumatology*, 12.

of the apostles, enabling them to spread the gospel far beyond their natural capabilities.¹⁴⁰

In this way, the power of glossolalia received through the Spirit at Pentecost can be understood as an ability that is strongly connected to prophecy, prophetic speech, and even salvation.¹⁴¹ The apostles are described as filled with the Spirit, representing a complete overtaking of their internal faculties.¹⁴² It is made abundantly clear by the author of Acts that the disciples are receiving this Spirit in the eschatological age, and as a result, this gift ushers in a new post-Pentecostal reality.¹⁴³

The connection to prophecy at the eschaton is further supported by the use of the quotation from the Book of Joel in Acts 2:17-21. As discussed in the previous chapter, the Book of Joel depicts the gift of the Spirit as an abundant outpouring, one that is available to *all* people and that comes in the days leading up to the “day of the LORD” (Heb. Joel 3:4). The quotation as it is given in Acts, however, is a slightly modified version of what is found in the LXX text.¹⁴⁴ While the LXX begins simply with the time indicator “after this,” the Greek of Acts makes the time in which the Spirit is being

¹⁴⁰ Levison, *Filled*, 345-346, also Schnabel, *Acts*, 86-87 and Larkin, *Acts*, 50.

¹⁴¹ Levison, *Filled*, 345-346. Cf. Wall, “Purity,” 68. Schnabel highlights this last function, explaining that without the gift of the Spirit, new life in Christ would not be possible and that the testimony of the apostles is necessary for this message to be disseminated. Schnabel, *Acts*, 87.

¹⁴² For discussion on the (particularly Greco-Roman) connotations of being filled with the Spirit, see Levison, *Filled*, 334-337. Schnabel, too, notes the internal aspect of this filling as taking over the inward capacities. Schnabel, *Acts*, 115.

¹⁴³ Wall, “Purity,” 66. Larkin contends that these “last days” are the final days of the current age and that the age to come has now been inaugurated. Larkin, *Acts*, 53. Schnabel, too, understands these “last days” as an eschatological statement of the new age, which he describes as being ushered in first by the coming of Jesus. He notes, however, that the Spirit bestowal here seems to be a kind of climax to this inauguration, despite the continued waiting for the “final day” which will be marked by the second coming of Christ. Schnabel, *Acts*, 135-136.

¹⁴⁴ For a full list of the changes made to the LXX verse Barrett, *Volume I*, 136-139. I will only discuss those changes here that are pertinent to my argument.

bestowed more specific from the start of the passage. Rather than waiting until the end of the quotation to state that this Spirit will come in the Day of the LORD,¹⁴⁵ the text of Acts states, “And it will be in the last days, says God, I will pour out from my Spirit upon all flesh” (Acts 2:17).

While the verb ἐκχέω depicts the great force with which the Spirit will be spilled onto the apostles,¹⁴⁶ the text also includes a possibly partitive genitive, ἀπὸ πνεύματος.¹⁴⁷ It is likely that the author means to draw a connection between the event of the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, the prediction made in Joel, and the distribution of Moses’ Spirit to the elders in Numbers 11.¹⁴⁸ In both Num. 11:17b and 25b, the words of God are very similar to those spoken by God¹⁴⁹ in this instance, each using the

¹⁴⁵ For the eschatological connotation of this time stamp, see Section 2.2.1 of this dissertation.

¹⁴⁶ Larkin notes that this outpouring should be understood as a kind of torrential downpour, one that denotes the finality and universality of the gift of the Spirit. He also contrasts this kind of Spirit bestowal with the coming of the Spirit onto kings and prophets of the past. Larkin, *Acts*, 54. Peterson, too, points to the “unprecedented deluge” that is suggested by the verb. Peterson, *Acts* 140-141. Cf. Bock, *Acts*, 113, who refers to the imagery as a “torrential downpour” but also notes the partitive genitive.

¹⁴⁷ While not all commentators note or translate the partitive genitive here, many depict this nuance through either their translations alone or with accompanying comment. Schnabel, *Acts*, 135-137; Larkin, *Acts*, 52-54; and Peterson, *Acts*, 140-141 do not translate or note a partitive genitive. Johnson, *Acts*, 48, does not address the partitive genitive in his notes, but he does translate 2:17b “I will pour out *from* my Spirit,” which can be interpreted either as a partitive genitive or genitive of origin. Although in his shorter commentary Barrett neither translates nor notes the partitive genitive (Barrett, *Acts*, 21, 24), in his longer commentary he does not translate, but does comment on this nuance (Barrett, *Volume 1*, 127, 136-137). This is also true of Bock, *Acts*, 109, 112-113. Bruce, *Acts*, 120-121, gives only the Greek text, but notes the partitive genitive. Fitzmyer translates “pour out from my Spirit” and comments that the partitive genitive indicates that human beings only partake of the Spirit as the totality of the Spirit remains with God. Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles*, 252. Gunkel, in his seminal work on the Spirit, *Influence*, puts this instance of Spirit bestowal alongside the instance in 1Jn 4:13 as being indicative of the ability of God to give the Spirit proportionally. He notes, however, that instances of the partial coming of the Spirit are not the norm in the New Testament and that the dominant idea is that where the Spirit is, the Spirit is there completely. Gunkel, *Influence*, 42-43.

¹⁴⁸ Many scholars note these connections. See Barrett, *Volume 1*, 135-137; Bruce, *Acts*, 121; Bock, *Acts*, 112.

¹⁴⁹ It is interesting to note that λέγει ὁ θεός in 2:17a is an addition made to LXX Joel by the author of Acts. This addition makes it abundantly clear that these words are the words of God, likely because Peter is

construction ἀπό with the genitive albeit with different verbs. Furthermore, the main purpose of the gift of the Spirit in each case is to endow those who receive it with the ability to prophesy in some way.¹⁵⁰ It seems likely that the use of the partitive genitives in Acts 2:17-18 serves to connect the apostles receiving the Spirit at Pentecost to the elders in the narrative from Numbers 11 and to show that the wish of Moses in Num. 11:29 “that all the LORD’s people were prophets, that the LORD would put his Spirit upon them” has now been fulfilled.¹⁵¹ It is also a possibility that the partial bestowal in Acts 2:17-18 adds a sense of distribution to the outpouring of the Spirit, a distribution that is incomplete until the gift to the Gentiles in Acts 10:45.¹⁵²

Similarly, the gift of the Spirit to the apostles is described in Acts 2:33 with the verb (ἐκχέω), but in this instance, the outpouring comes through the exalted Jesus (who received it from God) and not directly from God the Father. There is also no use of a partitive genitive in 2:33; having received the Holy Spirit from the Father, Jesus pours out “this that you see and hear.” What is being poured out in this instance, though, is

speaking and does not want the audience to confuse the identity of the speaker. However, it also serves as another parallel to the text of Num. 11, where it is God who speaks to Moses and tells him the intentions God has for the distribution of the Spirit.

¹⁵⁰ Another addition that the author of Acts makes to the text of LXX Joel is to repeat the phrase “and they will prophesy” in 2:18b. Again, this recalls not the text of LXX Joel so much as it does the text of Num. 11:25c, “and when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied.” Cf. Montague, *Holy Spirit*, 285.

¹⁵¹ Both Bock and Barrett argue that the specific fulfillment of Num. 11:29 is in view here. Bock, *Acts*, 112; Barrett, *Volume 1*, 137. While they do not specifically cite Num. 11:29, Montague and Aaron J. Kuecker also point to the likely influence of the narrative in Numbers 11. Montague, *Holy Spirit*, 285; Kuecker, ‘*Other*’, 120 n. 105.

¹⁵² Bock explains the partitive genitive as denoting the distribution of the Spirit to multiple persons and notes the parallel verse about the outpouring to the Gentiles in 10:45. Bock, *Acts*, 113. While this may be the case, it seems more likely that the partitive genitive is an attempt by the author to connect the language back to that of Numbers 11. Given the additions that the author of Acts makes to the text of Joel (“says God” in 2:17a and “and they will prophesy” in 2:18b), it would seem that he makes a great effort, perhaps even more so than in the translation of LXX Joel, to connect the prophecy of the apostles to that of the seventy elders.

somewhat ambiguous. While “this” likely refers back to the Holy Spirit, it is also modified by “that you see and hear.”¹⁵³ While the outpouring could be of the effects of the Spirit (what is being seen and heard), it could also refer directly to the Holy Spirit. Either way, the effects of the Spirit cannot be separated from the gift of the Spirit. Those present see and hear the manifestations of the gift of the Spirit, which Jesus has poured out in his authority as exalted Messiah.

A large part of the new reality ushered in by the outpouring of the Spirit is the new power of prophecy received by the apostles. The use of the quotation from the Book of Joel so early on in the text (it marks the reception of the Spirit by the first of the four groups of recipients), sets an expectation for the effects that this Spirit will have on those that receive it. In the passage from LXX Joel 3:1-4, the result is that *all* people, regardless of social standing, gender, or age will have the power of prophecy, presumably because they will now have a new, more immediate relationship to and knowledge of God.¹⁵⁴ Those who are familiar with the passage from the Book of Joel, then, can predict the effects that this outpouring of the Spirit will have on the believers who are now described as receiving it. In Acts 2:4, the effect of this outpouring has already been witnessed, as the apostles are able to spread the Word of God more effectively. Interestingly, while there may be some indication of a partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit in Acts

¹⁵³ Schnabel, for instance, translates the verse, “Exalted to God’s right hand, he has received from the Father the promised Holy Spirit, whom he has poured out. This is what you now see and hear.” Schnabel, *Acts*, 147. While the text might leave somewhat more ambiguity, the use of the verb ἐκχεῖν paired with a mention of the Holy Spirit recalls the gift of the Spirit just a few verses earlier in 2:17-18, and should likely be understood to depict a similar outpouring. Furthermore, τοῦτο ὃ (this which) are both singular and neuter, as is the noun τοῦ πνεύματος. For readings that acknowledge the ambiguity see Barrett, *Acts*, 28; Bock, *Acts*, 130-131; Johnson, *Acts*, 55.

¹⁵⁴ Moore, “Promise,” 250. Also Larkin, *Acts*, 54 and Schnabel, *Acts*, 135-137.

2:17-18, the prophetic effects are fully realized by any and all of God's servants (Acts 2:18) who call upon God (Acts 2:21).

After the apostles the next to receive the gift of the Spirit is a group of Samaritans. Acts 8:14-17 depicts the mission of the apostles to Samaria, stating: "When they arrived, they prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit, because it had not yet come upon them, for they had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (8: 15-16). The text here makes it evident that it is not only through baptism that believers receive the Spirit; this group of Samaritans has already been baptized, but still has not received the Spirit.¹⁵⁵ Time has passed between their baptism in the name of the Lord and their reception of the Spirit.¹⁵⁶ It is only after the prayer of the apostles (8:15) and the subsequent laying of the apostles' hands upon them that the Spirit is transmitted to the people (8:17-18). In spite of the fact that the Spirit moves from God the Father to Jesus (2:33), from Jesus to the apostles (2:33), and from the apostles to believers (8:17-

¹⁵⁵ By contrast, Paul receives the Spirit and becomes a brother to Ananias *before* he is baptized in Acts 9:17. Here again, though, the gift of the Spirit does not seem to be the *result* of baptism, but a precursor to it. Larkin notes the inconsistencies in the chronological patterns of Spirit reception, but agrees with Schnabel that the case of the Samaritans seems to be extraordinary. Larkin, *Acts*, 128. Schnabel's reasoning, however, is not entirely convincing. He states that the "not yet" (οὐδέπω) in verse 16 would be superfluous if time between baptism and Spirit reception was the norm. Schnabel, *Acts*, 410. It seems to make more sense grammatically that the "not yet" here has more to do with the Samaritans only having received baptism in the name of the Lord.

¹⁵⁶ Bruce, "Holy Spirit," 174. Larkin, too, notes the interval between baptism and Spirit reception here. Larkin, *Acts*, 128. A possible reason for the delay of the Spirit's coming to the people of Samaria might be gleaned from the surrounding narrative about Philip and the magician Simon. While the Samaritans accept Philip's proclamation about the Messiah, they seem to do so mainly because they are impressed by the signs and miracles that he performs (8:5-7, 13), just as they had listened previously to Simon because they were amazed by his magic (8:9-11). The Samaritans receive baptism based on their belief in Philip's words, belief that is in turn based on his ability to perform signs and miracles. The Spirit, acting always on its own accord, therefore does not come upon the Samaritans until Peter and John arrive and pray for the Samaritan's to receive the Spirit (8:14-17). The subsequent confrontation between Peter and Simon regarding the ability to transmit the Spirit through the laying on of hands stresses the idea that is not the act itself that conveys the Spirit, but the petitioning of the Spirit through prayer and God's willingness to answer that petition (8:18-24).

18), there is no indication in this case that at each stage it is not the fullness of that Spirit that is being transmitted.

Following the gift of the Spirit to the Samaritans, the mission of the apostles (guided by the Spirit)¹⁵⁷ brings them to various groups of believers. After having received revelatory visions, both Cornelius (10:3-6) and Peter (10:10-16) are brought together by the power of God in order that Cornelius, a centurion, and his household might receive the Spirit. In this particular pericope, there is no laying on of hands or baptism by Peter, but rather the Spirit comes down without any physical action during the words of Peter's speech about Jesus.¹⁵⁸ According to the text, as he was speaking "the Holy Spirit fell upon all who heard the word," and those who received this Spirit gained the power to speak in tongues (10:44, 46).¹⁵⁹ Furthermore, the text of the Book of Joel quoted earlier in Acts is again recalled in 10:45 where it states that "the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out" onto the Gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη) there. Once again, a group of believers receives the Spirit just as was predicted in the Jewish Prophetic text of Joel, and there is no indication in 10:45 that the gift is in any way incomplete nor that the transformation of those that have received it has led to anything more than prophetic abilities and acceptance into the community of believers. As in other places in Acts, the baptism of

¹⁵⁷ Bruce, "Holy Spirit," 174. Cf. Larkin, *Acts*, 31.

¹⁵⁸ Bruce, "Holy Spirit," 175.

¹⁵⁹ Turner points to the verb ἐπιπίπτω as an "abnormally dramatic irruption(s) of the Spirit." Turner, *Power*, 357. Larkin, too, explains that this verb along with ἐκχέω in the following verse denotes a suddenness and intensity of Spirit bestowal and highlights the totality of salvation being experienced. Larkin, *Acts*, 167-168.

those who have received the Spirit takes place *after* the Spirit has been poured out upon them (Acts 10:48).¹⁶⁰

The final group in Acts to receive the gift of the Spirit is a group of disciples in Ephesus (Acts 19:1ff.). In this instance it is Paul, having received the Spirit when Ananias laid his hands on him in 9:17, who lays his hands upon the group, resulting in their reception of the Holy Spirit. This particular group of believers, it is discovered, has been baptized only with the baptism of John (baptism for repentance) and as such has no knowledge of the Holy Spirit (19:2-4).¹⁶¹ Therefore, this group of “about twelve” are baptized in the name of Jesus and receive the gift of the Spirit when Paul lays his hands upon them (19:5-6). Again here the gift of the Spirit leads directly to glossolalia (19:6).¹⁶² Here, the reception of the Spirit does not purify these disciples from sin or cause repentance. Rather, they have already repented in their initial baptism provided by John. They must, however, be baptized again in the name of Jesus (which, as Paul explains in 19:4 is really a logical progression from John’s baptism) and receive the Spirit in order to speak in tongues and prophesy.

¹⁶⁰ Schnabel, *Acts*, 506.

¹⁶¹ Barrett reads 18:24-19:7 together, noting the juxtaposition between the inadequacy of John’s baptism as a mark of belief and the adequacy of the gift of the Spirit in marking off members of the faith community. Barrett, *Acts*, 284. While the pericope certainly serves to highlight the insufficiency of John’s baptism alone, it would seem that the *disciples* in Ephesus are already counted among the faithful, even before they receive baptism in the name of Christ and the gift of the Spirit. Cf. Schnabel, *Acts*, 788-789, who points to the contrast between the previous story of Apollos, who is described as fervent in the Spirit and teaching accurately (but not perfectly) about Jesus, and the disciples depicted here, who have also received only John’s baptism but do not yet possess the Spirit. This contrast is helpful in understanding the power and importance of Spirit reception, particularly in regard to its ability to produce disciples who can prophesy and spread the word of God.

¹⁶² Bruce, “Holy Spirit,” 177; Schnabel, *Acts*, 789; Barrett, *Acts*, 288.

While the ability to prophesy is not the only function of the Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles, it certainly would seem that the prophetic Spirit of the Jewish Scriptures lies behind the author's understanding of the prerogatives that result from the receipt of the eschatological Spirit.¹⁶³ It seems evident that he understands early Christians to be living in an entirely new age following the departure of Jesus and his gift of the Spirit to his disciples. It is important to note, however, that the author of Acts is careful to remind his readers that the time of the ultimate restoration of the kingdom is not for them to know (Acts 1:6-7). While he may understand the beginning of the last days to have been inaugurated with the gift of the Spirit on Pentecost,¹⁶⁴ it is not clear whether the eschatological prerogatives of the community go beyond those highlighted in the text of Joel. There is some indication that the Spirit in Acts betrays a strong likeness to the conception of the Spirit/Paraclete in the Farewell Discourses of GJn, particularly in its depictions of the Spirit as a reminder or replacement for the presence of Jesus after his ascension (or in the case of GJn, return) to the Father.¹⁶⁵ These roles, however, do not seem very strongly tied to the actual reception of the Spirit by groups of believers in Acts. The results of the Spirit that stand out most prominently in the text are prophetic ability and the egalitarianism to which this newfound openness to prophecy alludes.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ Wall, "Purity," 67; Bruce "Holy Spirit," 180.

¹⁶⁴ Wall, "Purity," 68. Cf. Larkin, *Acts*, 53 and Schnabel, *Acts*, 135-136.

¹⁶⁵ The Spirit's role as witness is also a parallel to parts of the Johannine corpus, but this witnessing can be viewed as part of the larger task of standing in for Jesus after he is gone. In Acts, however, the Spirit's function as witness is inextricably connected to its major role as Spirit of prophecy. For a list of the ways in which the Spirit's role as witness is manifest in Acts, see Turner, "The 'Spirit of Prophecy'," 330-331.

¹⁶⁶ Dunn notes in several places the preeminence of the Spirit of prophecy throughout Acts, but contends that this function of the Spirit is not entirely distinct from the soteriological function of the Spirit, as the outpouring of the Spirit represents a new epoch of salvation. Dunn, *Christ*, 12, 27, 213-214, 235. Cf. Keener, *Spirit*, 195, who also understands the outpouring of the prophetic Spirit to be evidence of the time

This focus can likely be attributed to the importance of the Spirit in missionizing and community formation in Acts, rather than the prerogatives of the individual believer.¹⁶⁷

While there may be a sense in Acts that the Spirit can be given partially, such partialness is only indicated in one instance, and the effects of that Spirit bestowal on its recipients leads to a full transformation into prophets of God who are able to spread the gospel throughout the nations.

Conclusion to the Spirit in Non-Johannine New Testament Literature

An overview of the New Testament Literature outside of the Johannine corpus displays varied conceptions of the eschatological Spirit of God, some of which are more detailed than others. While the Synoptic gospels make clear *that* the gift of the Spirit can be expected by believers, they seldom give any indication of *how* that gift will be given and what *effects* it will have. In Acts, a more detailed description of the manner and effects of the gift of the Spirit is given, which is patterned very closely on the predictions of the Book of Joel and harkens back to the distribution of the Spirit to the seventy elders in Numbers 11. There is not much effect on the ethical behavior of recipients of the Spirit in Acts, and instead the focus of the passages is on the power of prophecy. As in the text

of salvation. Kuecker and Wenk see more than just the prophetic function of the Spirit depicted in Acts, with Kuecker pointing to the link between Spirit reception and community formation and the new equality of access to God, and Wenk arguing that the outpouring of the Spirit leads to new social structures commonly associated with the theology of Luke-Acts. Kuecker, '*Other*', 120 n. 105, 121 n. 109; Wenk, 'Acts,' 118, 124.

¹⁶⁷ The focus on prophecy and openness in Acts makes perfect sense, given the overall thrust of the narrative. The author of Acts seeks to tell the story of the missionizing work of the early apostles, and their ability to missionize is strongly tied to their ability to speak in languages beyond their native tongues. Furthermore, a major theme in Acts is universal salvation, the inclusion of all believers into the people of Israel. First Peter and later Paul begin the process in Acts of making believers out of Samaritans and Gentiles, proving that God means not only to save the remnant of Israel through Christ, but any and all human beings who believe in him. For a discussion of the major purposes and themes in the Acts of the Apostles, see Squires, 'Plan,' 19-40. Cf. Schnabel, *Acts*, 37, who describes the purpose of Acts as largely to explain how a movement coming from within Judaism became so Gentile-inclusive.

of the LXX Joel, the Spirit in Acts is described as being *poured out* on believers, but this outpouring is qualified with a partitive genitive, indicating that the gift is a portion *from* God's Spirit. There is no sense, however, that the resulting prophetic effects are only partially realized. There are also no other instances in Acts of partial outpourings of the Spirit.

While the conception of the Spirit in the Pauline corpus of literature shows a greater variety of effects, none of these instances in which the Spirit has been described presents the notion of the Spirit given in a partial way. Where partialness does exist, however, is in the pervasive understanding of the partial *effects* of the Spirit. The Spirit as it is presented across the Pauline corpus of literature makes evident that to early Christ believers, there was an understanding of the eschatological Spirit of God that bore a striking resemblance to the eschatological Spirit predicted in the Jewish Prophetic Literature, at least in its effects. In much of the Pauline corpus, the reception of the Spirit of God leads believers to knowledge of God, ethical purity, and a newness of life. However, the eschatological blessings of God are not depicted as fully realized. It is only with the second coming of Christ and the resurrection of believers to eternal life that the effects of the Spirit will be fully transformative. Given the many, shared effects of the Spirit that are depicted, it is fair to understand the conceptions of the Spirit in the non-Johannine New Testament to be derived from readings of the Jewish Prophetic Literature, in spite of those effects remaining largely unfulfilled. While each author seems to understand himself and his audience as possessing that same Spirit of God that was promised to Israel in the Jewish Scriptures, only one instance seems to limit the

possession of that gift to a partial endowment, while nearly all depict the *effects* as incomplete.

The Spirit in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

In the interest of attaining a broader perspective on how believers were reading and interpreting the depiction of the gift of the eschatological Spirit in Jewish Prophetic Literature, I continue my exploration of conceptions of the gift of the eschatological Spirit in a Christianized Jewish text that bears the marks of apocalypticism.¹⁶⁸ *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (T12P) presents the final words and exhortations of the leaders of the twelve tribes of Israel to their descendants.¹⁶⁹ Within these testaments the term πνεῦμα appears numerous times, typically within the context of ethical dualism, particularly to refer to evil spirits vying for control over humanity. That is to say, the texts depict a worldview in which human beings are constantly being led to behavior by spirits, some that lead to positive actions and some to negative actions.¹⁷⁰ While much of

¹⁶⁸ The academic literature concerning the Spirit in T12P is much less widely produced in comparison to that concerning conceptions of the Spirit in the other texts discussed in this chapter. For treatments see Marinus de Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (SVTP 18; Leiden: Brill, 2003); John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000); Marinus de Jonge, "Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?" in *Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Jurgen C. H. Lebram* (eds. J.W. Van Henten, et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1986), 150-162; H. W. Hollander and Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985); John J. Collins, "Testaments," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. Michael E. Stone; CRINT; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 325-356; Anders Hultgard, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches Vol. I: Interpretation des Textes* (AUU Historia Religionum 6; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1977); also Gunkel, *Influence*; M. de Jonge, "Two Ways;" and Kugler, "Witness."

¹⁶⁹ For a full introduction to the background, major themes, and reception of T12P, see Hollander and de Jonge, *Testaments*, 1-86.

¹⁷⁰ The ethical dualism in the text of the T12P is extremely pronounced. In nearly every testament, there is some description of the competing spirits of goodness and evil that control human behavior. See Collins, "Testaments," 335-336.

what is written in the *TI2P* concerns the ethical teachings being passed down to the descendants of the patriarchs, the texts also depict predictions of what is to come in the future, eschatological age.¹⁷¹ Although it seems necessary to address briefly the presentation of the dueling spirits of the *TI2P*, the bulk of this section will be devoted to the texts that depict the eschatological outpouring of *God's Spirit* in the *Testament of Levi* (*TLev*) and the *Testament of Judah* (*TJud*).

As in the other literature discussed in this section, *TI2P* contains varying portrayals of πνεῦμα, sometimes as the inner workings of a human being, sometimes as supernatural entities that sway human behavior, and comparatively fewer times as the Spirit of God¹⁷² that will be given at the eschaton.¹⁷³ While there is no need to address those instances that simply portray the inner workings of the human person, the instances that display opposing supernatural forces might be helpful in further understanding how groups of early believers conceived of possession of spirits, particularly possession of spirits of those they considered their enemies. Similar to what is found in the apocalyptic

¹⁷¹ It is widely accepted by scholars that the text as we have is a Christianized text and that the text was circulated among groups of early Christians, who likely considered themselves to be presently living in the age being predicted by these texts. According to Collins, "There is no longer room for doubt that the final text of the *Testaments* is a Christian document." Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 175. Cf. M. de Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha*, 97-99.

¹⁷² There are only three instances in which πνεῦμα θεοῦ is used in the text. First in *TSim* 4.4, Joseph is described as having the Spirit of God and again in *TBenj* 8.3 and 9.3. The Spirit of God is first described as resting upon the man whose heart is pure, and later it is bestowed upon the Gentiles at the death of the only-begotten prophet. The first instance does not describe the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit. The second is of interest in that it shows the effect that the Spirit of God has on the ethical behavior of persons upon whom it rests, but does not describe the eschatological gift of the Spirit to believers at large. The third is very likely a Christian interpolation, and although it has parallels in Joel and Acts in that the Spirit will "pass on to the Gentiles, as a fire that is *poured out*," it does not report the effects of the Spirit on the Gentiles who receive it. As a result, these instances will not be addressed in detail in this section.

¹⁷³ Hollander and M. de Jonge, 49-50.

texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls,¹⁷⁴ *TI2P* contains various warnings against possessing the evil spirits of Beliar, which manifest in ways that are detrimental to the human person.¹⁷⁵

The *Testament of Reuben* (*TReu*), which begins the larger work, describes seven spirits of falsehood that come from Beliar.¹⁷⁶ These spirits act to guide human beings into behaviors grounded in falsehood like promiscuity, arrogance, lying, trickery, or injustice.¹⁷⁷ Such spirits are called spirits of falsehood (τῆς πλάνης), because they “darken the mind from the truth.”¹⁷⁸ This opposition between the Spirit that leads to knowledge of the truth and proper behavior and spirits that lead to falsehood and debauchery betray a situation in which one group possessing the proper Spirit (or spirits) is pitted against another that possess these opposing spirits. As in the texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the text of the *TI2P* leaves room for human beings who possess the proper spirits to also be affected by the spirits of deception, although they have the ability to overcome them.¹⁷⁹ There is no indication of a total transformation based on possession of the spirit of understanding or the spirit of truth; it is not as if possession of these spirits preclude falling prey to those that lead to falsehood.¹⁸⁰ What is shown in passages that emphasize the evil spirits is that human beings are constantly struggling against such

¹⁷⁴ M. de Jonge, “Two Ways,” 194.

¹⁷⁵ Hollander and M. de Jonge, *Testaments*, 49-50.

¹⁷⁶ *TReu* 2.1-2.

¹⁷⁷ *TReu* 3.1-9.

¹⁷⁸ *TReu* 3.8.

¹⁷⁹ M. de Jonge, “*Testaments*,” 184. Cf. Gunkel, *Influence*, 103.

¹⁸⁰ Hollander and M. de Jonge, *Testaments*, 48-50.

unholy inclinations.¹⁸¹ In several of the testaments (*The Testament of Simeon*, *The Testament of Issachar*, *The Testament of Zebulon*, and *The Testament of Benjamin*) the patriarchs assure their offspring that by turning towards God, they will be able to cause the spirits of deceit to flee from them.¹⁸² *TSim* 3.5 reads, “if someone flees towards the Lord, the evil spirit will run from him, and his mind becomes light.” Similar sentiments are also presented in *TIss* 7.6-7, in which the patriarch explains that loving the Lord in all things causes the Spirit of Beliar to *desire* to escape from a person, and in *TBenj* 3.4, in which practicing love of neighbor and fear of God renders the spirits of Beliar incapable of affecting a person.¹⁸³ It would seem, then, in the view of *TI2P*, that the actions of human beings can overcome those evil spirits that are present in them by virtue of their being enfleshed and that there will be a time in the future when such impulses will be entirely absent.¹⁸⁴

In *TJud* 20, Judah is depicted as describing a reality of spirits in which one spirit struggles against another inside human beings. He warns his children that “two spirits occupy humanity, the spirit of truth and the spirit of falsehood.”¹⁸⁵ In a fashion typical of apocalyptic dualism, Judah states that all human beings have the works of the truth and the works of deceit “written upon their chests,” so that God might identify which spirit

¹⁸¹ Ibid, 50. Cf. Gunkel, *Influence*, 103.

¹⁸² Kugler, “Witness,” 347.

¹⁸³ Hollander and M. de Jonge, *Testaments*, 251. As Hollander and de Jonge explain, the passage from *TIss* 7.7 likely ends with a reference to the eschatological future, in which the blessings of God’s presence and ethical perfection will be realized.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, 50.

¹⁸⁵ *TJud* 20.1

each possesses.¹⁸⁶ Furthermore, the spirit of truth “witnesses all things” and “judges all things.”¹⁸⁷ The duality of spirits here, as it does in the Dead Sea Scrolls, betrays the eschatological worldview within which we would expect to see the ultimate bestowal of God’s Spirit.¹⁸⁸

Given the eschatological worldview supported by these passages containing evidence of apocalyptic dualism, it seems appropriate to turn to the points in the text that present the gift of the Spirit to groups of believers in *TI2P*. Some of the most applicable passages in this case can be found in the texts that describe the coming of Messianic figures. There are two passages in particular that depict the concept of the gift of the eschatological Spirit in the *TI2P*. These texts are *TLevi* 18 and *TJud* 24. In each case, the author describes the future coming of Messianic figures (one a priest and one a king from the tribe of Judah) who will act to bring about the eschatological promises that God has previously made to Israel.¹⁸⁹ Furthermore, it becomes apparent from reading these passages that they represent interpretations of passages concerning the promised Messiah(s) in the Jewish Scriptures.¹⁹⁰ As is the case in other texts discussed in this chapter, the prophecies of the Jewish Prophetic Literature are being interpreted in *TI2P*

¹⁸⁶ *TJud* 20.3

¹⁸⁷ Hollander and M. de Jonge, *Testaments*, 219-220.

¹⁸⁸ For an overview of the eschatology of *TI2P*, see Hultgard, *L'eschatologie*, 82-85. Cf. Kugler, “Witness,” 341-343.

¹⁸⁹ As M. de Jonge points out, though, the text has been Christianized, and as we have it the future high priest of *TLevi* 18 is not explicitly stated to be of the tribe of Levi. Rather, it seems to be the case that because of the sins committed by the descendants of Levi, the “new priest” does not come from them. M. de Jonge, “Two Messiahs,” 157-159.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid, 159. Because the text has been Christianized, however, the understood referent of both of these passages is most likely specifically Jesus, at least as the text currently stands. Cf. Hollander and de Jonge, *Testaments*, 63-64 and Kugler, “Witness,” 341-343.

by a group that understands itself to be living in an age *after* the bestowal of the eschatological Spirit has taken place. In this way, the interpretation of the gift of the Spirit as it appears in this text may help illuminate how the texts of the Jewish Prophetic Literature were being read and interpreted, particularly with respect to the expectations of eschatological Spirit reception.

In *TLev* 18, the patriarch Levi describes the coming of one who will take his place as the ideal high priest after the failure and punishment of the previous priesthood.¹⁹¹ That this priest is an eschatological figure is not explicitly stated, but given that Levi describes to his children what they will do “at the end” in 14.1 and that the figure is depicted sharing characteristics with the Messiah figure in the Book of Isaiah (Isa. 11:2), it would seem likely that Levi means for this person to be understood as the priest of the final, perfect kingdom of Israel.¹⁹² The text of chapter 18 portrays a new priest who will be raised up by God and by whom “all the words of the Lord will have been revealed.”¹⁹³ This priest will have unprecedented knowledge and wisdom, which he will utilize to enlighten the entire world and “will drive out all darkness from under heaven,” resulting in “peace in all the earth.”¹⁹⁴ In the following verse, the author uses the verb *χυθήσεται* to

¹⁹¹ Hollander and de Jonge, *Testaments*, 63.

¹⁹² Hultgard, *L'eschatologie*, 270-271. While Hultgard sees in this depiction a Christianized version of a previously Levitic document that also had the idea of an idealized priest from the tribe of Levi, M. de Jonge asserts that the priest here is already identified as Jesus Christ, and therefore any attempt to read the text as referring to some other ideal priest is impossible. While I tend to agree with de Jonge's more conservative approach, it is not unreasonable to think that a previous (pre-Christianized) version of the text upheld the coming of an ideal, eschatological priest, as the idea does seem evident in the, albeit fragmentary, text of 4Q540-541.

¹⁹³ *TLev* 18.2.

¹⁹⁴ *TLev* 18.4.

describe the dispersion of this knowledge over all of the earth.¹⁹⁵ This wording recalls the description of the outpouring of the eschatological Spirit in the Jewish Prophetic Literature previously discussed¹⁹⁶ and presents one of the prerogatives of that Spirit, that is, knowledge of God. Furthermore, this new priest is presented as receiving a spirit of understanding and sanctification (ἁγιασμός), and during his priesthood “will eliminate all sin, and the lawless ones will cease doing evil.”¹⁹⁷ Most importantly, though, he “will give to the holy ones to eat from the tree of life, and the Spirit of holiness will be upon them.”¹⁹⁸ What is described here is a Messianic priest who has been given the prerogatives of the eschatological Spirit (knowledge, purity, righteousness, life) and has in turn bestowed all of these gifts, through the Spirit, to other holy ones¹⁹⁹ and to the world at large.²⁰⁰

We find a similar description of a Messianic king in *TJud* 24. Of all the passages in *TI2P* that have been discussed thus far, *TJud* 24 has the clearest depiction of the gift of the eschatological²⁰¹ Spirit. The gift of the Spirit is described in this passage in much the

¹⁹⁵ *TLev* 18.5.

¹⁹⁶ The same root verb (ἐκ)χέω is used in the LXX translations of Ezek. 39:29 and Joel 2:28-29, but in those cases it is the Spirit that is being poured out.

¹⁹⁷ *TLev* 18.9.

¹⁹⁸ *TLev* 18.11.

¹⁹⁹ These holy ones can be identified with τέκνοις αὐτοῦ in 18.13, in whom the Lord is made glad. If the αὐτοῦ here is understood as referring to God (and not to the priest), then yet another prerogative of the eschatological Spirit would seem to be present here, that is, the process of becoming children of God as a result of receiving the Spirit. While it is not entirely clear from the text if Levi is describing the children of the priest or the children of the Lord, the proximity of the term κύριος to the αὐτοῦ, seems to support the latter reading. However, even if the αὐτοῦ here is understood to refer to the priest, it would seem from the context that these descendants would also be considered children of God in some sense.

²⁰⁰ Gunkel, *Influence*, 102.

²⁰¹ For an argument as to the eschatological nature of the passage, see Hultgard, *L'eschatologie*, 204ff.

same way that it is in the Jewish Prophetic Literature. It is portrayed as being *poured out*, first upon the sinless Messiah figure when the heavens “will be opened upon him” and later on the children of Judah to whom he is speaking his testament.²⁰² The results of this outpouring of the Spirit bear a striking resemblance to those that have been previously found in the Jewish Prophetic Literature. To begin, the reception of the Spirit “upon you all” in 24.2 will make those who receive it “into sons in truth” and ensure that “you will walk in his commandments from the first to the last.”²⁰³ In addition, the “shoot of God” will also bring life to “all flesh,” presumably through the outpouring of the Spirit, which will result in salvation for all those “calling upon the Lord.”²⁰⁴ The outpouring of the Spirit from the Messianic figure onto the sons in truth not only connects this gift with sonship, but also with the ability of those sons to follow the *totality* of God’s commands.²⁰⁵ Both of these prerogatives of the eschatological Spirit can also be seen in the Jewish Prophetic Literature and in the other texts discussed in this chapter. While this text seems to indicate a total transformation of the sons, like the passages from 1QS, the outpouring of the Spirit according to the narration of the text is still a future prospect, one that Judah predicts will occur in the time of his descendants. There is also no indication in this text that the Spirit of the holy ones is not abundantly given.

²⁰² *TJud* 24.2. While this verse has obvious links to the gospel narratives of Jesus’ baptism, the language of outpouring of the Spirit, while certainly heavily adopted by New Testament authors, likely reflects an interpretation of the Jewish Prophetic Literature. Even if the outpouring of the Spirit here is also attributed to Christian interpolation, it is the eschatological outpouring first described in the prophets that is depicted.

²⁰³ *TJud* 24.3. Here, as in *TLevi* 18.8, believers are considered sons of God, and this promise is made more emphatic with the addition of “in truth.” Hollander and de Jonge, *Testaments*, 228.

²⁰⁴ *TJud* 24.6. The terminology used here looks very similar to that used throughout the Jewish Prophetic Literature, particularly in the texts of Isa. 11:1 and Joel 3:1-2. Hollander and de Jonge, *Testaments*, 228.

²⁰⁵ Gunkel, *Influence*, 102.

Conclusion to the Spirit in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

The presentation of the Spirit in *TI2P* has been shown to display a great deal of overlap with those conceptions of the eschatological gift of the Spirit that are presented in prior sections of this chapter and with the Jewish Prophetic Literature. While much of what appears shows the competing spirits typical of apocalyptic dualism (and is similar to the depiction of competing spirits in the Two Spirits Treatise), there is also a depiction in *TI2P* of two Messiah figures, each who is understood as receiving God's Spirit prior to his dissemination of that Spirit unto believers at large. Many of the effects of this gift of the Spirit also resemble other texts stemming from eschatologically inclined, apocalyptic groups, effects that these groups understand as being predicted in Jewish Prophetic Literature. Much like the texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in passages that discuss current realities, a full take over of the human spirit by the Spirit of God has not yet occurred, as evidenced by the competing spirits of truth and falsehood within human beings. However, in the texts that discuss future realities, both the gift of the Spirit and its effects are depicted as complete. There is still no precedent in any of these passages, however, for a gift of the Spirit (even if it comes through the Messiah figure as in *TI2P*) that is given in a lesser *quantity* to the other children of God on whom it is bestowed.

Conclusion to Chapter Three

The survey of texts undertaken in this chapter both builds off of the conceptions of the eschatological gift of the Spirit presented in the Jewish Prophetic Literature and serves as a basis for understanding how groups of believers living in an age they understand to be eschatological read and interpret those texts. The analysis here shows that for many of these believers the expectations of the Spirit predicted in the Jewish

Prophetic Literature have begun to come to fruition. While most of the texts explored in this chapter point towards groups of believers that see themselves as having already received the promised gift of the outpouring or indwelling of God's Spirit, rarely do they understand themselves to have experienced the full promise of transformation. Except in cases where the author of the text depicts a future reality, the gift of the Spirit is fully given, but is not completely effective in fulfilling the eschatological expectations promised by the prophets. In only two instances of the texts surveyed is there any possible indication that the Spirit of God is given in a partial way, in one (1QH 6.12-13) knowledge of God increases and the capacity to sin decreases based on the proportion of the spirit of holiness given to each human being, in the other (Acts 2:17-18) the portion of God's Spirit poured out upon the apostles leads to their total transformation into prophets of God, allowing them to spread the gospel far and wide. Typically in these texts, though, the Spirit is depicted as bestowed on the people of God abundantly yet fails to enact the kind of total transformation predicted by the prophets.

In the following chapter these presentations of the gift of the eschatological Spirit of God will be compared with the presentation of the gift of the Spirit in 1Jn. Because 1Jn similarly displays an eschatological orientation and apocalyptic traits, one might assume that the presentation of the gift of the eschatological Spirit of God would be depicted in that text in a way that closely follows the texts reviewed in this chapter. While there is some truth to this assumption, particularly in 1Jn's depiction of the transformative effects of the Spirit, the way that the Spirit is given to believers and the distinction between their possession of the Spirit and that of Jesus arguably stands apart from both the predictions made in the Jewish Prophetic Literature and the texts of other groups who similarly see

themselves as existing in the eschatological age and already having received the Spirit of God. It is to making a case for this uniqueness that I turn in the following chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

PARTIAL GIFT, PARTIAL TRANSFORMATION: THE CONCEPTION OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL GIFT OF GOD’S SPIRIT IN 1JN

In the previous chapters, I have reviewed both the foundational literature for understanding the eschatological bestowal of the Spirit (the Jewish Prophetic Literature) and various interpretations of that literature by groups understanding themselves to be living in the eschatological age (the Dead Sea Scrolls, non-Johannine New Testament, and Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs) in order to establish a basis for comparison for the depiction of the gift of the Spirit in 1Jn. Before making claims about the uniqueness of the portrayal of the reception of the eschatological Spirit in 1Jn, I turn in the following sections to explications of the Spirit passages within the text, seeking to highlight first the beliefs of the author of 1Jn concerning his and his audience’s possession of the Spirit and then the beliefs of his opponents. After thoroughly explaining the concept of Spirit bestowal as it is presented in 1Jn, I will make a case for the unique perspective of its author by comparing that presentation to those found in the literature surveyed thus far.

The Spirit of God in 1Jn

As noted in Chapter One, the pneumatology of 1Jn in its own right has historically been difficult to pin down. In addition to most scholars focusing more heavily on the Christological and ethical aspects of the letter, the less frequent use of the term πνεῦμα to refer to the Spirit of God has likely contributed to the lack of focus on the pneumatology of the letter. The term is used 12 times in 1Jn, and seven of those instances

are found in 4:1-6. Furthermore, most instances in that passage on the testing of the spirits (4:2 being the exception) arguably refer to the internal effects that the Spirit of God and the spirit of the Antichrist have on human beings, and not to the Spirit of God itself.¹ As a result, the conception of the Spirit as the author and his opponents understand it is not easily extricated from the text. It is necessary, therefore, to do quite a bit of exegetical work on the few Spirit passages that do appear in order to interpret what the author wants to say about the bestowal of the Spirit and what understanding of the Spirit he seeks to warn against. In order to make sense of these passages, they must be read with an eye towards the Spirit of God as it is presented in the texts of the Jewish Prophetic Literature and GJn itself² and then be compared to other depictions of the eschatological bestowal of the Spirit in the Jewish Apocalyptic and non-Johannine New Testament texts.

As in the texts reviewed thus far, the author of 1Jn discusses the bestowal of God's Spirit, the character of the time in which believers live, the avenue(s) by which they can be absolved from sin, and their knowledge and responsibility in following God's commandments. With a background in the previously reviewed literature, the following sections will explore 1) whether the Spirit bestowed on the Johannine believers is the eschatological Spirit of God, 2) in what quantity that Spirit is given to believers, 3) how the receipt of the Spirit in 1Jn transforms those who receive it, and 4) what the reader can glean about the opponents' views of the Spirit from the text.

¹ It is the instance in 4:2 and the remaining five instances (found in only three separate passages), then, that are the main focus here.

² GJn in this case is understood as a version before the addition of the Paraclete passages. For a discussion of the sequence of Johannine literature and arguments in favor of this position see Excursus on the Sequence of Johannine Literature.

The Spirit in 1Jn is the Eschatological Spirit of God

It becomes evident when reading 1Jn that, like other apocalyptic groups represented by the texts reviewed in Chapter Three, the letter audience and its opponents see themselves as existing in an age in which the last era (whatever that might mean) is upon them, the time that has been predicted in the Jewish Prophetic Literature that came before it.³ While it may seem obvious, therefore, that the Spirit discussed in the letter is the eschatological Spirit of God, it is necessary to show exactly what in the letter points to this designation of the Spirit. Because the conceptions of the Spirit of God from which the author of 1Jn likely takes his own understanding are quite varied, not every instance in which the Spirit of God is depicted displays the same function or place in time as those that depict the eschatological Spirit of God.

Many passages and themes of the letter suggest that the Spirit of God being referred to therein is the same Spirit of God predicted in the Jewish Prophetic Literature to be given at a future time, the Spirit of God meant to usher in the destruction of the enemies of the people of God and to restore and redeem God's people. To begin, as in the literature discussed earlier, there are multiple time markers in the Greek text that support the contention that this Spirit is being received at the end of the age, at a time when believers are looking to see (or are already seeing) a drastic transformation between the past and the present/future.

Similarly to the Jewish Prophetic Literature and its use of phrases like "last days," "Day of the Lord," and "in those days" to denote the inauguration of the eschatological

³ See G. K. Beale, "The Old Testament Background of the 'Last Hour' in 1Jn 2,18," *Biblica* 92 no. 2 (2011), 231-254. Cf. Donald W. Mills, "The Eschatology of 1Jn," in *Looking into the Future: Evangelical Studies in Eschatology* (ed. David W. Baker; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 97-111.

age, the author of 1Jn uses expressions that point towards an ending of one era and beginning of another. Twice, the author writes of something “passing away” and giving way to something new. First in 2:8 it is the darkness that is passing away, and later in 2:17 it is the world and its desires.⁴ The verb in both instances is *παράγεται*, denoting that this transformation is currently in the process of taking place.⁵ The inauguration of this process is further solidified in the use of ἤδη at the end of 2:8, where the true light is “*already* shining.”⁶ A number of scholars note one or both of these phrases as being particularly indicative of the eschatological environment of the text, pointing to God’s eschatological intervention as the light that pushes out the darkness⁷ and God’s similar eschatological action in ridding the world of the desires associated with the Antichrist.⁸

⁴ Many scholars, however, do not understand the passing away of the world to be an indication that some catastrophic destruction of the currently existing, physical world is already taking place. Rather, they note the contrast here as between the permanent abiding of believers and the transient nature of those things belonging to the world. It is the will of God that has begun its introduction into the otherwise corrupt world, and those who desire the pleasures of that world will not be around forever, as believers will. For this understanding see Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 123-124; Smalley, *1 John*, 82; Lieu, *1 John*, 96; von Wahlde, 3:81. Grayston, similarly, understands the passing away of the world as a metaphorical passing of society as believers know it. Grayston, *Epistles*, 73.

⁵ As explained by Brown, *Epistles*, 287 and Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 106-107, the coming of Christ at the Incarnation for the Johannine believers has begun the process of the light entering the world. The darkness, therefore, is in the process of being overcome in the current age, but cannot be fully overcome until the second coming. Cf. Lieu, *1 John*, 79; Witherington, *Letters*, 472; Grayston, *Epistles*, 68; Smalley, *1 John*, 54; and von Wahlde, 3:62.

⁶ Whether or not the “true light” here refers personally to Jesus or to the revelation of Jesus in its continual expression by believers and larger salvific context, the fact that this light is *already* shining solidifies the notion that although there is still darkness to be overcome, the process has begun, likely with the Incarnation of Jesus. Brown, *Epistles*, 269; Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 106; Lieu, *1 John*, 79; and von Wahlde, 3:69.

⁷ See Brown, *Epistles*, 287; Painter, *1 John*, 179; Smalley, *1 John*, 55; Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 106; Witherington, *Letters*, 472-473; von Wahlde, 3:62.

⁸ Brown, *Epistles*, 314.

As discussed previously, these marked differences resulting from God's intervention in history are indicative of an eschatological context.

Furthermore, the expression "last hour" is used in 2:18 to describe the present time. This expression is likely closely related to the "last days" of GJn 12:48, a reference to the days of judgment.⁹ 1Jn, too, warns of the coming day of judgment in 4:17.¹⁰ GJn also makes several references to a coming hour, a few of which represent a marked change in the situation of believers (GJn 4:21, 23; 5:25, 28). Jesus tells the Samaritan woman that the hour is coming and is now when worship will be exclusively "in the Spirit and in truth," (GJn 4:23-24) and tells his disciples that the hour is coming and is now when "the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who have heard will live" (GJn 5:25). Both of these outcomes of the coming and current hour are characteristic of the eschatological age and have likely influenced the "last hour" of 1Jn.¹¹

⁹ Ibid, 331. See von Wahlde for the difference between the ἔσχατη ἡμέρα in GJn and the ἔσχατη ὥρα in 1Jn. von Wahlde, 1:487. Because the author of 1Jn is concerned with addressing the crisis created by those who have "gone out" from his audience, he views the time in which he lives as that of the Antichrist who ushers in the final, apocalyptic hour. Also see Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 151-152, who understands the "last hour" to be the time in which the powers that are in opposition to God are active; an hour that will end with the second coming of Christ. Cf. Smalley, *1 John*, 90, who notes the familiarly eschatological associations with the term in GJn.

¹⁰ As discussed in Chapter Two, this Day of Judgment in the Jewish Prophetic Literature is closely connected with the Day of the Lord and seems to typically denote a shift between one era and another. See Beale, "Old Testament Background," 240; Stefanos Mihalios, *The Danielic Eschatological Hour in the Johannine Literature*, (LNTS 436; New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 159-169.

¹¹ While the "hour" in these instances does not refer directly to the "last hour" of 1Jn, the first is a reference to the time at which believers will receive the eschatological gift of the Spirit, and the second is both to the gift of life in the present that is available to believers through the bestowal of the Spirit and to life that will be available at the final resurrection. Von Wahlde, 2:175, 234-235. Consequently, each of these references can be understood as influencing the eschatological conception of the "last hour" as it appears in 1Jn. Cf. Smalley, *1 John*, 90.

In addition to the passing away of the present era and the last hour that the author claims to be living in, the letter makes reference to the (seemingly) imminent coming of Christ himself, in which he will be revealed again (2:28). The term *παρουσία* in its technical sense¹² is used only here in the Johannine texts and seems to refer to a future coming of Christ.¹³ Elsewhere in the New Testament the term is used to describe just this expectation, the time at the end of the era when Christ would return to judge the living and the dead (Mt. 24:3, 27, 37, 39; 1Cor. 15:23; 1Thes. 2:19, 3:13, 4:15, 5:23; 2Thes. 2:1, 8; Jas 5:7, 8; 2Pet. 1:16, 3:4).¹⁴ The use of this language, then, also points very strongly to an eschatological context for the letter.

The apocalyptic dualism that permeates the letter is another indication that the author considers believers to be living in the eschatological age.¹⁵ Contrasts are made between light and darkness (1:5-7; 2:8-11), the world and believers (2:15-16; 3:13; 5:4-5, 19), and the truth and lies (2:4, 21; 4:1-6). This type of deep polarity in the reality of believers is a definite sign of its eschatological context.¹⁶ As previously stated, similar dualistic beliefs are also evident in the writings of the Dead Sea Scrolls and *T12P*, indicating that their audiences perceived themselves as living at the end of an era and

¹² For discussion of the meaning of *παρουσία* as a technical term for Jesus' eschatological return see Brown, 380. Cf. A. Oepke, "*παρουσία*," *TDNT* 5:865-866.

¹³ Brown, *Epistles*, 380; Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 152; Smalley, *1 John*, 125; von Wahlde, 1:487. Even Lieu, who is hesitant to understand the "coming" here as definitively Jesus' coming at the end of the age, notes the eschatological framework that lies behind these verses. Lieu, *Epistles*, 116.

¹⁴ Oepke, *TDNT* 5.858-60.

¹⁵ Judith Lieu, "The Nature and Character of Dualism in the Johannine Corpus," *Phronema* 14 (Jan. 1, 1999), 24-27. The dualism in the text also recalls the opposition between the spirits of good and evil found in the Two Spirits Treatise of 1QS iii.13-iv.26 and the variety of battling spirits in *T12P*.

¹⁶ Ibid. Cf. von Wahlde, 3:18-19.

expected God's intervention in history on behalf of God's chosen people to be imminent.¹⁷ Furthermore, as reflected in the letter, the author sees his current reality being infiltrated by the antichrist(s) (2:18, 22; 4:3) through false prophecy, a common precursor to the end of the age in New Testament literature (Mk 13:22//Mt 24:24; cf. Mt 24:11).¹⁸

All of these characteristics point to an eschatological context for the letter. They show an author that believes himself and his audience to exist in and on the precipice of a new age of reality. It follows, then, that these believers also understand the gift of God's Spirit to be an eschatological one. Their receipt of God's Spirit, in other words, marks a completely new reality for them and certain expectations for the effects of this Spirit were likely assumed. Given the Jewish background of the Johannine believers argued for here,¹⁹ it stands to reason that they would have expectations of the Spirit that fell in line with the predictions found in the Jewish Prophetic Literature (at least to some degree) and similar expectations to other apocalyptic groups that were interpreting those texts. Having established that the Spirit given to believers in 1Jn was understood to be the same eschatological Spirit of God expected in the Jewish Prophetic Literature and interpreted by later apocalyptic groups, I now turn to answer the question of *how* it is that the author of 1Jn and his audience understand themselves to have received that Spirit and how that

¹⁷ The apocalyptic dualism found throughout the texts of Qumran is widely noted. See Geza Xeravits ed., *Dualism in Qumran* (London: T&T Clark, 2010), various essays. Cf. von Wahlde, 1:252-255, for an explanation of dualistic elements in both the Dead Sea Scrolls and *T12P*.

¹⁸ See David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 87-88. Cf. Hans-Josef Klauck, "Internal Opponents: The Treatment of the Secessionists in the First Epistle of John," in *Truth and Its Victims* (eds. W. Beuken, et al; Concilium 200; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 59; Brown, *Epistles*, 335; Smalley, *1 John*, 209.

¹⁹ See Chapter One for a discussion of the major proposals regarding the background of the Johannine believers in the Survey of Scholarship.

understanding compares to other Jewish Apocalyptic and New Testament interpretations of Spirit bestowal.

The Bestowal of the Spirit as Understood by the Author of 1Jn

As seen in the reviews of the Jewish Prophetic Literature and its various interpretations, the eschatological Spirit of God is typically understood as being bestowed upon God's people in an abundant way, either in an outpouring, inputting, or filling that leads to transformative effects in those receiving it. Because these texts and 1Jn seem to be speaking about the same Spirit of God that will be given in the eschatological age, it might be assumed that the description of its bestowal on believers would likewise be similar to the descriptions found in those texts. While there does seem to be some overlap in language—the idea of indwelling the believer found in 1Jn looks quite a bit like the Spirit being put within Israel at the end of the age in Ezekiel²⁰—the image of the Spirit as being poured out onto believers in the Jewish Prophetic Literature has no equivalent in 1Jn.

In the first place, the Spirit of God (at least when the term πνεῦμα is used directly) is always said to be *given*, either in the aorist ἔδωκεν (3:24) or the perfect δέδωκεν (4:13). While this verb usage in and of itself does not denote any partialness to the gift, it is noteworthy that the image is not the same overwhelming deluge that is implied by the description of being poured out. While the Hebrew verb נָתַן (one meaning of which is give) is often used in those instances in which the Spirit of God is put within the people of Israel in the Jewish Prophetic Literature, it is in each case accompanied by קָרַב (within)

²⁰ Again, con. Hamilton, *Indwelling*, 41-54.

(Isa. 42:1; Ezek. 11:19, 36:26-27, 37:14).²¹ In 1Jn, conversely, the author never states that πνεῦμα is given into or put within believers. Rather, the gift of the Spirit of God in 1Jn leads to the *knowledge* of God's indwelling (1Jn 3:24, 4:13). However, when the term πνεῦμα is passed over for a more metaphorical expressions χρῖσμα in 2:20 and 2:27 and σπέρμα in 3:9,²² it is only then that the Spirit itself is depicted as directly remaining in or indwelling the believer.²³

Furthermore, there is a strong argument to be made (although still very much debated) that the Spirit of God in 1Jn is given to believers in only a partial way. While some scholars see the genitives in both 3:24 and 4:13 as indicative of no more than the source of the Spirit,²⁴ others point to the fact that the usage of the genitive should be interpreted with greater care.²⁵ It can be argued that the genitive in 4:13 in particular is not merely a slight variation on the text of 3:24, but is meant to contrast the receipt of God's Spirit by believers with its receipt by God's only and unique Son, which takes place in an altogether more complete way.

²¹ This is also the construction of Jer. 31:33, but the reference there is to the law.

²² This assumes, as I do, that the terms χρῖσμα and σπέρμα are veiled references to the Spirit. For an overview of arguments concerning these terms, see Chapter One.

²³ While this admittedly nuanced difference might not be a deliberate effort to avoid some overemphasis the opponents have placed on the results of Spirit possession, it does seem curious that the direct indwelling of the *Spirit* itself (even if it is implied by the notions that the gift of the Spirit *results in* the confidence the believer has in her connection with Christ or God) is not explicitly stated outside of these metaphors. It could be, however, that this is a deliberate move by the author to steer the community away from understandings of Spirit bestowal that look too much like those of his opponents, that is, those that show too strict a reading of the eschatological bestowal in the Jewish Prophetic Literature.

²⁴ Perkins, *Epistles*, 48; Witherington, *Letters*, 533-534; Marshall, *Epistles*, 219.

²⁵ Brown, *Epistles*, 557 n. 43; von Wahlde, 3:167. Cf. Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 219, who notes that it is only in this verse that the believer is described as *partaking* of God's Spirit.

While the phrase ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ could be read as a genitive of origin, there are compelling reasons to think that it is a partitive genitive and denotes a partial gift of the Spirit. In addition to a majority agreement in scholarship that the genitive here is partitive,²⁶ the construction ἐκ plus a genitive used as the partitive genitive has been noted as a literary feature of the Johannine corpus.²⁷ There are some 40 instances of this construction in GJn and the letters.²⁸ Given the tendency of this phrasing in the Johannine corpus, it seems likely that ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος should here also be read as a partitive, and therefore understood as denoting a partial bestowal of God's Spirit to believers.

Furthermore, this argument seems even more convincing when the partitive genitive of 4:13 is read in conjunction with GJn 3:34b, in which Jesus is said to receive God's Spirit "without measure."²⁹ While there is some ambiguity in the Greek text regarding who gives the Spirit and who receives it, most scholars agree that it is God who gives the Spirit in an unlimited way to Jesus.³⁰ Particularly when the verse is read with

²⁶ This opinion is held by Brown, *Epistles*, 522; Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John*, 238-239; Painter, *1, 2, and 3 John*, 272-273; von Wahlde, 3:161-162. Lieu, even though she cautions against pushing the point of difference too far, acknowledges that the partitive here requires a different translation than in 3:24b, one that "might suggest that God distributed some portion of God's own spirit" to believers. Lieu, *1 John*, 186.

²⁷ C. K. Barrett adds the feature to his list of characteristic Johannine usage, but does not list individual verses. C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary on Notes on the Greek Text, 2nd Edition* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 8. Eugen Ruckstuhl, *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums* (NTOA 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 302, also notes the construction as a Johannine style marker.

²⁸ Barrett contends that there are at least 42 instances without noting chapter and verse. Barrett, *John*, 8. Ruckstuhl lists 34 passages containing the construction, some of which include more than one instance. His list includes: GJn 1:16, 24, 35; 3:1; 6:11, 39, 50b, 51b, 60, 66b; 7:19, 31, 40; 9:40; 10:20, 26; 11:19, 45; 12:3, 9a, 42; 16:5, 14, 15; 17:12; 18:3, 9, 17, 25; 21:2; 1Jn 2:19; 4:13; and 2Jn 4. Ruckstuhl, *Die literarische*, 302.

²⁹ Von Waldhe, 1:450; Klauck, *Erste*, 256.

³⁰ The Greek text reads, ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ρήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ, οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα. The ambiguity lies in the question of whether the one God sent or God is the subject of the verb to give. While only a few scholars argue that it is Jesus who does not give the Spirit in a limited way, most

what directly follows in GJn 3:35, it seems likely that this gift of the Spirit is among the “all things” that are given into the hands of the Son.³¹ This emphasis on the fullness of Jesus’ possession of the Spirit allows for a contrast to be drawn between Jesus’ gift of God’s Spirit and that of believers. When the two verses are contrasted with each other, it is easy to imagine that for the Johannine believers there was a difference in possessing the Spirit without measure and being given “of the Spirit.”

This contrast is even more evident when considering the Johannine conception of being born of the Spirit (GJn 3:5, 6, 8). It would seem that for the Johannine believers, receipt of the Spirit was inextricably connected to becoming children of God.³² While it is not explicitly stated that becoming children of God takes place through different means for believers than it does for Christ himself, it does seem that the author of 1Jn goes to

understand God to be the subject. Grammatically, either could be the case, but arguments for God as the subject are more convincing. First off, von Wahlde, Schnackenburg, and Brown all point to the Rabbinic use of the phrase ‘in (or with) measure’ where it describes how the Holy Spirit rests on the prophets. While Brown is hesitant to accept that a direct contrast is being made between Jesus and these other prophets, that each instance uses the very uncommon phrase to describe possession of the Spirit points to a more than general connection. Von Wahlde and Schnackenburg both see an explicit contrast. Furthermore, von Wahlde and Schnackenburg note the connection between receiving the Spirit and speaking the words of God. Because the γάρ in the second part of the sentence is explanatory, as Schnackenburg explains, if Jesus is the subject of the giving, that would mean that the author is here expressing the belief that because Jesus imparts the Spirit it is evident that he speaks God’s words. While this is not impossible, it seems more likely that what the author means to convey is that Jesus speaks the words of God because God gives him the Spirit without measure. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John Vol. 1* (New York: Herder, 1968), 387. Cf. von Walde, 2:154-155 and Brown, *John*, 157-158. Witherington and Smith also understand God to be the subject of the giving, but do not provide extensive explanations. Ben Witherington III, *John’s Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: John Knox, 1995), 111; D. Moody Smith, *John* (ANTC; Nashville: Abington Press, 1999), 107.

³¹ Brown, *John*, 161; Schnackenburg, 1:387; Smith, *John*, 107.

³² For a full discussion of Sonship and begottenness in Johannine literature generally, see Vellanickal, *Sonship*, especially 191-202. In the particular case of 1Jn, Schnackenburg explains that the connection between being “born of God” and being “children of God” is not merely an adoptive or moral connection, but an ontological reality. Once a believer is born of God, that person is also a child of God, the two concepts being interchangeable. Furthermore, it is God or the Spirit that affects the creative act of being born. Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 162-163.

great lengths in order to demonstrate that Jesus stands apart from all other believers in his relationship to God as God's Son.³³ Being born of God and children of God is not the fullest expression of salvific promise. There is still something that believers are yet to become, although what that is in 1Jn is not specifically stated.³⁴

In addition, it is only Jesus who holds the title of *μονογενής*, an indication that his sonship was somehow unique (1Jn 4:9; GJn 1:14, 18, 3:16, 18).³⁵ While there is arguably a variety of ways in which the Johannine literature depicts Jesus' relationship with the Father as unique,³⁶ I would contend that those ways are all to some extent based upon Christ's unique receipt of the Spirit (without measure).³⁷ If it is understood to be the case that believers in the Johannine conception were begotten as Jesus was, it is not much of a jump to the assertion that they might have seen themselves as receiving the same Spirit of God that Jesus had received (a Spirit that put them in special relationship to God as God's children). The difference, then, comes in the *extent* to which they received that Spirit; only Jesus (who is called *μονογενής* of God) received the Spirit in the fullest possible way.

³³ See Michael Peppard's article on the sonship in Paul and John. Michael Peppard, "Adopted and Begotten Sons of God: Paul and John on Divine Sonship," *CBQ* 73 no. 1 (Jan 2011), 102-109. Cf. Lieu, *I John*, 230-231 and Vellanickal, *Sonship*, 124.

³⁴ Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 164.

³⁵ Von Wahlde, 1:4

³⁶ Peppard argues that Jesus is "uniquely close to God the Father, uniquely revelatory of God's glory and uniquely able to empower others to become God's sons and daughters." Peppard, "Adopted," 109.

³⁷ For a rather convincing argument, see von Wahlde's discussion of divine Sonship in *Commandments*, 146-152. Becoming children of God is dependent in Johannine thought on being born of God or the Spirit, because it is through the reception of the Spirit that believers are brought to life. If the Sonship of Jesus is conceived in a parallel way, this would mean that the divine life that Jesus possesses from the Father is likely a result of his full and complete possession of the divine Spirit, such that he is even able to pass on that life and Spirit to others. Cf. Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 208-209.

While there is some indication, particularly in 1QH 6.12-15 and possibly in Acts 2:18-19 (LXX Joel 2:28-29), that the Spirit can be given in different portions, in no other text of the New Testament is so much effort made in creating a distinction between the Messiah's possession of the Spirit and that of believers. Most of the texts from other apocalyptic groups, when they describe the bestowal of the eschatological Spirit, use language similar to that used in the Jewish Prophetic Literature. The Spirit is sprinkled/spread upon (1QH 15.6-7, 7.15, fr. 2.i.9-13), comes/falls upon (Acts 8:14-17, 10:44, 19:6), is poured out upon (4Q504 fr. 1-2 5.15-16; Acts 2:17-21, 33, 10:45; Titus 3:5-7; *TJud* 24.2-3), or given into the hearts of believers, at times filling or indwelling them (Rom. 8:9, 11; 2Cor. 1:22, 3:3-6, 5:5; Acts 2:4). While 1Jn takes up similar language of indwelling, it is never explicitly stated that the *Spirit* indwells believers. In spite of the allusion to a possible partial bestowal of the Spirit in 1QH, that text does not overtly depict the actual bestowal of the Spirit, it simply states that God is able to multiply the portion of the spirit of holiness that human beings receive during their lives. The possibility of the partitive genitive in LXX Joel 2:28-29 that is quoted in Acts 2:18-21 by Peter may provide a parallel to the partial bestowal of 1Jn, but given the number of other instances of bestowal in the text that indicate no partialness and that the verb ἐκχέω itself connotes an abundant outpouring, this prospect seems unlikely. In any case, if 1Jn is not entirely distinct in its depiction of a partial possession of the Spirit of God, it is certainly unique in its emphasis on the *distinction* between the Spirit possession of believers and that of Christ.

The Transformative Effects of the Spirit as Understood by the Author of 1Jn

While the reception of the Spirit as it is depicted in 1Jn may differ quantitatively from the outpouring predicted by the Jewish Prophetic Literature and other apocalyptic interpretations of that outpouring, the results of the receipt of the Spirit of God seem somewhat more in line with what these other texts dictate. The effects of the gift of the Spirit in 1Jn include many of the effects seen in the Jewish Prophetic Literature and its interpretations, such as a fullness of knowledge about God's commandments and about the truth, a cleansing from sin, and a renewed closeness to God through God's indwelling presence. For the Johannine believers, though, these similarities only go so far. Looking at the Spirit passages of the text of 1Jn, it becomes evident that the transformative effects of the Spirit are in each case mitigated in some way, much like many of the transformative effects found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, non-Johannine New Testament, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Typically, however, the partialness of effects is contrasted with the abilities of Jesus, in order to emphasize the role of *Christ* in believers' knowledge, relationship to God, or sinlessness.

The knowledge that comes from the gift of the Spirit in 1Jn is portrayed in a variety of ways throughout the text. The Spirit as an assurance of God's indwelling the believer is a theme that recurs in two different passages of the letter. 1Jn 3:24d states, "in this way we know that he remains in us, by the Spirit that he gave us." The knowledge of God's indwelling is a result of (ἐκ)³⁸ the Spirit that God has given to believers. Similarly

³⁸ For this use of ἐκ see von Wahlde, 3:131. Smalley, too, reads the ἐκ here as a "by," giving the sense that it is by means of the Spirit that the believer has assurance of God's indwelling. Smalley, *1 John*, 201. While Schnackenburg does not explicitly note the grammar here, he interprets the verse in a similar way. It is the because of the believers' possession of the Spirit that the believer has knowledge of her fellowship with God. Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 190. Brown notes that some scholars explain the ἐκ in conjunction with the verb ("we can know...from the Spirit") and does not refute this outright, but also points to a partitive sense

in 4:13, the text expresses the assurance of indwelling that the gift of the Spirit provides.

Again the text states, “in this we know that we remain in him and he remains in us, because he has given us of his Spirit (ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος)” (1Jn 4:13). Here it is even clearer that the knowledge is the result of the gift of the Spirit, given the causal ὅτι present in the verse.³⁹ This kind of knowledge of God’s indwelling can be loosely connected to knowledge that God’s eschatological Spirit is said to ensure in the Jewish Prophetic Literature. Knowledge of God’s enduring presence, for instance, is a result of the outpouring of the Spirit in Ezek. 39:29.

In addition, the Spirit of God is depicted as the Spirit of truth in the letter, implying that the content of the knowledge that the Spirit provides is what is *true*. In both 1Jn 4:2, 6 and 5:6-12, possession of the Spirit is made manifest in the believer through his proclamation about what is true.⁴⁰ 1Jn 4:2 connects possession of the Spirit of God with a very particular confession, stating, “In this you know the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesses Jesus Christ has come in flesh is from God.” The contrast being made in this section is between those who possess the Spirit of truth that comes from God and those that possess the spirit of falsehood that comes from the Antichrist. This distinction looks very similar to distinctions made in other apocalyptic literature from the

of the gift of the Spirit. Brown, *Epistles*, 466. While this is possible given the similarities between this verse and 4:13, the more emphatic sense of the ἐκ seems to be one of means.

³⁹ Brown, *Epistles*, 522; Smalley, *1 John*, 238; Painter, *1 John*, 272-273; von Wahlde, 3:161.

⁴⁰ The reverse, however, can also be understood from these passages. If knowledge that an individual possesses the Spirit of God (or Truth) comes from that person’s demonstration of proper adherence to what is true, it would stand to reason that the possession of this Spirit is also what *leads* the believer to this knowledge of what is true. See Brown, *Epistles*, 356; Smalley, *1 John*, 238; von Wahlde, 3:168.

DSS and *T12P*.⁴¹ The content of the truth, however, differs in these texts. While the *truth* in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature pertains to the will of God as it applies to behavior (likely to proper interpretation and adherence to Torah),⁴² the *truth* according to 1Jn is specific to confessions about Jesus. This kind of truth finds somewhat of a parallel, perhaps not surprisingly, in 1Cor. 12:4, in which wisdom and knowledge allows believers to confess that Jesus is Lord.

There is some circularity, though, to the author's argument about truth and the Spirit in 1Jn. The knowledge about Jesus' coming in flesh is both a result of the witness of the Spirit of truth as well as an indication of who possesses this Spirit of God.⁴³ This circularity is made more evident in 1Jn 5:6c where the author writes, "And the Spirit is the witness, because the Spirit is the truth." Here, the Spirit is not just a witness to the truth on behalf of the believer, but is itself the truth, which the believer has access to by virtue of his or her possession of it.⁴⁴ The Spirit is the one testifying, so when the text states, "the one who believes in the Son of God has the witness in him," the indication is that those who display proper belief (in the Son) do so because they have the testimony of

⁴¹ 1QS 3.13-iv.26; *TJud* 20.1-3.

⁴² This assertion seems particularly true in passages like 1QH 6.12-15, 8.15, and fr. 2 1.13, in which serving the truth is connected to proper obedience to God's commands and the foundation of the community itself. Knowledge of the truth allows believers to avoid sinning against God and ties them together as God's people. Similarly, in *T12P* the descendants of the patriarchs are continually warned against following the wrong spirits, which in each case incline them towards *behaviors* that are opposed to the behaviors that God wants. For 1Jn, the Spirit of Truth seems to be more concerned with proper *belief* and *confession* than with behavior.

⁴³ Brown, *Epistles*, 482; Burge, *Anointed*, 174; von Wahlde, 3:168.

⁴⁴ Here, the Spirit both testifies to the truth and enables the believers who possess it to recognize that truth when it is told to them. See Brown, *Epistles*, 598; Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 234-235; Smalley, *1 John*, 267; von Wahlde, 3:188.

the Spirit of God, the truth, within them (1Jn 5:10).⁴⁵ Since the Spirit here is identified with the truth, it follows that the indwelling of the Spirit allows believers to understand the truth about the Son and his redemptive death.⁴⁶ While it is obvious that some of the *content* of this truth (particularly the knowledge about Jesus and his death) is quite different than what is found in the Jewish Prophetic Literature and its interpretations, the idea that the Spirit leads to special knowledge of God's truth is evident in various places (Isa. 59:20-21; Ezek. 11:19-20, 36:26-27; 1QS 4.20-22; 4Q444 fr. 1.1; 4Q506 frs. 131-132. 10-14). Again, the understanding that believers gain in 1Jn from the testimony of the Spirit is more similar to other texts from the New Testament that emphasize the Spirit's role in revealing wisdom and truths that pertain to the life and death of Jesus, some of which might seem like foolishness if not interpreted according to the Spirit (1Cor. 2).⁴⁷

In addition to the truthful proclamation concerning the Son that the Spirit witnesses to, part of what the believer knows because of this testimony is that "God gave us eternal life, and this life is in his Son" (1Jn 5:11). While the *knowledge* concerning

⁴⁵ Brown contends that the witness does not come from inside of believers themselves, but that witness in Johannine tradition is always a reference to something external. Brown, *Epistles*, 583. While this does ring true based on other passages in which 1Jn and GJn describe witnesses or being witness to, even if the witness itself is not a voice inside of believers that comes from within themselves, the external witness of the Spirit, once it has been accepted by believers, is somehow internalized and allows for the truth to remain *within* them.

⁴⁶ Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 234; Brown, *Epistles*, 584; von Wahlde, 3:192.

⁴⁷ Paul's message of Christ crucified could not have been easily accepted by those expecting a more traditional Lord or Messiah, one that would come as a conqueror and not an apparent victim of conquerors. But, as Paul explains to the Corinthians in 1Cor. 2, the event of Jesus' death cannot be understood properly without the testimony and guidance of the Spirit of God, which probes the depths of the mind of God. The human mind alone is not able to comprehend the apparent foolishness of a crucified Messiah. A similar link is made between the Spirit of Truth and its testimony to Jesus' coming in flesh. For reasons specified in Chapter One, I do not understand coming in flesh to be an anti-Docetic contention of the author of 1Jn, but rather one that refers to the confession of Jesus' death as having salvific force. For a summary of reasons for not reading 1Jn as specifically anti-Docetic, also see Urban C. von Wahlde, *Gnosticism, Docetism, and the Judaisms of the First Century: The Search for the Wider Context of Johannine Literature and Why It Matters* (LNTS 517; New York: T&T Clark, 2015), 68-80.

eternal life is a result of the Spirit/testimony that the believer has, eternal life itself is here attributed to the Son (and is a result of the believer's belief in the Son).⁴⁸ In 5:12 we read, "the one who has the Son has the life; the one who does not have the Son of God does not have the life." The role of the Spirit in producing life, as seen in Ezekiel 37:14 and in various places in GJn, seems here to be instead given to the Son, marking another place in which the author has shifted the emphasis from the Spirit to Christ when referring to the reception of eschatological gifts. Elsewhere in apocalyptic interpretations of the Jewish Prophetic Literature, however, the Spirit itself is credited with effecting eternal life, but coming *through* a Messiah figure (Titus 3:5-7; *TLex* 18.9). While the emphasis in 1Jn is on Jesus' salvific role, the Johannine tradition more broadly conforms to the idea in these texts that eternal life is brought to believers by the gift of the Spirit that Jesus provides during his ministry and more fully at his death, if only they believe in him (GJn 1:4; 3:15-16, 36; 4:14; 5:21-26, 40; 6:27, 33-35, 40, 47-48, 51-54, 63; 10:10-11, 28; 11:25; 14:6; 17:2-3; 20:22, 31).

The most evident example of the fullness of knowledge that comes through the gift of the Spirit, however, can be found in 1Jn 2:20, 27-28 and the depiction of the effects of the *χρῖσμα* (anointing). First, in 1Jn 2:20, it is stated that because believers have the *χρῖσμα* from the Holy One, they *all* (*πάντες*) know.⁴⁹ What they all know is stated

⁴⁸ Brown notes that there exists a chain of giving life in GJn that is necessary for understanding possession of life through Jesus. Because Jesus has the Spirit without measure (GJn 3:34b) and possesses it in himself just as the Father does (GJn 5:26), Jesus is able to convey the Spirit onto believers when they accept the testimony and believe in him. Brown, *Epistles*, 600-601. Cf. Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 240-241; Smalley, *I John*, 274-275. Von Wahlde more specifically makes reference to the shift in emphasis from the Spirit giving life to the Son and attributes this to the centrality of Spirit possession as the cause of the crisis. Von Wahlde, 3:195-196.

⁴⁹ The difficulty of deciding between the textual variants of this verse has been widely discussed. For a discussion see Brown, *Epistles*, 348-349 or Smalley, *I John*, 87 and 103. For the purposes of this

more particularly in 1Jn 2:21: they know the truth. The truth here, again, differs from the knowledge provided by the outpouring of the Spirit in the Jewish Prophetic Literature, but bears a closer resemblance to what is found in other New Testament texts. Rather than being knowledge of God's Torah commands (Jer. 31:34; Ezek. 11:19, 36:26-27) or an ability for new, prophetic knowledge (Joel 3:1-2), this knowledge refers the believer back to "what you have heard from the beginning" (1Jn 2:24).⁵⁰ Such a proclamation leaves very little room for the kind of novelty that could be implied in a text like that of Joel, in which what counts as prophetic declaration could come from just about anyone (male or female, old or young, slave or free) and, as a result, could run the gamut as far as content is concerned. A similar limitation on prophetic proclamation to that described in 1Jn is evident in 1Cor. 12:3, where Paul warns that "no one speaking by God's Spirit says that Jesus is accursed and no one is able to say that Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Spirit." Each connects specific proclamations concerning Jesus to possession of God's Spirit, limiting what constitutes prophetic truth.

discussion, either variant, οἶδατε πάντα or οἶδατε πάντα, seems to reflect some similarity to the Jewish Prophetic Literature. If the variant that reflects the more original text is in fact οἶδατε πάντα and not, as argued here, οἶδατε πάντες, there is all the more reason to mark it as a parallel to the prophetic texts. Describing the Johannine believers as "knowing all things" fits well with the transformative effects depicted in Ezekiel and Jeremiah, where the people will have an internal capacity to know and follow God's commandments. For an alternative translation that emphasizes the eschatological dualism of the text ("you know all people"), see von Wahlde, 3:85.

⁵⁰ While what constitutes the truth is not specified in 1Jn 2:20, the author returns to the subject of what believers know in 1Jn 2:24 after contrasting the truth with the lies of the Antichrist in 1Jn 2:21d-23d. Even though it is not explicitly stated that the content of the truth is what believers heard from the beginning, most scholars connect the two. As Brown explains, the anointing with the Spirit (who is the truth) is in a "symbiotic relationship" with what has been heard from the beginning. The Spirit abides in believers, enabling them to understand the truth about God and Jesus about which they have been taught from the beginning (either the beginning of Jesus' ministry or the beginning of their acceptance of Jesus as Son of God). Brown, *Epistles*, 372-373. Cf. Smalley, *1 John*, 112-113.

The passages concerning the anointing of believers also have further affinities to the texts of the Jewish Prophetic Literature in the statements of 2:27, “and you do not have need of anyone to teach you, but just as his anointing teaches you about all things and it is the truth and not a lie, in this way he taught you, you remain in him.” Believers, just as it is written in Jeremiah 31:34, will have no need for any human being to teach them, because they will instead be taught about all things⁵¹ through the anointing that they have received.⁵² Again, though, the *content* of the teaching that comes from this anointing is for the author relatively standardized, betraying a marked difference from the teaching that the eschatological Spirit will do according to the Jewish Prophetic Literature. The implication in Jeremiah’s text is, of course, that the content of the teaching will be that of the Torah, which all people (from the greatest to the least) will spontaneously come to know in the last days. In the case of 1Jn, the teaching has to do with the life and work of Jesus, “what has been from the beginning, what we have heard, what we have observed with our eyes, what we have seen and our hands have felt concerning the word of life” (1Jn 1:1).

⁵¹ It would seem that all things here has a rather specific definition. The knowledge being discussed in this portion of the letter is that Jesus is the Christ and the Son of the Father and that believers have eternal life. All of these are things ὃ ἠκούσατε ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, things that believers should already know, but are being reinforced by the χάρισμα that they have received.

⁵² It is only the Spirit, conveyed in their anointing, that has the ability and authority to teach the truth. By assuring believers that it is not through human teachers that they will gain knowledge of God, but through the Spirit that is manifest in proclamations of what they have heard since the beginning, the author gives them confidence against those false teachers that may try to sway them. See Brown, *Epistles*, 374-375. Although it might seem a bit hypocritical for the author (who seems to be teaching throughout the letter) to assert that human teaching is no longer necessary, once the role of the Spirit in witnessing to the truth is understood, the paradox diminishes. Because the Spirit indwells believers, including the author, they are able to profess and accept the true testimony, which does not constitute “teaching” as such. The testimony is simply a reminder of what has been taught previously and is separated from the information being taught by false prophets in that it is assured by the Spirit. Smalley, *1 John*, 118-119.

This χρῖσμα also leads to another prerogative of the eschatological Spirit found in the Jewish Prophetic Literature and its interpretations, that of a new relationship to God. By virtue of the very fact that the author states that believers at large have received a χρῖσμα, they now share something very important with Jesus, who is ὁ Χριστός.⁵³ This anointing, however, is not understood by the author of the letter to be of the same quality as Jesus has received. If the anointing is a reference to the receipt of the Spirit,⁵⁴ as I posit here, it seems that it comes to believers not directly from God (the gift of the Spirit that Jesus receives at his baptism), but through Jesus (symbolized by Jesus' coming to the disciples in GJn 20:22).⁵⁵ Given this reading of GJn 20:22 and the surrounding verses in 1Jn 2:20-29, the ἀπ' αὐτοῦ in 1Jn 2:27, most likely refers to Jesus.⁵⁶ Emphasis on the fact that the anointing is mediated by Jesus may be an indication that the author of the letter wants to explicitly demonstrate that believers, although they have *an* anointing, do not share the same kind of anointing as *the Anointed*, who is Jesus (1Jn 2:22). Again, if the anointing here is a reference to the Spirit of God, it seems likely that the author is

⁵³ Brooke, *Critical*, 54; Brown, *Epistles*, 344-345; Smalley, *1 John*, 103; Burge, *Anointed*, 175; von Wahlde, 3:98. In spite of this shared anointing, however, Jesus is still uniquely, *the* Christ.

⁵⁴ Grayston, *Epistles*, 78-79; von Wahlde, 3:94-95.

⁵⁵ The idea that the Spirit is somehow mediated through Jesus to believers is not unique to 1Jn. It also appears in Acts 2:33 and Titus 3:6, where it is Jesus who pours out the Spirit that results in prophetic abilities or God who pours out the Spirit abundantly *through* Jesus.

⁵⁶ While many scholars agree with this reading, it is helpful to acknowledge that God is the ultimate source of Spirit/anointing and eternal life. However, it would seem that the description of what the 'he' in 1Jn 2:20-29 does is more applicable to Jesus. Furthermore, although the Holy One in 1Jn 2:20 can also be understood as God, in GJn 6:69 it is Jesus, not God, who holds this title. The only real issue that I see here is 1Jn 2:29, as it is never explicitly stated in either the gospel or the letter that the believer is born of Jesus. However, if Jesus can (and does) provide the Spirit that enacts new life in the believer (GJn 20:22), it is not too far of a jump to consider them to be born of Christ as they are born of God or the Spirit. See Brown, *Epistles*, 347-348; Smalley, *1 John*, 102-103; Grayston, *Epistles*, 87; von Wahlde, 3:85-89 for various readings.

attempting to subordinate the Spirit possession of believers to that of Jesus.⁵⁷ The transformation enacted by their possession of the Spirit, likewise, is still somehow incomplete, as they have not yet become “like him” (1Jn 3:2), a prospect that will only be achieved when Jesus once again appears to them.

Although it seems that the author wishes to downplay believers possession of the Spirit, at least with respect to Jesus’ possession of the Spirit, this does not change the fact that their receipt of the Spirit drastically alters believers’ lives in relation to God.

Throughout the text, believers are referred to as children of God (1Jn 3:1, 2, 10; 4:4; 5:1), a result of being born of the Spirit (GJn 3:5, 6, 8) or born of God (GJn 1:13; 1Jn 3:9, 4:7, 5:4) in Johannine tradition.⁵⁸ As such, they have a new life in familial relation to God.⁵⁹

This familial relationship is a result of the seed⁶⁰ of God that remains in the believer. In

⁵⁷ Von Wahlde, 3:98.

⁵⁸ It is interesting to note the difference in phrase usage between the text of the gospel and that of the letter. Where the letter uses the phrase *born of God* several times and never uses the phrase *born of the Spirit*, the gospel does practically the opposite. While there is one use of *born of God* in the gospel, it occurs in the Prologue, which is widely regarded as one of the latest additions to the text. If it is the case that the letter was written after the gospel in some form, but before the final additions had been made to it, then this usage, too, might be an indication of the author’s desire to downplay the function of the Spirit in bringing about new life in the believer. See von Wahlde, 1:328.

⁵⁹ This relationship, however, is still held in contrast to the relationship Jesus has to God, as discussed earlier in Section 4.1.2. The term τέκνα denotes a human being still in the process of growing, that is, not fully realized. This process is suggested by 1Jn 3:2, in which the author states, “Beloved, now we are children of God, what we will be has not yet been revealed. We know that when he is revealed, we will be like him, because we will see him just as he is.” The implication here is that although believers are children of God *now*, there is something else that they *will become* (i.e. like Jesus) in the future when Jesus returns. Believers are not referred to as sons or daughters of God in the Johannine writings, and this seems to be a deliberate effort to display a different familial relationship between the believer and God and Jesus and God, one that has begun but will not be fully realized until Jesus’ return. While the author of 1Jn does not conceive of this relationship as sonship by adoption as Paul does, he ensures that in spite of believers having been born of God (or in the case of GJn born of the Spirit), they know that their birth is of a different kind than Jesus’. Furthermore, as Smalley notes, Jesus is still *the* (unique) Son of God. Smalley, *I John*, 275.

⁶⁰ In addition to acknowledging σπέρμα as a metaphor for the Spirit, reading this language as philosophical/physiological aids in further explicating the text. According to Aristotle’s notion of epigenesis, it was the σπέρμα (or semen) of the father that endowed the child with λόγος and πνεῦμα,

1Jn 3:9 being born of God is inextricably connected to the presence of the σπέρμα within the believer. While understandings of this verse vary,⁶¹ the idea it conveys is largely uncontroversial. The term conveys the idea that part of God's own self is given over to the believer when he or she is born of God (or the Spirit, in the case of GJn), just as part of a father is passed on to his offspring.⁶² While the term is typically translated into literal English "seed"⁶³ (NRSV, NASB, NIV), the connotation of the term is often described as a principle of spiritual life⁶⁴ and denotes both a sense of likeness to God in Spirit and indicates from where the familial relation of the believer to God comes (i.e., from the Spirit).⁶⁵ While the concept of a familial relationship between God and God's people is apparent throughout Jewish Apocalyptic Literature, believers go from dust to sons of heaven in 1QH fr. 2 1.9-13 and are called sons of truth in *TJud* 24.2-3, the closest

because it acted as a vehicle for implanting these vital forces into the womb of the mother. The σπέρμα, therefore, was thought to actually *contain* the πνεῦμα and was responsible for giving the child its form and principle movement. The vessel into which the σπέρμα was implanted (the womb) provided the nourishment and the 'genus' of the child, but the child's primary traits and ability to move itself came from the semen of its father. See Yii-Jan Singh, "Semen, Philosophy, and Paul," *JPS* 4 no. 2 (Spring, 2007), 34-39. In this way it would seem that physiologically the σπέρμα and the πνεῦμα would not have been entirely separate entities, giving further support to the notion that believers who received the Spirit or seed would have taken on the traits of the divine Father, including the animating principle of eternal life. Cf. Adele Reinhartz, "And the Word Was Begotten: Divine Epigenesis in the Gospel of John," *Semeia* 85 (1999): 83-103.

⁶¹ For various meanings see Brown, *Epistles*, 408-411; Smalley, *1 John*, 164-166; Grayston, *Epistles*, 166-167; von Wahlde, 3:108.

⁶² Brown, *Epistles*, 409; Smalley, *1 John*, 144-145; von Wahlde, 3:114-115.

⁶³ The RSV translates "nature," as does Smalley, *1 John*, 144.

⁶⁴ It is important to note, however, that the term does not denote a fullness of life, but only the beginning of it. If we read the term seed as an agricultural metaphor, it is by no means understood as fully realized. It is the beginning of what will one day *grow into* something else. And although it is not yet fully realized, it has the essence of that thing which it will one day become. Similarly to the term τέκνα in reference to believers, that they have a seed of God within them suggests a work in progress. Both terms denote a *partialness* that may also be indicative of their *partial* receipt of the Spirit. See Brown, *Epistles*, 409; Smalley, *1 John*, 164; Burge, *Anointed*, 176.

⁶⁵ Brown, *Epistles*, 409-410; Smalley, *1 John*, 144-145; von Wahlde, 3:114-115.

parallels to 1Jn can be found in the Pauline corpus of literature. In the Pauline texts, however, believers are not born of God, but rather undergo a kind of adoption into divine sonship whereby they are able to call God Father.⁶⁶ In each case, though, the process of becoming sons or children of God and taking on the likeness of *the* Son of God is not complete. Believers await the fullness of adoption in the Pauline texts (Rom. 8:23) and the full transformation of what they “will be” in 1Jn (1Jn 3:2).

The σπέρμα of God in 1Jn, however, does not function only in the begetting of the believer, but also in transforming the actions of those in whom it remains. This seed and the begotten-ness that it implies are also instrumental in the believer’s inability to sin. In 1Jn 3:9 we read, “Everyone who has been born of God cannot sin, because his seed remains in you, and is not able to sin, because he is born of God.” Both instances of ὅτι in this verse are used in the causal sense and indicate *why* the believer does not or cannot commit sin.⁶⁷ While there is a clear sense that those in whom God’s seed remains now have an increased ability to avoid sins, this is not a complete and automatic inability, as it seems to be throughout much of the Jewish Prophetic Literature (Ezek. 11:19, 36:26-27; Jer. 31:34) or as in descriptions of future Spirit endowment in 1QS 4.20-22 and *TJud* 24.3 where those who have received God’s Spirit have had any spirit of injustice in them removed or are able to walk perfectly in God’s commands. The Pauline texts, too, point to the ethical effects of the Spirit, as believers who are “in the Spirit” are able to live according to that Spirit (Rom. 8:2; 2Cor. 3:6; Gal. 5:25), but it is not clear that ethical

⁶⁶ According to Rom. 8:14-15 it is not because believers are born of God, but because they are led by the Spirit and have received the spirit of sonship that they are considered sons of God. Their full adoption, however, is described as still yet to come in Rom. 8:23. In Galatians 4:4-7, adoption seems to be a more direct result of God’s sending the Son but is at the same time connected to reception of the Spirit.

⁶⁷ Brown, *Epistles*, 412; Grayston, *Epistles*, 106.

perfectionism is intended. The gift of the Spirit in these texts, as in 1Jn, does not completely eliminate the ability of believers to sin, indicating a less than full transformation of their behavior.

As made evident in 1Jn 1:8, “if we say that we do not have sin, we lie to ourselves, and the truth is not in us,” and again in 2:1, “I write these things to you in order that you might not sin; and if someone sins, we have the Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous one,” believers in the author’s understanding are not entirely free of sin.⁶⁸ The implication is that believers still have the *capability* to sin and cannot deny this ability, and so they require a back-up plan,⁶⁹ the Paraclete (in this case, Jesus Christ), who will advocate on their behalf.⁷⁰ Furthermore, the juxtaposition between Jesus, who is here called “the righteous one,” and believers shows that the author intends to mark Jesus’ perfect behavior apart from the behavior of believers.⁷¹

In addition, the letter breaks from typical prophetic expectation in its understanding of forgiveness of sin. In many of the texts of the Jewish Prophetic

⁶⁸ In fact, the entire passage from 1Jn 1:6-10 expresses the continued ability of the believer to sin and instructions for dealing with this sin when it does happen.

⁶⁹ A continued ability to sin even after the reception of the eschatological Spirit is common in other interpretations of the Jewish Prophetic Literature as well. For instance, texts of the DSS similarly contain warnings against sliding back into improper behaviors that go against the will and commands of God. While the Pauline literature links the gift of the Spirit frequently with the ability to walk in the Spirit, behaving as God intended, the crises faced by the communities to whom these letters are written indicate a less than perfect transformation of behavior for believers.

⁷⁰ Brown, *Epistles*, 240-241; Smalley, *1 John*, 34; von Wahlde, 3:42-43. Advocating on behalf of believers is also a function of the Spirit and Jesus in Rom. 8:26-28 and 8:34, in which both intercede on behalf of believers.

⁷¹ As Smalley points out, Jesus is uniquely able to act as Paraclete for believers due to his own righteousness. They cannot ask God for righteousness for themselves, because only the one who is sinless can go before God in perfect purity and make such a request. Smalley, *1 John*, 35. Brown, too, notes that it is only Jesus who has no wrongdoing in him and therefore is the one from whom all others need to be purified. Brown, *Epistles*, 216. Cf. Grayston, *Epistles*, 58-59.

Literature, the outpouring or inputting of the eschatological Spirit of God results in the full obedience (seemingly without effort) to the commands of God. This receipt also results, however, in the cleansing of their impurities or forgiveness of their iniquities (Isa. 44:22, 59:20-21; Ezek. 36:27; 39:23, 26; Jer. 31:33). 1QH fr. 2 1.13 likewise interprets the reception of the eschatological Spirit as atoning for the guilt of God's people. In 1Jn, the presence of the seed and the fact that people are born of God may be instrumental in their ability to avoid sin (1Jn 3:9), but *forgiveness* of sin occurs not through the gift of the Spirit, but through the death of Christ.⁷² The author explicitly states this role of Jesus's death, writing, "the blood of Jesus his Son purifies us from all sin" (1Jn 1:7). This role, formerly granted to the eschatological Spirit of God in the Jewish Prophetic Literature, has been reassigned in the letter to give the death of Jesus salvific force.⁷³

As has been shown, the effects of the gift of the eschatological Spirit in 1Jn look both similar and dissimilar to those effects depicted in the Jewish Prophetic Literature and later interpretations of that literature. While the Spirit of God (particularly when it is described in more metaphorical terms) does produce a transformation of the believer's knowledge, behavior, and relationship to God, these effects are often left incomplete. Furthermore, effects that were once depicted in the Jewish Prophetic Literature as the direct result of the reception of the eschatological Spirit are in 1Jn, as in other texts from the New Testament, attributed to the person and death of Jesus, the Christ and Son of God. While the beliefs of the author of 1Jn regarding the gift of the Spirit are evident in

⁷² Brown, *Epistles*, 239-240; Smalley, *1 John*, 36; von Wahlde, 3:43-44.

⁷³ Grayston, *Epistles*, 25. While at times Messianic figures in the Jewish Apocalyptic Literature also effect salvation through their actions, this typically takes the form not of death but of passing on of the Spirit. Examples of this have previously been reviewed in *TLevi* 18 and *TJud* 24.

the text, the beliefs of his opponents regarding the receipt of the Spirit are also implied. I will now examine those beliefs, insofar as they can be gleaned from the text, and draw comparisons between those beliefs and the predictions made in the texts of the Jewish Prophetic Literature and its interpretations.

The Opponents' Understanding of the Bestowal of the Spirit and Its Transformative Effects

A great deal of controversy has arisen over what exactly can and cannot be said about what the opponents believe based on the words of the author of 1Jn.⁷⁴ For those who see the letter as largely rhetorical and non-polemical in nature,⁷⁵ very few passages count as genuine reflections of what the opponents believe. For those who see the letter as the author's attempt to directly address a historical polemic, more passages are considered to give insight into the basic tenants of the dispute.⁷⁶ Given this debate, it is necessary to first establish which passages can fairly be used to reconstruct the beliefs of the opponents concerning possession of the Spirit and the resulting effects of that possession. In the following sections, the passages agreed upon by even the most vigorously rhetorical critics will be examined⁷⁷ to determine what can be said about the conception of the Spirit held by the opponents, insofar as it can be understood from the words of the author.

⁷⁴ Klauck, "Internal Opponents," 57; Lieu, *I John*, 11; Terry Griffith, "A Non-Polemical Reading of 1Jn: Sin, Christology and the Limits of Johannine Christology," *TynBul* 49 no. 2 (1998): 253-276.

⁷⁵ Lieu, *I John*, 11-12; Perkins, *Epistles*, xxiii.

⁷⁶ See Brown's widely accepted 17 instances, *Epistles*, 762.

⁷⁷ While Brown has 17 instances in the letter that he sees as reflecting the beliefs of the secessionists, I will focus on those that are more widely accepted and those that have particular bearing on what can be described as the opponents' beliefs concerning their possession of the Spirit. See Brown, *Epistles*, 762.

1Jn 2:18-23

Even those who bring the healthiest skepticism to the letter with regards to the expression of the opponents' beliefs see 1Jn 2:18-19 as addressing the conflict directly and providing some insight into those that have "gone out from us." While these verses might seem to establish very little about the actual *beliefs* of the opponents, they do, in the estimation of most scholars, give an accurate account of the situation at hand.⁷⁸ It seems evident from the description, "they went out from us, but they were not from us; for if they were from us, they would have remained among us," (1Jn 2:19) that the author is (at least in these particular verses) addressing a group of people that have formerly been counted among the Johannine believers, but have left them, according to the author, because they were never actually from them. Furthermore, we can understand from these verses that these opponents have been deemed antichrists, for reasons that are not entirely clear in this passage. The title ἀντίχριστος, in spite of its coming from the author, carries a certain connotation, particularly since it is used in such close proximity to the assertion that believers are living in the "last hour" (1Jn 2:18). Given the eschatological connotation and the explicit mention in 4:1, it is evident that the author sees these individuals as false prophets, as well.⁷⁹ The implication here, then, is that these individuals claim to possess a prophecy of their own, a prophecy that presumably comes

⁷⁸ Brown, *Epistles*, 363-367; Smalley, *I John*, 97; Grayston, *Epistles*, 77; Lieu, *I John*, 100-102; von Wahlde, 3:89.

⁷⁹ The connection between antichrists and false prophets and their appearance at the end of the age can also be found in Mark 13. See Brown, *Epistles*, 335; Smalley, *I John*, 208; Witherington, *Letters*, 430.

(as prophecy in the Jewish Prophetic Literature does) from inspiration by the Spirit of God.⁸⁰

In addition, using the term antichrist likely suggests a faulty understanding of who Jesus is as the Christ.⁸¹ This assertion is affirmed in 1Jn 2:22, where an antichrist is said to be “the one who denies that Jesus is the Christ.” This denial that Jesus is the Christ can, however, vary in meaning. It seems unlikely that a group that was formerly considered part of the Johannine believers would deny outright the Messiahship of Jesus.⁸² It is difficult to accept that the author here is describing a group of Jews who had not come to believe that Jesus was in fact the Jewish Messiah. If they were, it is unclear how they would have been considered members of the Johannine *believers*, even if—as I propose here—the majority of them had a Jewish background.⁸³ If Brown’s hypothesis concerning the different conflicts being addressed by the gospel (a conflict with other Jewish groups that had not accepted Jesus as the Messiah) and by the letter (a conflict with former Johannine Christ believers)⁸⁴ is to be believed, it does not seem plausible that the author is here addressing opponents who refused to believe Jesus was in fact the Jewish Messiah. Believers at this point presumably would be beyond that. So, the assertion made by the author that the opponents deny that Jesus is the Christ likely has a different meaning, perhaps one that connects to another accepted claim of the opponents,

⁸⁰ Aune, *Prophecy*, 224-225. Cf. Brown, *Epistles*, 504-505; Smalley, *1 John*, 205.

⁸¹ Smalley, *1 John*, 94; Grayston, *Epistles*, 78-79; Lieu, *1 John*, 99; von Wahlde, 3:95.

⁸² Brown, *Epistles*, 352; Smalley, *1 John*, 108; Lieu, *1 John*, 105; von Wahlde, 3:95.

⁸³ Grayston, *Epistles*, 27; Lieu, *1 John*, 25; von Wahlde, 1:52.

⁸⁴ Brown, *Epistle*, 29.

that of Spirit reception.⁸⁵ It is possible that the opponents also overestimate their own possession of the Spirit⁸⁶ and do not see Jesus' designation as *the* Christ as indicative of a unique relationship to the Father. If the opponents understand the eschatological gift of the Spirit in a way that conforms to the abundant outpouring and total transformation depicted in the Jewish Prophetic Literature, it is unsurprising that they might see themselves as being on a similar level as Jesus in their knowledge and relationship to the Father.

1Jn 4:1-6

Another passage that is typically understood as depicting the views of the opponents by even the most critical scholars is 1Jn 4:1-6.⁸⁷ The polemic evident in the so-called 'Testing of the Spirits' passage is almost too obvious to deny. That the author explains at the beginning of the passage that "many false prophets have come out into the world" (1Jn 4:1), likely means to equate those who possess the spirit of the Antichrist with the same antichrists who "went out from us" in 1Jn 2:18-19.⁸⁸ The author describes these false prophets as having a "spirit of falsehood," and the author conversely describes the believers who have remained in Christ as possessing the "Spirit of truth" (1Jn 4:6). The fact that the author acknowledges a *need* to test all professed spirits likely indicates that his opponents are claiming to possess a legitimate, prophetic Spirit, which for believers with a background in Jewish Prophetic Literature could only be the divine Spirit

⁸⁵ Grayston, *Epistles*, 18-19, 78-79; von Wahlde, 3:94-95.

⁸⁶ Brown, *Epistles*, 373; Grayston, *Epistles*, 79; Klauck, "Internal Opponents," 58; Burge, *Anointed*, 172-173; von Wahlde, 3:100.

⁸⁷ Brown, *Epistles*, 503; Smalley, *1 John*, 205; Grayston, *Epistles*, 118; Witherington, *Letters*, 428.

⁸⁸ Smalley, *1 John*, 309.

of God.⁸⁹ As in texts that express the Spirit's outpouring as leading to a universal ability of prophetic proclamation and availability of knowledge about God (Heb. Joel 3:1-2; 4Q444 fr. 1.1; Acts 2:18-21), the opponents likely interpret their own possession of the Spirit as leading to proper confession and teaching. For the author of 1Jn, however, the spirit that they possess is not from God. The way to know one kind of spirit from the other, according to the author, is to determine whether that spirit "confesses that Jesus Christ has come in flesh" (1Jn 4:2). Again, it is difficult to imagine that a group that denied Jesus' actual, historical humanity would have ever been accepted into a group of Christ believers whose authoritative text was GJn in the first place.⁹⁰ It is more likely, then, that the author means to say here that the opponents deny the soteriological importance of Jesus' life on earth and subsequent death.⁹¹ The emphasis on Jesus' salvific death is prominent throughout the letter and is therefore widely accepted as a major contributor to the schism reflected therein.

1Jn 1:6-10

Another passage that is (a bit more tenuously) accepted as revealing something about the beliefs of the opponents is 1Jn 1:6-10. For many of the more conservative critics, these verses are considered possible, though not probable, expressions of the opponents' position.⁹² However, this passage does seem to reinforce what has been

⁸⁹ Brown, *Epistles*, 372, 466, 503; Smalley, *1 John*, 205-206; Grayston, *Epistles*, 118.

⁹⁰ Marshall, *Epistles* 205; Grayston, *Epistles*, 121.

⁹¹ This understanding is also supported by the author's metaphor in 5:6. His insistence that Jesus has come "not only in water but in water and in blood," that is, not just to give the Spirit, but to die an atoning death. See Brown, *Epistles*, 239; Grayston, *Epistles*, 18-19; von Wahlde, 3:143.

⁹² Witherington argues, along with Griffith, that the "we" of these passages refers to the author's own community and is not a veiled reference to the beliefs of the opponents. While this might be the case, the

established from other more accepted passages like 1Jn 2:18-23 and 4:1-6. For instance, the author states, “the blood of his Son Jesus cleanses us of all sins,” once again emphasizing the salvific nature of Jesus’ blood and the totality of the cleansing (1Jn 1:7). The text then states “if we say that we do not ourselves have sin, we lie and the truth is not in us” (1Jn 1:8). Whether or not this statement directly addresses the author’s opponents or certain individuals that are still counted as among the author’s audience, the implication here is that *someone*⁹³ is expressing a belief akin to ethical perfectionism, wrongly understanding this cleansing by the Spirit to mean that they no longer have sin.⁹⁴ Given the verses that have preceded 1Jn 1:8 and what follows concerning sin in 1Jn 3:4-9, it is easy to see how such a misunderstanding of the presence of sin could have occurred, particularly when considering the eschatological context⁹⁵ of the letter and the supposed transformation described in the Jewish Prophetic Literature.⁹⁶ Furthermore, the

content of the verses do seem to support the already established position (based on those verses that Witherington counts as indicative of the opponents’ position) that Jesus’ death was being denied its proper salvific efficacy and that there was some question among believers regarding their ability to sin. See Witherington, *Letters*, 429; Griffith, “Non-Polemical,” 260.

⁹³ Even if a more conservative approach to the opponents is taken and we deny that there is a specific group that espouses each of the false beliefs that seem to be addressed in the letter, the overall issue still remains. Beliefs that seem more in line with a typical, prophetic understanding of the gift of the eschatological Spirit of God are apparent. While my position here is that the author disputes an actual group of opponents who have left the believers to whom he writes, *where* these threatening beliefs are coming from matters little to the overall argument. The fact remains that while the author of 1Jn breaks from this typical, prophetic understanding of the Spirit, this understanding of the Spirit is still close enough to his audience to necessitate the author’s warning to avoid these kinds of beliefs.

⁹⁴ While some scholars react against this notion that the author is here referring to any kind of perfectionism, see Perkins, *Epistles*, 18; Lieu, *I John*, 104; Griffith, “Non-Polemical,” 261; others do see a belief in ethical purity being reflected in the text, see Brown, *Epistles*, 237; Smalley, *I John*, 27; Grayston, *Epistles*, 19; Klauck, *Erste*, 41; von Wahlde, 3:116.

⁹⁵ These verses are set within a description of the dualistic framework of light versus dark.

⁹⁶ Attempts to explain how these passages can be understood logically together are multiple and various. Cf. Brown, *Epistles*, 412-416; Smalley, *I John*, 33-34, 166-167; Grayston, *Epistles*, 50; Lieu, *I John*, 19-20; von Wahlde, 3:368.

author's insistence on emphasizing once again that it is the blood of Jesus that is responsible for removing sin may point towards the existence of a competing understanding of how believers are absolved of iniquities, namely, that they are absolved from sin through the receipt of the Spirit. Such an understanding would not be counter to certain interpretations of Jewish Prophetic Literature, in which the gift of the eschatological Spirit entirely removes sin from believers and provides them with a renewed ability to perfectly follow God's commands (Ezek. 11:19-20//36:36-37; 1QS 4.20-22; 1QH 8.15).

1Jn 5:6-8

While more conservative rhetorical critics do not accept 1Jn 5:6-8 as reflecting the opponents' views,⁹⁷ given what has been allowed in the previous sections, it seems appropriate to address the author's position on *how* Jesus *did* come in order to strengthen what has already been argued about the position of the opponents. In these verses, the author puts great emphasis on how one *should* understand Jesus' coming, implying that there is another way that some have understood this event. The author writes, "This is the one who came by means of water and blood, Jesus Christ, not only in the water but in the water and in the blood; and the Spirit is the witness, because the Spirit is the truth." For the purposes of my argument, this is a very important verse. First of all, there is the

⁹⁷ Lieu, for instance, does not see a polemical thrust in the statement, "not in water alone, but in the water and in the blood" in 1Jn 5:6b. She points to similar phrasing in 1Jn 2:2, where the author writes, "and he is the atonement for our sins, not only for our sins, but also for those of the whole world," and argues that in that verse the parallel construction does not indicate a lesser value for what is "not only" the case, but rather each complements and reinforces the other. In other words, the construction does not indicate that there is an oppositional group arguing that Jesus came only to atone for "our sins." Lieu, *1 John*, 211. While she is certainly correct in her reading of 1Jn 2:2, the continued emphasis throughout 1Jn on the salvific nature of Jesus himself seems to betray an alternative and opposing understanding of the expiation of sin (1Jn 1:7; 2:2; 3:5, 8; 4:10).

implication (that has already been seen in more than one accepted passage) that there is a certain false belief about Jesus' salvific death and that Jesus' blood was somehow being undervalued. By stating that Jesus did not come in "the water only, but in the water and the blood," the author seeks to emphasize this important fact. The question then becomes: what would it mean for Jesus to come in water *only*, as opposed to in water and blood?

While the metaphor here can be understood in a variety of ways,⁹⁸ the most plausible argument seems to be that the water to which the author refers has to do

⁹⁸ Brown, *Epistles*, 573-578; Smalley, *1 John*, 264-267; Lieu, *1 John*, 209-212; von Wahlde, 3:183-186; cf. Grayston, *Epistles*, 136. Brown, Smalley, Lieu, and von Wahlde each list common explanations of the passage. There are a few major interpretative foci of the passage that scholars typically note: sacramental readings, in which the water and blood are understood to represent the believers' practices of baptism and Eucharist; historical readings, in which the water and blood are understood to refer to events in the life of Jesus (baptism/birth and death); and metaphorical/soteriological readings, in which the water and the blood are understood to refer metaphorically to the ways that Jesus saves. Each also notes the possible connection with GJn 19:34. The sacramental reading is almost universally doubted, mainly because the passage uses an aorist participle and does not seem to refer to a current manifestation of Jesus in the lives of believers, but to a definite point (or points) in the past when Jesus *came*. While most scholars do not deny some connection to GJn 19:34, it is hard to say how much that passage illuminates 1Jn 5:6-8, as it has its own interpretative difficulties. The majority of modern scholars opt for some form of the second or third readings, each with individual nuances.

For instance, Brown sees the emphasis as placed on the death of Jesus, contending that the water in this case refers to Jesus' baptism, which the opponents of 1Jn have overemphasized as the point at which the incarnation took place, the time at which Jesus fully *came* as the Son of God. He explains that they would have understood the coming of the Spirit at Jesus' baptism as in itself salvific and therefore underestimated the soteriological function of Jesus' death. Jesus is confirmed as both the revealer of eternal life through the Spirit and redeemer of life through his death. Brown, *Epistles*, 578 (cf. Brown, *Community*, 573-578). While this explanation is certainly illuminating, I am hesitant to understand coming in water in this case to refer particularly to Jesus' baptism. While the connections between baptism and water are obvious, water in the Johannine tradition is more typically associated with eternal life, the living water offered to believers by Jesus (GJn 3:5; 4:10-14; 7:38). Furthermore, if the prepositions *διὰ* and *ἐν* are expressions of the *manner* in which Jesus came, it seems odd to locate that coming at such particular points in time (at Jesus' baptism and death). Interpretations of how it is Jesus "came" at the time of his death also seem forced.

Similarly, Smalley understands the water as a reference to Jesus' baptism and the blood as a reference to his death. He, however, sees the passage as correcting two separate "heresies;" that Jesus comes in water and in blood shows those that deny his humanity that he was in fact fully human and those that deny he was the Christ and fully God that he did in fact bring divine salvation and eternal life. While his explanation contributes to the soteriological understanding of the passage, the need for the interpretation to conform to his theory of two groups of opponents takes away from it. It is still unconvincing to me that in addressing an *internal* conflict the author of 1Jn is writing to oppose groups that deny Jesus' humanity or divinity. Smalley, *1 John*, 266.

While Lieu does not understand the passage to be an overt opposition to a specific group, she does seem most convinced by explanations of the text that read the water and the blood in more metaphorical

somehow with the spiritual element of Jesus' coming.⁹⁹ If I am right to conclude that the blood has continually been a reference to Jesus' earthly death and that the denial of Jesus coming "in flesh" also reflects a denial of the importance of his earthly life and death, then it follows that the water metaphor very plausibly reflects Jesus' spiritual coming, that is, his coming to give eternal life.¹⁰⁰ In fact, it is the Spirit itself that *witnesses* to Jesus' dual purpose, and not just any spirit, but the Spirit of truth. It would seem then, if this passage is read with 1Jn 4:1-6, the implication is likely that it is those who possess the spirit of falsehood that hold this limited view of Jesus' coming. Again, in spite of the fact that this particular passage is not accepted by a number of rhetorical scholars, this

ways and do not connect them to exact instances in the life of Jesus. She points to the soteriological importance of the passage, and reads the coming in water and blood as an expression of the benefits that Jesus brings with his coming and how those benefits are achieved. She contends that the author means to "reinforce the achievements and effects of the whole story of the Son of God, including his death," the life-giving water that Jesus offers is also available through his death. Lieu, *1 John*, 213. While I do not agree that this passage should be read without polemical force, I think Lieu's explanation of the text is very convincing. She does not ground the water reference in the specific act of Jesus' baptism, which seems appropriate given that Jesus' baptism is never explicitly narrated in GJn and arguably takes a backseat to associations between water and eternal life.

Von Wahlde, too, connects the water here not particularly to the baptism of Jesus, but to the purpose for which Jesus came-Spirit bestowal. The living water offered to believers by Jesus as an outpouring of the Spirit conveyed to them eternal life. In addition, though, von Wahlde contends that the author wishes not only to confirm that Jesus came for this purpose, but to emphasize that the gift of the Spirit is not the end of the story of salvation, a misunderstanding that the opponents of the author hold based on their reading of an early form of the text of GJn that highlighted the importance of Spirit bestowal and possession for eternal life. The soteriological function of Jesus' death, then, could have been overlooked. The coming in blood, therefore, is understood as a reference to Jesus' salvific death, which according to 1Jn cleanses believers from sin (1Jn 1:7). It is not Jesus' bestowal of the Spirit alone that conveys eternal life, but his death that was instrumental to the bestowal of the Spirit and to the atonement of believers. Von Wahlde, 3:191-192. Salvation in the Johannine tradition comes through both the Spirit and Jesus' death that releases that Spirit (GJn 20:22) and redemption comes through his blood sacrifice (GJn 1:29, 36; 6:53-56). Given the overall emphasis in the letter on Jesus' salvific function, a soteriological reading that interprets water and blood as the methods by which Jesus saves (the reason that he came) is persuasive.

⁹⁹ Grayston, *Epistles*, 19; von Wahlde, 3:192.

¹⁰⁰ For an overview of this metaphor in the Johannine literature and beyond, see von Wahlde, 3:187-188, 191-194.

reading makes sense when considering other accepted passages in those more skeptical views.

Conclusion to Chapter Four

What emerges from this analysis of the gift of the Spirit as the author of 1Jn and his opponents understand it is a variety of views that are more or less consistent with the conception of the eschatological Spirit of God in the Jewish Prophetic Literature and its interpretations. It is evident from the letter that the author holds a view of the Spirit that is first of all a gift given in the last hour, the eschatological Spirit of God that was looked forward to and predicted by the prophets and that other groups that interpret these texts understand themselves to possess. Second, the Spirit in 1Jn is described as being bestowed in a rather different way, in a partial or incomplete way. While there is some indication in a few texts that other apocalyptic groups understand the Spirit of God to be given in varied proportions, the majority of instances of eschatological Spirit bestowal more closely parallel the abundant outpouring or inputting of the Spirit common in the Jewish Prophetic Literature. Finally, the transformative effects that have begun to take place in this eschatological context are not fully complete or attributed solely to the gift of the Spirit in 1Jn. While there are certainly passages that suggest a connection between the reception of the Spirit of God and eschatological effects including knowledge of God (1Jn 2:20, 27), the ability to refrain from sin (1Jn 3:9), and a new relationship to God as God's children (1Jn 3:9), these effects are also attributed to the coming of Jesus, particularly to his death and subsequent presence among believers. Furthermore, these effects in the view of the author are nearly always described as being somehow incomplete; there is in each case a caveat that mitigates the totality of the transformation

of the believer. These mitigated or partial effects represent the typical belief of apocalyptic groups that interpret the Jewish Prophetic Literature. There seems to be a difference in understanding of effects that has developed between the predictions of future Spirit bestowal and the present possession of that Spirit by groups who see themselves as already having received the Spirit in the eschatological age. The totality of effects predicted to take place is typically interpreted as only being partially born out.

When examining the beliefs of the opponents (insofar as they can be revealed from the author's words) about the transformative effects of the Spirit, however, a conception that is closer to what is expressed in the Jewish Prophetic Literature emerges. For instance, it can be argued that the author warns against a position that 1) claims a possession of the Spirit that allows for continued (novel) knowledge and prophecy, 2) claims to have attained ethical perfection in some form, and 3) claims that the anointing negates the importance of Jesus as *the* Christ. Particularly with regards to the ethical perfectionism and the egalitarianism that results in the people's knowledge and relationship to God, the beliefs of the opponents concerning the transforming effects occurring at the eschaton bear a greater resemblance to those more traditional, canonical views of the Spirit presented in the Jewish Prophetic Literature than do the beliefs of those whom the author addresses.

The differences between the more traditional conception of Spirit bestowal and transformation reflected by the Jewish Prophetic Literature and held by the opponents and the unique conception of partial Spirit bestowal paired with a typically apocalyptic interpretation of partial transformation enacted by the reception of that Spirit that is held by the author of 1Jn necessitate some kind of explanation. While it seems evident why

the opponents of 1Jn might expect the full gift of the eschatological Spirit of God to result in complete transformative effects, given the depictions of Spirit bestowal in the Jewish Prophetic Literature, it is less obvious why so many instances in the apocalyptic interpretations of this literature only expect partial effects. It is even more curious as to how the author of 1Jn could interpret what is otherwise understood to be an abundant outpouring of the eschatological Spirit to result in an only partial possession of the Spirit by believers. Given the conclusions reached in these sections about the partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit in 1Jn, I turn now in my concluding chapter to positing reasons for the unique characteristics of this conception.

CHAPTER FIVE

EXPLANATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

As shown throughout this dissertation, the pneumatology of 1Jn is difficult to ascertain and relatively few commentators have produced a systematic understanding of the Spirit passages in the letter, particularly one that understands the schism with which the author is concerned as directly related to the opposing views about their possession of the Spirit. As shown in Chapter One, most look to a source outside of the group of Johannine believers (those believers to whom GJn was authoritative) in order to explain the issues that have given way to the departure of members of that group. In the previous chapters, I have argued first that the schism was in large part the result of varying understandings of the comprehensiveness of the gift of the Spirit and of its transformative effects, and second that the conception of eschatological Spirit bestowal in 1Jn is unique among conceptions of Spirit bestowal both in the Jewish Prophetic Literature and certain apocalyptic groups that interpret that literature. It is my contention that a partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit of God that leads to partial transformative effects is depicted nowhere else in the comparative literature and represents a move away from the abundant outpouring and complete transformation that was predicted by the prophets. A close examination of the literature has uncovered very few possible precedents for a partial gift of the Spirit of God to God's people in the end times.

For the most part, those who see the promises of the prophets as coming to fruition in their own time understand a full gift of the Spirit, but for many that fullness of

Spirit bestowal does not lead to a fullness of the transformative effects predicted in the Jewish Prophetic Literature. This partial transformation is actually quite common, but the partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit is much more rare.¹ Only two instances of possible partialness in the bestowal of the eschatological Spirit arise from the literature reviewed herein: the potential for the increase of the Spirit of holiness in 1QH 6.15 and the distributed outpouring of the Spirit in Acts 2:17-18. A distinction between the former and the conception of Spirit bestowal in 1Jn seems obvious. While the sense that human beings can have more or less of a holy spirit within them may have informed the concept of partialness of Spirit bestowal as seen in 1Jn, the increase of the Spirit of holiness in 1QH is an individual endowment and is used as an explanation for a person's better or worse behavior or understanding of God. In 1QH the spirit of holiness competes inside individuals with other negative spirits, so any increase or decrease in that spirit is

¹ Although Gunkel seems to find some element of partial bestowal in a number of verses, I would reject most of them as they are either not descriptions of the eschatological gift of the Spirit to the people of God or do not convey definitive partialness. Among the verses that Gunkel considers to reflect partial Spirit bestowal are Heb. 2:4, which states, "testifying together with God by signs and wonders and various miracles and by distributions of the Holy Spirit according to his will." While the word *μερισμός* literally means partition or separation, most translations of the text render it 'gifts' or 'distributed gifts,' likely because 'distributions' here seems to refer to those powers of the Holy Spirit that can be manifested by the believers who possess them. In keeping with the testimony of signs, wonders, and miracles, to understand these distributions as manifestations of the Holy Spirit and not a divided Holy Spirit itself makes more sense in context. I would, therefore, understand this text in much the same way I understand the variety of *χαρίματα* in 1Cor. 12:1-4, where the gifts are varied and distributed, but the Spirit from which they come is one and the same. Gunkel also contends that the use of the term *πλουσίως* in Titus 3:6 indicates that it is possible to give the Spirit sparingly (as opposed to abundantly). Such a reading goes beyond the text, which would seem simply to add a descriptive element to the outpouring and reinforce the fullness with which the Spirit is poured forth. Finally, Gunkel points to the description of being "filled with" the Spirit in Luke and Acts as indicative of differences in the amount (more or less) of Spirit which each person can hold according to his or her internal capacity. Even if this is the case, filling up with the Spirit still leads to a complete internal takeover of the person who receives the Spirit and does not denote a partial gift of the Spirit to that person. In addition, Gunkel cites Rom. 8:23 and "first fruits" of the Spirit as pointing towards partial Spirit bestowal. For reasons already set out in Section 3.3.3.1, I also reject this instance as one depicting a partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit. Gunkel, *Influence*, 42-43.

manifest in that person's knowledge and actions.² This does not seem to be the case in 1Jn, where human beings are only grouped into those who *have* the Spirit of truth within them because they have been given *of* God's Spirit and those who do not because the spirit they possess is false.³

Furthermore, because the comparative literature shows that a partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit can be gleaned from the text of LXX Joel 2:28-29, which is then reproduced in Acts 2:17-18, some scholars attempt to explain the conception of the partial bestowal of the Spirit in 1Jn by also linking it to the distribution of the Spirit from Moses to the seventy elders in Numbers 11.⁴ Such an argument does not take into

² That the spirit of holiness can exist in varying degrees inside human beings and that it competes for influence with other spirits of depravity could well be attributed to the eschatological expectations of the sect. As Collins explains, there seems to be a conception of a prolonged and ongoing experience of the end times, in which some of the blessings promised by the prophets were realized within the community, but the ultimate end was yet to come. Collins, "Expectation," 89-90. Because of this continuing process of salvation, members of the community could express a variety of behaviors over time, more or less ethical purity, that could be chalked up to one or another competing spirit controlling their behavior at any given time. It is not until the predicted day of visitation (at least according to 1QS) that a total purification and removal of sin can be expected, which is perhaps why the spirit of holiness exists in degrees in human beings.

³ The difference here is in the fact that while the bestowal of the Spirit is partial, the Spirit of Truth is not conceived of as battling other spirits that exist inside believers and exercise influence over them. Once they have partaken of God's Spirit, the Spirit of Truth remains within them, reiterating what they have heard from the beginning and assuring them of their fellowship with God and Christ. While the author of 1Jn also uses apocalyptic motifs, his understanding of true versus false spirits is explicitly dualistic, and he uses this apparent duality between those possessing the Spirit of Truth (believers) and those possessing the spirit of falsehood (antichrists) as an indication that it is not just the last days, but in fact the last hour that he and his audience are currently experiencing. The crisis and sharp divisions to which it has led are confirmation of the expected end time order. For an overview of the eschatology of 1Jn, see, Jörg Frey, "Remembering the Future—Eschatology in the Letters of John," in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents* (ed. Jan G. Van der Watt; WUNT 315; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 514-534; Cf. von Wahlde, 1:486-490.

⁴ Levison, *Filled*, 413-421, notes that the phrase "from the Spirit" is unique in early Jewish and Christian literature and contends that other writings describe God as giving the Spirit and not giving from the Spirit. As a result of this peculiarity, though, he argues that the instance in 1Jn 4:13 must draw upon the same phrase in Num. 11:25a as LXX Joel 3:1-2 (and therefore Acts 2:17-18) does. While it is true, as Levison argues, that the discussion of the Spirit in 4:13 follows a mention of the false prophets in 4:1 and instructions regarding testing the spirits in 4:1-6, the connection he seeks to make between prophecy and Spirit bestowal in 4:13 seems overstated. Levison's argument that Numbers 11 lies behind the partial

consideration, however, the multiple attempts by the author to distinguish the possession of the Spirit, anointing, and sonship of believers from that of Jesus. I would argue that the partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit in 1Jn has more to do with these concerns, all of which are related to one another, than it does some notion of “eccentric, if not outlandish” possession of the Spirit akin to that of Jesus that has led to the complete transformation of believers into prophets like Moses.⁵ According to 1Jn, teaching must

bestowal of the Spirit in 1Jn relies heavily on his idea that it is the author of 1Jn (and not the opponents) that has an “outlandish” claim of Spirit possession, understanding his and his audience’s anointing as being on the same level as the anointing that took place at Jesus’ baptism and therefore inspiring prophetic abilities that negate any need for acquired knowledge. While there is some connection to prophetic utterances in 4:1-6, the discussion turns at 1Jn 4:7 to believers’ experience of love. 1Jn 4:13 describes the mutual abiding that results from love and the gift of the Spirit that assures believers of that abiding. The verse itself seems to have little to do with the spiritual gift of prophecy as the passages from Joel and Acts clearly do. Furthermore, given that both the LXX texts of Num. 11:17, 25a and Joel 3:1-2 use the preposition *ἀπό* with the genitive, the construction of *ἐκ* with the genitive in 1Jn 4:13 sets it apart linguistically. If the author of 1Jn wanted to make a clear connection between the narrative of gift of Moses’ Spirit to the seventy elders, there would seem to be a better way to do so, as the author of Acts does. In addition, it is my contention that the author of 1Jn wishes to steer believers away from the notion that their possession of the Spirit is on the same level as that of Christ and that it allows them to prophesy free of any restrictions. The prophecy of those who truly possess part of God’s Spirit in 1Jn are identified by their proclamations that Jesus is *the* Christ, *the* Son, that which they have been taught since the beginning. As a result, I reject Levison’s argument concerning 1Jn’s background in Numbers 11, but very much appreciate his acknowledgment of the uniqueness of the conception of the partial bestowal of the eschatological Spirit in 1Jn.

⁵ Con. Levison, *Filled*, 417-420. Levison understands the claims that “you all know” in 1Jn 2:20 and “you do not need anyone to teach you” in 1Jn 2:27 to have universal application for the audience of 1Jn and therefore contends that members of this “community of truth” repudiate all education and acquired knowledge. As a number of other scholars point out, however, the idea that the author means for teaching of any kind to be completely eliminated is problematic. See Brown, *Epistles*, 376; Smalley, *1 John*, 118-119; Lieu, *1 John*, 112-113. The letter itself is arguably a device for human teaching, in which the author instructs his audience on tenants of the faith, albeit mainly reiterating what they have known “from the beginning” (1:1; 2:7, 24 [x2]; 3:11). Cf. Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 149. While it may be the case that the author means to prohibit *new* teaching, teaching that is different from those ideas that he sees as firmly grounding the faith and perhaps it is better to call their proclamations ‘witness’ instead of ‘teaching’, to assume that he advocates doing away with any kind of intellectual inquiry and assumes authority to make claims that are “less moored to the person of Jesus” than in GJn seems overreaching. Con. Levison, *Filled*, 419. Furthermore, these passages regarding teaching and knowledge are more easily explained if the letter is understood as a response to the crisis faced by the author, as warnings concerning believing the alternative teachings about GJn that the opponents have accepted (Brown, *Epistles*, 374-376; Painter, *1 John*, 209), or as simply a way to assure them that it is the anointing (the Spirit) that allows them to be certain about the knowledge that they already have and that this anointing is the *true teacher* of all things (Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, 149; von Wahlde, 3:97).

always be grounded in the words and deeds of Jesus, and the reception of the Spirit does not give recipients the authority to prophesy however they choose. In fact, it would seem that it is just this kind of *carte blanche* prophecy and exaggerated view of Spirit possession that the author means to condemn and correct. Jesus, however, is the conduit of the Spirit to believers in the Johannine tradition,⁶ and so it is not totally out of the question that the *idea* that one individual who fully possesses the Spirit could distribute it (or have it distributed) to others has its roots in the story about Moses and the elders.

If it is correct to see the opponents as one-time members of the anointed group who have an alternative understanding of the quantity and effects of their own Spirit possession, how can this alternative understanding be explained? One explanation is that they accept at face value the predictions about the eschatological bestowal of God's Spirit in the Jewish Prophetic Literature. As shown in Chapter Two, the expectations of the prophets were generally that when the Spirit of God was given to God's people at the end of the age, that Spirit would be given abundantly and would enact in its recipients a total transformation of their knowledge, behavior, purity, and ability to prophesy. For a group that sees itself as living in the eschaton and having received the Spirit that God has promised them, such an assumption of complete possession and transformation is not unreasonable. Particularly given the undertone of very realized eschatology throughout much of GJn, the fact that a group accepting that text as authoritative would expect the

⁶ According to GJn, it is Jesus who distributes the Spirit that remains on him at his baptism (GJn 1:32-34) to his followers after his glorification on the cross (GJn 7:37-39; 19:30; 20:22). See Gary M. Burge, "Chapter 9: The Gospel of John," in *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit* (eds. Trevor J. Burke and Keith Warrington; Eugene: Cascade Books, 2014), 104-111; cf. von Wahlde, 1:206.

fullness of God's eschatological promises to be realized through the gift of the Spirit is not at all improbable.⁷

The author of 1Jn, then, likely also means to correct the overemphasis on realized eschatology that the opponents espouse. If it is the case, as I argue in Chapter Four, that the opponents overestimate their possession of the Spirit to be on the same level as Jesus' possession of the Spirit, then such a corrective might be expected. Understanding the eschatological bestowal of the Spirit and their transformation to be complete would mean a full realization of all of God's Scriptural promises. As I have also shown in Chapter Four, however, the author of 1Jn mediates this understanding, going to great lengths to distinguish believers who have been anointed with the Spirit from Jesus in a variety of ways. Believers have not yet fully transformed in the estimation of the author, and they await a future time at which they "will be like him" (3:2). Throughout 1Jn, there is an emphasis on how believers are at this point still distinct from Jesus in respect to their relationship to God, their knowledge, and their purity. The author looks forward to the time of Jesus' coming, at which point believers' transformations will be complete; while their process of becoming Christ-like has begun with their own anointing and they have already been born of God as God's children, there is yet more to come at the future coming of *the* Christ, *the (unique)* Son, of God.

It is important to note that most of the comparative literature reviewed in Chapter Three agrees with the author of 1Jn, at least in its depiction of the partialness of transformative effects and the not yet fully realized eschatology. Even though such an

⁷ Most scholars acknowledge a strand of strongly realized eschatology in GJn, an eschatology that many times seems more *already* than *not yet*. See Burge, "Gospel," 111-112; von Wahlde, 1:483-486; Brown, *John I-XII*, cxvii; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 159-160.

understanding seems to depart from predictions made by the prophets, the idea that while the eschatological Spirit has been received already, the full effects of that Spirit have not yet come to fruition is the most common understanding found in the literature of apocalyptic groups, especially those groups who believe that Jesus is the Messiah. For these Christ believers, the full transformation of the Spirit cannot take effect until Christ returns or until their own deaths allow them to fully participate in Christ's resurrection. The focus of many of these groups leans towards the *not yet* side of the eschatological equation. In fact, it would seem from reviewing the variety of literature that those groups of Christ believers who hold the most realized eschatologies also tout the fullest effects of the Spirit.⁸ It makes sense, then, that a gospel such as GJn with all its references to realized eschatology, particularly such explicit assurance that believers "have life" already (GJn 3:36; 5:24, 40; 6:47, 54; 8:12), could be easily understood as supporting a believer's full possession of the Spirit and the transformative effects that such possession ensures.

For the author of 1Jn and his audience, the need to lessen the focus on realized eschatology and make clear distinctions between believers and Christ with respect to anointing, sonship, and relationship to God likely stems from the crisis at hand. It is my contention that those who have gone out from the group overestimate their possession of God's Spirit and the fullness of eschatological transformation it enacts. They claim to

⁸ This certainly seems to be the case with the text of Acts 2, in which the reception of the Spirit (even when it is bestowed in a partial way) leads to the full ability to prophecy as predicted by the text of Joel. For arguments that uphold the realized eschatology of Acts 2 see Bock, *Acts*, 174. Cf. John Noland, "Chapter 4: Salvation History and Eschatology," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* eds. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 73, who notes the "pervasive sense of eschatological fulfillment" in Acts 1-2. Other commentators also point to the general sense of realized eschatology throughout Acts, see Larkin, *Acts*, 23-24; Schnabel, *Acts*, 1088-1089.

have received the Spirit in full, in the same quantity as Jesus had, and therefore to be transformed into fully righteous, knowledgeable sons of God. In order to refute the claims of the opponents, claims that seem to actually fit with an understanding of the outpouring of the eschatological Spirit of God presented in the Jewish Prophetic Literature, the author of 1Jn focuses his treatise largely on the person of Jesus, making it clear that he is unique among the anointed and that it is his death (and not the gift of the Spirit) that atones for sin. In addition, it seems that the author is attempting to argue for a lesser Spirit endowment for believers by describing a partial bestowal of the Spirit and clarifying that the result of that partialness is that believers are not fully transformed in righteousness, knowledge, and sonship, at least not to the extent that Jesus possesses these characteristics.

If, however, the partialness of transformation is a common trait among most of the comparative literature reviewed throughout this dissertation, it leads to the question of why each of the groups producing this literature, in spite of understanding themselves as having already received the outpouring of the eschatological Spirit promised by the prophets, would not understand the transformative effects to be complete (as promised by the prophets). The answer may lie not in any systematized pneumatology or mapping and checking off of expectations traced from the Jewish Prophetic Literature down through the apocalyptic groups behind the Dead Sea Scrolls, New Testament, and Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Rather, the pneumatologies of these groups may be better

attributed to their *experiences* of the Spirit, understandings built on what they observe taking place around them.⁹

Therefore, having witnessed and experienced the schism among his own group of believers, the author of 1Jn provides an explanation for and corrective to that situation. The partialness of the transformative effects of the Spirit could be viewed all around: false proclamation from within (2:22-23, 26; 3:7a; 4:1-6, 20), continued misbehavior (1:6, 8-10; 2:1-2, 4, 9, 11; 3:4, 7b, 10, 15; 5:16-17), and a split among believers as a result of these issues (2:18-19). The explanation for this enduring hardship is that the transformative effects promised by the prophets had not yet come to full fruition. While they had begun to witness the love and fellowship that resulted from their gift of the Spirit, they could not yet claim the same righteousness, knowledge, and relationship to God that Christ had. Their endowment of the Spirit was lesser than his, and therefore they did not witness the fullness of the effects of that Spirit among themselves that Jesus manifested during his time on earth. While he possessed the Spirit without measure (GJn 3:34b), believers had been given *of* the Spirit (1Jn 4:13), resulting in a distinction between the way the gifts of the Spirit could be seen in Christ and the way the gifts of the Spirit could be seen in them. Because they did not experience or witness their own complete transformations after they had received the eschatological Spirit, there must be more to come and they must not have received the Spirit in the same way that Christ had.

⁹ Frey convincingly makes the suggestion that much of early Christian pneumatology was experiential before it was theological. He applies this notion to Pauline pneumatology, noting that while Paul was the first early Christian author to produce a theology of the Spirit this theology was based in experience. He writes of Paul, "His views are, however, hard to systematize, for different reasons. First, they are still fluid, developing, depending on his own experiences and also phrased in reaction to the phenomena he had to deal with in his communities..." Frey, "Paul's View," 244. I contend that something similar to this is going on in developing the concept of the Spirit in 1Jn.

In other words, there was no way for them to claim full possession of the Spirit of God if they did not see the full transformative effects promised by that Spirit being manifest among themselves.

These conclusions open discussion on a few important topics for Johannine literature and beyond. First of all, that it is the opponents that seem to have a more straightforward understanding of the fulfillment of prophetic promises and implications of realized eschatology brings to the fore the idea that alternative understandings of authoritative texts by those who were deemed ‘anti-orthodox’ or ‘heretical’ were at times very reasonable and consistent readings of those texts. Taken at face value, the Jewish Prophetic Literature is relatively uniform and obvious in its expectations for the outpouring of God’s eschatological Spirit on the people of God; it predicts an abundant bestowal and a total transformation. It is actually the opponents who adhere more closely to the conception of the bestowal of the Spirit presented in the canonical texts of Judaism, while 1Jn seems much more influenced by aspects of apocalyptic viewpoints.¹⁰ Paired with GJn, a gospel that has a strong emphasis on realized eschatology and the fulfilled promises of Spirit bestowal, the viewpoint of the opponents is entirely logical and explicable given the authoritative texts from which this group of outliers draws its conception of the Spirit.

The fact that this viewpoint can be explained without appealing to some outside influence like Gnosticism, Docetism, or Cerinthianism is another important point. The conclusions drawn here serve to support the notion that the crisis being addressed by the letter is the product of internal conflict, not of a conflict between the Johannine Christ

¹⁰ Von Wahlde, *Gnosticism*, 123-124.

believers and some unidentifiable group with separate beliefs and different authoritative texts. If it can be successfully argued that the conflict is explained by elements internal to the Johannine Christ believers then there is no longer any need to appeal to these alternative belief systems for explanations. Furthermore, acknowledging that the conflict stems entirely from internal concerns aids in a better overall understanding of the concept of the eschatological bestowal of the Spirit in 1Jn and the divisions that arose based on alternative interpretations of that concept. It also helps in seeing the development of the concept of the Spirit in the Johannine tradition more generally.

Finally, while it might seem a simple or obvious explanation, conclusions concerning experiential pneumatology should not be undervalued. While there is certainly an element of systematic and textually-based pneumatology to be found in 1Jn, the core of that pneumatology must be grounded in the believers' experiences of the Spirit. No appeal to what *should* be the case in light of textual evidence can replace what believers observe to be taking place in their own time. In spite of expectations about the quantity and effects of the eschatological bestowal of the Spirit that could be gleaned from their authoritative texts, the author of 1Jn depicts these expectations differently. The concept of Spirit bestowal in 1Jn draws from both canonical and apocalyptic Judaism, a hybrid concept that can be explained by the situation in which the author of 1Jn finds himself and his audience. The uniqueness of his depiction, the eschatological Spirit of God that is bestowed partially and has partial effects, is likely a product of how that bestowal has been experienced by believers and the need for correction (at least in the mind of the author) of alternative understandings of the Spirit that have split his community apart.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Leslie C. *Ezekiel 20-48*. Vol. 28. WBC. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990.
- Allen, Leslie C. *Jeremiah: A Commentary*. Louisville: John Knox, 2008.
- Anderson, A. A. "The Use Of "Ruah" In 1Qs, 1Qh And 1Qm." *JSS* 7 no. 2 (1962): 293-303.
- Assis, Eliyahu. *The Book of Joel: A Prophet between Calamity and Hope*. Edited by Claudia V. Camp and Andrew Mein. Vol. 581. LHB/OTS. New York: T&T Clark, 2013.
- Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Hermenia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Aune, David Edward. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Baker, David W., ed. *Looking into the Future: Evangelical Studies in Eschatology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Bakon, Shimon. "The Day of the Lord." *JBQ* 38 no. 3 (July 2010): 149-56.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Shorter Commentary*. New York: T&T Clark, 2002.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles Volume 1: 1-14*. ICC. New York: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.
- Bøe, Sverre. *Gog and Magog: Ezekiel 38-39 as Pre-text for Revelation 19,17-21 and 20,7-10*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Beale, G. K. "The Old Testament Background to the 'Last Hour' in 1Jn 2,18." *Biblica* 92, no. 2 (2011): 231-54.

- Berges, Ulrich. *The Book of Isaiah: Its Composition and Final Form*. Translated by Millard Lind. Vol. 46. HBM. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012.
- Bertone, John. "The Function of the Spirit in the Dialectic Between God's Soteriological Plan Enacted But Not Yet Culminated: Romans 8.1-27." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 7, no. 15 (1999): 75-97.
- Block, Daniel I. "Gog and the Pouring Out of the Spirit." *Vetus Testamentum* 37, no. 3 (1987): 257-70.
- Block, Daniel I. "The Prophet of the Spirit: The Use of Rwh in the Book of Ezekiel." *JEIJ* 32, no. 1 (1989): 27-49.
- Block, Daniel Isaac. *The Book of Ezekiel Chapters 25-48*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Acts*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke: The NIV Application Commentary from Biblical Text--to Contemporary Life*. NAC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes., Helmer Ringgren, John T. Willis, Heinz-Josef Fabry, David E. Green, and Douglas W. Stott. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Vol. 6. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Botterweck, Gerhard Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and John Thomas Willis, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Vol. 15. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Botterweck, Gerhard Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and John Thomas Willis. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Vol. 11. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Botterweck, Gerhard Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and John Thomas Willis. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Vol. 13. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Bray, Gerald Lewis., ed. *James, 1-2 Peter, 1-3 John, Jude*. Vol. XI. ACCS New Testament. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Brooke, Alan England. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1912.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.

- Brown, Raymond E. *The Epistles of John*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John (i-xii): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Vol. 29. ABC. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966.
- Bruce, F. F. *1 & 2 Thessalonians*. WBC. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Revised Edition*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistles of John*. London: Pickering & Inglis, 1970.
- Burge, Gary M. *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Burke, Trevor J., and Keith Warrington. *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Eugene: Cascade Books, 2014.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 2001.
- Clement. *Clemens Alexandrinus*. Edited by Otto Stählin and L. Früchtel. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1970.
- Clement. *Protrepticus Und Paedagogus*. Edited by Otto Stählin. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1905.
- Clement. *Clemens Alexandrinus*. Edited by Otto Stählin. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich, 1906.
- Coetzee, J. C. "The Holy Spirit in 1 John." *Neotestamentica* 13, no. Studies in the Johannine Letters (January 1979): 43-67.
- Cohick, Lynn H. *Ephesians: A New Covenant Commentary*. NCCS. Eugene: Cascade Books, 2010.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Collins, John J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. SPS. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Cosgrove, Charles H. *The Cross and the Spirit: A Study in the Argument and Theology of Galatians*. Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1988.

- Crane, Ashley S. *Israel's Restoration: A Textual-comparative Exploration of Ezekiel 36-39*. Vol. 122. VTSupp. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Culpepper, Alan R. *The Gospel and Letters of John*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.
- De Jonge, Marinus. *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*. SVTP. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- De La Potterie, Ignace, and Stanislas Lyonnet. *The Christian Lives by the Spirit*. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1971.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Johannine Epistles*. New York: Harper, 1946.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Christ and the Spirit: Volume 2 Pneumatology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Edwards, Ruth B. *The Johannine Epistles*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Emmrich, Martin. "Hebrews 6:4-6...Again! (A Pneumatological Inquiry)." *WTJ* 65, no. 1 (Spring 2003): 83-95.
- Evans, Craig A., and Peter W. Flint, eds. *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Everson, A. Joseph. "The Days of Yahweh." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93, no. 3 (1974): 329-37.
- Fee, Gordon D. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Fiore, Benjamin. *The Pastoral Epistles: First Timothy, Second Timothy, Titus*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2007.
- Firth, David G., and Paul D. Wegner, eds. *Presence, Power, and Promise: The Role of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Vol. 31. ABC. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Freidrich, Gerhard, ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament: Vol. 7. Edited by G. Freidrich ; Edited and Translated by G.W.Bromiley*. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.

Frestadius, Simo. "The Spirit and Wisdom in 1 Corinthians 2:1-13." *JBPR* 3 (2011): 52-70.

Friedrich, Gerhard, and Geoffrey Bromiley, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament: Vol.5. Edited by G. Friedrich ; Edited and Translated by G.W.Bromiley*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

Gowan, Donald E. *Eschatology in the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.

Grayston, Kenneth. *The Johannine Epistles: Based on the Revised Standard Version*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

Griffith, Terry. "A Non-Polemical Reading of 1Jn: Sin, Christology and the Limits of Johannine Christology." *TynBul* 49, no. 2 (1998): 253-76.

Gunkel, Hermann. *The Influence of the Holy Spirit: The Popular View of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul: A Biblical-theological Study*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Hahn, Roger L. "Pneumatology in Romans 8: Its Historical and Theological Contexts." *WTJ* 21, no. 1-2 (1986): 74-90.

Hamilton, James M. *God's Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old & New Testaments*. Edited by E. Ray. Clendenen. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2006.

Harding, Mark. "Disputed and Undisputed Letters of Paul." Edited by Stanley Porter. *The Pauline Canon*, 2004, 129-68.

Heil, John Paul. "Ephesians 5:18b 'But Be Filled in the Spirit'" *CBQ* 69 (July 1, 2007): 506-516.

Henze, Matthias, ed. *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

Hildebrandt, Wilf. *An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995.

Himmelfarb, Martha. "Impurity And Sin In 4Qd, 1Qs, And 4Q512." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8, no. 1 (2001): 9-37.

Hoehner, Harold W. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.

- Hoffmann, Yair. "The Day of the Lord as a Concept and a Term in the Prophetic Literature." *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93, no. 1 (1981): 37-50.
- Hollander, Harm W., and M. De Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. SVTP. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Holmes, Michael W. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999.
- Houlden, J. L. *A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- Hultgård, Anders. *L'eschatologie Des Testaments Des Douze Patriarches*. AUU Historia Religionum. Uppsala Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1982.
- Hyatt, James Philip. "The View of Man in the Qumran 'Hodayot'." *NTS* 2, no. 04 (1956): 276-84.
- Irenaeus. *Libros Quinque Adversus Haereses: Textu Graeco in Locis Nonnullis Locupletato, Versione Latina Cum Codicibus Claromontano Ac Arundeliano Donuo Collata, Praemissa De Placitis Gnosticorum Prolusione*. Edited by William Wigan Harvey, STB. Vol. 2. Cantabrigiae: Typis Academicis, 1857.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Joyce, Paul M. *Ezekiel: A Commentary*. Vol. 482. LHB/OTS. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Juncker, Günther H. "'Children of the Promise' : Spiritual Paternity and Patriarch Typology in Galatians and Romans." *BBR* 17, no. 1 (2007): 131-160.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Keener, Craig S. *1-2 Corinthians*. NCBC. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Keener, Craig S. *Romans: A New Covenant Commentary*. NCCS. Eugene: Cascade, 2009.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997.

- Kerry, Stephen. "An Exegetical Analysis of Galatians 3:1-5 with Particular Reference to Pneumatological Themes That Relate to the Onset and Continuation of Christian Identity with Respect to the Law and Gospel." *JBPR* 2 (2010): 57-74.
- Kingsbury, J. D. "Luke 24:44-49." *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 35, no. 2 (April 01, 1981): 170-74.
- Kittel, Gerhard, G. W. Bromiley, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 Vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Der Erste Johannesbrief*. EKK. Zürich: Benziger, 1991.
- Klein, Anja. "Prophecy Continued: Reflections on Innerbiblical Exegesis in the Book of Ezekiel." *Vetus Testamentum* 60 (2010): 571-82.
- Knibb, Michael A., Charlotte Hempel, and Judith Lieu, eds. *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Koester, Craig R. *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. 36. ABC. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Kruse, Colin G. *2 Corinthians*. TNTC. Grand Rapids: IVP Academic, 2008.
- Kruse, Colin G. *The Letters of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Kuecker, Aaron J. *The Spirit and the 'other': Social Identity, Ethnicity and Intergroup Reconciliation in Luke-Acts*. LNTS. New York: T&T Clark International, 2011.
- Kysar, Robert. *I, II, III John*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.
- Lambrecht, Jan. *Second Corinthians*. SPS. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Larkin, William J. *Acts*. Edited by D. Stuart. Briscoe and Haddon W. Robinson. IVP New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1995.
- Law, Robert. *The Tests of Life, a Study of the First Epistle of St. John*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1909.
- Lebram, Jürgen-Christian, and J. W. Van Henten, eds. *Tradition and Re-interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honour of Jürgen C.H. Lebram*. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- Levison, John R. *Filled with the Spirit*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Lieu, Judith. *The Gospel of Luke*. Epworth Commentaries. Peterborough, UK: Epworth Press, 1997.

- Lieu, Judith. *I, II & III John: A Commentary*. Louisville: John Knox, 2008.
- Lieu, Judith. "The Nature and Character of Dualism in the Johannine Corpus." *Phronema* 14 (January 1, 1999): 18-28.
- Lieu, Judith. *The Theology of the Johannine Epistles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Loader, William R. G. *The Johannine Epistles*. London: Epworth Press, 1992.
- Lust, J., ed. *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*. Vol. 74. BETL. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peters, 1986.
- Lust, Johan. "Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript." *CBQ* 43 (1981): 517-33.
- Lust, Johan. "The Spirit of the Lord, or the Wrath of the Lord? Ezekiel 39,29." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 78, no. 1 (April 2002): 148-55.
- Mansoor, Menahem. *The Thanksgiving Hymns*. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- Marshall, I. Howard., and David Peterson, eds. *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Epistles of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Martínez, Florentino García, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Martínez, Florentino García, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. Vol. 2. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Matthewson, Dave. "Reading Heb 6:4-6 in Light of the Old Testament." *WTJ* 61 (1999): 209-25.
- Menken, M. J. J. *2 Thessalonians*. NTR. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Meyer, P. W. "The Holy Spirit in the Pauline Letters: A Contextual Exploration." *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 33, no. 1 (January 1979): 3-18.
- Mihalios, Stefanos. *The Danielic Eschatological Hour in the Johannine Literature*. LNTS 436. New York: T&T Clark, 2011.
- Mills, Donald W. "The Holy Spirit in 1 John." *DBSJ* 4 (Fall 1999): 33-50.

- Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville: John Knox, 1993.
- Montague, George T. *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition*. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.
- Moo, Douglas J. *Galatians*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Morgan, David M. "Ezekiel and the Twelve: Similar Concerns as an Indication of a Shared Tradition." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 20, no. 3 (2010): 377-96.
- Mullins, Michael. *Gospel of Luke: A Commentary*. Blackrock, Co Dublin: Columba Press, 2010.
- Nardoni, Enrique. "The Concept of Charism in Paul." *CBQ* 55 (1993): 68-80.
- O'Brien, Peter Thomas. *The Letter to the Hebrews*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- O'Neill, J. C. *The Puzzle of 1 John: A New Examination of Origins*. London: S.P.C.K., 1966.
- Painter, John. *1, 2, and 3 John*. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Vol. 18. SPS. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2002.
- Painter, John. "The Opponents in 1 John." *NTS* 32, no. 1 (1986): 48-71.
- Peppard, Michael. "Adopted and Begotten Sons of God: Paul and John on Divine Sonship." *CBQ* 73, no. 1 (January 2011): 92-110.
- Perkins, Pheme. *The Johannine Epistles*. Wilmington: M. Glazier, 1979.
- Peterson, David. *The Acts of the Apostles*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Philip, Finny. *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology: The Eschatological Bestowal of the Spirit upon Gentiles in Judaism and in the Early Development of Paul's Theology*. WUNT. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Plummer, Alfred. *The Epistles of St. John*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.
- Popović, Mladen. "Anthropology, Pneumatology, and Demonology in Early Judaism: The Two Spirits Treatise (1QS III, 13-IV, 26) and Other Texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls." Academia.edu. 2010. Accessed September 27, 2015.
http://www.academia.edu/2374108/Anthropology_Pneumatology_and_Demonology

gy_in_Early_Judaism_The_Two_Spirits_Treatise_1QS_III_13_IV_26_and_Other_Texts_from_the_Dead_Sea_Scrolls.

Porter, Stanley E., ed. *The Pauline Canon*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Quinn, Jerome D. *The Letter to Titus: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary and an Introduction to Titus, I and II Timothy, the Pastoral Epistles*. Vol. 35. ABC. New York: Doubleday, 1990.

Reinhartz, Adele. "And the Word Was Begotten: Divine Epigenesis in the Gospel of John." *Semina* 85 (1999): 83-103.

Rey, Jean-Sébastien, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Rhymer, David. "Jeremiah 31:31-34." *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 59, no. 3 (July 01, 2005): 294-97.

Robson, James. *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*. Vol. 447. LHBO. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.

Ruckstuhl, Eugen. *Die Literarische Einheit Des Johannesevangeliums: Der Gegenwärtige Stand Der Einschlägigen Forschungen ; Im Anhang: Liste Der Johanneischen Stilmerkmale Mit Allen Belegstellen Aus Dem Johanneischen Schrifttum ; Sprache Und Stil Im Johanneischen Schrifttum ; Die Frage Ihrer Einheit Und Einheitlichkeit*. NTOA. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.

Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Acts*. ZEC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John Volume I*. Translated by Kevin Smyth. New York: Herder & Herder, 1968.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Johannine Epistles: Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Crossroad, 1992.

Sekki, Arthur Everett. *The Meaning of Ruach at Qumran*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Singh, Yii-Jan. "Semen, Philosophy, and Paul." *JPS* 4, no. 2 (Spring 2007): 32-45.

Sloyan, Gerard S. *Walking in the Truth: Perseverers and Deserters: The First, Second, and Third Letters of John*. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.

Smalley, Stephen S. *1, 2, 3 John*. Waco: Word Books, 1984.

Smith, D. Moody. *First, Second, and Third John*. Louisville: John Knox, 1991.

- Smith, D. Moody. *John*. ANTC. Nashville: Abington Press, 1999.
- Staab, Karl. "Die Griechischen Katenenkommentare Zu Den Katholischen Briefen." *Biblica* 5, no. 3-4 (1924): 296-353.
- Stone, Michael E., ed. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. CRINT. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1984.
- Strecker, Georg, and Harold W. Attridge. *The Johannine Letters: A Commentary on 1, 2, and 3 John*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Ephesians and Colossians*. PCNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Tertullianus, Q. Septimius Florens. *Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Adversus Praxean Liber: Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*. Edited by Ernest Evans. London: SPCK, 1948.
- Thielman, Frank. *Ephesians*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Thomas, Rodney. "The Seal of the Spirit and the Religious Climate of Ephesus." *Restoration Quarterly* 43, no. 3 (2001): 155-166.
- Thompson, J. A. *The Book of Jeremiah*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Thüsing, Wilhelm. *The Three Epistles of St. John*. Translated by David Smith. New York: Herder and Herder, 1971.
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J. C. "Historical Origins of the Early Christian Concept of the Holy Spirit: Perspectives from the Dead Sea Scrolls." Academia.edu. 2014. Accessed September 27, 2015.
http://www.academia.edu/8214277/Historical_Origins_of_the_Early_Christian_Concept_of_the_Holy_Spirit_perspectives_from_the_Dead_Sea_Scrolls.
- Timmer, Daniel. "Variegated Nomism Indeed: Multiphase Eschatology and Soteriology in the Qumranite Community Rule (1QS) and the New Perspective on Paul." *JETS* 52, no. 2 (June 2009): 341-56.
- Tobin, Thomas H. *Paul's Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Towner, Philip H. *1-2 Timothy & Titus*. IVP. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1994.

- Tuppurainen, Riku P. "The Contribution of Socio-Rhetorical Criticism to Spirit-Sensitive Hermeneutics: A Contextual Example—Luke 11:13." *JBPR* 4 (September 2012): 38-66.
- Turner, Max. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. JPTSup. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Van Der Woude, A. S., ed. *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993.
- Vellanickal, Matthew. *The Divine Sonship of Christians in the Johannine Writings*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977.
- Vermès, Géza, ed. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London: Penguin, 2011.
- Von Wahlde, Urban C. *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Von Wahlde, Urban C. *Gnosticism, Docetism, and the Judaisms of the First Century: The Search for the Wider Context of Johannine Literature and Why It Matters*. LNTS 517. New York: T&T Clark, 2015.
- Von Wahlde, Urban C. *The Gospel and Letters of John*. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Von Wahlde, Urban C. *The Johannine Commandments: 1 John and the Struggle for the Johannine Tradition*. New York: Paulist Press, 1990.
- Wall, Robert W. *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*. THNCT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Wall, Robert W. "'Purity and Power' According to The Acts of the Apostles." *Pneuma* 34, no. 1 (Spring 1999): 215-31.
- Watt, Jan G. Van Der., ed. *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. *The Epistles of St. John: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays by Brooke Foss Westcott: 3. Ed.* Cambridge and London: MacMillan and Company, 1892.
- Witherington, Ben, III. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Socio-rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Witherington, Ben. *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Louisville: John Knox, 1995.

Witherington, Ben. *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006.

Wong, Ka Leung. "The Masoretic and Septuagint Texts of Ezekiel 39,21-29." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 78, no. 1 (April 2002): 130-47.

Woodcock, 139-163. "The Seal of the Holy Spirit." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 155 (April 1998): 139-163.

Xeravits, Géza G. *Dualism in Qumran*. New York: T&T Clark International, 2010.

VITA

Lauren T. O'Connell was born and raised in Barrington, Illinois. Before attending Loyola University Chicago, she attended the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where she earned a Bachelor of Arts in Journalism, in 2004. From 2006 to 2008, she also attended the University of Chicago, where she received a Master of Arts in Religion at the Divinity School.

While at Loyola, Dr. O'Connell was nominated for the Provost's Award for Excellence in Teaching Freshman and awarded a Pre-Doctoral Teaching Fellowship by the Graduate School in the 2013-2014 academic year. In the course of that fellowship, she helped run the Teaching Effectiveness Seminar, which is required preparation for all CAS graduate student teachers.

Dr. O'Connell currently holds a full-time teaching position in Loyola's Department of Theology.

