

# How did the Spirit become a Person?

---

For English language writers, it is a crucial question when to write “spirit” in the lower case or in the upper case. Other languages do not have such a distinction; nor can orthography decide upon an issue of traditional Christian doctrine. But the issue pertains to any language, whenever the spirit is the subject of discussion: When do we mean “spirit” in the sense of spirit or spiritual being(s), and when do we mean the unique divine Spirit, the Holy Spirit, or even the third person of the Trinity? Do we consider the spirit/Spirit neutral (‘it’), male (‘He’), or – with regard to the Hebrew word רוח (*ru<sup>a</sup>h*) – even female (‘She’)?

## 1. Development within the Divine? A Theological Introduction

With regard to the biblical tradition things are not quite as clear as one might assume: Is it true that, whenever a divine spirit is mentioned in the Bible, this is the Spirit of Christ, that gives liberty (2 Cor 3:17), enables us to pray (Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6) or leads the church in all truth (John 16:13), the ‘Holy Spirit’ and third person of the Trinity?

The problems are obvious with regard to the Hebrew Bible: In Israel’s Scriptures, there is no Trinitarian concept of God. The ‘vestiges of the trinity’ as presupposed by the church fathers<sup>1</sup> are unconvincing for present interpreters. What does this mean for the concept of the Spirit? Can we actually assume that the spirit that empowered the judges to violence<sup>2</sup> or the ecstatic spirit that ‘infected’ Saul’s messengers (1 Sam 19:20) was the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity? There is good reason to say that these manifestations of spirit are at best a kind of empowerment or dynamics but do not point to a personal reality. And what about the spirit/Spirit hovering over the waters in the creation account (Gen 1:2)? Is it mere potentiality, a creative power or already a divine person, pre-existent as the Logos of John 1:1? Things may become somewhat different when the prophetic messenger in Isa 61:1 says that “The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me” – a saying quoted again by Jesus in Luke 4:18. But even the Spirit inspiring the prophets or empowering the Messiah is conceptually different from the Spirit sent by the exalted Lord, to act as he did, to ‘replace’ him (John 14:16) and to teach them the true understanding of himself (14:26).

Thus, in the biblical tradition, even without regard to extra-biblical or history-of-religions aspects, there are quite different concepts of the Spirit. How can these differences be explained, historically and theologically? Is there a development, from the lower to the higher, from a rather diffuse and unclear notion of ‘spiritual realities’ to a more distinct view of the divine, from a mere ‘dynamic’ to a ‘personal’ view of the Spirit? Does the divine Spirit ‘develop’, does it or he (or she) ‘become’ a person?

---

<sup>1</sup> Thus, e.g., the visit of the three “men” to Abraham Gen 18:2, the triads in the threefold blessing Num 6:24-26 and the *trishagion* Isa 6:3, or the plural form “Let us make man in our image” in Gen 1:26. Cf. Manfred Oeming, “Vestigia trinitatis? Vorahnungen der Trinität im Alten Testament!,” *Glaube und Lernen* 17 (2002) 41-55.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Othniel in Judges 3:10; Gideon in Judges 6:34; and Jephthah in Judges 11:29.

For some readers, such a question may sound inappropriate, because according to a very common traditional view, God and the divine reality is eternal and thus immutable, excluded from the worldly processes of development and ‘becoming’. A philosophical view of God considered God free of change, and that tradition has strongly influenced Christian dogmatics. The biblical tradition, however, questions such a philosophical image of the divine,<sup>3</sup> with God being capable of sorrow and revising his wrath,<sup>4</sup> the Divine Logos ‘becoming’ flesh (John 1:14), yet suffering the ultimate reality of death. Based on this paradoxical truth, that God is even capable of death, the biblical tradition breaks with philosophical images of the divine. Consequently, the idea of a ‘change’ or ‘development’ within God can be considered. This is necessary not only for historical but also for theological reasons.<sup>5</sup>

The fundamental reason for this lies in Christology: In the cross and resurrection of Jesus, the divine Logos has definitely entered and ‘adopted’ the sphere of death. The resurrected one ‘incorporates’ the vestiges of the crucifixion (John 20:20, 27), and the crucified one is exalted to the divine throne (Rev. 5:6). Consequently, since Christ’s crucifixion and exaltation, God cannot be imagined without a reference to the exalted crucified One. In Christian perspective, after Good Friday and Easter morning, God can only be spoken of as a God who has definitely adopted the human life of Jesus and his death, who has entered into a connection with human history, and even death. Such could not have been said before the Christ event, but after Christ’s exaltation, God cannot be considered any more *etsi crux non daretur* (“as if the cross had not happened”). Thus, in this perspective, the idea of a change, or ‘development’ in God cannot be dismissed.

But what about the Spirit? Has it/He (or even She) also a ‘history’? Did He also ‘become’ what He is, according to the insight and teaching of the Christian tradition, in a process or ‘development’: How did the Spirit ‘become’ the Spirit of Jesus Christ, the ‘personal’ comforter of the disciples, the third person of the Trinity?

The present essay will sketch a few stages of this alleged ‘development’, with particular focus on the early Christian concepts.<sup>6</sup> We must, however, be aware that human language, insight and scholarship is not really capable to meet the reality of the divine, but can only draw on concepts based on language and human testimonies, on experience and reflection. We are, thus dealing with a ‘noetic’ or conceptual development rather than with an ‘ontic’ one, but even a theological and dogmatic view is basically bound to the concepts presented and developed in the biblical tradition, and the conceptual development discovered there, will inevitably affect the theological and pneumatological teaching.

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf., most comprehensively, the Biblical Theology by Reinhard Feldmeier and Hermann Spieckermann: R. Feldmeier and H. Spieckermann, *God of the Living: A Biblical Theology* (trans. M. E. Biddle; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2012); German original: R. Feldmeier and H. Spieckermann, *Der Gott der Lebendigen: Eine biblische Gotteslehre* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

<sup>4</sup> Cf., on this, Jörg Jeremias, *Die Reue Gottes: Aspekte alttestamentlicher Gottesvorstellung* (Biblich-theologische Studien 31; 3rd ed.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener 2002).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. already the attempt of writing the Old Testament story as a “biography of God”: J. Miles, *God: A Biography* (New York: Knopf, 1995); idem, *Christ: A Crisis in the Life of God* (New York: Knopf, 2001); and also Eberhard Jüngel, *The Doctrine of the Trinity: God’s Being Is in Becoming* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976).

<sup>6</sup> Cf., more thoroughly, J. Frey, “Vom Windbrausen zum Geist Christi und zur trinitarischen Person: Stationen einer Geschichte des Heiligen Geistes im Neuen Testament,” in *Der Heilige Geist* (ed. J. Frey and D. Sattler; Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie 24 [2009]; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2011), 121-54.

## 2. The Plurality of Spirit-Phenomena in Early Christianity

Within the New Testament, we not only find a variety of spirit concepts but even more obviously a wide variety of phenomena linked with or attributed to ‘the’ Spirit (πνεῦμα), as its (or His) ‘manifestations’ (1 Cor 12:7). The lists of ‘spiritual gifts’ (πνευματικά: 1 Cor 12:1) in 1 Cor 12:8-10, 28; Rom 12:6-8 only mention a small selection, and with regard to some phenomena it was quite open to debate whether they were given by the divine Spirit or from elsewhere.

Among the phenomena attributed to the Spirit are prophetic visions of the future (Luke 1:41, 67; Acts 11:28), ‘prophetic’ insight into the hidden motifs of a human heart (Acts 13:9), various types of prophetic speech (1 Cor 14:1-2), and the discernment of the spirits (1 Cor 12:10), but also a testimony without fear (Mark 13:11; John 15:26), or forthright preaching (Acts 4:31), partly combined with confirming ‘signs and wonders’ (1 Thess 1:5; 1 Cor 12:10), exorcisms (Matt 12:28) and healings (1 Cor 12:9). A unique narrative associates the power of disciplinary punishment (Acts 5:1-10) with the Spirit. Moreover, the Spirit is viewed as giver of particular insight and wisdom, especially from the Scriptures (cf. John 14:26; 16:13-15), or as the realm in which such wisdom can be communicated and aptly received (1 Cor 2:13). The Spirit guides the church, inspires decisive words in a leading board (Acts 13:2) or a community meeting, brings about both visionary (Acts 7:55) and auditive (Acts 2:2, 6) experiences, ecstasy (2 Cor 5:13), even raptures (Rev 4:2; 21:1<sup>7</sup>) and translocations (Acts 8:39), forms of ecstatic speech such as glossolalia (1 Cor 13:1; 14:2, 5, 18) or inspired praise (1 Cor 14:16) and hymns (Eph 5:19). But in contrast with this, even the very simple confession of belief in Jesus (1 Cor 12:1-2) and the prayer to the Father or more generally the Christian prayer (Rom 8:15) can be attributed to the Spirit.

The list shows at first, how numerous and diverse the phenomena are that were attributed to the Spirit by early Jesus followers and their contemporaries. And in some instances we can see traces of a discussion whether certain experiences were authorized by the divine Spirit or by a different spirit. The authorization of prophetic utterances, for instance, is open to debate or discernment, and in the Corinthian community, spiritual phenomena such as glossolalia were in danger of being (mis)interpreted by others as manifestations of a different, ‘maniac’ or Dionysiac spirit (1 Cor 14:23).<sup>8</sup> The distinction between divine and foreign, Christian and ‘pagan’ is not always possible, since the phenomena are similar, and we cannot assort the phenomena mentioned into clearly distinct categories.

As the present volume amply shows, the traditional distinction between Jewish and Hellenistic contexts or concepts is inappropriate, chiefly because the encounter of Second Temple Judaism with the Hellenistic culture largely predates the early Christian period<sup>9</sup> and the Jesus movement very quickly spread into areas where Hellenistic-Roman concepts were omnipresent. Nor is it possible to distinguish within the early Christian concepts of the Spirit between a more ‘spiritual’ view of the

---

<sup>7</sup> Interestingly, Paul does not connect his own rapture experience (2 Cor 12:3-4) with the Spirit.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. G. Theissen, “Glossolalie – Sprache des Unbewussten? (1 Kor 14),” in idem, *Psychologische Aspekte paulinischer Theologie* (FRLANT 131; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 269-340 (277-82).

<sup>9</sup> This was the most important insight from Martin Hengel’s magisterial work: M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh.s v. Chr.* (WUNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1969; see also the 3rd ed. from 1988). English translation: M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine in the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. J. Bowden; 2 vols.; London: SCM & Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974).

Spirit as a mere immaterial power and another, more material or ‘substance’-oriented view.<sup>10</sup> The concepts are often mixed and somewhat fluid, and possibly the ancient readers regarded the phenomena more ‘material’ than we do after a long history of Platonic and Cartesian thought.

In the present context, I would like to focus on another tension within the New Testament which might also help to elaborate a distinctive early Christian development in pneumatology: the tension between more ‘dynamic’ views of the Spirit (as a power) and a more ‘personal’ concept with the Spirit acting, speaking or teaching (as a ‘personal’ subject). Of course, there is no strict alternative between the two, and the ‘dynamic’ element is never totally abandoned even when the ‘personality’ of the Spirit is widely accepted. The ‘personal’ aspect, however seems to have been gradually developed in early Christian thought, beginning with some Pauline passages, and it is most strongly present in the Gospel of John, so that it is quite conceivable that this Gospel became the main source in the later Christological and Trinitarian debate.

The concept of the Spirit as a ‘personal’ reality was developed, as I will demonstrate, in close connection and analogy with the view of the risen Christ as an acting subject. Thus, I will now try to sketch the increasing ‘personalization’ of the Spirit as an independent subject of certain activities. Starting with the biblical tradition and some important aspects that can be found in the Qumran corpus (3.), we will focus on the view of the Spirit in the earliest Jesus movement (4.), on the developments in Pauline thought (5.), on the Lukan concept (6.) and, finally, on the concept of Johannine pneumatology (7.). A few concluding remarks (8.) will sum up the argument.

### 3. Presuppositions: The Biblical Tradition and Its Reception

In biblical Hebrew (and Aramaic), ‘spirit’ (רוח) is no less an umbrella term than is its common rendering with πνεῦμα in Greek. The notions include<sup>11</sup> the physical dimension of air in motion, the anthropological dimension of the human disposition or – in a holistic concept – ‘spirit’ as the place where human feelings and emotions, but also insight and spiritual disposition are located, and, finally, the theological notion of a divine spirit or the spirit from God, the Holy Spirit. But only one third of the instances in which רוח is used refers to a divine spirit, e.g., the spirit of the creator in Gen 1 or the spirit that empowers the judges or that is bestowed upon prophets. Notably, the term ‘holy spirit’ is used only twice in Hebrew, in Isa 63:10-11 and Ps 51:13, in two relatively late texts, and twice in Aramaic, in two passages in Daniel (Dan 5:12; 6:4). Thus, the notion of the Holy Spirit was by no means common in biblical times.<sup>12</sup> By the time, however, the notion of the spirit was increasingly

---

<sup>10</sup> This was the fundamental presupposition of Eduard Schweizer; cf. “πνεῦμα κτλ. D-E,” *TWNT* 6:389-454 (ET: *TDNT* 6:389-455).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner and J. J. Stamm, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament, Lieferung IV* (3rd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1990), 1117-21; W. Gesenius, R. Meyer and H. Donner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament, 5. Lieferung* (18th ed., Heidelberg: Springer 2009), 1225-1227; D. J. A. Clines (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew 7* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010), 427-440 (with a very helpful list of meanings). For the range of meanings in Greek see T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 567; F. W. Danker (ed.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (3rd ed.; Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 832-36.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. K.-D. Schunck, “Wesen und Wirksamkeit des Geistes nach der Überlieferung des Alten Testaments,” in idem, *Altes Testament und Heiliges Land: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament und zur biblischen Landeskunde* (Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums 17; Frankfurt: Lang, 1989), 137-51 (137): “Das Reden vom ‘Heiligen Geist’ ist im AT erst relativ spät üblich geworden und war dazu keineswegs allseitig verbreitet bzw. geläufig.”

linked with God's creative activity<sup>13</sup> and with his own 'holiness', so it could be called not only 'God's spirit' but also 'holy spirit'.

The term 'holy spirit' is, then, much more frequent in post-biblical literature,<sup>14</sup> including the Qumran corpus,<sup>15</sup> but notably absent in Philo and Josephus as also in the non-Jewish Greek literature. From this, we may conclude that the concept of a 'holy spirit' or the 'holy spirit', that has a share in and conveys God's holiness, is a concept rooted and developed within the biblical and Palestinian Jewish tradition. Strikingly, it is this term, which became the most characteristic term for the spirit in the New Testament.

In post-biblical Jewish tradition (and the New Testament), 'spirit' is also quite frequently used with a notion that is still absent in the Hebrew Bible: Due to the rise of angelology and dualistic concepts in the Enochic literature and other major traditions of Second Temple Judaism,  $\pi\alpha\rho$  or  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  (often in the plural) frequently refer to 'spiritual' beings, i.e., angels and demons.<sup>16</sup> This usage is adopted in the New Testament with regard to "unclean" (Mark 1:23, 26-7; 3:11) or "evil" (Luke 7:21) spirits, the spirits of deceased (1 Petr 3:19) or heavenly 'spirits' (Heb 1:7, 14; Rev 1:4; 3:1 etc.). The related concept of unclean or evil spirits was obviously present in the context of Jesus' ministry, so we might assume that it was especially his exorcizing activity, attributed by his opponents to the demonic power of Beelzebul, that could be understood as the manifestation of a higher spiritual power, the power of the divine spirit.<sup>17</sup>

For the concept of the Spirit in the New Testament, three biblical motifs are particularly relevant:<sup>18</sup>

A first important motif is the idea that the divine Spirit is (or will be) given to the Messiah, as a steady gift and equipment for his work. As the Judaeans were anointed and thus considered to be commissioned and enabled for their office, the Messiah is thought to be equipped or anointed with the

---

<sup>13</sup> Cf. A. W. Pitts and S. Pollinger, "The Spirit in Second Temple Jewish Monotheism and the Origins of Early Christology," in *Christian Origins and Hellenistic Judaism: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament* (ed. S. E. Porter and A. W. Pitts; vol. 2 of *Early Christianity in Its Hellenistic Context*; Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 10; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 135-76, who describe the development of a "spirit monotheism".

<sup>14</sup> Cf., e.g., in the Daniel tradition in the LXX: Dan 5:12; 6:3 LXX (and more instances in the Theodotion version); cf. also Sus 34 0' (on these passages see John R. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 127-30); furthermore Wis 1:5; 7:22; 9:17; *Pss. Sol.* 17:37; *Jub.* 1:21-23; *L.A.B.* 18:11; 28:6; 32:14; 60:1; 62:2; *T. Levi* 3:6 (Greenfield/Stone/Eshel); *T. Ab.* 20:15; *T. Job* 51:2; *Apoc. Zeph.* (in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5:77:2); some more passages in the *As. Mos.* might be Christian).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. 1QS 3:7; 4:21; 8:16; 9:3 1QS<sup>b</sup> 2:24; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 4:38; 6:24; 8:20, 21, 25, 30; 15:10; 16:13; 17:32; 20:15; 23:29, 33; CD 2:12-13; 5:11; 7:4, 4Q270 2 ii 11; 4Q287 10 13; 4Q213a 1 13; 4Q416 2 ii 6 par 4Q 418 8 6; 4Q 418 76 1-3; 4Q422 1:7; 4Q444 1-4 1+5 1; 4Q504 1+2 v recto 11-18; 4Q504 4 5 par 4Q506 131-132 11; 1 Q 39 1 6; 4Q434 1 I 11. A related expression "spirits of the holiest holiness", used in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q400-407; 11Q17) refers to angelic beings. – I am thankful to Eibert Tigchelaar for his collection of relevant texts; cf. his contribution in the present volume.

<sup>16</sup> Cf., for the beginnings A. T. Wright, *The Origin of Evil Spirits* (WUNT 2/198; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

<sup>17</sup> Interestingly, those who attribute Jesus' power to demonic forces (Mark 3:30), are the target of the saying about the 'blasphemy against the Holy Spirit' (Mark 3:29).

<sup>18</sup> On the latter two, cf. especially F. Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology* (WUNT 2/194; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 34-76.

Spirit that “rests upon him” (Isa 11:2, cf. also Isa 42:1).<sup>19</sup> This is programmatically adopted in the presentation of the prophetic and priestly Anointed One in Isa 61:1-3.<sup>20</sup> In post-biblical times, the Melchizedek-Midrash 11QMelch from Qumran continues the line of Isa 61 and links it with the figure of a heavenly or angelic messianic figure.<sup>21</sup> Somewhat later, it is a fundamental text for Jesus’ self-presentation, not only in the view of Luke (cf. Luke 4:21) but probably already in the ministry and the sayings of the earthly Jesus.<sup>22</sup> The Divine Spirit is the power that enabled also the Messiah Jesus to act and to proclaim his message. This is, at least, the view of the Gospel writers and, historically, the presupposition for the second motif to be mentioned, the bestowal of the Spirit to Jesus’ followers or the community.

A second biblical concept is the idea that the Spirit will not only be given to the Messiah or a prophetic messenger but poured out over Israel as a whole (cf. Ezek 36:26-27; 37:1-14; 39:29 and also Isa 32:9-20; 44:1-5).<sup>23</sup> Within this concept, the divine Spirit is seen as the means of an eschatological restitution of Israel, and the bestowal with the Spirit implies a new internal relationship with the Torah and also with God himself (Ezek 36:26-7).<sup>24</sup> In this concept, the Spirit is an eschatological gift not only for the Messiah but also for the eschatological people of God, and, respectively, the community.

A parabiblical text from the Qumran corpus, *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* (4Q385) shows that the vision of Ezek 37 was later linked with the physical resurrection of the dead as individuals.<sup>25</sup> Such a development in reading Ezekiel’s vision is also fundamental for the concept of the Spirit as the power of the resurrection of the dead and, particularly, for the early understanding of the resurrection of Jesus. This concept is presupposed in the confession formula in Rom 1:3-4, which probably derives from a Semitic language milieu and thus originates in the early Palestinian community. So we can see that the resurrection of Jesus (as Davidic Messiah) was attributed to the power of the ‘Spirit of Holiness’. With the Spirit acting in Jesus’ resurrection, this event could therefore be considered the beginning of a new period of the manifestation of the Spirit of the end times and of eschatological fulfilment.

A third aspect is, finally, the idea that the bestowal of the Spirit also includes prophetic and visionary phenomena (cf. Joel 3:1-5), eventually related with the removal of social and traditional divergences. The Joel tradition is most clearly adopted in Luke (cf. Acts 2).<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Interestingly, prophetic utterances were not usually attributed to the Spirit until the time of Ezekiel (apart from a few exceptions: Hos 9:7; Mic 38; Isa 30:1 and 31:3). Only since exilic or post-exilic times, prophecy is viewed to be inspired by the Spirit of God, cf. Zech 7:12 and Neh 9:30).

<sup>20</sup> On this important text, cf. R. Achenbach, “König, Priester und Prophet: Zur Transformation der Konzepte der Herrschaftslegitimation in Jesaja 61,” in *Tora in der Hebräischen Bibel: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte und synchronen Logik diachroner Transformationen* (ed. R. Achenbach, M. Arneith and E. Otto; BZAR 7; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 196-245; K. Schmid, “Herrschererwartungen und -aussagen im Jesajabuch: Überlegungen zu ihrer synchronen Logik und zu ihren diachronen Transformationen,” in *Prophetische Heils- und Herrschererwartungen* (ed. K. Schmid; SBS 194; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2005), 37-74.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. R. Achenbach, “11 Q Melki-zedek und der Repräsentant Zions in Jesaja 61,” in *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and E. E. Popkes; WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014, *in press*).

<sup>22</sup> See below, on the original Beatitudes Luke 6:21f. par. Matt 5:3-5 and the answer to the Baptizer (Luke 7:22 par Matt 11:5).

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Philip, *Origins*, 34-64.

<sup>24</sup> On Ezek 36-37, see also Johannes Schnocks, “‘Und ich werde meinen Geist in euch geben’ (Ez 37,14): Konzeptionen der Rede vom Geist in Ez 36-37,” in *Der Heilige Geist* (ed. Frey and Sattler), 31-52.

<sup>25</sup> On 4Q385 frg. 2, see A. L. A. Hogeterp, “Resurrection and Biblical Tradition: Pseudo-Ezekiel Reconsidered,” *Biblica* 89 (2008): 59-69.

<sup>26</sup> On this cf. Philip, *Origins*, 64-74.

All three concepts are important for particular aspects of the notion of the Spirit in the New Testament, and we can see from the Qumran corpus how texts such as Isa 61 and Ezek 37 were read and interpreted in the traditions of contemporary Palestinian Judaism. For all three concepts, however, it is quite clear that the Spirit of God, empowering the Messiah, enacting the eschatological renewal of Israel and the resurrection of the dead or causing dreams and visions in the final period, is merely considered a power, a means of purification (sometimes metaphorically compared with water or fire), or a means of revelation, but not a personal reality, acting as a subject or an agent in analogy to other personal agents. The Spirit is given by God, it is part of his eschatological activity, it is a power and dynamics, but not a personal agent or a personal subject.

#### 4. Jesus and the Spirit

The ‘personalization’ of the Spirit sets in with Jesus and his earthly ministry as a messianic exorcist, healer and teacher.<sup>27</sup> Although the historical reconstruction is always debated, and the narratives about the descent of the Spirit “like a dove” at the occasion of Jesus’ baptism (Mark 1:9-11 parr.) are designed from a later perspective, the canonical Gospels unanimously confirm that during Jesus’ earthly ministry he was the only one who had the Spirit.<sup>28</sup> Although it is narrated that Jesus included his disciples into the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom and commissioned them even to exorcise, they are not equally armed with the Spirit. This observation may also point to the fact that the image of Jesus in the Gospels is not totally reshaped according to the image of later charismatics or the situation of the later community, nor is the earthly Jesus depicted as the archetype of later charismatics. Rather, the Gospels underline the uniqueness and eschatological function of Jesus, also with regard to his authorization by the Spirit.

The idea that the Spirit did play a significant role in Jesus’ ministry is first supported by the fact that some of his most probably authentic sayings are strongly influenced by the tradition from Isa 61:1-3 (and other related texts from Isaiah), such as the three authentic Beatitudes (Luke 6:20-21 par. Matt 5:3-5)<sup>29</sup> or Jesus’ answer to the Baptizer (Luke 7:18-23 par. Matt 11:2-6). The so-called ‘Messianic Apocalypse’ from the Qumran corpus (4Q521) shows, how the good news to the poor, comfort for the weeping, healing of the blind and the proclamation of divine remission could be viewed as eschatological works of God.<sup>30</sup> The text reveals the framework of Scriptural interpretation within which contemporaries could perceive Jesus’ works as works of the messianic time, and the one who performed such works and proclaimed God’s kingdom could be considered a messianic figure,<sup>31</sup> acting in the power of God or, respectively, his spirit.

---

<sup>27</sup> Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1975), 41-92.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. F. Hahn, *Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments* (vol. 2 of *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 265. In John, Jesus not only has, but gives the Spirit (cf. John 1:32; 3:34), but only after his resurrection, at the Easter day, the disciples receive the Spirit (John 20:22; cf. also the paraclete sayings, esp. 15:26 and 16:7).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (ICC; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988-1997), 1:436-38.

<sup>30</sup> On 4Q521 see J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 2/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 343-89, and M. Becker, “Die ‘messianische Apokalypse’ 4Q521 und der Interpretationsrahmen der Taten Jesu,” in *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007), 237-303.

<sup>31</sup> One of the most important insights from the Qumran corpus is the pluriformity of eschatological and messianic expectations in contemporary Palestinian Judaism. On this see J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the*

That Jesus' healings and predominantly his exorcisms were viewed as works in the power of the divine Spirit is especially suggested by the saying about the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Mark 3:28-29) which in its present context in the Beelzebul controversy is the answer to the accuse of Jesus' expelling the demons by the power of Beelzebul, a superior demonic spirit. This demonstrates that within the worldview of contemporary Palestinian Judaism, which is best illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls,<sup>32</sup> Jesus' exorcisms and healings could originally be understood as a battle between different spirits, thus the spirit that gives him the strength to defeat the demons could either be interpreted as a leading demon or as the divine Spirit. The view that the divine Spirit is at work in Jesus' ministry is part of the conviction that now, in his time and ministry, there is "more than" in the time of Jonah or Solomon (Matt 12:41-42), i.e., that the eschatological restoration is in progress.

The most important shift is probably connected with the Easter events, the appearances of the crucified one to his followers and also to others who had been sceptical against him. Those appearances, interpreted as the beginning of the eschatological resurrection (which was connected with the Spirit in some biblical and early Jewish traditions), could confirm to Jesus' followers that God's eschatological work had not ceased with Jesus' crucifixion, but continued or had entered a new stage, with the resurrection of the crucified Messiah. The 'enthusiasm' of the primitive community could grow on this soil. There are no compelling reasons to limit this awareness of the Spirit to the Hellenistic part of the primitive community or even to deny it with respect to Palestinian Judaism,<sup>33</sup> because central aspects of the concept of the spirit as the power of resurrection and also the concept of the bestowal of the spirit on the community are well attested in the Qumran corpus, so that also the latter cannot be attributed only to Hellenistic influence.<sup>34</sup>

## 5. The Dynamics of the Spirit in the Earliest Jesus Movement

With Jesus' departure, his death and the Easter appearances, the time of the Spirit begins for his disciples.<sup>35</sup> Although Jesus' disciples had already been commissioned with some temporary preaching or exorcising activity during his earthly ministry, their power over the demons (Luke 10:17, 20) is not explained by any reference to the Spirit, but only by the commissioning through Jesus himself (Luke

---

*Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), and Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*; on the eschatological concepts see A. L. A. Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End: A Comparative Traditio-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (STDJ 83; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>32</sup> Cf. L. T. Stuckenbruck, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. N. Dávid and A. Lange; Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 57; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 131-70 (145-50).

<sup>33</sup> This is the view in F. W. Horn, "Holy Spirit," *ABD* 3:260-80 (268-69).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. for the interpretation of the resurrection as a work of the Spirit (Rom 1:4; cf. Ezek 37) especial 4QPs.-Ezek. The idea that the Spirit is given to (or even into) a person is widely attested in Sectarian documents such as the Hodayot, cf. J. Frey, "Paul's View of the Spirit in the Light of Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature* (ed. J.-S. Rey; STDJ 102; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 239-62 (255-60). For the idea that the Spirit is 'poured out' over the community (Isa 44:3) see also 4Q504 1+2 v recto 16-17; cf. also the contribution by E. Tigchelaar, in this volume, ???).

<sup>35</sup> This is most clearly stated in John 16:7, where the necessity of Jesus' departure is confirmed, but also in Acts 2. Both concepts are, of course, theological constructs, but they are historically supported by the fact that even the earliest Synoptic tradition does not claim any relevance of the spirit for the pre-Easter disciples.



10:19) and the defeat of Satan (Luke 10:18). During Jesus' earthly ministry there is no idea of the disciples having a proper share in the Spirit. Such a bestowal is first mentioned in post-Easter times.<sup>36</sup>

The earliest traces of this new consciousness of the Spirit can be found in formulaic phrases such as "God has given us the Spirit,"<sup>37</sup> the believers have "received the Spirit,"<sup>38</sup> or "God's Spirit dwells in you."<sup>39</sup> The Spirit that had empowered the Messiah Jesus, now becomes a gift for his disciples that empowers them and 'dwells' among and within them. These phrases probably go back to pre-Pauline communities, not only to Antioch, but – at least partly – to the earliest Jesus movement in Palestine or even Jerusalem, where the earliest followers of the Messiah Jesus were aware of the continuing eschatological activity of the Spirit and lived in an 'enthusiastic' conviction of the open heaven and the incipient kingdom of God.

Such a conviction could best be triggered by the Easter appearances, the visions of Jesus after his death, interpreted within the framework of contemporary expectation as the beginning of the resurrection of the dead and thus as a sign of the inauguration of the end time. In a very early Jewish-Christian confession formula, Jesus' resurrection is attributed to the power of the "Spirit of Holiness" (Rom 1,4), in reception of the tradition from Ezek 37:5, 9-10 where the eschatological resurrection of the dead – which was later understood in terms of an individual, bodily resurrection<sup>40</sup> – is attributed to the power of the divine Spirit. Those who had experienced the visions of the Risen One and others who had joined their circle could consider themselves as being included in God's eschatological activity, captured and moved by its dynamics, which could be understood as a heavenly and pneumatic one.

Being convinced that God's work that had begun with Jesus' ministry, had not come to an end in his death, but rather entered a new dimension, beyond earlier boundaries, they could develop a hitherto unknown dynamics of mission among their fellow Jews in the vicinity, but also among the people from the Diaspora who lived in Jerusalem.<sup>41</sup> This was probably also accompanied by visionary phenomena, and, on the other hand, those manifestations of the Spirit could again confirm the conviction of the presence of the Spirit, indeed of God himself. In spite of particular differences from region to region or from community to community, the entirety of the earliest Jesus movement from Jerusalem to Antioch and Corinth shows the impact of a dynamics which was – at least partly – attributed to the Spirit.

This Spirit is still conceived of as God's Spirit, a dynamic power known from the biblical tradition which is now given to the circle of believers or even into the heart of any single believer. There is still no idea of a stronger analogy or connection between this Spirit and the risen Christ, and the Spirit is still a medium of comfort and revelation, rather than an acting subject. Humans receive the Spirit (Acts 2:38), it is poured out on them (Acts 2:33) and dwells in them (1 Cor 3:16). So the power that had exclusively empowered the Messiah Jesus was now also given to his followers.

---

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Acts 2:38. In John, the Spirit is transmitted to the disciples on Easter day (John 20:22). In the early post-Easter time, however, the bestowal of the Spirit was regularly understood as a gift from God. Only later, the gift is also viewed as a gift of the risen or exalted Jesus (cf. Acts 1:8; 2:33 and Luke 24:49, and then in John: John 15:26; 16:7; 20:22).

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Rom 5:5; 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; 1 Thess 4:8; Acts 5:32; 15:8 etc.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Rom 8:15; 1 Cor 2:12; 2 Cor 11:4; Gal 3:2, 14; 1 John 2:27.

<sup>39</sup> Rom 8:9; 1 Cor 3:16.

<sup>40</sup> This is confirmed by the Pseudo-Ezekiel text from Qumran (4Q385 frg. 2); see above.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. M. Hengel, "'Sit at my Right Hand!' The Enthronement of Christ at the Right Hand of God and Psalm 110:1," in *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 119-225 (218-20).

## 6. The Holy Spirit as the Spirit of Christ in Paul

### 6.1 Paul's view of the Spirit and its Sources

The first theologian of the Jesus movement to develop a distinguished view of the Spirit, however, is Paul.<sup>42</sup> Although he had grown up in the Diaspora, he was also strongly influenced by ideas rooted in the Palestinian Jewish tradition, such as the Pharisaic view of bodily resurrection, the holistic view of the human being, the eschatological reading of the Scriptures (as paralleled in the Pesharim from Qumran) etc.<sup>43</sup> His views of the Spirit are hard to systematize. Neither were they fixed nor were they simply adopted from tradition, but they were steadily developing, in the course of his own experiences and the encounter with his communities, e.g., in Corinth. This means that the Pauline epistles give also evidence of views and phenomena developed independently from Paul's theological views or influenced from other early Christian (Apollos), Hellenistic Jewish (Philo or Alexandrian exegesis) and Greco-Roman views. Thus it is most important to look at Paul's own interpretation of the phenomena or to his reaction to the views held within the various communities.

Although Paul was acquainted himself with prophecy (1 Thess 5:19), ecstatic speech (glossolalia: see 1 Cor 14:18), visionary experiences (2 Cor 12:1) and auditions (2 Cor 12:4), and he could also claim that his preaching was accompanied by "signs and wonders" (1 Thess 1:5-6; Gal 3:5; Rom 15:18-19),<sup>44</sup> he does not focus on his own experiences in his epistles but rather stresses aspects of the spirit that point to a different direction. The assumption is justified, that these aspects particularly reflect his own interests or, rather, his theological reasoning, and it is striking that they also correspond to particular aspects of the notion of the spirit in Palestinian Judaism and some aspects from the Qumran corpus.<sup>45</sup> This suggests that Paul's view of the Spirit was strongly coined by Biblical and Palestinian-Jewish traditions, not only by concepts he could have encountered in Antioch or in Gentile-Christian communities.<sup>46</sup>

Already in his earliest letter, Paul stresses the fact that God gave (or rather put in the present tense: 'gives') his Holy Spirit to the addressees (1 Thess 4:8). This is an aspect extensively documented in

---

<sup>42</sup> On Paul's view of the Spirit, see M. Wolter, "Der heilige Geist bei Paulus," in *Der Heilige Geist* (ed. Frey and Sattler), 93-119; U. Schnelle, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 244-50; most extensively G. D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994); and recently Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 253-316.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. J. Frey, "The Jewishness of Paul," in: O. Wischmeyer (ed.), *Paul: Life, Setting, Work, Letters* (transl. by Helen S. Heron; London – New York: T&T Clark, 2012), 57-95; id., "Eine neue religionsgeschichtliche Perspektive. Larry W. Hurtados *Lord Jesus Christ* und die Herausbildung der frühen Christologie," in: C. Breytenbach / J. Frey (eds.), *Reflections on Early Christian History and Religion – Erwägungen zur frühchristlichen Religionsgeschichte* (AJEC 81: Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2012), 117-168 (153-164).

<sup>44</sup> On these dimensions, see B. Heining, *Paulus als Visionär: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Studie* (Herders Biblische Studien 9; Freiburg: Herder, 1996); C. Meier, *Mystik bei Paulus: Zur Phänomenologie religiöser Erfahrung im Neuen Testament* (TANZ 26; Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 1998); B. Kollmann, "Paulus als Wundertäter," in *Paulinische Christologie* (ed. U. Schnelle and T. Söding; FS Hans Hübner; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 76-96; G. Williams, *The Spirit World in the Letters of Paul the Apostle: A Critical Examination of the Role of Spiritual Beings in the Authentic Pauline Epistles* (FRLANT 231; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009).

<sup>45</sup> Cf. J. Frey, "Paul's View of the Spirit in the Light of Qumran."

<sup>46</sup> See, for further argument Frey, "Paul's View of the Spirit in the Light of Qumran,"

the *Hodayot* from Qumran.<sup>47</sup> The “promise of the Spirit,” which the Galatians received when they came to believe (Gal 3:14), might even refer to some experiences they are now reminded of, and at least for Paul himself, such an interpretation of ‘manifestations’ of the Spirit could be related to the Scriptural background from Ezek 37 and Joel 3.<sup>48</sup> An interesting aspect also paralleled in some Qumran texts is the idea that the Spirit purifies or better sanctifies the Gentiles for God (Rom 15:16).

In distinct contrast with some of his addressees in Corinth, Paul accentuates the revelatory function of the Spirit that leads those attending the communal ceremony to repent (1 Cor 14:25). It seems significant that Paul does not stress the extraordinary manifestations of the spirit but rather its revelatory function. In dialogue with the Corinthian group particularly interested in wisdom and possibly influenced by a form of Alexandrian exegesis, Paul adopts the idea of the hidden wisdom of God which is now revealed (in the gospel) and pronounced through the spirit, so that it can be understood by ‘spiritual’ people (1 Cor 2:13-16). This is an idea particularly paralleled in the Wisdom texts from Qumran, thus representing a more Palestinian Jewish perspective in contrast with the Corinthian view.

With the dwelling of the spirit in the community, the community becomes God’s temple (1 Cor 3:16). The sanctity has, of course, ethical implications: Paul is concerned about the purity of the community, especially with regard to severe sins; therefore the man practicing incest is excluded. The sanctity is also expressed for the body of the individual believer which is also called a “temple of the holy spirit” (1 Cor 6:19). This again has consequences regarding ethical behavior, and especially ‘bodily’ sexual behavior.<sup>49</sup> The idea of the community as a temple in which the Holy Spirit is present and sanctifies those within the community, but should not be defiled by unethical behavior, impurity or even bodily deformations is also found in the sectarian Qumran texts.

A distinctive function of the spirit, which goes back to Ezekiel 37, is that it brings life or brings to life (πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν).<sup>50</sup> Based on the conviction that God raised Jesus from the dead through the spirit, it is the spirit which warrants the future resurrection of the believers (Rom 8:11), so the spirit can be called ἀρραβών (“first installment”: 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5) or ἀπαρχή (“first born” or “first fruit”: Rom 8:23; 1 Cor 15:20, 23), i.e. guarantee of future fulfilment. This idea is, of course, strongly dependent on the Christian eschatology (between Easter and the Parousia), but adopts Jewish eschatological concepts which are also best explained from Palestinian Judaism as documented in the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>51</sup>

## 6.2 *The Spirit in Analogy with the Risen Christ and the Development of ‘Personal’ Aspects*

But how does Paul develop a view of the spirit that is – more and more – conceptualized as a personal hypostasis? This is, in my view, due to the fact that the spirit and his work is increasingly paralleled to the work of the exalted Christ. The ‘personal’ elements of the Spirit are thus ‘borrowed’ from Christ.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> See Frey, “Paul’s View of the Spirit in the Light of Qumran,” 255-60; cf. also the contribution by Eibert Tigchelaar in the present volume.

<sup>48</sup> On Paul’s adoption of Ezekiel’s vision see also Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 253-63. Ezekiel and Joel are – apart from some passages from Isaiah – the main sources for this view of the eschatological bestowal of the Spirit upon people.

<sup>49</sup> This can already be seen in 1 Thess 4:8f. Cf. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 263-67.

<sup>50</sup> 1 Cor 15:45; cf. Rom 8:11; 2 Cor 3:6.

<sup>51</sup> On the eschatological concepts documented in the Scrolls see Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End*.

<sup>52</sup> A different reconstruction was suggested by G. Kretschmar, “Der Heilige Geist in der Geschichte: Grundzüge frühchristlicher Pneumatologie,” in *Gegenwart des Geistes: Aspekte der Pneumatologie* (ed. W. Kasper; QD 85; Freiburg: Herder, 1979), 92-130 (103-105), who starts with the idea of the spirit as a

Adopting the early Christian experience of the eschatological Spirit, Paul addresses his readers as πνευματικοί, i.e., as people who are given the Spirit or live by the Spirit (Gal 6:1; Röm 8:9). The Spirit is considered to shape their ethical conduct and their understanding (1 Cor 2:13; 3:1). The influence of the Spirit on the life of the community and the life of its members is considered not only sporadic or temporary but continuous, the Spirit is the continuum of the divine power of life,<sup>53</sup> leading from the resurrection of Christ toward the eschatological resurrection of his followers (Rom 8:9-11).

Some Pauline passages even phrase a discrete intention of the Holy Spirit. Thus the Spirit represents a mindset or a way of thinking (φρόνημα: Rom 8:6, 27) that the addressees can be open for and dedicated to – or otherwise resist. Such a discrete intention comes already close to a concept of a personal subject.

This impression is reinforced in passages in which the work of the Spirit is set in an analogy with the work of the exalted Christ: God has sent the Spirit (Gal 4:6), as had sent his Son (Gal 4:4). The Spirit dwells in the believers (Rom 8:9, 11) as Christ dwells in them (Rom 8:10; Gal 2:22). The Spirit represents those who believe and pray in God's realm, as also the exalted Christ represents them and intercedes for them (Rom 8:34; cf. 1 John 2:1). It is striking that Paul articulates these parallels in relatively narrow textual units, esp. Gal 4 and Rom 8. This means that the correspondences are not accidental but deliberate and programmatic.

We can add a number of actions ascribed to the Spirit. Frequently, these actions correspond the actions of Christ during his earthly ministry or as the exalted one, or the actions of God himself: The Spirit liberates from the deadly power of the Law (Rom 8:2), as Christ has set us free from the Law (Gal 5:1). He gives gifts of grace (χαρίσματα) to each, “as he wills” (1 Cor 12:11), as God himself gives them according to his will (1 Cor 12:6). The Spirit has a mind or an intention (Rom 8:6, 27), which is in conflict with the intention of the ‘flesh’ or the human nature opposed to God.<sup>54</sup> He “searches” all things (1 Cor 2:10), as God himself searches human hearts (Rom 8:27), he bears witness with the human spirit (Rom 8:16) and helps in the human weakness (Rom 8:26), as an intercessor before God. He teaches (1 Cor 2:13), moves and leads those who are under his influence (Rom 8:14), and enables them to cry “Abba,” that is to pray to the Father (Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15), in analogy to Jesus' own words of prayer. The Spirit thus gives the language of prayer, verbalizing even the ineffable depths of the human spirit (Rom 8:26f.).

In some passages, the relationship between the exalted Christ and the Holy Spirit is expressed even more precisely. In his account in Rom 15:14-22, Paul stresses that it is Christ himself who has accomplished his work “by the power of signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God” (Rom 15:19). In other words, Christ himself is present and effective in the Spirit and through the Spirit.<sup>55</sup>

---

heavenly reality, which is then paralleled with the angels. The textual fundament of that reconstruction (Acts 8:26, 36, 39 and Rev 5:6) is, however rather late.

<sup>53</sup> The Spirit is “das Kontinuum göttlicher Lebensmacht: Was Gott an Christus vollzog, wird er durch den Geist auch den Glaubenden zuteil werden lassen” (Schnelle, *Theologie*, 247).

<sup>54</sup> On the background of the concept see J. Frey, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought: Studies in Wisdom at Qumran and its Relationship to Sapiential Thought in the Ancient Near East, the Hebrew Bible, Ancient Judaism and the New Testament* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 367-404.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. M. Fatehi, *The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul: An Examination of Its Christological Implications* (WUNT 2/228; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 169-73.

This is a significant change: Whereas the spirit was originally clearly the spirit of *God* that had empowered the Messiah Jesus and – after Easter – also his followers, the spirit can now be considered increasingly as the power and means of Christ’s actions. Since Christ is the exalted one at the right hand of God, God’s spirit is more and more perceived as the spirit of Christ as well. Thus in two corresponding phrases, Rom 8:9 can speak of “God’s Spirit” and “Christ’s Spirit”. The acting of God himself, of the exalted Christ and of the Spirit are thus considered in one line, so that Paul can attribute the “graceful gifts” (χαρίσματα), the “ministries” (διακονίαι) and the “powerful acts” (ἐνεργήματα) experienced within the community to the one Spirit, the one Lord and the one God in a triadic sequence. What is intended here, is not a clear-cut distinction but rather a most intense relation between the three. The gifts and manifestations of the Spirit are at the same time also acts of the one God and the exalted Christ. Thus, the Spirit comes close to both and, and his acts are increasingly seen in analogy with the acts of Christ.

Notably, Paul does not declare that the Spirit has been sent or given by Christ. This is not stated before the Johannine writings (John 15:26; 16:7; 20:22). For Paul it is still God alone who gives the Spirit (1 Cor 6:19; 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; Gal 4:6; 1 Thess 4:8), but in spite of that the Spirit is also “the Spirit of his Son” (Gal 4:6), “the Spirit of (Jesus) Christ” (Rom 8:9; Phil 1:19) or “the Spirit of the Lord” (2 Cor 3:18). The much debated phrase ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν (2 Cor 3:17a) could even suggest an identification between the exalted Christ and the Spirit, were there not the immediate continuation “where the Spirit of the Lord (τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου) is, there is freedom,” which marks the ‘subordination’ of the Spirit under the ‘Lord’ (the exalted Christ) and thus the clear distinction between the two.<sup>56</sup>

Far from trying to identify Christ and the Spirit,<sup>57</sup> Pauline theology comes to a clarification of the hitherto wide and “somewhat nebulous concept” of the Spirit of God through its novel understanding as “being related to Christ.”<sup>58</sup> In the community situations addressed by Paul, the relation of the Spirit with Christ has a criteriological function: Among the manifold manifestations of the Spirit and the phenomena interpreted as such by parts of the communities, only those manifestations that actually correspond the Spirit of Christ and his salvific work can be really appropriate and according to the Spirit of God. By use of this criterion, Paul can meet the Corinthian issues and struggles with the proclamation of the fundamental relevance of the cross that reverts all human values (1 Cor 1:18-25), the criterion of love (1 Cor 13) and the additional criteria of the edification of the community (1 Cor 14:26), the common good (1 Cor 12:7) and the comprehensible communication of the gospel (1 Cor 14:23-24). One might say that the πνεῦμα with its manifold manifestations which are not always precisely discernible from the phenomena of the religious contexts, becomes really ‘Christian’ only in the specific relation to Christ.

---

<sup>56</sup> On this passage, see F. W. Horn, “Kyrios und Pneuma bei Paulus,” in *Paulinische Christologie* (ed. Schnelle and Söding), 59-75.

<sup>57</sup> Cf., however, Schnelle, *Theologie*, 245, who uses the term “identification,” but tries to understand it not as a “static identification,” but as a “description of the dynamic presence of the exalted Lord” (ibid.).

<sup>58</sup> J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 263: “The Spirit of God, hitherto a somewhat nebulous concept, was now being understood as related to Christ. Jesus Christ had come to be seen as the definition of the Spirit. ... The Spirit of Christ in view must be the Spirit which distinguished his [sc. Paul’s] whole ministry.”

The close correlation of the works of Christ and the Spirit is not without effect on the concept of the relation between God and Christ, or the Father and the Son.<sup>59</sup> Surely, Paul is still far away from the view of the Spirit as a divine person, but on the other hand, the Spirit is no longer simply an apersonal divine power (and certainly not a heavenly substance), but from the relation with Christ, the Spirit has developed the profile of a discretely acting and speaking subject, so that it is at least tentatively conceptualized in personal categories.<sup>60</sup> If it is true that Jesus followers at a very early stage came to a veneration of Christ that saw him in a very close relation to God – a “binitarian monotheism,” in the words of Larry Hurtado<sup>61</sup> – this texture is further developed and widened by the beginning ‘personalization’ of the Spirit in Pauline thought, so that – only in retrospect, of course – we can see already here a very cautious step towards the Trinitarian concept as developed much later.<sup>62</sup>

## 7. The Spirit as a Discrete Agent and Subject of the Mission in Acts

For the present issue, we can only very briefly look at Luke’s concept of the Spirit, which would deserve a discussion of its own. In Luke’s gospel, during his earthly ministry, Jesus himself is the only bearer of the Spirit. The disciples are equipped with the Spirit not before Pentecost (Acts 2), and henceforth the Spirit is the decisive agent within the mission of the disciples and the church. But in spite of the fact that the Spirit is always and clearly God’s Spirit, it is Jesus himself who, after his departure to heaven and his exaltation to the right hand of God, equips his followers with the power from above. Acts 2:33 states that Jesus himself has received the promise of the Spirit from the father and poured it out over his disciples.<sup>63</sup> With regard to the Christological mediation, this is a step beyond Paul and a certain anticipation of the Johannine concept. On the other hand, the metaphorical image of the Spirit as a fluid that can be poured out is still far away from the idea of the Spirit as a divine hypostasis or person.

Interestingly, the variety of the effects of the Spirit is less wide in Luke/Acts than in Paul, with a stronger focus on ‘extraordinary’, miraculous manifestations.<sup>64</sup> Prophetic utterances and visions, glossolalia or xenolalia (Acts 2:4, 11) and other signs and wonders accompany the path of the early community and mission, and especially the miracles reported link the acts of the apostles with the acts of Jesus in the gospel (cf. Acts 10:38). The disciples thus continue Jesus’ activity in the period of the church, but ultimately it is Jesus himself who acts through the power of the Spirit given to the

---

<sup>59</sup> The correlation between God and Christ was expressed even before Paul in the confession formula 1 Cor 8:6 which is actually a ‘binitarian’ interpretation of the *Shema Israel* (cf. E. Waaler, *The Shema and The First Commandment in First Corinthians* (WUNT 2<sup>nd</sup> ser. 253; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

<sup>60</sup> Thus Schnelle, *Theologie*, 250.

<sup>61</sup> L. W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 3 and elsewhere.

<sup>62</sup> Thus also Dunn, *Theology*, 264; even more clearly Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence*, 839-42: “Paul’s understanding of God was functionally trinitarian” (ibid., 839). See also the statement by H. Hübner, *Die Theologie des Paulus und ihre neutestamentliche Wirkungsgeschichte* (vol. 2 of *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 346: “Kennt auch Paulus, überhaupt das Neue Testament nicht das Dogma der Trinität, so ist doch das, was dieses Dogma später einmal auslegen wird, in der Theologie des Paulus schon wurzelhaft und substantiell angelegt.”

<sup>63</sup> In a certain manner this anticipates the Johannine concept.

<sup>64</sup> Some of the manifestations of the Spirit mentioned in Paul’s enumeration of charismatic gifts are missing in Luke, e.g., wisdom speech or the discernment of the spirits. Even healings are normally not related to the Spirit, although the empowerment of the apostles through the Spirit may include them.

disciples (or through his ‘name’).<sup>65</sup> Significantly, neither the healings of the apostles nor the healings of Jesus in the gospel are directly ascribed to the Spirit. The effects of the Spirit, instead, are almost totally related to the progress of the mission (Acts 9:31). The ‘pentecostal’ gift of the Spirit empowers the disciples to preach and to evangelize. Repeatedly it is said that, “filled by the Spirit” (Acts 2:17-18; 4:8; 6:8, 10; 7:55; 9:17; 11:23f.; 13:9; 21:10), they speak openly to the people and its leaders, do powerful deeds and spread the message of Jesus. Phenomena of tongues are especially mentioned at certain turning points, thus at Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4), at the beginning of the mission to Gentiles (Acts 10:44-46) and with regard to the disciples of the Baptizer in Ephesus (Acts 19:6).

It is striking, how often the Spirit appears as a discretely acting subject,<sup>66</sup> so that one could even consider the Spirit the true protagonist and leader of the church, whose directions and actions are followed by the human protagonists: The Spirit speaks, not only to the assembly in prayer (Acts 13:2), but also in other situations and unexpectedly (Acts 8:29; 10:19). He inspires prophetic announcements and directions (Acts 11:28; 20:23; 21:4, 11), guides the steps of the witnesses, opens and closes doors (Acts 16:6-7, 9-10) and intervenes actively in the progress of the mission. He powerfully conquers external and internal resistance against the proliferation of the gospel. In Acts 10:44 the Spirit unexpectedly befalls the people listening to Peter so that they begin to speak in tongues, and this signalizes convincingly for Peter and the Jerusalemites that the inclusion of the Gentiles is in accordance with the divine will. In Acts 13:4, it is the Holy Spirit who sends the messengers, in 20:28 he appoints to the office of an overseer, and in 15:28 he is even co-author of the ‘apostolic decree’ when this is introduced by the formula: “It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us...”.

Thus, Luke/Acts also shows some tendencies towards a personalization of the Spirit. The personal aspect is even strengthened by the idea that it is possible to lie to the Spirit or to tempt him (Acts 5:3, 9), or that the Spirit is also a witness of the events surrounding Jesus’ resurrection (Acts 5:32). The latter passage is particularly interesting: In contrast with the early view as documented in Rom 1:4, the Spirit is no more simply the power that was effective in Jesus’ resurrection but (additionally) a proper authority that bears witness to those events and communicates them together with the human witnesses. In the story of the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8, there is a remarkable change of the agents: Philip is first called by an “angel of the Lord” (8:26), then he is commissioned by the Spirit (8:29), and finally it is also the Spirit that takes him away in a miraculous manner (8:39). This is also a hint at a growing independence of the Spirit, which is, however, less clearly related to Christ than in Paul.

According to Luke’s concept, the Spirit grants the continuity between the time of Jesus and the time of the church, it is the gift from above that Jesus had promised to his disciples and then poured out on them as soon as he had received it from the Father after his exaltation, and it is the leading protagonist of the Christian mission, but the precise relationship between Christ and the Spirit is less clearly reflected than in Paul. Although it is quite probable that Luke historically presupposes the developments within Pauline thought, he stays behind them with regard to the theological reflection.

## 8. The Personal Character of the Spirit-Paraclete in John

---

<sup>65</sup> See F. Avemarie, “Acta Jesu Christi: Zum christologischen Sinn der Wundermotive in der Apostelgeschichte,” in *Die Apostelgeschichte im Kontext antiker Historiographie* (ed. J. Frey, C. K. Rothschild and J. Schröter; BZNW 162; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2009), 539-62 (551-56).

<sup>66</sup> Thus Avemarie, “Acta Jesu Christi,” 558.

In a final step we have to consider the Johannine writings,<sup>67</sup> the Fourth Gospel which is probably the last one of the canonical gospels<sup>68</sup> and clearly later than Luke/Acts, and the three epistles which are probably from the same community circle.<sup>69</sup> In spite of the predominant Christological focus in the Johannine writings, the Holy Spirit has a central role in Johannine thought as well. Promised to the disciples in the Farewell Discourses and transmitted to them by the risen Lord at Easter Day (John 20:22), the Spirit and His teaching is fundamental for the life of the post-Easter community, for the disciples' understanding of the words and deeds of Jesus and for their testimony, including the written testimony in the gospel book. Thus, more so than Luke and even Paul, the Fourth Evangelist can be called a theologian of the Spirit.<sup>70</sup> Pneumatology is an important foundation of his thought. However, the Johannine concept of the Spirit differs considerably from the views in Paul and Luke. But with his ideas of the Spirit, John has shaped the further theological development towards the Trinitarian dogma.<sup>71</sup>

### 8.1 *The Particular Shape of Johannine Pneumatology*

At first, it is striking that in the Johannine writings the 'charismatic' phenomena are almost totally missing. Here we find no idea of miracles performed through the power of the Spirit and nothing about ecstatic speech phenomena. This is even more significant as we can assume that such experiences were not totally unknown to the Johannine communities as well.

In fact, there are a few traces of earlier experiences of the Spirit,<sup>72</sup> but it is unclear whether those experiences were still a present reality within the Johannine community. When John 15:26 describes the work of the Spirit as an aid for bearing witness in the situation of impeachment, we can assume that the background of the saying is formed by the Synoptic logion on the assistance of the Spirit in trial (Mark 13:11), but it is unclear whether the members of the Johannine community were still subject to lawsuits or whether the trials they felt to be involved in were rather internal contestations. The mention of the ἐρχόμενα, the "coming things," in John 16:13 might also point to a certain prophetic preaching,<sup>73</sup> but in the present gospel context, from the perspective of the departing Jesus, the phrase predominantly refers to the situation of the addressees. Finally, 1 John 4:1-6 mentions the testing of the spirits, but in the context of 1 John, this is not so much a 'prophetic' activity but rather

---

<sup>67</sup> Revelation can only be called 'Johannine' in a limited sense. Its language and theology differ considerably from the other Johannine writings, and its author is obviously shaped by different traditions. On the riddle how the book was – perhaps only secondarily – connected with the author of the gospel, see J. Frey, "Das Corpus Johanneum und die Apokalypse des Johannes," in *Poetik und Intertextualität der Johannesapokalypse* (ed. S. Alkier, T. Hieke and T. Nicklas; WUNT; Tübingen Mohr Siebeck, 2014, *in press*).

<sup>68</sup> On the interpretation of John, see my collected essays: J. Frey, *Die Herrlichkeit des Gekreuzigten: Studien zu den Johanneischen Schriften 1* (ed. J. Schlegel; WUNT 307; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), especially the introductory essay "Wege und Perspektiven der Interpretation des Johannesevangeliums: Überlegungen auf dem Weg zu einem Kommentar," *ibid.*, 3-41. On the theology of John and its pneumatology see especially the article "Die johanneische Theologie als Klimax der neutestamentlichen Theologie," *ibid.*, 805-35 (originally in *ZTK* 107 [2010]: 448-78).

<sup>69</sup> Although the precise relationship between the gospel and the epistles and their temporal sequence is still a matter of dispute, the epistles are the most important commentary for interpreting and contextualizing the gospel narrative. See most extensively M. Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (London: SCM, 1989).

<sup>70</sup> Cf. U. Schnelle, "Johannes als Geisttheologe," *NT* 40 (1998): 17-31; *idem*, *Theologie*, 664-72.

<sup>71</sup> See also J. Frey, "Die johanneische Theologie als Klimax der neutestamentlichen Theologie."

<sup>72</sup> On this, see basically R. Schnackenburg, "Die johanneische Gemeinde und ihre Geisterfahrung," in *idem*, *Das Johannesevangelium* (4 vols.; HTKNT 4/1-4; Freiburg: Herder, 1965-1984), 4:33-58.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. J. Frey, *Die eschatologische Verkündigung in den johanneischen Texten* (vol. 3 of *Die johanneische Eschatologie*; WUNT 117; Tübingen 2000), 195-204.



the theological discernment of Christological and ethical teachings, in marked contrast to the charisma of the *διάκρισις πνευμάτων* as possibly practiced in the Corinthian community (1 Cor 12:10).

But apart from the problem of the actual experience of the Johannine community members, it is striking that in the Fourth Gospel, the theological reflection about the work of the Spirit is entirely focused on its verbal effects, the ‘logos function’. There is no reference to the Spirit in the context of Jesus’ miracles, nor is there any idea that the disciples in the post-Easter period should perform miracles through the Spirit.<sup>74</sup> Nothing is said about ecstatic or visionary phenomena in the community of the disciples, and in John 1:51, the motif of the vision of the ‘open heaven’ is completely related to the perception of the glory or heavenly dignity of Jesus, the incarnate (cf. John 1:14; 14:7 etc.) and the exalted one. The Spirit merely reminds (of the words, the work and the fate of Jesus), he teaches the disciples (John 14:26), as the ‘paraclete’ he assists them like an advocate, conducts the trial about the truth of the faith in Christ (John 16:8-11), and guides them in all truth (John 16:13-15). Thus, the Spirit shall be with the disciples, in the place of Jesus, after his departure, in order to comfort and teach them, as Jesus himself had taught them, or even beyond the teachings of the earthly Jesus.<sup>75</sup> Thus, the Spirit is focused on the ‘logos’, i.e., on Jesus, and his activities are almost completely word-related: reminding, teaching, guiding.

### 8.2 *The Spirit as the Gift of the Risen Christ*

The Spirit effective within the community is Christ’s paschal gift. Apart from the narrative representation of that idea in the Johannine Easter narrative (John 20:22f.), this is particularly expressed in the Farewell Discourses where the five paraclete sayings point to the sending of the Spirit as an event still in the future.<sup>76</sup> There are subtle differences with regard to the one who sends the Spirit: Whereas in the first two sayings (John 14:16-17; 14:26), the Father shall send the “other Paraclete” to the disciples upon Jesus’ request, the following three sayings – in the context of the second Farewell Discourse (John 15:1 – 16:33) – share the concept that Jesus, after his departure, will send the Spirit-Paraclete to the disciples (John 15:26; 16:7). We should, however, not overestimate these conceptual differences: The episode at the end of the Gospel, in John 20:22, corresponds to the view expressed in the second part of the Farewell Discourses: Jesus himself is the giver of the Spirit that enables the disciples to continue his salvific work. Jesus breathes into the disciples,<sup>77</sup> as God had breathed into the figure of clay to bring it to life (Gen 2:7 LXX).<sup>78</sup> The life-giving divine Spirit is now communicated to the disciples by Jesus, the divine Son (cf. John 20:28).

In the context of Johannine Christology, this is a final confirmation of Jesus’ true divinity, which is also expressed in earlier sayings on the Spirit. Already in the opening of the gospel, John the baptizer confirms that Jesus is the one, on whom the Spirit rests in abundance (John 1:32f.), and in a later passage, also attributed to John (John 3:31-36), it is said that the one whom God has sent and who pronounces God’s words “gives the Spirit without limitation” (John 3:34). This again is a

---

<sup>74</sup> The ‘greater works’ mentioned in John 14:12 (cf. 5:20) are probably not miracles but the salvific work of Jesus, according to the commissioning in John 20:23.

<sup>75</sup> This is the focus of the so-called paraclete sayings. See the thorough investigation by D. Pastorelli, *Le Paraclet dans le corpus johannique* (BZNW 142; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2006).

<sup>76</sup> On the temporal structure of the paraclete sayings see especially C. Hoegen-Rohls, *Der nachösterliche Johannes: Die Abschiedsreden als hermeneutischer Schlüssel zum vierten Evangelium* (WUNT 2/84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996).

<sup>77</sup> On the problems of this expression, see the articles by Annette Weissenrieder and Michael Becker in the present volume.

<sup>78</sup> The creation of faith in the disciples at the Easter day is thus put into analogy with the creation of the human being, and Jesus appears in analogy with the creator (cf. also John 1:3).

Christological claim:<sup>79</sup> It is Jesus who not only has, but (from a post-Easter perspective<sup>80</sup>) even gives the Spirit in abundance, and as the giver of the Spirit, he takes the place that was held by God himself in the earlier tradition.

Pneumatology thus confirms and corresponds the high Christology of the Gospel. Furthermore, the legacy of the work of the Spirit is only derived from Jesus, not only from the exalted one but quite clearly from the incarnate one and his way. It is Jesus who promises the coming of the Spirit after his departure, and the Spirit is said to remind of Jesus' words and deeds. There is no space for any 'independent' activity of the Spirit, and the assumption is not far-fetched that this may be a reaction to some concerns or debates within the community. Especially the last one of the paraclete sayings, John 16:13-15, emphatically rejects any idea that the Spirit could act in an unauthorized manner, stressing the fact that everything the Spirit does or proclaims is taken from the realm of Jesus, i.e., closely related to him, and authorized through the relation with Jesus. So the whole teaching activity of the Spirit can be summarized as glorifying Jesus. Thus, not only the sending of the Spirit but also the whole activity of the Spirit in the post-Easter community is related to and based upon the events of Jesus' death and resurrection (cf. John 7:39). The Spirit, as Jesus' delegate and the disciples' assistance, or, respectively, the community of disciples empowered by the Spirit (John 20:22f.) continues Jesus' proper work in the post-Easter period: The disciples' testimony about Jesus, their preaching is of decisive eschatological significance, it has the effects of death or life, as had the preaching of Jesus (cf. John 5:22f.), and they are authorized to their work through the Spirit, who not only empowers them but represents the exalted Jesus and makes him present within the disciples' proclamation of the gospel.

### 8.3 *The Spirit as a Personal and Divine Figure*

In Johannine theology, the Holy Spirit is a predominantly personal figure. And – in spite of all the problems of 'gendering' the divine – the analogy with Jesus and the use of the term ὁ δὲ παράκλητος rather suggest to use the male form 'he' instead of the female 'she', as would be appropriate for the Hebrew *רוח*. The neuter 'it' which might be still appropriate for parts of the early Christian experiences of the πνεῦμα is certainly inappropriate in the Johannine context.

The Spirit shall be with the disciples in the period of Jesus' absence so that they will not be lonely or lost (as 'orphans'; cf. John 14:18). He teaches the disciples as Jesus had taught them and leads them as he had led them, thus in a certain manner 'replacing' the incarnate Jesus, although Jesus after his glorification is actually not inactive, let alone inexistent, but invisible to the disciples (cf. John 16:10) and in the realm of the Father. The 'personal' features of the Spirit are largely phrased in analogy to the person of Jesus, the exalted and the earthly one. Even the term 'the Paraclete' (ὁ παράκλητος) was (probably) first coined for the heavenly Christ who helps the believers as a heavenly intercessor in the realm of the Father (1 John 2:1), and the fact that the Spirit-Paraclete is introduced in the Gospel as the "other Paraclete" (John 14:16) probably points to an original concept according to which the 'first' paraclete or advocate is Jesus himself. Of course, the Spirit-Paraclete is not a real successor, because Jesus has not ceased to be active for the disciples, but he is nevertheless a substitute for the departed Jesus, taking his place at the side of the disciples in the time after Jesus' departure, i.e., in the time of the church.

---

<sup>79</sup> In John 3:34b, the grammatical subject is the subject of the verb λαλεῖ in 3:34a, i.e., the one whom God has sent, Jesus. Thus (in contrast with some Bible translations), according to John 3:34 it is not God, but precisely Jesus who is the giver of the Spirit.

<sup>80</sup> This is the perspective characteristically taken in the Fourth Gospel; cf. generally Hoegen-Rohls, *Der nachösterliche Johannes*, and also J. Frey, *Das johanneische Zeitverständnis* (vol. 2 of *Die johanneische Eschatologie*; WUNT 110; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

As the teacher of the community of disciples the Spirit confirms to them their salutary situation: In spite of Jesus' departure, his invisibility and apparent absence, they are truly not orphaned (cf. John 14:18), but rather transferred to a considerably better situation than any of the pre-Easter disciples could imagine (cf. John 16:7). Whereas the disciples such as Peter, Thomas and Philip were always subject to misunderstandings, the post-Easter community is led by the Spirit to a deeper (or even to the true) understanding of Jesus' words, works and death.

As the teacher of the words of Jesus, the Spirit acts in continuation of Jesus' teaching (John 14:26; 16:13-15), explaining its real meaning to the minds of the post-Easter disciples and their later followers and guiding them in the truth (which is Jesus himself; cf. John 14:6). Thus, the Spirit can be considered the real 'author' of the Johannine image of Jesus in its marked differences from the views of the earlier and Synoptic tradition. In other words, the Spirit is the subject of the Johannine Christology: "He will glorify me" (John 16:14).

#### *8.4 The Spirit as the Author of the Johannine Christology and Theology*

The Spirit has, thus, an important interpretative function within the gospel and, even more, for its 'history of origins'. It is the Spirit who reminds the disciples of the story and the words of Jesus and leads them to its true understanding. The gospel even openly admits that the disciples of the earthly Jesus, during the time of their discipleship, did not understand his words, his actions and his fate, but only after his resurrection or glorification, they *remembered* (John 2:22; 12:16: ἐμνήσθησαν) things and understood their true meaning. The correspondence between those 'anamnesis remarks' and the didactic and anamnestic function of the Spirit-Paraclete (John 14:26: διδάξει πάντα καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς) points to the fundamental insight that the whole image of Jesus as depicted in the gospel, based on the testimony of the 'beloved disciple' is actually a creation of the post-Easter remembrance which is actually ascribed to the Spirit as the teacher and guide into the truth. Thus the difference between the Johannine image of Jesus (depicted in the light of the Easter events or of his glorification) and the images of the earlier tradition (which are probably much closer to the historical 'facts') is explained by the reference to the activity of the Spirit. The Gospel's claim is, thus, that the creator of the deeper perception of Jesus, indeed the proper author of the Johannine Christology, is the Holy Spirit that has "reminded" and "taught" the disciples in the post-Easter period and thus opened their eyes for the true understanding of Jesus words, history and person. In other words, the Johannine Christology with its 'high' and divine traits is not an arbitrary and unauthorized interpretation, but shaped under the guidance of the Spirit and in relation with the earthly Jesus (John 16:14-15).<sup>81</sup>

#### *8.5 A Proto-Trinitarian Theology*

In a distinct manner the Johannine theology depicts the Holy Spirit as a divine figure with personal traits. The dynamic elements of the effects of the Spirit that were dominant in the early period have almost disappeared, and instead the verbal, 'logos-oriented' functions abound, combined with the aspect of a personal presence, in replacement of the apparently absent Jesus. In his activities, the Holy Spirit appears decisively as a divine person. It is not simply a mode of Jesus' 'spiritual' coming, as has often been suggested with regard to John 14:18-23. The paraclete sayings clearly distinguish between Jesus and the Spirit-Paraclete and also between both and God the Father: The Father shall give the Spirit-Paraclete on Jesus' request (John 14:16). He will send the Spirit in Jesus' name (John 14:26). Or Jesus will send the Spirit-Paraclete from (the realm of) the Father (John 15:26). In the concluding paraclete saying, the Spirit, as effective in the post-Easter community, is specifically related to the

---

<sup>81</sup> Cf., on those claims of the Johannine preaching and on the fundamental function of the Spirit with regard to its development, C. Dietzfelbinger, "Paraklet und theologischer Anspruch im Johannesevangelium," *ZTK* 82 (1985): 389-408.

exalted Jesus and to the Father: “He will not speak on his own authority, but whatever he hears he will speak ... He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine and declare it to you. All that the Father has is mine; therefore I said that he will take what is mine and declare it to you.” The Spirit-Paraclete, Christ as the exalted one, and God the Father are clearly distinguished and correlated, so that it seems justified to call this a ‘proto-trinitarian’ theology.

Of course, the Johannine view is still far away from the later Trinitarian doctrine, as developed in the 3rd and 4th century, based on Greek ontological terms which were still inconceivable for the authors of the New Testament. But the Johannine statements on the Spirit provide the most important Scriptural basis for the later view of the Holy Spirit as a divine person in specific correlation with, and distinction from, the Father and the Son. While triadic formulae and sequences are documented already in earlier periods of early Christianity (cf. 1 Cor 12:4-6; 2 Cor 13:13) and – almost contemporary with John in the end of Matthew (Matt 28:18), the Johannine reflection goes far beyond a merely sequential alignment of three divine figures, reflecting their connection, their mutual relationship and yet their complex ‘unity’. This is true for the relationship between God and the Logos (John 1:1, 18) or the Father and the Son (John 10:30; 14:9 etc.), but also for the relationship between the Spirit, Jesus Christ and God the Father. “As it is impossible to talk about God in the Johannine sense without talking about his son, it is also impossible to talk about the divine Spirit without a glimpse at the one who has breathed it onto his disciples at Easter in the manner of the new creation.”<sup>82</sup> In the Fourth Gospel, the personality of the Holy Spirit and the precisely reflected coordination of Spirit, Son and Father are developed in a manner that became later normative in the development of the Christian doctrine. And it is the Gospel of John that provided the Scriptural basis for dismissing some of the options of relating Father, Son and Spirit in the early church: Excluded is not only the idea of three divine figures (‘tri-theism’), but also the idea of a strict ‘monarchianism’ of the Father over against the Son and the Spirit and the ‘modalism’ of the three hypostases as mere modes of appearance of the one deity behind the three. Quite soon, the Gospel of John served as the ‘canon’ for the understanding of the relationship between Father, Son and Spirit and for the construction of the later Trinitarian teaching and the decisive Christian image of the Holy Spirit as a divine ‘person’.

## 9. Conclusion

The ‘history’ of the Holy Spirit from the dynamic power compared to the boom of a wind (Acts 2:2) or from the divine power that empowers the Messiah to fulfill his work, to an increasingly discrete agent, representing the exalted Christ and acting in analogy to his acts, indeed to a divine person subtly correlated with the Father and the Son, could only be sketched briefly here. It is a story, told here with primary focus on the internally Christian development and, to a large extent, in disregard of external history-of-religions contexts. But the development towards the personality of the Spirit constitutes one of the decisive Christian developments, which is not to be explained not from external history-of-religions influences but from internal developments. It is the main aspect in which the Christian concept of the Holy Spirit differs from its biblical and Jewish roots as well as from its

---

<sup>82</sup> Thus M. Theobald, “Gott, Logos und Pneuma: Trinitarische Rede von Gott im Johannesevangelium,” in *Monotheismus und Christologie: Zur Gottesfrage im hellenistischen Judentum und im Urchristentum* (ed. H.-J. Klauck; FS K. Kertelge; QD 138; Freiburg: Herder, 1992), 41-87 (64): “Wie man im johanneischen Sinne von Gott nicht reden kann, ohne von seinem Sohn ... zu sprechen ..., so auch nicht vom Geist Gottes, ohne auf den zu schauen, der ihn an Ostern seinen Jüngern im Gestus der Neuschöpfung ‘zugehaucht’ hat.”

Greco-Roman contexts, and it was predominantly triggered by the correlation of the Spirit with the exalted Christ.