

Chapter One

Methodological considerations

Introduction

The objectives of this introductory chapter are sevenfold: Firstly, I intend to use it to sketch my perception of the problem and the task. Secondly, I aim to demonstrate my conviction regarding the topicality and timeliness of the study. Thirdly, since this study is an exegetical study I wish to introduce the issue of exegetical ambiguity. Fourthly, I desire to motivate my conviction that it is important to address the area of Pneumatological ambiguity. In the fifth instance, I wish to introduce the motivation of my choice to study the Gospel of John from both a literary social, and historical perspective. Since this study is presented as a scientific study, I deem it important in the sixth place, to share the methodological procedure I plan to follow. And in the seventh instance I would like to outline the chapter design in order to make known where this study is heading.

1.1. The problem and the task

The subject of this dissertation is an exegetical analysis of the Paraclete sayings and a comparison of the concepts of the Paraclete and the Holy Spirit in John's Gospel. Taking into consideration the vast literature¹ published on the Johannine corpus, it might seem arrogant to present another study.² The position taken here, as inspiration for this study, is that as long as

¹ When you take O. Betz (1963:4-35); J. Blank (1964:317-322), G. Johnston (1970:80-118), F. Porsch (1974:5-14 and 305-317), and D. Woll (1981:69-80) into consideration, there is already clear enough indication that Johannine literature receives much attention in scholarly research. The *Johannine Literature Web* created and maintained by Prof. Felix Just, S.J., of Loyola Marymount University gives a good contemporary indication of the enormity of literature published on Johannine literature since it was last updated on 12 June 2002. However, the point here is that the overabundance of articles, monographies and dissertations on Johannine material are overwhelming.

² Yet, as Felix Just's bibliography indicates quite clearly, in comparison to other Johannine themes surprisingly little was published during the last three decades on the Paraclete. See Just, 2002 and ATLA Religion Database 2001.

the enigma of the Paraclete³ remains unanswered⁴, one is justified to attempt a contribution to the understanding of this important subject in Christian theology.⁵

J. Behm (1964) has assembled the etymological and semantic material available for the Greek word παράκλητος in a concise and comparative way. Scholars are in agreement that the word παράκλητος is peculiar to John. R. Brown (1984:1135) points to the fact that Christian tradition has identified this figure as the Holy Spirit, but that some scholars have doubted whether this identification is true to the original picture and have suggested that the Paraclete was once an independent salvific figure, later confused with the Holy Spirit.⁶

1.2. Topicality of this study

In Christian theology a study of the Holy Spirit or Pneumatology is often discussed in the context of Systematic Theology and not in the context of Biblical Theology.

C. Vos (1984:1) unlocks the theme and relevance of his study, *The Holy Spirit as Cosmic-Eschatological Gift – an Exegetical-Dogmatical study*, with a reference to the fact that research in the field of the Pneumatology experienced a bloom phase in the latter half of the twentieth century. P. Rosato (1981:181) even argued in his study, *The Spirit as Lord*, that Karl Barth should be seen primarily as a 'pneumatologist'.

³ S. Schulz (1975:143), H. Thyen (1977:343), H. Riesenfeld (1972:266), A. Leany (1972:152), U. Müller (1974:5), A. Kothgasser (1971:569), Y. Congar (1983a:45-62), E. Franck (1985:9-11), J. Breck (1991), O. Hofius (1996:87-190), and I. De la Potterie (1999:281-478) are giving us an indication of the enigmatic character of the Paraclete.

⁴ J. Behm (1976:800-813) states that the use of the term παράκλητος in the New Testament, though restricted to the Johannine writings, does not make any consistent impression, nor does it fit smoothly into the history of the word as described.

⁵ P. Rosato (1981:181) closed his study as follows: "A study of Karl Barth's pneumatology must unfortunately conclude with the same ambiguity and embarrassment which Barth himself expresses concerning the Spirit theology. Perhaps this is because, with regard to the Holy Spirit, all Christian theologians are almost necessarily novices. The study of the divine Pneuma, whose transparent person and work reaches into the recesses of God and creation, is not easily definable and can quite readily be coloured by the theological bent of the observer."

⁶ Scholars like F. Spita (1925:260-277), H. Delafosse (1925), H. Windisch (1968), H. Sasse (1925:260-277), R. Bultmann (1971), and O. Betz (1963) have expressed their doubts.

The Holy Spirit, or Holy Ghost, is usually described as the third person of the Trinity, distinct from but coequal with God the Father and God the Son. Biblical references to prove this are given, often without proper exegesis or analysis of the meaning of these texts in their context. The Holy Spirit is sometimes described as the creative, healing, renewing presence of God. Once again, biblical proof texts are mentioned often without proper exegetical regard for their contexts. Theologians often point to a gradual development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Scripture without in depth exegesis and analysis of this development. In general statements are made that indicate that in the Old Testament the Spirit was, for example, at work in the creation of the world (Genesis 1) and in prophecy (Isaiah 61:1). Or that in the New Testament, the Spirit was present in the life and works of Jesus Christ (Mark 1:12) and continues to be present as the Paraclete (advocate) in the Christian community (John 14:26). The early church saw the descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles at Pentecost as the outpouring of divine gifts of holiness, love, prophecy, healing, and speaking in Tongues.

It is most intriguing however that Pneumatological research would often either stay clear from any detailed exegetical exposition, analysis of the Paraclete references and comparison with the Holy Spirit announcements, or would just mention that the Paraclete is the Spirit.⁷

It should also be mentioned that although exegetical Johannine research is vibrant, not many Johannine scholars focus exegetically on this theme. There are also those scholars who indeed question whether the Paraclete and Holy Spirit could or should be identified this closely. Yet, their question posed and answer given are often not substantiated and authenticated by thorough exegetical analysis.

As stated, if I consider the work of, for example Felix Just, it is my perception that there is a lack of interest in studying the Johannine Paraclete sayings. The reason for this perceived lack of interest might be any of the following:

⁷ This is not always the case. R. Brown (1966:1135-1144) and R. Schnackenburg (1982:138-154 and 1984:33-58) are 2 obvious exceptions.

- In biblical literature the word παράκλητος is only to be found in John 14-16 and in 1 John 2:1. R. Kysar (1975:234) calls it one of John's innovative concepts. In fact, material upon which one might make direct comparisons is missing in the rest of the New Testament and the LXX. E. Franck (1985:9) mentions that this lack of internal comparative material becomes problematic for linguistic and history of religions analysis.

However, not all Johannine scholars share this interpretation. Behm, for instance, disagrees. He suggests that the thought is common to primitive Christianity even though the word παράκλητος does not occur in the non-Johannine writings. He feels, therefore, that the lack of biblical references cannot be used as excuse for not studying this theme in Johannine thought. He asks the question however, whether this lack of biblical reference to the Paraclete is a caprice of tradition?⁸ (J. Behm's comment gives us reason to investigate the proposed theme.)

- E. Franck (1985:9) mentions that there also is a recognized break between the Paraclete's title and his functions in the Gospel of John itself.⁹ If the title retains the general meaning of secular Greek, it does not naturally label the functions ascribed to it in the Gospel according to John. Thus one possible reason why exegetical Paraclete research remains so sparse is related to text-internal problems.
- Then there are also the different emphases of scholarly research and the pitfalls they create. Biblical research developed along the lines of three basic approaches – theological, historical and literary.¹⁰ All three approaches include some degree of incompleteness.¹¹ All three approaches have some tendencies toward a kind of totalitarianism.¹² In examining the Johannine usage of παράκλητος, therefore, it is necessary to take into account all three interpretive emphases. It is my understanding

⁸ See J. Behm (1976:812).

⁹ He refers to C. Dodd (1953:414-415; same as Dodd 1970) and A. Casarella (1983:142-143) as motivation for his point of view.

¹⁰ The theological approach dominated until the eighteenth century. Then came the historical. And the literary has just begun to emerge.

¹¹ T. Brodie (1993:9) mentions that the theological approach, intent on ultimate meaning, pays little attention to the important questions of history and literary structure. The literary approach on the other hand often gives the impression of bypassing some legitimate traditional concerns. And the historical approach, in their preoccupation with one facet of the gospel, sometimes involve in a persistent misreading of the text.

¹² They see their particular approach as essentially total, complete or at least as being the correct way to approach the text – a way that may not be fundamentally questioned (T. Brodie, 1993:10).

that a balanced use of these three emphases form the basis of any proper exegetical debate.

In some Christian theological circles the perception exists that a study of the Holy Spirit or Pneumatology should be conducted in the context of Systematic Theology and not in the context of Biblical Theology.¹³ This might create the impression that:

- Biblical theologians are not interested in the implications of their exegesis and interpretation for the formation of doctrine, or
- Systematic theologians are not too keen to found their formulation of church doctrine on exegetical research.

The abovementioned discrepancy causes a study of this theme to be very stimulating, topical, timely and relevant. The high profile that Pneumatology had in the latter half of the 20th Century and the very rapid growth of the Charismatic Movement with its emphasis on the role/function of the Holy Spirit, justifies a study of the Johannine understanding of the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete and the relationship between the two.¹⁴

This study wishes to place emphasis on the belief that a proper understanding of παράκλητος is only possible when you engage in thorough exegetical biblical exposition where the text in its immediate literary context and broader socio-historical context receives its rightful place. Any discussion in this study with systematic theology will be solely to emphasize that systematic theology cannot function properly without a solid biblical and exegetical foundation.

The hidden danger of an approach that lacks a proper exegetical foundation is that at best the interpretation then cannot be anything else than dogmatic or tradition bound and at worst it is mere personal speculation. My conviction is that such an approach compromises proper

¹³ See C. Vos (1984:1).

¹⁴ It should be mentioned that although not many Johannine scholars focus their study on this theme, there are those scholars who question whether παράκλητος and Holy Spirit could or should be identified this closely.

understanding of the text. With this in mind, this study will attempt to guard against the dogmatising of texts.

Although it might seem as if this study over-simplifies with regards to an interpretation of the Paraclete-Spirit, I wish to challenge such a notion by stating the firm belief that it is unrealistic to imagine that a simplistic interpretation will resolve the deep divisions among scholars from different scientific paradigms. The point that should be stressed however is the unyielding conviction that a comparative biblical exegetical study of a Paraclete-Spirit can contribute to the discussion.

1.3. The haunting ambiguity of Biblical Exegesis

S. Porter (2002:23) emphasizes that it is notoriously difficult to define exegesis.¹⁵ Exegesis means to draw out of a text what it means in contrast to eisegesis, to read into a text what we want it to say. W. Egger (1996:2), however, alludes to the fact that the activity of understanding is a spontaneous response to reading. All readers give the words the sense they are familiar with. They draw connecting lines between what is read and their own subjective experience. They connect the statements in a text with other statements whose meaning is familiar. For this very reason we need to acknowledge that any first reading of a text has a highly subjective and personal colouring. This implies that we always run the danger of eisegesis if we do not put mechanisms in place to make sure that we allow the text to speak louder than our own subjective experience.

S. Porter and A. Clarke's article "*What is exegesis? An analysis of various definitions*", gives us a good overview of the ambiguity of the word exegesis.¹⁶ They state that exegesis comprises the most important task of the study of the New Testament, but that there are few terms in biblical studies that are used so freely and represent so many different things to various scholars and students as the term "exegesis".

¹⁵ See S. Porter (2002:24-25) for a discussion and evaluation of some of the exponents of New Testament exegesis.

¹⁶ See especially their example in the introduction (S. Porter, 2002:3-4).

H. Boers comments in the introduction to W. Egger's *How to read the New Testament: An introduction to Linguistics and Historical Critical Methodology*, "In the 1970 Society of Biblical Literature seminar I was able to see for the first time that one could distinguish between the meaning of Paul's statements taken by themselves and the way they functioned in his letters." H. Boers (1996:xxxvii-xxxviii) refers to a variety of studies discussed at the seminar and alludes to the fact that what these studies have done is opening a window on the functioning of language, not only in Paul's writings, but in the New Testament. H. Boers (1996:xlvi) also emphasises the difference between traditional grammar and transformational grammar.

Traditionally defined, exegesis is the process by which a reader seeks to discover the meaning of a text via an understanding of the original author's intentions of the text. The classic goal of exegesis has been to articulate the meaning of the passage as the original writer intended it to be understood by his contemporary audience.¹⁷

Where the emphasis of grammatico-historical exegesis has focused on what biblical texts originally meant, more recently scholars have argued that the exegetical task should (and even must) be expanded to include both what the text has meant for the original writer and his contemporary audience and what the text means for us today.¹⁸

As a result recent biblical interpreters have chosen to emphasise other exegetical criteria. S. Porter (2002:10) lists these alternative forms of exegesis as discourse analysis, rhetorical and narratological criticism, literary criticism, ideological criticism, social scientific criticism, and canonical criticism. Although I firmly believe in the importance of grammatico-historical exegesis, the alternative forms of exegesis have their place in an exegetical study of any text.

Widening the exegetical task, to include both what a text meant in the past and what it means in the present, complicates exegesis. But this complication is something we will have to live with if we want to treat texts responsibly. However, W. Egger's distinction between synchronic and diachronic approaches, where the first seeks to answer what the text means in the present and

¹⁷ S. Porter (2002:7) calls this grammatico-historical exegesis or simply historical exegesis.

¹⁸ See W. Stenger (1993:3-5). See also G. Osborne (1991:7).

the later seeks to answer what it meant originally, is helpful to address texts exegetically in a holistic way.¹⁹

Another issue that causes exegesis to be ambiguous is the issue of objectivity. R. Bultmann asked the question: "Is interpretation without presuppositions possible?" He answered this question this way: "No exegesis is without presuppositions, in as much as the exegete is not a tabula rasa, but on the contrary, approaches the text with specific questions or with a specific way of raising questions and thus has a certain idea of the subject matter with which the text is concerned." (R. Bultmann, 1960:289) In other words exegesis must be without prejudice but cannot be read from a neutral stance. It is my wish to look at the topic under discussion without prejudice, but with an acknowledgment of the fact that my presuppositions will play a role in the way I am addressing matters.

S. Porter (2002:14) acknowledges that "not only is every exegete determined by his or her own individuality, special biases, habits, gifts, and weaknesses, but in reading a text, the interpreter must formulate an initial understanding of what the text is saying. This then must be verified by the text itself. The danger, however, is that we allow our theological fallacies to dictate how we interpret texts. D. Carson's book (1996a) is helpful in identifying common blind spots.

In this context I acknowledge my own exegetical bias and affirm that although I prefer to place a high premium on grammatico-historical exegesis, we have to amend this form of exegesis by making use of other more recent developments in the exegetical domain as well. Although this study claims to be a scholarly exegetical study, this claim does not ensure correctness of understanding.

I agree with W. Egger (1996:3) that scholarly reading should ascertain the sense of a text through the most complete systematic recording possible of the phenomena of the text and through the grappling with the reasons that speak for or against a specific understanding of it.

¹⁹ Although I will address some issues that would fall under a diachronic approach, this investigation would also be synchronic in nature.

T. Van Dijk (1972:161) and T. Van Dijk and W. Kintsch (1975:98-116) refer to the fact that all readers of a text construct a macro-structure for the text that is relevant to them. H. Boers' view as stated in (1996:xlix) goes so far as to suggest that we can say that a single reader will not read a text with exactly the same macro-structure every time, but organises the various parts of the text differently in each case.

C. Lévi-Strauss (1976:115-145) argued that the meaning does not reside in words but in the structural relationships between words. D. Carson (1996a) would agree with this.²⁰ The implication of this for New Testament interpretation is that we cannot only look at the lexical meaning of words used in Scripture but that we should look at words as transformation of functions that have meaning only in relationship to other functions. This implies that the meaning of words might change when placed in relation to other words. The meaning of words is therefore often gained through the context.

D. Carson (1996a) reveals how easily scholars fall into the trap of making serious exegetical mistakes.²¹ Carson takes on an area of academic investigation that is rarely attempted and even more rarely tolerated by theologians today, exposing to light improper techniques of biblical interpretation. Creating numerous groupings of fallacies, Carson categorizes many of the common errors made by pastors, laymen, commentators, and theologians resulting in improper conclusions about passages of Scripture.²² Most notable is Carson's excellent discussion of the primacy of context in interpretation. If context is abandoned, the phrases and words of Scripture, no matter how thoroughly researched and no matter how carefully scrutinized by the

²⁰ D. Carson (1996a:28) explains for example "The Root Fallacy" in his chapter, "Word-Study Fallacies" and identifies it as one of the most basic exegetical errors we make. He writes, "One of the most enduring of errors, the root fallacy presupposes that every word actually has a meaning bound up with its shape or its components." D. Carson (1996:131-132) also points out in the chapter, "Presuppositional and Historical Fallacies," the fallacy called "uncontrolled historical reconstruction." That is, "The fallacy is in thinking that speculative reconstruction of first-century Jewish and Christian history should be given much weight in the exegesis of the New Testament documents." This is because there is "almost no access to the history of the early church during its first five or six decades apart from the New Testament documents."

²¹ S. Porter (2002:25) comments on this book as follow: "Very provocative, as well as highly entertaining, is D.A. Carson's Exegetical Fallacies (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996) He classifies a range of potential and actual exegetical mistakes under four categories – lexicography, grammar, logic and historical method. This is an intriguing book, not least because it shows how easy it is to make serious exegetical mistakes.

²² This book has four chapters, giving overviews of word-study, grammatical, logical, presuppositional, and historical fallacies. Each chapter in turn has some smaller sections in which Carson defines and discusses the particular fallacies of each general type.

etymologist, will rarely yield the proper definition or interpretation.²³ This understanding is the foundation of much of Carson's discussion of word study fallacies and grammatical fallacies.

This study will attempt to make a scholarly exegetical contribution to the appearance and interpretation of the Paraclete-Spirit in John's Gospel.

1.4. The haunting ambiguity of the Paraclete in Johannine Pneumatology

Over the centuries the identity and function of the Paraclete have evoked much debate and conflicting ideas.²⁴ With regards to identity we have the two major conflicting ideas: there are those scholars who see the Paraclete as a person and there are others who see the Paraclete as a force. Add to this that in biblical literature the word παράκλητος is idiosyncratic to Johannine literature. To be even more specific, it is peculiar to John 14-16 and 1 John 2:1. As stated earlier E. Franck (1985:9) rightly asserts that this peculiarity, and the absence of additional biblical material that we might have used to make direct comparisons, becomes problematic for both linguistic and history of religion analyses.

G. Burge (1987:xi-xii) observes that most discussions of New Testament Pneumatology focus on the writings of Luke or Paul. He also articulates that this is readily explainable by the clear emphasis of each on the lively activity of the Spirit in the early days of the church and the ultimate development of charismatic Pauline communities. However, he also shares this conviction regarding the Johannine Pneumatology: "It is my belief that the Johannine community's experience of the Spirit offers us an important and necessary balance." I share Burge's sentiment.

²³ D. Carson tackles exegetical flaws that commonly abound in commentaries and theological works and does it with pinpoint accuracy and straightforwardness. He exposes flaws not only committed by non-evangelical scholars, but those considered evangelical! He shows how exegetical fallacies are committed by the choice of words used, improper grammar use, improper use of logic, and ones presuppositions and historical attachments.

²⁴ See for instance E. Bammel (1973), O. Betz (1963), J. Breck (1991), R.E. Brown (1967), P.E. Brown (2002), G. Burge (1987), S. Burgess (1984, 1987 and 1997), A. Casarella (1983), J. Dunn (1975), G. Fee (1994), E. Franck (1985), N. Johansson (1940), G. Johnston (1970), G. Locher (1966), H. Sasse (1925), A. Shafaat (1981), H. Windisch (1968), etc.

Another problem area would be that much of the scholarly work on παράκλητος has attempted to find one more or less complete history of religion background for the παράκλητος²⁵ and one meaning for the functions attached to it²⁶ in John 14-16. However, not many scholars have asked whether it could be that the Historical-Religious background of the Johannine concept of Paraclete and the functionality of the Paraclete in John's Gospel are much broader than just one dominant historical religious influence and one dominant function? Or whether there are unique characteristics in the Johannine usage of the word παράκλητος? The view promoted by this study is that this is indeed the case. I intend to show that John's usage is indeed unique and that it cannot be narrowed down to one specific historical origin or one specific dominant function. If my view is correct it has got far reaching implications for the understanding of background of παράκλητος.²⁷

Should we interpret the Johannine concept of Paraclete as synonymous with the Holy Spirit? Should we consider him to be an angel, the beloved disciple, modern preachers, or somebody else? In this study a synopsis of current positions held, an evaluation of their validity and a reason for my preference will be given.

There are many different ways to organize an approach to the biblical revelation concerning the Holy Spirit and therefore also to the Paraclete-Spirit. We could focus on a description and discussion of His Person and deity (both of which are found throughout the Bible), His ministries, prior to, during, and after the New Testament age. An approach like this would traditionally be interpreted as a pneumatology.

²⁵ We could see here for instance Jewish, Gnostic, Iranian, Mandeian, Hellenistic, Qumran, Islam, etc.

²⁶ E.g., an interpretation of παράκλητος as advocate, or to interpret παράκλητος predominantly in a legal context.

²⁷ The Historical Critical method alone with its search of the historical rootedness of texts is not very helpful in the attempt to understand John's usage of παράκλητος. How can we prove that John's usage of this concept stems from that of e.g. Philo, or Josephus or the early Greeks, since we have no clear indication in John's Gospel that this is the case? There are no such indications. Therefore, all that we can do in our attempt to understand John's usage better, is to socio-cultural ecology and to try and plot John's interpretation in the broader context. Because of the unique characteristics of John's usage of the concept παράκλητος, we cannot claim or prove that John derived his understanding from other proponents of this concept.

On a doctrinal level the premise is that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was initially far less developed (than say for instance the doctrine of the Personhood of Christ), and until the middle of the fourth century was never a subject of special controversy. The Apostles Creed devotes only one article to the third person of the holy Trinity, while the confession of the Son of God, in six or seven articles, forms the body of the symbol. Even the original Nicene Creed breaks off abruptly with the words: "And in the Holy Spirit;" the other clauses being later additions. Logical knowledge regarding the Holy Spirit appears to be here still further removed than in Christology from the living substance of faith. This period was still in immediate contact with the fresh spiritual life of the apostolate, still witnessed the lingering operations of the extraordinary gifts, and experienced in full measure the regenerating, sanctifying, and comforting influences of the divine Spirit in life, suffering, and death; but, as to the theological definition of the nature and work of the Spirit, it remained in many respects confused and wavering down to the Nicene age.

Yet, rationalistic historians go quite too far when, among other accusations, they charge the Early Church with making the Holy Spirit identical with the Logos. To confound the functions, as in attributing the inspiration of the prophets, for example, now to the Holy Spirit, now to the Logos, is by no means to confound the persons. On the contrary, the thorough investigations of recent times show plainly that the ante-Nicene fathers, with the exception of the Monarchians and perhaps Lactantius, agreed on the two fundamental points, that the Holy Spirit, the sole agent in the application of redemption, is a supernatural divine being, and that he is an independent person; thus closely allied to the Father and the Son yet hypostatically different from them both. This was the practical conception, as demanded even by the formula of baptism. But instead of making the Holy Spirit strictly coordinate with the other divine persons, as the Nicene doctrine does, it commonly left him subordinate to the Father and the Son.²⁸

P. Schaff (1997) writes the following about pneumatology, "This is most fully set forth in the farewell discourses of our Lord, which are reported by John exclusively. The Spirit whom Christ promised to send after his return to the Father, is called the *Paraclete*, i.e., the Advocate or Counsellor and/or Helper, who pleads the cause of the believers, directs, supports, and comforts

²⁸See Schaff, P., and D.S. Schaff (1997).

them.²⁹ He is 'another Advocate'. Christ himself being the first Advocate who intercedes for believers at the throne of the Father, as their eternal High priest. The Spirit proceeds (eternally) from the Father, and was sent by the Father and the Son on the day of Pentecost. He reveals Christ to the heart and glorifies him and the atoning death of Christ."³⁰

R. Zuck (1996) states that Johannine theology is, in essence, Christology. The person of Jesus Christ is at the heart of everything the Apostle John wrote. Whether in the gospel of John with its unique emphasis on the Word made flesh, in the Johannine epistles with their emphasis on the Word of life amid the controversy of church schism, or in Revelation with its vision of the exalted Christ (Revelation 1:12-16) and His ultimate triumph, the primary goal of the apostle was to explain to his readers who Jesus is. An attempt to discuss the theology of the Johannine writings by dividing it into the traditional categories of systematic theology (e.g., anthropology, soteriology, pneumatology, eschatology) will inevitably produce some distortion because John did not organize his material along these lines. Instead, he had one central focus, and that was Jesus Christ. Much of what John wrote about Jesus, particularly in the gospel and the three epistles, was tempered by years of reflection and Christian experience, but always at the centre was Christ Himself.

This is not to say, however, that John said nothing about anthropology, soteriology, pneumatology, or eschatology. It simply means, according to R. Zuck, that whatever he said about these and other topics is almost always related to his Christological emphasis. Any attempt to treat these individual aspects of Johannine theology must therefore be somewhat repetitive since all point back to Christ. In the following discussion the major emphases of Johannine theology will be considered along with the structures and techniques employed by the Evangelist to communicate those emphases to his readers.³¹

²⁹ John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7. Comp. also 1 John 2:1, where Christ is likewise called παράκλητος. He is our Advocate objectively at the throne of the Father; the Holy Spirit is our Advocate subjectively in our spiritual experience. The E. V. renders the word in all these passages, except the last, as "Comforter" (*Consolator*), which rests on a confusion of the passive παράκλητος with the active παρακλήτωρ.

³⁰ See P. Schaff (1997).

³¹ See R. Zuck (1996).

In John 15:26, 16:6 and Luke 24:49, Jesus promises he will send/commission the Spirit to the disciples from heaven, and in John 14:16-23 he teaches that the Spirit will mediate to them the presence of the Father and the Son. (It is through the promised Spirit that Jesus and the Father are to make their self-revealing dwelling with the disciples). As the phrase 'Spirit of God' was understood as referring to God himself in action (speaking, revealing, empowering, etc.), Jesus' implicit claim to be Lord of the Spirit goes beyond the bounds of creaturely possibility. The same claim also pushes pneumatology in a Trinitarian direction. The Spirit can no longer be thought of as a way of speaking of the Father himself, without making Jesus' commissioning of the Spirit tantamount to his being Lord in some respect over the Father! It is not surprising that in the very context in which the Spirit is revealed as the One who will come as the Spirit of Jesus (*i.e.* in the Paraclete discourses of John 14-16), the Spirit also emerges as a divine person, distinguishable from both the Father and the Son. Thus, (1) he comes from the Father and the Son as a full personal replacement for Jesus ('another Paraclete of the same kind': 14:16), (2) he is so united with them that he mediates their presence and activity (as Jesus had the Father's), and (3) he glorifies the Son in his teaching, just as the Son had glorified the Father (John 16:14; 17:4). A similar perspective is perhaps encapsulated in the great commission of Matthew 28:19, where disciples are instructed to baptise in the *one* Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Spirit.

Peter's Pentecost speech chimes well with the teaching in the Johannine Farewell Discourses. The apostle affirms, 'This Jesus being exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this which you see and hear' (Acts 2:32-33). Jesus is hereby declared to fulfil the promise of Joel 2:28-32 that God would pour out his Spirit (2:17). Accordingly, in 2:36, 38, Peter concludes that Jesus has become one with 'the Lord' of Joel 2:32 (Acts 2:21) on whose name people should call for salvation.

While Trinitarian theology could have taken off from such proclamation, it is perhaps not surprising that the Early Church devoted more time to elucidating its Christology than its pneumatology. This was the appropriate response to the Christ-event, which was a scandal to unbelievers, but was perceived as the definitive revelation of God's saving love by Christians.³²

³² See D. Wood (1996).

All of the abovementioned contribute to the enigmatic character of the Paraclete. We are saddled with an ambiguity that we cannot ignore. With this study I hope to contribute in a responsible way to a better understanding of the Paraclete as presented in the Johannine Gospel.

1.5. Literary hypothesis

In this study I am working with the premise that the Johannine Gospel focuses on the public career of Jesus. I also suggest as hypothesis that in many respects, John's Gospel is more "bookish" than the other Gospels.³³ It is less episodic, and it develops its story line with more explicit interplay between the parts of the narrative. With literary artistry, the Johannine author fashions narrative scenes with fascinating exchanges between Jesus and his interlocutors or forms dialogues and monologues that assumes front and centre stage in the overall drama (J. Bailey, 1992:95-96).

The speech attributed to Jesus in the Gospel according to John exhibits a character and tone far different from the terse sayings and parables of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels. R. Brown (1982:CXXXII) refers to the fact that many scholars have recognised that the Johannine prose of the discourses of Jesus is uniquely solemn in contrast to that of the Synoptics. R. Schnackenburg (1984:111-114) discusses the whole issue of Johannine language, style, rhythm and types of discourse. He refers to the Johannine style as "solemn and monotonous dictation" and suggests that this is due to the meditative and long-pondered theology of John. His assessment is that especially in the discourses we find a "hymnic" type of prose. In his discussion of the literary characteristics and structure of the Gospel Barrett (1982:5-26) comments on the fact that the Johannine style is highly individual, very impressive, charged with a repetitive emphasis and solemn dignity. He reminds us that one of the most striking features of John is the great bulk of discourse material given in a form peculiar to this gospel. L. Morris (1995:38-40) also refers to the great difference in style between the teachings of Jesus according to John and the Synoptics. He, however, feels that H. Riesenfeld's explanation for this difference is plausible and suggests that we accept his explanation as one possible way in which

³³ Although John's Gospel is dealing with historical and verifiable facts it is a well written literary work, written in a literary style that enables people (hearers and readers) to be drawn into what actually happened. The author had a clear picture in his mind of what he wanted to share and what literary devices to use to get his message across most effectively.

two views of Jesus' teaching as divergent as those in the Synoptic Gospels and in John could nevertheless originate from one teacher. D. Carson (1991:48-49) also reminds us that we must not exaggerate the differences between John and the Synoptics. He is of the opinion that Jesus indeed sometimes spoke in nothing less than what we would call the Johannine style and Jesus himself indeed influenced John. In response to those who argue that the Synoptics reveal a more realistic picture of Jesus' style Carson asks the question: Did Jesus never utter more than aphorisms?

Therefore it seems to me plausible to say that John presents his material in the form of extended dialogues or discourses rather than the 'proverbial' or 'pithy' sayings found often in the Synoptics not only for stylistic reasons or theological reasons but also because this might have been Jesus' style: John 3 (with Nicodemus); John 4 (with the Samaritan woman); John 6 (the Bread of Life Discourse); John 13 – 17 (the Farewell Discourse with the disciples). As Goppelt (1982; 2:293) observed: "The Gospel of John passed on the words of Jesus predominantly in another genre than the synoptics; it did not do so in sayings, parables, and controversy dialogues, but in connected or dialogical discourses."³⁴

Johannine discourse sections display a more sustained and unified character, presenting extended dialogues and monologues as literary wholes.³⁵ Because the speech in John reveals a speaker explicitly aware of his divine nature and mission, most scholars agree that this

³⁴ See here also R. Schnackenburg (1984a:37), C. Kruse (2003:18), C. Keener (2003:47, 53-54), T. Brown (2003, chapter 3 and 8), C. Dodd (1968:391ff), R. Culpepper (1983:8-11, 110-111), R. Whitacre (1999:21-24), A. Köstenberger (1999:38-39) and J. Dunn (1996:301-313)

³⁵ In substance even more than in form the Johannine discourses appear to stand in complete contrast to the Synoptic teaching. The message of the kingdom of God is barely alluded to, and in place of it Jesus is occupied almost exclusively with the doctrine of His own Person. In view of the marked differences, it seems hard to establish any connection between John's account of our Lord's teaching and that of the other evangelists; the discourses are either the product of free invention, or they are based on an independent tradition now lost to us. But there is a third alternative, which commends itself on closer examination as the most probable. In the discourses, as in the narrative, John draws from the Synoptics; but he uses his sources freely, expanding, compressing, changing the emphasis, re-stating the actual words to bring out more fully the inward idea. There are few Johannine utterances to which we cannot find some parallel in the other Gospels. The resemblance may not be immediately apparent, and is often little more than a vague echo, but in almost every case the thought is derivable from some authentic saying of Christ preserved in our Synoptics. Examples might easily be multiplied, but we need only refer to one, which illustrates in a very striking manner the evangelist's method. The doctrine of the New Birth as set forth in the dialogue with Nicodemus is peculiar to the Fourth Gospel.

discourse, cast as the revelatory speech of Jesus as the divine Son, reflects the confessional and homiletical language of a Johannine community (J. Bailey, 1992:172).

This study is concerned about a comprehensive use of language that includes the grammatical-textual and conceptual-ideational as well as the social-interpersonal functions of language. The argument is that only when all such implications have been considered can it be said that a text has been interpreted (B. Blount, 1995:7).

E. Dussel (1976, 1985, 2003a and b) provides a sociological model capable of defining the different interpretative strategies of the marginal members and the 'insiders' of society.³⁶ I am working however with the hypothesis that sociology is not a reality external to texts. I am interested not only in the different social categories, but also, and maybe even more specifically, in how people from those different categories use language. I will attempt to augment E. Dussel's model with M.A.K. Halliday's linguistics, which includes a socio-linguistic component³⁷, insights from Z. Harris, T. van Dijk, L. Wittgenstein, M. Bakhtin, J. Derrida and M. Foucault.

Halliday's model utilizes three categories of text-linguistic inquiry: textual, ideational, and interpersonal. The textual category considers language as it functions grammatically. Here words, phrases and sentences are structured syntactically so as to establish meaning. The ideational category considers conceptual implications that lie behind the lexical terms and phrases. Meaning is more than the placement of terms and phrases. It is also the conceptual reference or references signified by those terms and phrases.

³⁶ I am thinking here specifically of Dussel's contributions in ethics, economics, history and liberation theology. Dussel's unique interpretation of M. Heidegger, P. Ricoeur, K. Marx, and E. Levinas caused him to develop his own philosophical methodology, coined as *analectical* or *anadialectical*. See especially his *Towards an Ethics of Latin American Liberation* and *Philosophy of Liberation* where he explains his model. Analectical refers to the real human fact by which every person, every group or people, is always situated beyond (ano) the horizon of totality. For Dussel analectics goes beyond a dialectical ontology to the praxis of the exteriority of the other. To know how to risk one's life in order to fulfil the demands of the protest of the oppressed and to throw oneself into praxis for them is the analectical moment. In this sense the analectical moment is not only a response to classic dialects but should also be seen as a criticism and a surmounting of the negative dialectical method of Neo-Marxist like Th. Adorno, M. Horkheimer, J. Habermas, H. Marcuse and even E. Bloch.

³⁷ Here I am thinking of the contribution of B. Blount (1995:7).

In both textual and ideational categories, meaning is understood to reside within the formal boundaries of a particular text's language. To create or amend meaning, the language user manipulates the textual and ideational evidence and draws proper conclusions. In the third, interpersonal category, however, socio-linguistic factors play a determinative role. Language is understood to function interactively so that its meaning cannot be comprehended by considering textual and ideational features alone. The socio-cultural environment of the language user functions as a primary variable in the determination of the language's meaning. According to Halliday's model, the full potentiality of the meaning of language can be grasped only when all three linguistic categories have been applied fully. The interpreter who wishes to secure a more complete picture of a text's meaning must therefore operate beyond the boundaries of formal linguistic criteria (B. Blount, 1995:8).

A key consideration is M. Halliday's assertion that every speech event entertains all three of these functions (1985:11). Language occurs in what Halliday calls a 'context of situation'. This context of situation relates specifically to the linguistic context in which a speech event takes place. Language does not occur in isolation, but it comes to life only when functioning in a specific environment. The context critically influences the meaning. Halliday lists three types of linguistic situations: first, what is actually taking place – the field of discourse; second, who is taking part – the tenor and style of discourse; and third, what part the language is playing – the mode of discourse (B. Blount, 1995:11-12).

This recognition assists our effort to interpret biblical texts more completely because it directs us to analyse the tenor or role relationships in the text. "The selection of interpersonal options, those in the systems of mood, modality, person, key, intensity, evaluation and comment, and the like, tends to be determined by the role relationship in the situation." (M. Halliday, 1978:144)

It is therefore my supposition that in seeing language as discourse and as social practice, one is committing one's effort not just to analysing texts, nor just to analysing processes of production and interpretation, but to analysing the relationship between texts, process, and their social

conditions, both the immediate conditions of the situational context and the more remote conditions of institutional and social structures.³⁸ These works. Social and historical analyses will only be conducted where it seems to be profitable for a better understanding of the text.

1.6. Methodological course of action

Since the study is primarily of an *investigative* and *exegetical* nature, I plan to use the different available exegetical instruments relevant to specific aspects of the study. It is my intention to use a question-based approach. The basic questions I would like to address are:

- 1) Who is the παράκλητος that we find in John's Gospel?
- 2) What does the relevant texts specifically and the Gospel in general reveal regarding the παράκλητος and the Holy Spirit?
- 3) Can we glean useful information regarding the παράκλητος from the socio-historical ecology?
- 4) What are the unique roles and functions of παράκλητος in Johannine thought and how do this compare with the roles and functions of παράκλητος in other texts?
- 5) What does Johannine theology contribute to our understanding of the Holy Spirit?
- 6) Can we identify a distinct Johannine Pneumatology based on his references to the παράκλητος?
- 7) What would the implications and contribution of a Johannine Pneumatology be for the Church in the 21st Century?

As I work through the respective texts I plan to use the relevant exegetical instruments functionally when needed in order to address these questions. Relevant information will be gathered through a literary study and through exegesis of the relevant Scripture passages. The exegetical approach followed in this study function within the parameters of *grammatical*, *literary*, *social* and *historical* analyses and interpretation as discussed in the work of C. Caragounis (2004), W. Egger (1996), G. Fee (1983), M. Gorman (2001), J. Green (1995), J. Hays and C. Holladay (1987), I. Marshall (1979), R. Morgan and J Barton (1988), G. Osborne (1991), S.

³⁸ See here for instance N. Fairclough (1989:26).

Porter (2002), U. Schnelle (1998) and J. Van der Watt (2004a and b). The exegetical instruments that I will use are being discussed in these works. Social and historical analyses will only be conducted where it seems to be profitable for a better understanding of the text.

In addressing the above-mentioned questions the following goals are also worth mentioning:

- This study will attempt to analyse the Johannine data with regards to παράκλητος and the Holy Spirit
- It will also attempt to interpret and evaluate current and available views on the identity of the Paraclete as well as the relationship between παράκλητος and the Holy Spirit
- The consequences of specific interpretations for the Christology, Pneumatology, Trinity and Ecclesiology will be discussed in the context of the formation of specific scientific traditions. This will be analysed and interpreted from the perspective of a Reformed Protestant understanding
- This study will also attempt to investigate whether there are any anomalies or even crises in the understanding of the roles/functions of the Paraclete/Spirit in the context of the biblical Johannine tradition and modern theological interpretation
- This study will also try to address the question whether or not we need a new paradigm of interpretation of the Paraclete/Spirit to replace inconsistent or insufficient paradigms or whether one of the current paradigms is sufficient, consistently biblical and exegetically sound.

Since no scientist can escape his own paradigm or the paradigm of the scientific community he is part of, this study would be approached from the perspective of the Reformed Protestant tradition. Within the context of this framework, this study will also have a critical and evaluative character.

1.7. Chapter design

In order to present a scientifically acceptable study an outlay of proposed chapters of this dissertation are:

Chapter 1. Methodological considerations

In this chapter I have addressed:

- The problem and the task
- Actuality of this study
- The haunting ambiguity of Biblical exegesis
- The haunting ambiguity of Pneumatology
- Literary presupposition
- Methodological procedure

Chapter 2. The origin, background history and usage of the word Paraclete

In this chapter I will attempt to uncover the origin, background history and usage of παράκλητος in:

- In the Jewish world
- In the Greek world
- In New Testament times and the early Church
- Initial Concluding Statements

Chapter 3. Exegesis and Analysis of the Paraclete Passages

This chapter presents the greater part of my exegetical endeavour. I plan to address

- Different components of my exegetical model, and
- An Exegetical Analysis of the Paraclete pronouncements in John 14-16 and 1 John 2:1

Chapter 4. A synopsis of references to the Holy Spirit in John and a Comparison of the Paraclete Statements and References to the Holy Spirit in the Gospel and an Assessment of the Significance of the Paraclete/Spirit and His role in Johannine Thought

In this chapter I plan to give a synopsis of the references to the Holy Spirit in John's Gospel. The meaning of those references will also be discussed. I plan to present a brief summary of the diverse scholarly interpretations of the Paraclete-Spirit relation in John. This will be followed by a presentation and assessment of a comparative analysis of παράκλητος and πνεῦμα in John (The significance of the Paraclete-Spirit and his role in Johannine thought). In this section I plan to focus on:

- Jesus and the παράκλητος
- ἄλλον παράκλητον as πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον
- The Paraclete-Spirit and Believers

Chapter 5. A Johannine based Pneumatology - Summary, Conclusion and Final Remarks

In this last chapter I plan to briefly summarise the result of my investigation and to present some suggestions and closing remarks regarding my interpretation of the origin, identity and functions of the Paraclete-Spirit from a Johannine perspective and its implications for the development of a biblical doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

With these introductory comments on method of work, point of view and a few more formal notes we can proceed with our investigation. First on the agenda is a brief diachronic survey of the origin, background history and usage of παράκλητος. This will be addressed in the next chapter.