

the Catholic Biblical Quarterly

The Gift of the Spirit in John 19:30?
A Reconsideration of παρέδωκεν τὸ
πνεῦμα

PETER-BEN SMIT

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam; Utrecht University;

University of Pretoria

1017 BW Amsterdam, Netherlands

Reprinted from

The Catholic Biblical Quarterly

The Gift of the Spirit in John 19:30? A Reconsideration of παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα

PETER-BEN SMIT

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam; Utrecht University;

University of Pretoria

1017 BW Amsterdam, Netherlands

Abstract: Based on insights from the history of interpretation, a Synoptic comparison, linguistic considerations, and narrative observations, I argue that the unusual expression παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα in John 19:30 indicates primarily that Jesus has completely died on the cross; it does not refer mainly to the gift of the Holy Spirit. For intratextual reasons, the reference to the spirit may also point proleptically to what unfolds in the last two chapters of the Gospel of John, but this should not be seen as the primary meaning of the expression found in John 19:30.

Key Words: Gospel of John • spirit • death of Jesus • pneumatology • history of interpretation

EVER SINCE EDWYN CLEMENT HOSKYNYS (and, less influentially, G. H. C. MacGregor twelve years earlier) introduced the interpretation of John 19:30 that Jesus does not just die and breathe his last but that he, in fact, bestows the Holy Spirit on the church, represented in the people at the foot of the cross (Hoskynys),¹

¹Edwyn Clement Hoskynys, *The Fourth Gospel* (2nd rev. ed.; ed. Francis Noel Davey; London: Faber & Faber, 1947) 532 (also already in the first edition, 1940). He supports his view with an argument based on the expression used by John and on the broader context: “This is no fantastic exegesis, since vv. 28-30 record the solemn fulfillment of vii. 37-39. The thirst of the believers is assuaged by the rivers of living water which flow from the belly of the Lord, the author having already noted that this referred to the giving of the Spirit. The outpouring of the Spirit here recorded must be understood in close connection with the outpouring of the water and the blood (v. 34). The similar association of Spirit and Water and Blood in I John v. 8 . . . seems to make this interpretation not only possible, but necessary.” See also David Crump, “Who Gets What? God or Disciples,

the debate concerning the merits of this interpretation has been ongoing and has recently been surveyed by David Crump. Crump notes that the interpretation has been governed by two key questions, provoked by the unique and grammatically curious (lack of indirect object) expression παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα:² (1) “To whom does Jesus ‘hand over’ τὸ πνεῦμα? John does not say.” (2) “[I]t is unclear how to interpret τὸ πνεῦμα. Is John referring to Jesus’ surrender of his human spirit or to his giving up the Holy Spirit?”³ Crump also proposed a further interpretation of the phrase παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα—that Jesus deposited the/his S/spirit with the Father, in order to be instrumental in its subsequent distribution in chap. 20.⁴ Crump presents his interpretation as an alternative to that of the pre-Hoskyns era (Jesus expires, often with the association, analogous to Luke, that Jesus entrusts his spirit, i.e., his life, to God),⁵ that of the post-Hoskyns era (Jesus gives the

Human Spirit or Holy Spirit in John 19:30,” *NovT* 51 (2009) 78-89, esp. 80; and G. H. C. MacGregor, *The Gospel of John* (MNTC; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1928) 349: “[A]t Jesus’ death his spirit was set free from the limitations of the body that it might be bestowed upon the church (7:39; 20:22).”

² See, e.g., those also mentioned by Crump (“Who Gets What?” 80-81 n. 7): Ignace de La Potterie, *Exegesis Novi Testamenti: Passio et Mors Christi: Io 18-19* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964-65) 129: “Locutus Joannis nullibi invenitur in tota litteratura graeca praeioannea,” for which conclusion, see also Anton Dauer, *Die Passionsgeschichte im Johannesevangelium: Eine traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung zu Joh 18,1-19,30* (SANT 30; Munich: Kösel, 1972) 214; Felix Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Frankfurter theologische Studien 16; Frankfurt: Knecht, 1974) 328; James Swetnam, “Bestowal of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel,” *Bib* 74 (1993) 556-76, here 564, 566.

³ Crump, “Who Gets What?” 78. See also, e.g., Ludger Schenke, *Johannes: Kommentar* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1998) 307: “In vollkommener Freiwilligkeit und Selbsthingabe übergibt er, indem er den Kopf neigt, den Geist. Wem?” Schenke does not answer the question, however.

⁴ Crump, “Who Gets What?” 79: “In John 19:30 Jesus gives the Holy Spirit to his heavenly Father in preparation for the future sending of the Spirit to the church.”

⁵ A good example of what would have been current in pre-Hoskyns exegesis of John 19:30 is provided by John Bernard in his 1929 commentary (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* [2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1929] 2:641). Regarding John 19:30, he notes that the term παραδίδόναι denotes a voluntary giving up and recalls John 10:18 (“I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it up”), which differs from the Marcan and Lucan expression ἐξέπνευσεν. In John, Jesus retains control and voluntarily lays down his life. Furthermore, the Johannine expression παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα may evoke Luke 23:48 and the faithful surrendering of Jesus’ spirit to God there. In addition, John 19:30 may be an allusion to Isa 53:12, where the LXX uses a passive form (παρέδοθη). A more literal translation of the Hebrew (דָּעַרָה), however, would lead to an active translation: παρέδωκεν εἰς θάνατον τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, “he gave his life to death.” Bernard rejects any suggestion that, in John 19:30, πνεῦμα could have any meaning other than ψυχή. See also the more recent commentary by Klaus Wengst, *Das Johannesevangelium* (2 vols.; Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 4; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007) 2:278-79, with emphasis on Jesus’ entrusting of himself to God. See also, e.g., George R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (2nd ed.; WBC 36; Dallas: Word, 1999) 353, who follows Rudolf Schackenburg in emphasizing Jesus’ handing over his own spirit to the Father. Wengst rejects the view that John 19:30 refers to

Spirit),⁶ and that of exegetes who seek to fuse the two so that “19:30 explicitly depicts Jesus’ death while implicitly symbolizing his impending gift of the Holy Spirit to the church.”⁷ In this article, I question the interpretation of John 19:30 in terms of the gift of the Spirit in a systematic way, raising a number of issues that pertain to the history of interpretation, Synoptic observations on the verse, linguistic considerations, and the narrative setting of the verse. Although the expression παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα remains somewhat of an anomaly, the most plausible interpretation remains one that sees it as analogous to the expressions used for Jesus’ expiring in the other (canonical) Gospels and, therefore, as an expression of Jesus’ death, involving his surrendering of any spirit imaginable, both human and divine (Johannine ambiguity). At the same time, I suggest that the reference to the πνεῦμα in John 19:30 also provides an intertextual and proleptic reference to the events after the crucifixion, when Jesus, restored to life, is so full of life that he can now distribute the spirit of life to others. The events leading to the conferral of the Spirit after the resurrection are inaugurated by Jesus’ fulfillment of his earthly mission (19:30, τετέλεσται) through his death on the cross, the mission entrusted to him by the Father. The events are inaugurated by Jesus’ fulfillment of the mission but do not coincide with it. The Johannine narrative in fact connects the gift of the Spirit both with Jesus’ handing over of his s/Spirit on the cross and with the conferral of the Spirit after the resurrection. The account of the latter is the narrative unfolding of that of which the fulfillment of Jesus’ mission consists and of that to which it leads: new life in abundance.

I. Observations from the History of Interpretation and Reception

Because the interpretation of John 19:30 that is at stake here is almost allegorical in character and constitutes a strongly theological interpretation in the most literal sense of the word, one may suspect that it has its roots in premodern forms

the giving of the Holy Spirit. See further Ulrich Wilckens, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000) 297-99.

⁶ See, e.g., Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (SacPag 4; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998) 508-9, who argues in favor of this interpretation, referring to the argument against it by, among others, Donald Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of John* (Passion Series 4; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991) 119-20. See also R. Alan Culpepper, *The Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 226: “To such true disciples Jesus hands over the Spirit (19:30).”

⁷ Crump, “Who Gets What?” 82, referring to R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John’s Gospel: A Commentary* (ed. C. F. Evans; Oxford: Clarendon, 1956) 319; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John (xiii-xxi): Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 29A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970) 931, 1015; George Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John* (SNTSMS 12; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970) 11-12, 94; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (2 vols.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003) 2:1149. See also D. Moody Smith, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* (NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) 120.

of exegesis, such as those practiced by early Christian authors, medieval exegetes, and the scholars of the era of the Protestant and Catholic reformations. This is worth testing—and of relevance for the remainder of this contribution—even if Hoskyns and MacGregor were already identified as the originators of this particular exegesis of John 19:30.

A survey of the extant early Christian, medieval, and other precritical exegeses of the Gospel of John shows a surprising unanimity on the subject of the meaning of *παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα*, which, in fact, continues into the critical era.⁸ The authors of the early church and of the medieval church—in fact, scholars up to the early twentieth century—consistently interpreted the phrase as referring to Jesus' death and not to his giving of the Spirit.⁹ This is noteworthy for two reasons. First, it shows how novel Hoskyns's and MacGregor's exegesis really was. Second, this contrast between the exegesis of the first 1,850 years and the last 75 is especially striking because it may well be assumed that the unusual phrase *παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα* must also have been noticed as odd by the native speakers of Greek that are part of this tradition. Even if this happened, however—which does not seem to be the case and therefore gives reason to doubt the emphasis that was placed in twentieth-century exegesis on its odd character—it did not produce an exegesis of the phrase in terms of Jesus' gift of the Spirit from the cross. For obvious reasons, the exegesis of the past cannot be the measuring rod for the exegesis of the present. Yet it is at the very least a reason for interpretative caution, especially when the interpretation has to do with oddities in the Greek, to which ancient ears may have been better attuned than ours today. Moreover, such oddities must have been assumed never to have been noticed before, even by those who were native speakers and by those who were interested so much in theological, especially Trinitarian, forms of exegesis. The case concerning John 19:30 can, of course, not be judged on the basis of its earlier history of interpretation only; but it is striking, nonetheless, when modern interpreters find more theology in a text than earlier exegetes, even if precisely these are often suspected of finding things in texts that are not there. Maybe in this case the silence of the early exegetes points toward something about which, indeed, nothing can or needs to be said, because it is not there: Jesus' gift of the Spirit from the cross.

⁸ For early Christian exegesis, see Maurice F. Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960) 62, 67: “[I]t is surprising to find that *πνεῦμα* is never interpreted of the Holy Spirit in John xix.30” (p. 67). See also Crump, “Who Gets What?” 79; and Joel C. Elowsky, *John 11–21* (Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture 4B; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2007) 322–24.

For critical interpretations, see the impressive list of commentaries provided in Crump, “Who Gets What?” 79 n. 2.

⁹ See *ibid.*, 78–79.

III. Synoptic Observations

Next, some Synoptic observations are helpful, given that the scene of Jesus' death and his last breath occurs in all four Gospels. The following texts are of relevance:

καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. (Luke 23:46) Then Jesus, crying with a loud voice, said, “Father, into your hands I commend my spirit.” (NRSV)	ὅτε οὖν ἔλαβεν τὸ ὄξος [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· τετέλεσται, καὶ κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα. (John 19:30) When Jesus had received the wine, he said, “It is finished.” Then he bowed his head and gave up his spirit. (NRSV)
ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα. (Matt 27:50) Then Jesus cried again with a loud voice and breathed his last. (NRSV)	ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀφείξ φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν. (Mark 15:37) Then Jesus gave a loud cry and breathed his last. (NRSV)

In the formulations used by the four evangelists, the Marcan and Lucan verses, both of which use the form *ἐξέπνευσεν*, are the least striking. Originally meaning “to breathe out,” the verb *ἐκπνέω* had already taken on the meaning of “expiring” long before these two Gospels were composed. Notably, the verb can also have an object, for example, *βίος* (“life”), *θυμός* (“anger,” “passion”), or *ψυχὴ* (“life,” “soul”), which may be of some importance for the interpretation of John 19:30. Apparently there were expressions having to do with “blowing away” one's life that did not clearly indicate its transfer to another person. With regard to the Lucan text, the quotation from Ps 30:6 LXX is striking; it indicates Jesus' handing over of his spirit to the Father (*πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου*), which, as the context indicates (*τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν*), can be seen as a commentary on a way of dying that entailed entrusting one's spirit—that is, oneself—to God, before breathing out that last spirit, in the sense of dying. Compared to this, John depicts the death of Jesus as rather more lonely: Jesus states that things have come to their end (*τετέλεσται*), and he hands over the spirit, but not to the Father—or at least not explicitly so, and also not with any other indication that he entrusts himself to the Father. At the same time, however, the expression *παραδίδόναι* denotes a voluntary giving up and is reminiscent of John 10:18 (“I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it up”),¹⁰ in contrast to the

¹⁰ See, e.g., the eloquent commentary of Hartwig Thyen, “Niemand hat größere Liebe als die, daß er sein Leben hingibt für seine Freunde (Joh 15,13),” in *idem, Studien zum Corpus Iohanneum* (WUNT 214; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007) 97–110, esp. 110: “Nach der Szene mit der Mutter

Marcan expression, while Luke's account of Jesus' last words (πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθειμι τὸ πνεῦμά μου) also suggests Jesus' own handing over of his spirit, even if this action is described with ἐξέπνευσεν.¹¹

Different from the rather common formulation in Mark and Luke, Matthew uses a somewhat unusual expression (ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα; cf. Gen 35:18 LXX; 1 Esdr 4:21), as has been duly noted by scholars.¹² The most straightforward interpretation of the verse is to understand it to mean "dying" in a rather forceful way, that is, by literally sending his spirit away or, if a gentler meaning of ἀφίημι is to be preferred, by letting the spirit go. The first option may be appealing because of the preceding κράζας φωνῆ μεγάλῃ. No noteworthy attempts have been made to interpret this verse in terms of Jesus' gift of the Spirit, even if the connotation of "sending," which ἀφίημι is capable of conveying, could well have given rise to that.

For the purposes of this article, the insights gained by this brief Synoptic comparison are the following. First, the Johannine description of Jesus' expiring is the only one that has given rise to an interpretation in terms of giving the Spirit, rather than Jesus' simply breathing his last. Second, though Mark and Luke use rather common expressions as far as the Greek is concerned, Luke's reference to Ps 30:6 LXX might be taken to suggest that Jesus entrusts his spirit to the Father.¹³ Still, this does not have to bear any relation to the gift of the Spirit in Luke-Acts, at least not according to most scholars. Third, the Johannine account of Jesus' expiring and its odd choice of words, compared to both the Lucan (common expression and reference to Ps 30:6 LXX) and Matthean (curious expression) accounts, do not necessitate an interpretation that goes any further than that of the Matthean and Lucan accounts. The curious expression in Matthew could be construed as Jesus' sending of the spirit, and the Lucan text, with its accompanying quotation, could be construed as Jesus' entrusting his spirit to, or depositing his spirit with, the Father. In other words, even though a Synoptic comparison cannot determine what the Johannine expression must mean, it can give reason for some

und dem Lieblingsjünger unter dem Kreuz (Joh 19,25-27) erreicht das Geschehen in dem Wort 'Es ist vollendet' und dem Bericht 'Er neigte das Haupt und gab den Geist hin' seine Klimax. Dieser weder als blutiges Sühnopfer noch als Gehorsam gegenüber einer apokalyptischen Notwendigkeit, sondern gänzlich unmythisch als freie Tat der Liebe begriffene Tod wird dann die Verheißung des Parakleten in Kraft setzen und den Geist der Liebe unter den Freunden auf den Plan rufen." See also, e.g., Robert Kysar, "He Gave Up the Spirit": A Reader's Reflection on John 19:30b," in *Transcending Boundaries: Contemporary Readings in the New Testament. Essays in Honor of Francis J. Moloney* (ed. Rekha M. Chennattu and Mary L. Coloe; Biblioteca di scienze religiose 187; Rome: LAS, 2005) 161-72, esp. 165.

¹¹ For comments on the Lucan account, see Michel Theobald, "Der Tod Jesu im Spiegel seiner 'letzten Worte' vom Kreuz," *TQ* 190 (2010) 1-30, esp. 27 n. 12.

¹² See, e.g., Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* (2 vols.; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1994) 2:1081.

¹³ See, e.g., Theobald, "Der Tod Jesu," 26-27.

caution regarding very "theological" interpretations concerning the gift of the spirit rather than "just" Jesus' death.

IV. Linguistic Observations

As has been firmly established, παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα is an unusual expression, likely coined by John. It stands in obvious analogy with Mark 15:37 (ἐξέπνευσεν), Luke 23:46 (παρατίθειμι τὸ πνεῦμά μου) and Matt 27:50 (ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα) and—whatever else it may indicate—points to Jesus' expiring. This, in fact, was the mainline interpretation from the early church onward until the beginning of the twentieth century. When Hoskyns introduced the interpretation that Jesus did, in fact, also bestow the Spirit on those assembled at the foot of the cross (the two Marys, the mother of Jesus, and the Beloved Disciple—these, at least, would be the obvious candidates—no other disciples are mentioned here; only after Jesus' death do Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus appear on the stage), he assumed that the verb παραδίδομι requires an indirect object.¹⁴ This is the case, quite in spite of the fact that the absence of an indirect object from a sentence does not usually point to an interpretation of that same sentence that hinges on filling in this absence. Even on the assumption that παραδίδομι would technically require an indirect object—a view contradicted by a dictionary such as Bauer-Aland—¹⁵ it is by no means clear that the indirect object always needs to be clearly specified. In fact, in John παραδίδομι is often used without an indirect object; it occurs with an indirect object only twice (18:30, 35), for obvious reasons of emphasis and identification of all parties.¹⁶ The point of the use of forms of

¹⁴ Crump's recent novel interpretation also hinges on this assumption ("Who Gets What?").

¹⁵ See Walter Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur* (6th ed.; ed. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988) 1242-43, s.v. παραδίδομι: "verlangt keinen bestimmten Tat" (p. 1242).

¹⁶ See, e.g., 6:64 (identification of one of the disciples as ὁ παραδώσων αὐτόν, "who would betray him"); 6:71 (the same expression: οὗτος γὰρ ἐμελλεν παραδίδοναί αὐτόν, "for he was going to betray him"); 12:4 (mention of Judas Iscariot as ὁ μέλλων αὐτόν παραδίδοναί, "the one who was about to betray him"); 13:2 (reference to the devil's suggestion to Judas ἵνα παραδοί αὐτόν, "to betray him"); 13:11 (Jesus' foreknowledge of Judas's upcoming betrayal: ἦδει γὰρ τὸν παραδιδόντα αὐτόν, "For he knew who was to betray him"); 13:21 (Jesus' announcement to his disciples ὅτι εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με, "one of you will betray me"); 18:2 (reference to Ἰουδας ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτόν, "Judas, who betrayed him"; see also 18:5: Ἰουδας ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτόν); 18:30 (answer of the group around the high priest, etc., to Pilate [the first time with an indirect object, notable because of its early position in the sentence]: εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος κακὸς ποιῶν, οὐκ ἂν σοι παρεδώκαμεν αὐτόν, "If this man were not a criminal, we would not have handed him over to you"); 18:35 (address of Pilate to Jesus, with explicit identification of subject, object, and indirect object: τὸ ἔθνος τὸ σὸν καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς παρέδωκάν σε ἐμοί, "Your own nation and the chief priests have handed you over to me"); 18:36 (Jesus' answer to Pilate, again with a focus on the actors involved, but with no indirect object: εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἦν ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμή, οἱ ὑπῆρέται οἱ ἐμοὶ ἡγωνίζοντο [ἀν] ἵνα μὴ παραδοθῶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, "If my kingdom were from this world, my followers would be fighting to keep me

παραδίδωμι without an indirect object is fairly clear: not so much the handing over of someone or something *to someone* but simply the handing over as such. The use of such an incomplete sentence can be understood as a case of valency reduction for stylistic reasons. In fact, in these cases where the indirect object is missing, its presence would distort the sense of an expression such as “he who would betray him.” The point is that Judas *hands over* Jesus as such, that is, betrays him. To whom he does this is secondary, given that the point is simply to identify Judas as the betrayer of Jesus.

John 19:30 can be understood by analogy with this frequent use of παραδίδωμι in the Gospel. The point of the expression is simply Jesus’ handing over, or giving up, his spirit. If one had to supply an indirect subject, one could still think of other persons or items that could fulfill this role. It would not, however, have to be God (as, e.g., Barnabas Lindars has it),¹⁷ or the followers of Jesus at the foot of the cross (as Hoskyns had it). For example, why could not the air be the one receiving Jesus’ spirit? This is at least as likely—or unlikely—as the suggestion that there is no indirect object mentioned in order to underline Jesus’ loneliness at the cross.¹⁸ In fact, the meaning without an indirect object would even be in line with the generally negative connotation of παραδίδωμι in John—that is, it usually denotes handing over something to perdition. (Methodologically, this observation, rather than the first meaning given by dictionaries such as BDAG and others, should be one’s starting point when interpreting the meaning of the same verb in John 19:30.) Furthermore, if good sense can be made of παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα without supplying an indirect object such as the disciples (which is highly problematic because of the resulting narrative redundancy in chap. 20) or the Father (which is problematic because this idea plays a role neither in chap. 19 nor in chap. 20, as will be elaborated on below),¹⁹ the need for alternative interpretations disappears.²⁰

from being handed over to the Jews”); 19:11 (part of a further response of Jesus: διὰ τοῦτο ὁ παραδούς μέ σοι μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν ἔχει, “therefore, the one who handed me over to you is guilty of a greater sin”); 19:16 (Pilate hands over Jesus, but it is not said to whom: Τότε οὖν παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σταυρωθῆ, “Then he handed him over to them to be crucified”).

¹⁷ Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972) 582–83. See also Crump (“Who Gets What?” 82), engaging Hoskyns’s view that the expression used by John requires “an indirect object (i.e. the disciples). But here, if one must be supplied it must surely be God himself to whom Jesus entrusts his spirit.”

¹⁸ See, e.g., Herwi Rikhof and Archibald van Wieringen, *De Zeven Sacramenten: Een Bijbeltheologische en Systematisch-theologische Studie* (Theologische Perspectieven Supplement Series 6; Bergambacht: 2VM, 2013) 47: “Er was niemand om de geest aan te geven want Jezus was alleen.”

¹⁹ Cf., however, Esther Straub, *Kritische Theologie ohne ein Wort vom Kreuz: Zum Verhältnis von Joh 1–12 und 13–20* (FRLANT 203; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003) 172, who argues, like many others, that Jesus returns the Spirit that had descended upon him according to 1:32–33 to the Father in 19:30.

²⁰ This also applies to the interpretation provided by Kysar, “‘He Gave Up the Spirit,’” 168.

Finally, a word should be said about the occurrence of the definite article in 19:30, that is, τὸ πνεῦμα. This could be interpreted as referring back to a known entity, which could be the Holy Spirit, but this spirit is identified explicitly as holy in John 14:26 (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον). John speaks of τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (“the spirit of truth”) in 14:17; 15:26; and 16:13, and of πνεῦμα ἅγιον (“a holy spirit”) in 20:22. The last reference to an “unqualified” spirit is in 13:21 (also with the article), and it is possible to argue that this spirit of Jesus, apparently also assumed to be known, is the one at stake in 19:30 as well. Of course, one could argue that John should have added αὐτοῦ in 19:30, but its absence does not mean that Jesus’ human spirit was not intended.

V. Narrative Observations

One question that has been raised with regard to the interpretation of John 19:30 along the lines proposed by Hoskyns is how the gift of the Spirit in 19:30 is related to the same gift to the disciples in 20:22. The proposal that in 19:30 the gift is to an inner circle and in 20:22 to the entire group of the disciples fails to convince, because of the lack of any clear indications in the text that such a subdivision among the disciples is operative in these verses. One would have expected a clearer indication of the indirect object in 19:30, for instance, or a hint that in 20:22 a broader group was intended as recipients of the Spirit. As both (supposed) instances of the gift of the Spirit stand now, there is little to indicate any relationship between them regarding the recipients of the Spirit. In fact, in chap. 19, it is unlikely that the mother of Jesus and the Beloved Disciple, whom Jesus has just entrusted to each other, are still in view from v. 28 onwards, given that μετὰ τοῦτο (“after this”) indicates the start of something new. Moreover, the protagonists change: Jesus’ mother and the Beloved Disciple are no longer mentioned, but only anonymous figures who occupy themselves with giving Jesus something to drink. These observations argue against the idea that the text speaks of the giving of the Spirit by Jesus to his mother and the Beloved Disciple. In addition, the gift of the Spirit in 20:22 occurs with a clear indirect object (καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐνεφύσησεν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον, “when he had said this, he breathed on them and said to them, ‘Receive the Holy Spirit’” [NRSV]) and does not give the impression that

Although emphasizing that he only argues that there *might* be an ambiguous reference to the gift of the Spirit in John 19:30, Kysar nonetheless argues the following: “Still, there are theologically significant and slightly different meanings to the possibility of two bestowals of the Spirit in the Gospel narrative. Read as a giving of the Spirit/Paraclete, 19:30b suggests that the new family of God . . . —formed around the foot of the cross and represented in the new association of Jesus’ mother and the Beloved Disciple—is empowered with the presence of the divine. The empowered ‘disciples’ on whom Jesus breathes the Spirit in 20:22 are given peace and a mission (20:21) as well as authority (20:23) through that Paraclete.”

the Beloved Disciple (and Jesus' mother) are excluded from this (alleged) second gift of the Spirit. In fact, there is only one person who is said to be absent, and that is Thomas (see v. 24).²¹

There are also other problems. The verb that is used in 20:22 (ἐμφυσάω) for the breathing of the Spirit on the disciples differs from the one used in 19:30 (here, ἐκφυσάω would have provided a better counterpart than παραδίδωμι). Furthermore, in 20:22, the Spirit is indeed identified as the Holy Spirit, rather than simply as πνεῦμα. At the same time, the gift of the holy Spirit in 20:22 echoes the promise of the holy Spirit in 14:26 (there is a difference between this verse and 20:22 in that in the latter Jesus acts as the giver/sender of the Spirit, rather than the Father, as 14:26 suggests: ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν [ἐγώ], "But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you everything, and remind you of all that I have said to you" [NRSV]). Even if one argues that 15:26 plays a kind of mediating role—here the spirit is not called "holy," though Jesus is identified as its sender—this spirit is qualified as τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ("the spirit of truth") and is not identified with Jesus' (dying) breath. This applies also to the appearance of the same spirit in 16:13. If one takes into account the interpretation of Crump—that Jesus deposited the Spirit with the Father in 19:30—it remains a striking oddity that in 20:22 Jesus sends the Spirit himself; the Father hardly plays a role. Why, in view of John 14:15-17, 25-26; 15:26-27; 16:7-11, 13-15, the readers "have no reason to expect the later narrative of the risen Christ's bestowal of that gift [i.e., the spirit]," as Robert Kysar argues, remains unclear. These texts are hard to harmonize with either 19:30 or 20:22; the point seems to be the sending of the spirit as such, not in relation to a specific chronology of Jesus' death and vindication.²²

Still, it is obvious that, in the broader context of the Fourth Gospel, Jesus and the Spirit are closely connected. Jesus is emphatically identified as the one who receives the Spirit at his baptism and as the one who will himself baptize with the Holy Spirit (1:32-33), a notion that is discussed further in chap. 3 (esp. vv. 5-8). John 3:34 indicates once more that Jesus had received a substantial share of the Spirit from the Father, an impression that is confirmed by his words in 6:63. In addition, Jesus is twice moved in his spirit (to empathy and anger), in 11:33 and 13:21,²³ and in 4:23-24 the way of relating to God that Jesus offers the Samaritan woman is identified as worshipping God in spirit and truth. These texts, however,

²¹ Because of the resulting narrative redundancy and the oddity that in one case one group of followers of Jesus is involved and in another case another group, there is reason to doubt a reference to the Holy Spirit in John 19:30. But cf. Kysar, "He Gave Up the Spirit," 166.

²² See *ibid.*, 166-67. Kysar's acknowledgment that there is no other repetition of any of Jesus' acts in the Gospel of John does not strengthen his argument for a kind of double gift of the spirit.

²³ The occurrence of παραδίδωμι and πνεῦμα in relation to Jesus' upcoming death in this verse

do not indicate the precise process of the distribution of the Spirit by Jesus or through Jesus in the later chapters of the Gospel. Nonetheless, it remains striking that, in at least one instance (7:39), the giving of the Spirit is related to the moment of Jesus' glorification, that is, his crucifixion. John 7:39 reads, οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη, "for as yet there was no Spirit, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (NRSV). This text, however, does not cohere with the expression παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα in 19:30. The verb λαμβάνω, which is used in 7:39 to indicate the reception of the Spirit, neatly returns in 20:22 but is absent from 19:30 and its context.

This leaves one, on the one hand, with a close interrelation between Jesus and the Spirit and, on the other hand, with a certain connection between Jesus' death and the gift of the Spirit. Furthermore, it gives rise to the question, which particular πνεῦμα does Jesus "hand over" in John 19:30? It could be argued that it must be Jesus' "human spirit" (so also for 11:33 and 13:21), or the πνεῦμα that Jesus is said by John the Baptist to have received (1:32-33; notably, in John, Jesus does not receive the πνεῦμα at his baptism but only in the context of John's baptismal ministry), or both.²⁴

Crump is right in highlighting this question in his essay, even if his solution has been rejected above for the reasons stated.²⁵ Indeed, as he argues, the reception of the Spirit (or, rather, John's acknowledgment that Jesus has received the Spirit) inaugurates Jesus' ministry, and his handing over of the Spirit concludes it (see 1:32-33 and 19:30).²⁶ Crump is also right in demonstrating that Jesus often refers to giving up his life using the word ψυχή (10:11, 15, 17, 24; 12:25, 27; 13:37, 38; 15:13) and not πνεῦμα. The majority of references to the πνεῦμα in the Gospel of John have to do with the divine Spirit in one way or another, even though something happening to Jesus' πνεῦμα can also refer to Jesus' being troubled or angered (11:33 and 13:21).²⁷ For Crump, this is reason enough to argue that the πνεῦμα

is noteworthy; see John Paul Heil, *Blood and Water: The Death and Resurrection of Jesus in John 18-21* (CBQMS 27; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1995) 102.

²⁴ See, e.g., Cornelis Bennema, *The Power of Saving Wisdom: An Investigation of Spirit and Wisdom in Relation to the Soteriology of the Fourth Gospel* (WUNT 2/148; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002) 253.

²⁵ See Crump, "Who Gets What?" 83, referring to Lindars, who "fails to note that deciding whether God or the disciples receive the spirit from Jesus first depends on the meaning attributed to τὸ πνεῦμα. If παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα refers to Jesus' loss of life, then the indirect object, the recipient of that life, can only be God. But if τὸ πνεῦμα is the Holy Spirit, then the indirect object remains uncertain. In this latter case, deciding between God and the disciples, either of which is grammatically possible, finally depends on which action is most likely within John's theological thought world."

²⁶ See Crump, "Who Gets What?" 83.

²⁷ Cf. Straub, who notes that only in 1:32-33 and 19:30 is the spirit directly related to Jesus (*Kritische Theologie ohne ein Wort vom Kreuz*, 172).

that Jesus hands over in 19:30 must be the divine Spirit. He overlooks two things, however. First, in order to establish the meaning of πνεῦμα in John 19:30, the question is not, what is the most common meaning of πνεῦμα in John? but rather, what is the most fitting meaning? Second, given that there are two options—that is, a clear reference to the divine Spirit or a turn of phrase, however unusual, that refers to Jesus' expiring—both should be considered in terms of their content, not just their frequency. This is to say, because of 11:33 and 13:21, it may well be that the spirit that Jesus hands over is the breath of life that he gives up.²⁸ Semantically, this is difficult to decide, given the two meanings that πνεῦμα can have in John's Gospel. This difficulty opens up another interpretative option—that indeed no decision needs to be made. If the πνεῦμα is that which makes one alive (John 6:63)—as Jas 2:26 has it, τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρὸν ἐστίν (“the body without the spirit is dead”)—and if Jesus is depicted as the one who is full of the divine Spirit, then Jesus' expiring means that he hands over everything that makes him alive, whether human or divine πνεῦμα.²⁹ In other words, John's choice to use πνεῦμα here makes clear that Jesus is completely dead after his handing over of it. According to this interpretation, it hardly matters to whom Jesus gives the spirit (to no one), or whether he hands over a divine or human πνεῦμα. He hands over what makes him alive, and the result is a completely dead Jesus. Neither human πνεῦμα nor its divine counterpart could resist the violence of Rome, it seems—until the surprise and shock of Jesus' resurrection and his distribution of the life-giving Spirit in the remainder of the Gospel. Thus, in view of John's penchant for double entendre³⁰ and the fact that at least in 7:39 the gift of the Spirit and Jesus' glorification are connected, a link may well be indicated. That is, *both* spirits are intended; Jesus gives up (not gives away) both of them.³¹ To be sure, the Spirit (of truth), the Paraclete, is also connected with Jesus' glorification in John (see 14:17, 26; 15:26; 16:13), but never in such a way that a gift of this spirit from the cross is mentioned. Its giving is connected with the Father, not with Jesus, and the

²⁸ Which would be a perfect match with common Hellenistic anthropological models; for this and the following, see Hans-Ulrich Weidemann, *Der Tod Jesu im Johannesevangelium: Die erste Abschiedsrede als Schlüsseltext für den Passions- und Osterbericht* (BZNW 122; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004) 387-90.

²⁹ In this sense, the expression in 19:30 indeed constitutes a double entendre—not an ironic one but one in which the two meanings complement each other to make an even more forceful statement. See also James L. Resseguie, *The Strange Gospel: Narrative Design and Point of View in John* (BIS 56; Leiden: Brill, 2001) 58 n. 144, referring to the expression as a double entendre indicating that Jesus both expires and hands over the Spirit.

³⁰ See John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) 424, in relation to John 19:30: “fruitful ambiguity.”

³¹ See *ibid.* Heil argues rightly that “[i]n handing over ‘the spirit,’ Jesus handed over not only his own human spirit but the Holy Spirit of God” (*Blood and Water*, 102).

references to it in John refer primarily to the postresurrection life of the community of believers, rather than to the interim between Jesus' death and resurrection.

The result is that John 19:30 indicates that Jesus is completely and utterly dead—in fact, actively dies.³² This view is well expressed by the interpretation of Jesus' death on the cross in Clement of Alexandria's *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 61. The departure of the πνεῦμα is understood there as the mode of Jesus' dying: Jesus “died at the departure of the Spirit which had descended upon him in the Jordan, not that it became separate but was withdrawn in order that death might also operate on him, since how did the body die when life was present in him?”³³ The bottom line, therefore, is that Jesus is totally dead because he performs the act of handing over the πνεῦμα. John's account of Jesus' passion underlines this by continuing in 19:31-37 with a rendition of the *crurifragium*, establishing that Jesus is dead indeed—not a word is said in these verses about anyone having received a life-giving spirit.³⁴ This interpretation of the ambiguous noun πνεῦμα in John 19:30 does not require deducing from the narrative an indirect object for παρέδωκεν (as would be the case if one suggests that the πνεῦμα is received by disciples at the foot of the cross), and it also stays close to the predominant Johannine usage of παραδίωμι, that is, handing over in a destructive sense. Methodologically, it is best to stop the immediate interpretative explorations here, since no large exegetical or theological theories ought to be based on a possible ambiguity. Therefore, one may agree with Kysar's statement that “the expression [i.e., πνεῦμα] refers to both Jesus' human spirit and the divine Spirit/Paraclete,”³⁵ but not with his discovery of all sorts of pneumatological and christological hints behind the expression found in John 19:30.³⁶

Nonetheless, in the flow of the Johannine narrative, this total death of Jesus in 19:30, his complete dying, giving up any spirit imaginable, sets further events

³² For an emphasis on Jesus' agency until the very moment of his death, see, e.g., Michael Labahn, “Verlassen oder ‘Vollendet’: Ps 22 in der ‘Johannespassion’ zwischen Intratextualität und Intertextualität,” in *Psalm 22 und die Passionsgeschichten der Evangelien* (ed. Dieter Sänger; Biblisch-theologische Studien 88; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2007) 111-53.

³³ Robert Pierce Casey, *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria* (Studies and Documents I; London: Christophers, 1934). For the text, see O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, and U. Treu, eds., *Clemens Alexandrinus: Dritter Band* (GCS 17; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1970) 127, as well as the edition by Manlio Simonetti, *Testi gnostici in lingua greca e latina* (2nd ed.; Milan: Mondadori, 2001) 383-85. See also the observations by Winfried Löhr, “Deutungen der Passion Christi bei Heiden und Christen im zweiten und dritten Jahrhundert,” in *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament* (ed. Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter; WUNT 181; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 545-74, esp. 561-62.

³⁴ For emphasis on the *crurifragium*, see, e.g., Manfred Lang, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse von Joh 18-20 vor dem markinischen und lukanischen Hintergrund* (FRLANT 182; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999) 239-52.

³⁵ Kysar, “He Gave Up the Spirit,” 172.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 167-71.

in motion that depend on his death/glorification, including the gift of the Holy Spirit in 20:22-23.³⁷ These events might be prefigured in the water from Jesus' side in 19:34,³⁸ but the point of Jesus' handing over of the πνεῦμα in 19:30 is primarily that Jesus completely dies—a death, however, that will bring forth fruits (cf. 12:24). Moreover, these fruits are not just “of the spirit” but are the Spirit itself. In this way, Jesus' remark, τετέλεσται, indicates fulfillment, the nature of which will unfold in the remainder of the Johannine narrative, that is, the gift of new life. The reference to the πνεῦμα in 19:30 likely serves as an intertextual and proleptic link with what is to come in the narrative.³⁹ It is not a description of these events, which unfold only in chap. 20, that is, *post factum*.⁴⁰ In these chapters, then, John recounts

³⁷ See, e.g., Hartwig Thyen, “Überlegungen zum Prozeß und Kreuzigung Jesu nach Johannes 19,” in idem, *Studien zum Corpus Iohanneum*, 323-50, here 347: “Die Wendung ‘er gab den Geist hin’ ist fraglos absichtsvoll doppeldeutig. Sie besiegelt nicht nur das Sterben Jesu, sondern eröffnet auch das neue Leben des Getöteten in den Seinen durch den Geist, ist als sein Gehen die Bedingung der Möglichkeit für das Kommen jenes Geistes.” In another contribution in the same volume, however, Thyen indicates that the Spirit is given directly in 19:30; see “Noch einmal: Johannes 21 und ‘der Jünger, den Jesus liebte,’” 252-93, here 284-85. See also Schenke, *Johannes*, 308: “Woran sollen die Leser glauben? Sicher nicht an die Tatsache des Todes Jesu, wohl aber an seine Bedeutung und Wirkung. Sie wird im Blut- und Wasserfluss aus Jesu Brust erkennbar. Im Blut wird sichtbar, dass Jesus ‘sein Fleisch für das Leben der Welt’ gegeben hat (6,51). In der eucharistischen Gabe des Weines wird es zum Heil getrunken (6,53f). So dürfte denn in dieser Stunde aus Jesu Brust der wahre Wein fließen, auf den die Weingabe in Kana als Zeichen hinweist (vgl. 2,4). Im Wasser sollen die Leser jene Quelle erkennen, aus der Jesus allen Lebensdurst stillen will (4,14), die Flüsse lebendigen Wassers, die der Heilige Geist sind (7,38f). Aus dem Tempel seines Leibes (2,21) brechen die Quellen auf, und die Flüsse beginnen zu strömen (7,38), von denen die Schrift spricht (Sach 13,1; 14,8). Jetzt gibt Jesus den Geist, ohne kleinliches Maß (3,34).”

³⁸ See, e.g., Weidemann, *Der Tod Jesu*, 405-10; also, e.g., Udo Schnelle, “Johannes als Geisttheologe,” *NovT* 40 (1998) 17-31, esp. 24; and the extended discussion by Stephen D. Moore, “Rifts in (a Reading of) the Fourth Gospel: Or, Does Johannine Irony Still Collapse in a Reading That Draws Attention to Itself?” *Neot* 23 (1989) 5-18.

³⁹ In this sense, a reference to a “proleptic” gift of the Spirit does make sense; see, however, Kysar, “‘He Gave Up the Spirit,’” 168.

⁴⁰ For an eloquent argument that considers the death of Jesus to be the start of his exaltation, which in fact is an ongoing event including the resurrection, the gift on the Spirit, and Jesus' ascension, see Tricia Gates Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-Scientific Perspective* (JSNTSup 253; London: T&T Clark, 2003) 101-5. She comes close to, but also corrects, Ashton's observations (*Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 424-25): “After the farewell discourse there is no further mention of the Spirit until the scene of Jesus' death. But the word πνεῦμα has now acquired such resonance that on being told that Jesus ‘gave up the ghost’ (παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα, 19:30), the reader will not stop at the obvious meaning but is sure to see an allusion to the gift of the Spirit. Not only the noun but also the verb (παραδιδόναι) is a notable instance of that fruitful ambiguity which makes it possible for two different meanings to be conveyed in a single phrase. In the first half of the Gospel John had used the word ὑψοῦν to suggest that Jesus' exaltation is conditional upon and contained in his death, so that passion and resurrection must be viewed as a single happening. Now the simple expression παραδιδόναι τὸ πνεῦμα allows him to fuse Easter and Pentecost as well, in that there is no need to think of the latter as a distinct and

the total death of Jesus and his complete resurrection and relates both to the Spirit, whereby the “handing over” of the s/Spirit in 19:30 indicates Jesus' death and simultaneously inaugurates the events leading to his resurrection and gift of the Spirit. The latter event provides a narrative contrast to Jesus' death: the one who gave up the Spirit (actively) is now so full of the Spirit that he can give it to others (equally actively). The connection between the account of Jesus' death and his giving up of the s/Spirit, on the one hand, and his resurrection and his gift of the Spirit, on the other, exists primarily on a conceptual level (death–resurrection) and on a semantic level, due to the prominence of the πνεῦμα in both cases. If this connection is not accepted, however—for example, because of the different verbs used in 19:30 (παραδίδωμι) and 20:22 (ἐνεφύσησεν), my main point, which is concerned with the meaning of 19:30 as such, rather than with its connection to 20:22, is not affected.

VI. Conclusions: The Interpretation of παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα in John 19:30

The conclusions to this study can be both positive and negative. When we return to the question with which we began—that is, what one is to make of the odd expression παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα, the conclusion can only be very modest and in line with the first 1,850 years of interpretation of the Gospel of John: the expression means only that Jesus expires and dies. It is highly unlikely that Jesus hands over the Holy Spirit to anyone at that point, and it is just as unlikely that Jesus deposits the Holy Spirit with the Father, in order to retrieve and distribute it one chapter later. What remains is a curious expression in John 19:30. Thus, I do not accept the interpretation associated with Hoskyns and MacGregor or the more recent proposal by Crump; this applies also to attempts to conflate the pre- and post-Hoskyns interpretations.

Furthermore, Jesus' handing over of the πνεῦμα in John 19:30 can be seen as underlining that he is entirely without any life force in him, that is, completely dead. The fact that πνεῦμα can denote both a human and a divine s/Spirit underscores this emphasis. The association of Jesus' death with the departure of the divine, and not just a human, πνεῦμα is due both to the explicit reference to πνεῦμα

separate event.” Gates Brown improves on this position insofar as she emphasizes the extended narration of Jesus' exaltation in chaps. 19-20 as including both “Easter” and “Pentecost.” See also R. E. Brown, *Gospel according to John (xiii–xxi)*, 931: “In vii 39 John affirmed that those who believed in Jesus were to receive the Spirit once Jesus had been glorified, and so it would not be inappropriate that at this climactic moment in the hour of glorification there would be a symbolic reference to the giving of the Spirit. . . . This symbolic reference is evocative and proleptic, reminding the reader of the ultimate purpose for which Jesus has been lifted up on the cross. In Johannine thought the actual giving of the Spirit does not come now but in xx 22 after the resurrection.”

in 19:30 and to the connection of Jesus with this πνεῦμα throughout the Gospel of John. At the same time, certainly in the light of the promises of the gift of the divine πνεῦμα earlier in John and its actualization in chap. 20, John 19:30 can also be seen as constituting an intertextual link with these other texts. In fact, in combination with Jesus' last word, τετέλεσται, the remark παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα can be seen as proleptically pointing toward what will unfold in the remainder of the narrative. Now Jesus has completed his mission by dying completely and surrendering his spirit for others (see, e.g., 15:13; 12:24), which constitutes the gift of new life in Jesus' resurrection and the gift of the Spirit to the disciples. Still, Jesus' death and handing over of the πνεῦμα remain distinct events, however closely they are related in terms of being part of the same process.