RAYMOND E. BROWN

THE PARACLETE IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

In recent years much literature has been devoted to this topic. If still another discussion can be justified, it is on the grounds that many of the best insights have not been brought together and that perhaps now we may be in a position to draw a larger picture that will represent a certain consensus.

The word παράκλητος is peculiar in the New Testament to the Johannine literature. In 1 John ii. 1 Jesus is a παράκλητος (not a title), serving as a heavenly intercessor with the Father. In five passages in the Fourth Gospel the title παράκλητος is given to someone who is not Jesus, nor is he an intercessor, nor is he in heaven. Christian tradition has identified the παράκλητος of the Gospel as the Holy Spirit, but many scholars have doubted that 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. To test this claim we must begin by isolating what John says in the Paraclete passages, thus keeping the Johannine picture of the Paraclete distinct from the general New Testament picture of the Holy Spirit.

We may arrange the information under four headings:

(A) The coming of the Paraclete and the Paraclete's relation to Father and Son: The Paraclete will come (but only if Jesus departs): xv. 26; xvi. 7, 8, 13.—The Paraclete comes forth from the Father: xv. 26.—The Father will give the Paraclete at Jesus' request: xiv. 16.—The Father will send the Paraclete in Jesus' name: xiv. 26.—Jesus, when he goes away, will send the Paraclete from the Father: xvi. 7.

(B) The identification of the Paraclete: The Paraclete is called 'another

1 Paper delivered at the Cambridge meeting of S.N.T.S. in August 1956.
2 The two latest books on the subject have good bibliographies: O. Betz, Der Paraklet (Leiden, 1963); M. Miquel, El Paraclete (Jerusalem, 1965). Besides the studies mentioned in the footnotes below, the following are worthy of note: F. de Haas, 'Doctrina S. Ioannis de Spiriite Sancto', Collectanea Munchenitana, xxxi (1939), 321-6; B. Gibert, De missione Spiritus Paracleti secundum Joa. xvi. 5-155; ibid. xxii (1952), 253-4; H. Schiller, 'Zum Begriff des Geistes nach dem Johannesevangelium', Beitrage auf das Neu Testament (Freiburg i. B., 1961), 264-71.
3 John xiv. 15-17; 26; xv. 26-7; xvi. 7-11, 13-14.
4 F. Spitta, H. Deleuze, H. Windisch, H. Sasse, R. Baltmann, O. Betz. The Paraclete is identified with the Holy Spirit in xiv. 26; and so if there was a confusion of two different figures, it goes back at least to the final edition of the Gospel. For the identification in early Church writing see Shepherd of Hermas, Mandate iii. 4 compared with v. 1-2. The basic difficulty about the identification is that in the New Testament the Spirit (sometimes) appears as a force that God gives to men, while the Paraclete is presented as a person sent to men (so Windisch). In the Fourth Gospel itself the functions of the Paraclete are not prima facie the same as those assigned to the Spirit, for example, begetting from above (iii. 5, in a baptismal context); the source of life (vii. 38-9); a creative force (xx. 22).
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Moreover, if one recognizes that John xiv and John xvi. 4-33 are very similar and may represent duplicate forms of the same basic discourse, the presence of two Paraclete passages in each of these units indicates that the idea of the Paraclete was associated with its context before the final editing of the Gospel.

Relying thus both on the Paraclete passages and on the context, we may now seek to answer the question of who the Paraclete is. If he is the Holy Spirit, as has been traditionally maintained, why is this title given to the Spirit and to what particular aspects of the Spirit’s functions does it allude? Why is this title found in John alone? There are three basic approaches to answering these questions: (1) the analysis of the Greek title; (2) tracing the background of the concept(s) involved; (3) reconstruction of the Sitz im Leben of the Paraclete in Johannine theology. We shall see that no single avenue leads us to a totally satisfactory understanding but that they converge; and when the results of all three approaches are put together, we have come a long way toward understanding the Paraclete.

Analysis of the Title Παράκλητος

If we knew that there was a Hebrew or Aramaic title that παράκλητος translated, we would have a key to the basic meaning of the Greek title. However, the closest study has not yet produced a truly acceptable Semitic candidate. Recently Betz has examined a whole series of words used at Qumran to describe people with functions similar to those of the Paraclete, and yet no one of these words plausibly represents a real equivalent of the Johannine παράκλητος as a title. Indeed the quest for a Hebrew equivalent may be in vain, for ישוע appears as a loan-word in Jewish writings of the second century A.D.

1. This is the more probable translation, but the δόλος παράκλητος may also be rendered: “The Father will give you another, a Paraclete,” thus removing any suggestion of a prior Paraclete. Compare the construction in Luke xxii. 32 which means ‘two others, malefactors’, not ‘two other malefactors’. However, as J. Behn, Παράκλητος, T.W.N.T. v, 799 objects, a similar pleonastic use of δύο is not typical Johannine style.

2. To some extent this is igōnus for igōnus, for Spirit of Truth occurs only here in the Bible. We shall discuss the Qumran usage below.

3. ‘Holy’ is omitted in the Old Syriac (Sin).

4. H. Windisch, ‘Die fünf johanneischen Parakletesprüche’, Forschungen für A. Jülicher (Tübingen, 1927), pp. 110-37, was a strong proponent of this thesis. He maintained that the Evangelist added the passages from a pre-Christian source (p. 115). Münsters, op. cit. pp. 27-44, discusses the passages individually and seeks to prove that they are not additions but fit in nicely with their context.

as well, the παράκλητος of John may have been simply a retroversion of the loan-word into Greek rather than a translation of a true Hebrew title.\(^1\) At any rate we must depend on the Greek term for our analysis.

We may begin with the two interpretations of παράκλητος that have a forensic colouring and then turn to two non-forensic interpretations.

(A) As a passive form from παράκλητος in its elementary sense ('to call alongside'), meaning 'one called alongside to help', thus an advocate or a defence attorney. Often this interpretation is combined with a picture drawn from other New Testament works where the Holy Spirit comes to the defence of the disciples when they are put on trial (Matt. x. 20; Acts vi. 10), and the Paraclete becomes the defence attorney of the disciples.\(^2\) That the Paraclete has a forensic function is clear from John xv. 26 (beareth witness) and xvi. 8--11 (proves the world wrong); yet there is not the slightest suggestion in any of the five Johannine passages that he will protect the disciples when they are in difficulties. If one insists on an analogy from modern court procedure, the Paraclete's role as seen in xvi. 8--11 would be closer to that of a prosecuting attorney proving the world guilty, than to that of a defence attorney for the disciples. However, we must recognize that neither role fits exactly into the judicial procedure familiar in Israel where the judge himself did much of the interrogation; at most there was a witness for the defence rather than an advocate (for which there is no word in Hebrew).\(^3\) If we are to attribute a forensic function to the Paraclete, it must be that of witness (xv. 26); by the evidence he gives on Jesus' behalf, he proves the world wrong.

Note that the forensic aspect of the Paraclete's action is related to the defence of Jesus and not to the defence of the disciples. It has been noted many times that the Fourth Gospel is written in a legal atmosphere where Jesus is put on trial. This theme runs from the opening scene in John where official interrogators challenge the Baptist, through the many interrogations of Jesus about his witnesses (v. 31--40; xiii. 13--19), to the dramatic trial before Pilate. In this background the forensic function of the Paraclete is to show the disciples (and through them to show the world) by his witness that

intercede for men before the tribunal of God, for example angels, the Law, good works. See Behm, art. cit. p. 809, lines 20--35. As for the usage of Greek-speaking Jews, παράκλητος occurs only once in Aquila and in Theodotion (in the plural in Job xvi. 2 to translate διδούς: miserable comforters are you all!). Philo uses παράκλητος for conscience and for various other factors that will be advocates before the Father. Josephus uses the word only in composite nouns.


1 One of the Old Latin renditions, advocatus, is a literal translation of this sense. Tertullian, De ejusmodio, 135: 'Paraclete, id est advocatus ad excursum judicium.' This understanding lies behind the frequent English translation of the title as 'advocate.'

2 This understanding has been adopted by the Catholic Confraternity; Westminster; E. V. Rieu; N.E.B. and perhaps also behind the R.S.V. translation as 'counselor'.

3 Miguēnas, op. cit., bases his whole treatment of the Paraclete on this approach. Actually the context of the Paraclete passages indicates that the disciples will face persecution (xv. 24--25; xvi. 2--3; xiii. 18), but we cannot assume that the Paraclete will defend them before the world. Rather his function toward the disciples in such hard times is one of internal strengthening.


Jesus was victorious in the trial and that the Prince of the world was defeated. This connotation is not captured precisely either by 'advocate' or by 'counselor'; moreover, a purely forensic translation of παράκλητος does not do justice to his role as teacher.

(B) In an active sense, reflecting παράκλητος in its meaning of 'intercede, entreat, appeal to',\(^3\) thus an intercessor, a mediator, a spokesman. This is certainly the meaning of παράκλητος in I John ii. 1 where Jesus is with the Father making intercession on behalf of Christians who fall into sin. But the Paraclete of the Gospel is not in heaven before the Father; rather he has come to dwell within the disciples, and there is no suggestion that he makes intercession for them or for Jesus. Nor is he a spokesman for the disciples (an idea again influenced by Matt. x. 20). As we see in xv. 26--7,\(^2\) he speaks and bears evidence through them; and the disciples are the spokesmen of the Paraclete whom the world cannot see (xviii. 17; cf. I John iv. 6). The only aspect of 'spokesman' that seems applicable to the Paraclete is that he is spokesman for the absent Jesus: 'He will speak only what he hears... because he will take what is mine to announce to you' (xvi. 13--14).

Here we may mention the translation of παράκλητος as 'helper' or 'friend'.\(^3\) While the meaning 'to help' is a legitimate extension of the intercessory sense of παράκλητος, there is nothing in the Paraclete passages that would spontaneously suggest 'helper' as the most appropriate meaning—perhaps the attraction of this type of translation is that by its very vagueness it covers in general the more precise functions specifically attributed to the Paraclete by John. However, a translation more directly related to the known functions of the Paraclete would seem preferable; and, with all its generality, 'helper' or 'friend' does not do justice to the Paraclete as a witness with proves the world wrong. Among its recent German supporters the translation 'helper' has been intimately bound up with the proto-Mandaean theory to be discussed below, and its acceptance depends on a great extent on the validity of that theory.

(C) In an active sense, reflecting παράκλητος in the meaning of 'comfort', thus a comforter,\(^4\) a consoler. Recently J. G. Davies\(^5\) has argued for this trans-
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The term simply as paraclete. In the Gospel he took the latter expedient (advocatus appears in I John), a course also followed in the Syriac and Coptic traditions. We would probably be wise to do the same in modern times and settle for 'Paraclete', a near-transliteration that at least preserves the uniqueness of the title and does not emphasize one of the aspects of the concept to the detriment of others.

Background of the Concept of a Paraclete

Another fruitful avenue of research into the Johannine notion of the Paraclete has been through its background. The attempt of the History of Religions School, especially of W. Bauer, H. Windisch, R. Bultmann, and H. Becker, to find the origins of the idea in proto-Mandaean Gnosticism is well known. This hypothesis is but an aspect of the broader theory which would make John dependent in whole or in part on a proto-Gnostic document, a thesis that raises formidable difficulties. Even if we concentrate on just the Paraclete-aspect of this thesis, there are difficulties. Bultmann holds that the Paraclete is an adaptation of the Mandaean Yawar (which he translates as 'Helper'), one of a number of heavenly revealers of Mandaean religion. The criticisms of W. Michaelis and J. Behm remain valid. (1) There are not in John a large number of heavenly revealers as there are in Mandaean thought; there are at most two: Jesus himself, who is departing, and the Spirit of Truth, who remains with the disciples (xiv. 17). (2) The Mandaean revealers are simultaneous, not in tandem as Jesus and the Paraclete are. (3) The Mandaean revealers do not present a forensic aspect in the same way that the Johannine Paraclete does. (4) The Mandaean 'Yawar' occurs as a name for a particular revealer, frequently in the combination Yawar Ziwa. To describe the other helpers different words are used. Thus the case for Yawar as an equivalent for the title Paraclete is not clear at all. Moreover one must insist that parakletos does not primarily or obviously mean 'helper' or 'friend' in Greek; βοηθός would have been a much more natural translation of a term meaning 'helper'. (5) To these objections may be added the

1 Old Syriac (Cor), Peshitta, Philoxenian (even for I John), Sahidic, and Bohairic (also for I John).
2 Gerard Manley Hopkins, so sensitive to the exactness of language, caught this truth in a sermon on John xiv. 5-14 given in Liverpool on the Fourth Sunday after Easter: 'What then is a Paraclete? Often the word is translated "Comforter", but a Paraclete does more than comfort. The word is Greek; there is no one English word for it and no one Latin word.'
3 Or 'friend'—a derivative from Persian jir, 'friend'; so also W. Brand, M. Litzbarski.
4 The Johannine picture of Jesus himself, in Bultmann's thesis, is influenced by the Mandaean portrait of the principal heavenly revealer, Manda d'Hayve. To support the thesis that the Paraclete belongs to a series of heavenly revealers much stress is placed on the phrase 'another Paraclete' of John xiv. 16.
5 Zur Herkunft des johannischen Paraklets-Titels,' Constudia Neotestamentaria, xx (1947—Friedrichsen Festschrift), 147—62. In our estimation Michaelis is wrong in making too much of the alternative translation of xiv. 16, mentioned above in n. 1, p. 114. As we shall see below, one can hold that the Spirit is another Paraclete, following Jesus, the first Paraclete, without giving any confirmation to the thesis of Mandaean borrowing.
contention of Lady Drower that Yawar does not mean 'helper' at all but 'one who glows', so that Yawar Ziwa would be the 'Glower of Heavenly Light'. Her derivation is not without philological difficulty, but one very important factor favours her theory: the Mandaeans glorified Yawar Ziwa as a figure of heavenly light.

When these objections are added to the plausible arguments given below for the late Jewish background of the Paraclete concept, there remains little reason for accepting the proto-Mandaean hypothesis.

Turning now to the Jewish background, we find that S. Mowinckel and N. Johanssøn were strong advocates of this even before the Qumran discoveries, and F. M. Cross and O. Betz have added important evidence from Qumran which is very persuasive. We may call from these investigations the following points that contribute to an understanding of the Paraclete:

(A) The tandem relationship, i.e. a principal figure dies and leaves another to take his place, carry on his work, and interpret his message. This is exemplified in the Moses/Joshua and the Elijah/Elisha patterns. The secondary figure in each case is closely patterned on the first so that Joshua is another Moses (even to crossing a body of water dryshod) and Elisha is another Elijah (same style of miracles)—so also we shall see that the Paraclete is closely patterned on Jesus. The concept of the spirit is not divorced from this relationship: Deut. xxxiv. 9 describes Joshua as filled with the spirit of wisdom when Moses lays hands upon him, and Elisha receives a double share of Elijah's spirit (2 Kings ii. 9, 15). G. Bornkamm also points out the tandem relationship of the Baptist/Jesus where the Baptist is instrumental in the coming of the spirit upon Jesus and Jesus replaces the Baptist as the proclaimer of the Kingdom.

(B) The concept of the spirit of God coming upon the prophets that they might speak the words of God to men. The apostles of the New Testament


2 Die Vorstellungen des Spätjudentums vom heiligen Geist als Frühsprücher und der johanneische Paraklet, Z.A.W. xxiii (1933), 97–130.

3 Paraklet (Land, 1940). Another suggestion of Hebrew background for the Paraclete is that of B. Vawter, 'Ezechiel und John', C.B.Q. xxv (1954), 455–8, namely, Ezekiel's conception of the prophetic office.


5 One may add the pattern of Moses/the Prophet-like-Moses as an element of the late Jewish understanding of Deut. xxviii. 15. Note that the Prophet-like-Moses will speak in God's name and speak all that God has commanded him—a description with similarities to John xvi. 13–14. Cf. G. Bornkamm, 'Der Paraklet im Johannesevangelium', Festschrifft für R. Bullmann (Stuttgart, 1945), 16–20; Bett, op. cit. pp. 146–90.

6 Art. cit. pp. 15–16. If one objects that here the second figure is the greater, we must remember that the Fourth Gospel had to argue to prove that point, since the earlier figure should have been greater (John i. 30, 37). Betz, op. cit. p. 157, points out that the Baptist is a witness to Jesus beforehand (i. 15), while the Paraclete is a witness to Jesus afterward. Bornkamm, art. cit. pp. 20–5, also insists on the relationship of the concept of the Son of Man to the Paraclete concept; this is less convincing.

7 At Qumran this idea persists, for those elected by God are said to have been made known by 'those anointed by His holy spirit and the scent of His truth' (C.D. ii. 12–13).
angel took over the task of protecting God's interests and people, for example, Michael in Dan. x. 13. This development was favoured by the custom of referring to God's appearance among men as 'the angel of the Lord', and it is worthy of note that in Zech. iii. 1-5 the satan is opposed by the angel of the Lord—a step toward the dualism of bad and good angels. Also in Job, besides the satan who tests Job, there is scattered and somewhat obscure reference to an angelic spokesman who takes the part of the just; seemingly he is a heavenly witness, a vindicator who after Job's death proves on earth the justice of Job's case.

At Qumran the picture of dualistic opposition is worked out fully in 1QS iii. 18 ff. where all mankind is divided under the leadership of the Spirit of Truth (or Light) and of the Spirit of Falsehood (or Darkness),122

and in 1QM xiii. 9-12 and xvii. 6-9 where Michael and Belial lead the forces of light and darkness into battle. The Qumran literature (and the Testament of Judah xx. 1-5) supplies the only pre-Christian instances of the title 'Spirit of Truth' which John uses synonymously with the Paraclete. The title at Qumran is somewhat ambiguous in its use. The evidence of QM that Michael and Belial were thought of as the leaders of light and darkness suggests very strongly that the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Falsehood of QS are these angels, especially since the 'Prince of Lights' and the 'Angel of Darkness' are mentioned specifically in the midst of the two-spirit passage of 1QS (iii. 20-1). Yet one also gets the impression that the two spirits are taken in a wider, psychological sense of a way of life and of something that penetrates man's very being. For instance, in 1QS iv. 23-4 we hear: 'Until now the spirits of truth and falsehood struggle in the hearts of men, and they walk in both wisdom and folly.' The personal and impersonal aspects of the Spirits of Truth and Falsehood are not at all contradictory; it is natural to shift from speaking of two personal Spirits who exercise a dominion over man to speaking of the two corresponding spirits according to which a man acts and shows his adherence to the respective domination. A similar variation between

1 Job xxxiii. 23: מָלֵךְ הַשָּׁמַיִם מֶלֶךְ הַשָּׁמַיִם. Often מָלֵךְ הַשָּׁמַיִם is suggested as the Hebrew term translated by ἡγοῦντος.
2 Job xvi. 19: this description is interesting since the Paraclete is one who bears witness (vv. 26).
3 Job, xix. 25-7: if we have understood correctly this difficult verse. Note the parallel to the Paraclete who after Jesus' death comes to earth to prove the justice of Jesus' case.
4 The origin of the Testament are disputed, but it is not unlikely that at least parts of the Testaments were of Qumran sectarian origin. T. Preiss, Life in Christ (London, 1954), p. 20, points out that there are several parallels between the description in the Testament of the spirit of truth (seemingly both personal and impersonal) that haunts man and the description in John of the Paraclete, for instance the functions of bearing witness and accusing.
5 Betz, op. cit., pp. 147 ff., gives much attention to the problem of whether or not the Spirit of Truth is identified with Michael in QS. He holds that the two seem to be distinct but are well on the road toward identification. On p. 156 he observes that they may be two different sides of the one coin. We would rather say that in QS the term 'spirit of truth' has both personal and impersonal application; when it is used of a personal being, then the Spirit of Truth is Michael. See the excellent treatment in H. Rüeggner, The Faith of Qumran (Philadelphia, 1953), pp. 68 ff. It is interesting that T. Benjamin puts 'Spirit of Falsehood' and Belial in apposition, just as John puts Paraclete and 'Spirit of Truth' in apposition.

the personal and the impersonal is encountered in the description of divine Wisdom in the late Jewish sapiential writing.

Is there any relationship between the angelic Spirit of Truth and the holy or prophetic spirit given by God to the prophets, the concept of spirit which, as we saw, forms a background for the teaching function of the Paraclete/Spirit? Betz is undoubtedly right in maintaining that originally these were two different concepts. But it must also be emphasized, perhaps even more strongly, how much holy spirit, angelic spirit, and Spirit of Truth had come together in pre-Christian Judaism. Besides the ambiguity about whether the Spirit of Truth was an angel or a spirit that God had put into the heart of man, there is the fact that angels were called spirits; and if sometimes angels were guides who pointed out things to come (a role given to the Paraclete in John xvi. 13), this role was also attributed to the spirit which God gave to the prophets: 'By his powerful spirit he [Isaiah] looked into the future' (Sirach xlv. 24). If the Qumran sectarian were taught that they had to be men who walked in the way of the Spirit of Truth, they were also taught that their sins were cleansed by the 'spirit of truth and counsel' and by the 'holy spirit' uniting them to God's truth (1QS iii. 6-7). Jubilees, which may well have been a Qumran sectarian composition, reflects the complexity of the thought about the various spirits: when Moses prays that God will create for his people an upright spirit that Belial may not rule over them, the divine answer is not in terms of God's sending an angel but in terms of God's creating in them a holy spirit (i. 20-4). Thus, Belial could be opposed by the holy spirit in men's hearts as well as by an angelic Spirit of Truth.

In summation, we find in late Jewish thought the basic elements that appear in the Johannine picture of the Paraclete: tandem relationship of two salvific figures corresponding to the tandem relationship of Jesus and the Paraclete; the passing on of his spirit by the main salvific figure; God's granting a spirit which would enable the recipient to understand and interpret divine deed and word authoritatively; a personal (angelic) Spirit who would lead the chosen ones against the forces of evil, even as the Paraclete brings about the condemnation of the Prince of this world; personal (angelic) Spirits who teach men and guide them to truth. And in the passages describing these various relationships and spirits there is much of the vocabulary of witnessing, teaching, guiding, and accusing that appears in the Johannine Paraclete passages; the title 'Spirit of Truth' is used; and

1 Similarly, if the prophetic spirit is given to men that they may understand, Jubilees iv. 15 describes the angels of the Lord descending on earth to instruct men.
2 For treatments of the complex concept of spirit at Qumran see J. Coppens, 'Le don de l'esprit d'après les textes de Qumran et le quartier de l'évangile', L'Evangile de Jean (Recherches Bibliques m. Léouvi, 1958), pp. 109-23; F. Nietzsche, 'Geist und Geister in den Texten von Qumran', Mélanges Bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert (Paris, 1957), pp. 955-15. Coppens treats the spirit only in relation to the community and is obviously apprehensive of the danger that Qumran anticipated a Christian (Trinitarian) concept of the hypostatized Spirit of God (of course, it did not). Nietzsche more objectively recognizes the Qumran tendency to personalize the spirit.
was probably in use in Judaism contemporary with John as a loanword with forensic connotations. Often these various strains were already mixed in the Jewish background.

The process of combining them and Christianizing them into the Johannine picture of the Paraclete was probably just as complicated as the process of combining and adapting concepts like Messiah, son of man, and Servant of Yahweh into a Christian understanding of Jesus Christ. However, we should qualify some previous theories about the combination of ideas that produced the Paraclete concept. The claim mentioned above that the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete were originally different concepts in Christianity because the one title describes a force and the other a person is a bad over-simplification. Undoubtedly in early Christian thought there was a progression in understanding the Holy Spirit; from a stage where the aspect of a God-given prophetic force or impetus was dominant, there was progression to a stage where more emphasis was given to the personal concept of the Spirit. But this progression was precisely in terms of *more attention*; it was not the creation of an entirely new picture. The intertestamental description of the spirit, as we have seen, was already taking on personal aspects borrowed from the idea of angelic spirits. And we must recognize that not only in John and in Acts but even in the earlier books of the New Testament, the Christian concept of the Spirit had personal features. John brings the personality of the Spirit more to the fore by giving the Spirit the masculine title παράκλητος and by referring to the Paraclete/Spirit with masculine personal pronouns, but in this the Evangelist was making more specific an attitude that already existed.

And indeed, in describing the Paraclete, John does not paint a picture without parallel in other New Testament descriptions of the Holy Spirit but only emphasizes certain aspects that were already present and gives them a new orientation and immediacy. The forensic function of bearing witness and

1. While there is seemingly no instance of this loan-word being used to describe the spirit, the synonymous רָשָׁב (n. 4, p. 115 above) is used in rabbinic writings to characterize the spirit, asking God for grace for the people and warning Israel to obey God; it is also used of Michael. See Behn, art. cit. p. 89, lines 20-35.
2. Betz, op. cit. p. 159, mentions another argument that has been used to bolster this over-simplified distinction, namely, the contention that the verbs that John uses in relation to the Paraclete betray a confusion of ideas. The Paraclete is given and received (ὁφηκαί) in the manner of a spiritual force in xiv. 16-17, but the Paraclete is sent and comes in the manner of a person in xiv. 26; xv. 26; xv. 7-9, 13. The argument is invalid; for Jesus, who is clearly a person, is also given (iii. 16) and received (v. 43), without the slightest loss of personality.
3. In speaking of a personal concept of the Spirit in the New Testament, we take for granted the understanding that there was also a development from the New Testament concept to that of the fourth century when it was defined that the Spirit is the Third Person of the Trinity.
4. The well-known triadic passages in Paul would be an example especially where they attribute voluntary actions to the Spirit, for example, I Cor. xii. 11, 'The same Spirit who apports to each one individually as he will'; Rom. viii. 16, 'It is the Spirit himself bearing witness'.
5. *Evangel in xiv. 26; xv. 26; xv. 8, 14; 40765 in xvi. 7.

proving the world wrong is emphasized in the Johannine Paraclete passages, but the Holy Spirit has a forensic function (somewhat different, it is true) in protecting the disciples on trial in Matt. x. 20 and Acts vi. 10. If the Paraclete comes only after Jesus departs, the same is true of Luke's description of the coming of the Spirit in Acts—a parallel that is more impressive when it is noted that Luke's understanding of Jesus' ascension shares much with John's concept of the resurrection (see John xx. 17). The Father gives the Paraclete at Jesus' request (John xiv. 16); even so the Father gives the Holy Spirit to those who ask him (Luke xi. 13). If the Paraclete bears witness on Jesus' behalf by means of the witness that the disciples bear, so the coming of the Holy Spirit in Acts is what moves the disciples to begin to speak of Jesus and to show the world that God had raised him up. Conceptually there is a very close parallel to John xv. 26-7 in Acts v. 32: 'We are witnesses to these things, and so is the Holy Spirit whom God has given to those who obey him.' If the Paraclete is to teach the disciples everything (John xiv. 26), Luke xii. 12 says that the Holy Spirit will teach them. Thus, when John xiv. 16 identifies the Paraclete as the Holy Spirit, this is not an artificial editorial joining of two distinct concepts; the similarities between the Paraclete and the Spirit appear in all the Paraclete passages. We shall show in the final section of the article how the particular features of the larger concept of the Spirit that John emphasizes under the title of Paraclete were pertinent to the purpose of the Gospel.

We have discussed this at length because it is here that we would modify the orientation given by Betz in his generally excellent treatment of the Quirinian background of the Paraclete concept. In emphasizing the contribution of the Spirit of Truth and of the angel Michael to the origins of the Paraclete concept, Betz leaves this reader, at least, with the impression that the angelic figure was consciously moulded into that of the Holy Spirit to form the Johannine Paraclete. This impression that the Evangelist deliberately drew on an angelic role is heightened by the parallelism that Betz draws between the respective roles of Christ and Michael in the Book of Revelation and the respective roles of Jesus and the Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel. We

1. If we have insisted above that such passages cannot be used to explain what John means by the Paraclete, they can be used to show that the forensic aspect of the Spirit is not unknown.

2. See W. E. Leithouse, *The Holy Spirit in the Acts and the Fourth Gospel*, Exp. Times, li (1940-1), 334-6. This author makes the interesting suggestion that Luke may have shared with John the tradition of a promise of the Spirit at the Last Supper, whence the enigmatic reference in Acts 1. 4. 3. Op. cit. pp. 149 ff. Betz's thought on this matter is not simple, and we hope that we do not distort it. If he has a strong emphasis in the direction described above (for example, p. 150), he has lines that recognize that the amalgamation of the angelic and the Holy Spirit may have been pre-Johannine.

4. Ibid. p. 154, where he says that while Revelation gives the basic figure his personal name (Michael), the Gospel gives him his title (Paraclete). We see no basis for this. Among the Gospels John shows the least interest in angelology (the author does believe in angels as subordinate to Jesus:1. 51); and the theory that conscious angelology heavily influenced the portrait of the Paraclete, a figure so like Jesus, would require very definite proof. If the author of Revelation and the Evangelist are from the same general Johannine school of thought, then we would suspect that the Evangelist's attitude...
agree fully that the Spirit of Truth in Qumrân thought is (sometimes) an angel, but there is not the slightest evidence in John’s picture of the Paraclete that these remote angelic origins have remained influential. The relationship between John and the Qumrân literature is not direct, as far as we can tell; and if some of the Johannean terminology and dualism came to John from Qumrân, it came only indirectly and after much reshaping and Christian adaptation. The figure of the Qumrân Spirit of Truth and/or the angelic Prince of Lights underwent adaptation and became part of the Johannean picture of Jesus who is the light of the world and the truth. In our judgement, it is because the Paraclete is very carefully patterned on Jesus that the figure of the Qumran Spirit of Truth and/or the angelic Prince of Lights has also become part of the Johannean picture of the Paraclete. If John calls the Paraclete the Spirit of Truth, we suspect that the primary factor that made this title seem fitting was that in Johanneine thought the Paraclete is the Spirit of Jesus and Jesus is the truth.

THE JOHANNINE ‘SITZ IM LEBEN’ FOR THE PARACLETE CONCEPT

If there remains something unique in John’s understanding of the Paraclete, so that the Christian concept goes beyond the mere sum of all the elements in the Jewish background, and no one translation of the Greek word can capture all its aspects, then the last approach to what is unique must be sought in John’s own description of the Paraclete. In all that John says of this figure, the intimate relation of the Paraclete to Jesus is what is dominant. Whatever is said about the Paraclete is said elsewhere in the Gospel about Jesus. Let us show this in each of the informative groups of statements about the Paraclete that we isolated at the beginning of the discussion.

(A) The coming of the Paraclete. The Paraclete will come; so also has Jesus come into the world (v. 43; xvi. 28; xviii. 37). The Paraclete comes forth (ἀνεγερθησαν) from the Father; so also did Jesus come forth (xvi. 27-8; ἐκεῖνος ἐγερθησαν) from the Father. The Father will give the Paraclete at Jesus’ request; so also the Father gave the Son (iii. 16). The Father will send the Paraclete; so also Jesus was sent by the Father (iii. 17 and passim). The Paraclete will be sent in Jesus’ name; so also Jesus came in the Father’s name (v. 43—in many ways the Paraclete is to Jesus as Jesus is to the Father).

toward Michael’s role would have been roughly the same as that of the author of Revelation, namely, that Michael would assist Jesus at the time of the second coming, but this would have nothing to do with the role of the Paraclete who takes Jesus’ place between the resurrection/ascension and the second coming. (As will be seen below, while we recognize that the Evangelist does not feel the immediacy of the second coming and is more interested in a type of realized eschatology, there is no reason to think that he had lost faith in the second coming.)


2 The incorporation into chirology of features and prerogatives that Judaism attributed to angels (not the least of which was the designation ‘son of God’) is a phenomenon apparent in many New Testament books, for example Hebrews, Colossians; it was probably a common Christian attitude.

(B) The identification of the Paraclete. If the Paraclete is ‘another Paraclete’, this seems to imply that Jesus was the first Paraclete, an observation that gains credence from I John ii. 1. If the Paraclete is the Spirit of Truth, Jesus is the truth (xiv. 6). If the Paraclete is the Holy Spirit, Jesus is the Holy One of God (vi. 69). These observations, combined with those about Jesus’ sending of the Paraclete, show that John shared the general New Testament picture of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of Jesus. For John (i. 32) the Spirit came to rest on Jesus and remain with him at the beginning of the ministry, and it is this same Spirit that he breathed forth on his disciples at the end of the ministry (xx. 22; perhaps xix. 30).

(C) The relation of the Paraclete to the disciples. The disciples will be granted the privilege to know or recognize the Paraclete; so also it is a special privilege to know or recognize Jesus (xiv. 7, 9). The Paraclete will be within the disciples and dwell with them (ἐν τοῖς ἐν μέρες; μετὰ τοῦτος); so also Jesus is to remain in and with the disciples and make his dwelling with them (xiv. 20; xviii. 23, 26; xiv. 4, 5; μετὰ τοῦτος; xiv. 23; μετὰ τοῦτος). The Paraclete will teach the disciples; so also Jesus taught those who would listen (vi. 59; vii. 14, 28; viii. 20). If the Paraclete will guide the disciples along the way of all truth, Jesus is both the way and the truth (xiv. 6). If the Paraclete announces or reveals to the disciples the things to come, Jesus identified himself as the Messiah to come who announces or reveals all things (iv. 25-6). If the Paraclete will bear witness, Jesus bore witness (viii. 14). And, to be sure, the Paraclete’s teaching or revelation is nothing new; he reminds the disciples what Jesus had taught; he bears witness on Jesus’ behalf and glorifies Jesus. (Once again we see that the Paraclete has the same relation to Jesus that Jesus has to the Father. Jesus did not speak on his own but only what the Father taught him [vii. 28 and passim]; Jesus glorified the Father [xii. 27-8; xiv. 3; xvii. 4].)

(D) The relation of the Paraclete to the world. The world cannot accept the Paraclete; so also evil men did not accept Jesus (v. 43; cf. xix. 28). The world does not see the Paraclete; so also men are told that they will soon lose sight of Jesus (xvi. 16). The world does not know or recognize the Paraclete; so also men do not know Jesus (xvi. 3; cf. vii. 28; vii. 14, 19; xiv. 7). The Paraclete will bear witness in a setting of the world’s hate; so also Jesus bore witness against the world (vii. 7). The Paraclete will prove the world wrong concerning the trial of Jesus, a trial that colours John’s whole portrait of the ministry of Jesus.

1 In which stage of his career was Jesus the first Paraclete? Miguecias, op. cit. p. 158 n., argues that Jesus was a Paraclete in heaven after the resurrection. He supports this by I John and also by the context given to the Paraclete passages by the last discourse where Jesus is going to the Father. However, we shall see that the career of the Paraclete is parallel in every detail by the earthly ministry of Jesus; this second Paraclete does what Jesus did on earth (teaching, bearing witness, proving the world wrong) and does not imitate the intercession of Jesus in heaven. Thus it seems that Jesus was the first Paraclete in his earthly ministry.

2 During his ministry men could see, Jesus, and his ministry was visible in a way that the Paraclete’s ministry is not.
This detailed parallelism between the ministry of the Paraclete and the ministry of Jesus is too exact to be coincidental. As 'another Paraclete', the Paraclete is, as it were, another Jesus—a duplication characteristic of the Old Testament tandem relationships that we discussed. Since the Paraclete can only come when Jesus departs, the Paraclete is the presence of Jesus when Jesus is absent. Elsewhere Jesus promises to dwell with his disciples (xiv. 23); this promise is fulfilled in the Paraclete. It is no accident that the first passage containing Jesus' promise of the Paraclete (xiv. 16–17) is followed immediately by the verse which says, 'I am coming back to you'. Jesus comes back to them through his Spirit which he handed over to the disciples during the whole process of being lifted up to his Father (vii. 38–9; xix. 30; xx. 22).

Now what was the Sitz im Leben in the Johannine tradition that brought emphasis on the Spirit as the Paraclete, i.e. as the continued post-resurrectional presence of Jesus with his disciples, teaching them and proving to them that Jesus was victorious and the world was wrong? This portrait of the Spirit/Paraclete answers two problems prominent in the composition of the Fourth Gospel.

The first problem is the uneasy confusion caused by the death of the apostolic eyewitnesses who were the living chain between the Church and Jesus of Nazareth. It is the thesis of many scholars that one of the purposes of the Fourth Gospel was to show the true connexion between the church life of the late first century and the already distant Jesus. They regard the Gospel as an attempt to counteract the danger that, instead of meditating Jesus to men and bringing men into living contact with Jesus, the Church might become a self-subsistent saviour of men. And so the Gospel is at pains to stress the necessity of faith in Jesus and to show by means of symbolism that the sacramental actions of the Church are directly related to Jesus' saving miracles on behalf of men (the concept of miracle as sign). In such a context the death of the apostolic eyewitnesses was a tragedy, for a visible link between Jesus and the Church was being severed. Previously, the men who had seen Jesus had been able to interpret the mind of Jesus in face of the new situations in which the Church found itself. Undoubtedly the impact of the loss of the eyewitnesses was felt acutely in the period after 70 (we would suggest 70–85 as the period for the first edition of a written form of John), but the full impact was felt at the time of the death of the Beloved Disciple, the Johannine eyewitness par excellence, a death which seemingly occurred just before the final edition of the Gospel (between 90 and 100), as implied in John xxi. 22–3. How was the Johannine community to survive without its principal visible link to Jesus?

The concept of the Spirit/Paraclete answers this question. If the eyewitnesses had guided the Church and if, in particular, the Beloved Disciple had borne witness to Jesus in the Johannine community, it was not primarily because of their own recollections of Jesus. After all, they had seen Jesus but had not understood: ‘Here I am with you all this time, and you still do not know me?’ (xiv. 9). Several times in the Gospel John insists that the eyewitnesses could not understand what they saw and heard until after Jesus' resurrection when he had been glorified (ii. 22; xii. 16). We can scarcely dissociate this post-resurrectional understanding from the gift of the Paraclete which took place after the resurrection in order that the disciples might be taught about and reminded of all the things that Jesus had told them. The apostolic eyewitnesses were able to preach and interpret Jesus precisely because they had received the Paraclete. And this Paraclete remains within those who love Jesus (xiv. 17) even after the apostolic eyewitnesses have died. The death of the apostles has not broken the chain, for the Paraclete who taught them about Jesus continues to guide Christians along the way of all truth. Thus, as for understanding, the later Christian is not further removed from the ministry of Jesus, because the Paraclete dwells within him just as he dwelt within the first generation.

John insists that the teaching function of the Paraclete involves nothing new; yet this does not mean that his role of reminding (xiv. 26) the disciples was simply one of recalling history. As the presence of Jesus among the disciples, the Paraclete played an interpretative role—making what Jesus had said and done relevant and meaningful to succeeding generations. His 'reminding' (προςαμανθησασθαι) the disciples participated in the character of biblical δοκιμήσεως, i.e. re-presentation in a living manner. John's Gospel is a perfect example of how the Paraclete went about his task of guiding men to the truth of Jesus' words and deeds, for in this Gospel a historical tradition...
has been rethought and its meaning reinterpreted for the Church at the end of the first century, removed by some fifty to sixty years from Jesus' ministry. The many scholars (A. Loisy, H. Sasse, A. Kragerud) who believe that the Beloved Disciple is the incarnation of the Paraclete have (somewhat exaggeratedly) touched upon an important truth. As the principal authority behind the Johannine Gospel, he and his circle of followers illustrate the work of the Paraclete in an ideal manner. Yet there is nothing to suggest that the work of the Paraclete is confined to the Beloved Disciple, or to any of the other apostolic witnesses. F. Mussner, who has shown so well how the Paraclete was active in the ministry of the apostles, makes the point that the Paraclete was promised only to the Twelve, i.e. to those who were with Jesus from the beginning (xv. 27). But, while this limitation corresponds to the historical setting of the Last Supper in which John places the Paraclete passages, we do not think that the indwelling of the Paraclete is the exclusive privilege of the Twelve Apostles or that this indwelling was passed on along with the apostolic office, as Mussner seems to suggest. Certainly, as kerygmatic preachers, all the apostles gave a clear exhibition of the Paraclete at work; they were fulfilling Jesus' command to let the Paraclete bear witness through them (xv. 26-7). But John holds up the Twelve as models of what every Christian disciple should be. The conditions upon which the coming of the Paraclete depends, namely, to love Jesus and to keep his commandments (xiv. 15), are essentials for every Christian. This does not do away with the existence of official teaching offices in the Church but recognizes that the understanding of revelation and the bearing of witness (the signs of the working of the Paraclete) are not the exclusive privilege of any group within the Church.\footnote{The basic teacher of all Christians is the Paraclete; as E. John ii. 20, 27 has it, 'You have been anointed by the Holy One and you all have knowledge...so you have no need for anyone to teach you.'} The second problem in Johannine tradition to which the concept of the Paraclete brings an answer is that of the delay of the parousia. \textit{Pace} Bultmann,\footnote{Art. cit. pp. 67-70.}

We presume the critical understanding of apostle as a much wider category than the Twelve, including all the eyewitnesses of the resurrected Jesus commissioned to preach him. In Roman Catholic theological vocabulary this is recognized in the concept of the \textit{sensus fidelium}. At times the official teachers of the Church draw their surety about doctrine from understanding of revelation attested by those who are to be taught, and thus the faithful lead the teachers.\footnote{In Roman Catholic theological vocabulary this is recognized in the concept of the \textit{sensus fidelium}.}

This statement, when properly understood, does not obviates a special role or office of teacher; this is illustrated by the very writing of the epistle: the author himself is exercising the role of teacher ('Whoever knows God listens to us': 1 John iv. 6). If the 'anointing' by the Holy One involves the presence of the Holy Spirit, as many exegetes think, then John in this passage is attributing to the Spirit the same internal teaching function that the Gospel attributes to the Paraclete—another indication that under the title of Paraclete, the Evangelist is only highlighting and isolating certain functions which the Spirit was thought to possess.\footnote{This statement, when properly understood, does not obviates a special role or office of teacher; this is illustrated by the very writing of the epistle: the author himself is exercising the role of teacher ('Whoever knows God listens to us': 1 John iv. 6). If the 'anointing' by the Holy One involves the presence of the Holy Spirit, as many exegetes think, then John in this passage is attributing to the Spirit the same internal teaching function that the Gospel attributes to the Paraclete—another indication that under the title of Paraclete, the Evangelist is only highlighting and isolating certain functions which the Spirit was thought to possess.}

Bultmann's position that all the references to final eschatology in the Gospel are to be attributed to the Ecclesiastical Redactor who was correcting the Evangelist's radical theology is very difficult to justify. The most careful study of Bultmann's theory, D. M. Smith's \textit{The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel} (New Haven, 1965), repeatedly shows how arbitrary is the process of consistently rejecting such references as secondary.

---

we find no evidence that Johannine theology ever abandoned the hope of the final return of Jesus in visible glory, although the Gospel clearly puts more emphasis on all the eschatological features that have already been realized in Jesus' first coming. The question is not one of the presence of Jesus in and through the Paraclete as opposed to the coming of Jesus in glory, but one of the relative importance to be given to each.

C. K. Barrett has perceptively pointed out that from the earliest post-resurrection days the idea of the Spirit was used to explain why the triumphal return of Jesus did not take place immediately. In Acts, Luke presents Pentecost with some of the apocalyptic trappings that were expected to surround the coming of Jesus in glory, e.g. Pentecost was the fulfillment of Joel’s prophecy about the last days. For Paul the sending of the Spirit makes comprehensible the existence of the Church, for the Spirit explains the tension between possession and hope. But, at least before A.D. 70, this appreciation of the role of the Spirit was combined most prominently with the expectation that Jesus would soon return in glory. John's theology reflects more prominently the attitude of the period after 70 when the vivid expectation of the second coming had begun to wane\footnote{Of course, persecution could fan it to life again, as we see in the Book of Revelation.} and an indefinite delay was forecast.

One contributing factor to this changed outlook was the failure of Jesus to return at the time of the fall of Jerusalem, an event hitherto thought of as a sign that the end was at hand (Mark xiii. 14 and parallels). Another contributory factor was the death of the apostolic generation, for sayings such as those found in Mark xii. 30 and Matt. x. 23 seemed to promise the parousia during the lifetime of those who had heard Jesus. The prominence of this second factor in Johannine thought is visible in John xxi. 23 which speaks of the expectation among the brethren that Jesus would return before the death of the Beloved Disciple.

John's stress on the Paraclete/Spirit as the presence of Jesus is the Evangelist's answer to the discouragement about the delay of the second coming.\footnote{We disagree with Betz (ibid. cit. pp. 149-50) who thinks that the parousia and the coming of the Paraclete go together, just as the coming of Christ and that of the angel Michael go together in Rev. xiv. 11-xx. 10.} The Evangelist is implicitly saying that the delay should produce no loneliness or dismay, for Jesus is already present to the Christian in and through the Paraclete. John does not deny that one day Jesus will return to call to resurrection those who are in their tombs (v. 28-9), but the Christian need not expend all his energies in expectation of that coming. Rather he should be consoled\footnote{The Paraclete is truly a 'Comforter' as seen in xiv. 15: 'I shall not leave you orphans; I am coming back to you.'} by the Paraclete who brings Jesus into his life. The earlier New Testament theologians who expected that Jesus would soon return in glory were consoled in the meantime by the manifestation and gifts of the Spirit in...
the Church; in the context of a more remote expectation of Jesus’ coming, John consoles Christians by the thought of the Paraclete as the spiritual presence of Jesus in all those who love him and keep his commandments.

The Johannine portrait of the ministry of Jesus in terms of partially realized eschatology means that for John many of the features which the Synoptic Gospels relate to the second coming have already been made realities on earth in and through Jesus, for example, eternal life and the gift of divine sonship (i. 12; xvii. 3). In particular, Jesus’ coming into the world as man represents the basic element of world judgment (iii. 19) that an earlier and simpler theology associated almost exclusively with the second coming. As part of this realized judgement the presence of the Paraclete puts the world on trial and proves the world wrong about Jesus.¹ And so, unexpectedly, in the Paraclete Jesus has fulfilled his promise that all these things would take place before this generation passed away.

We would be unfaithful to the Johannine portrait of the Paraclete were we not to say at least a word on the continued relevance of this concept in Christian life; for, after all, the very purpose of the Paraclete was to keep Jesus alive, and John’s brilliant grasp of this purpose would be in vain if the Paraclete had lost his relevance after the first century. But the implications of the understanding of the Paraclete as the abiding presence of Jesus in the Christian remain just as dramatic today as they were when the Fourth Gospel was written. The presence of the Paraclete differs from the presence of Jesus during the ministry in an essential feature: the Paraclete is invisible to the world because the Paraclete is within the disciple (xiv. 17). The only way that the Paraclete can exercise his ministry is through Christians and their way of life and the way they bear witness. The only way the world can know that Jesus’ death was not the end is that the Spirit which animated Jesus is still alive in his followers. This is how the Paraclete proves the world wrong and shows that Jesus is triumphant with the Father while the Prince of this world has been condemned, namely, that two thousand years after Jesus’ death, his presence is still made visible in his disciples; through Christians the Paraclete is still glorifying Jesus.

¹ Bornkamm, art. cit. p. 26, points out that the concept of the Paraclete serves to demythologize apocalyptic motifs; world judgment is an instance of this. Berrouard, art. cit. pp. 9–11, gives a magnificent analysis of the difficult passage in xvi. 8–11. If the Paraclete proves the world wrong, the proof is primarily directed to the disciples in times of doubt, for the Paraclete is given to them and cannot be seen by the world. The proof consists in explaining the true outcome of Jesus’ death. Although apparently he was condemned as a malefactor, the real sin was and is on the part of those who refuse to believe in him. Justice was truly done; yet this justice was not in his death at the hands of men but in his return to his Father in glory. And his adversary, the Prince of this world, who seemed victorious over Jesus was actually destroyed by Jesus’ death which led to life for all. See also Betz, op. cit. pp. 106 ff. on the verb ἀνάκαμψεν ‘to prove wrong’.