

4-2008

## Jesus and the Breath of Life: An Exegesis of John 20:22 in Historical and Modern Interpretation an Obscure and Mysterious Text

Douglas W. Balzer  
dbalzer@georgefox.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/seminary\\_masters](https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/seminary_masters)

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Christianity Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Balzer, Douglas W., "Jesus and the Breath of Life: An Exegesis of John 20:22 in Historical and Modern Interpretation an Obscure and Mysterious Text" (2008). *Seminary Masters Theses*. 50.  
[https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/seminary\\_masters/50](https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/seminary_masters/50)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Seminary Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact [arolfe@georgefox.edu](mailto:arolfe@georgefox.edu).

GEORGE FOX EVANGELICAL SEMINARY

JESUS AND THE BREATH OF LIFE:  
AN EXEGESIS OF JOHN 20:22  
IN HISTORICAL AND MODERN INTERPRETATION  
AN OBSCURE AND MYSTERIOUS TEXT

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF GEORGE FOX EVANGELICAL SEMINARY  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS (THEOLOGICAL STUDIES)

BY  
DOUGLAS W. BALZER

HILLSBORO, OREGON  
APRIL 2008

PORTLAND CENTER LIBRARY  
GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY  
PORTLAND, OR. 97223



GEORGE FOX  
EVANGELICAL SEMINARY

**THESIS ACCEPTANCE CERTIFICATE**


**Title:** JESUS AND THE BREATH OF LIFE: AN EXEGESIS OF JOHN  
20:22 IN HISTORICAL AND MODERN INTERPRETATION,  
AN OBSCURE AND MYSTERIOUS TEXT

**Presented by:** DOUGLAS W. BALZER

**Date:** APRIL 1, 2008

We, the undersigned, certify that we have read this thesis and approve it as adequate in scope and quality for the degree of Master of Arts in Theological Studies.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(R. Larry Shelton)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Kent L. Yinger)



To Jan  
My inspiration, best friend and wife

In the memory of  
Peter and Marie Balzer

Table of Contents	vi
Abbreviations	viii
Abstract	ix
Introduction: Jesus and the Breath of Life: an Exegesis of John 20:22 in Historical and Modern Interpretation: An Obscure and Mysterious Text	10
Chapter 1: Important issues of introduction to the study of John 20:22 <i>The Background of John's Gospel</i> <i>Authorship of John's Gospel</i> <i>The Literary Considerations for Authorship</i> <i>Dating of John's Gospel</i> <i>Location and Setting</i> <i>Theme and Purpose</i> <i>The Context of John 20:22</i> <i>An Examination of the Greek Text</i> <i>Conclusion</i>	14
Chapter 2: An examination of ἐμφυσάω in the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament <i>Investigating the Septuagint use and interpretation of ἐμφυσάω</i> <i>An Examination of ἐμφυσάω in the Greek Old Testament</i> <i>An Examination of Genesis 2:7</i> <i>An Examination of 1 Kings 17:21</i> <i>An Examination of Ezekiel 37:9</i> <i>Conclusion</i>	36
Chapter 3: An examination of ἐμφυσάω in the Apocrypha and the Qumran Scrolls <i>Examining the Apocrypha</i> <i>An Examination of Wisdom 15:11</i> <i>Examining the Qumran Scrolls</i> <i>An Examination of 1QS 4:21</i>	48
Chapter 4: Historical and Modern Interpretations of John 20:22 <i>The Early Church Fathers from the Nicene and Post-Nicene Period</i> <i>Cyprian the Bishop of Carthage ca.?-258 C.E.</i> <i>Athanasius the Bishop of Alexandria 293-373 C.E.</i> <i>Cyril the Bishop of Jerusalem 315-386 C.E.</i> <i>Gregory of Nazianzus 329-389 C.E.</i> <i>John Chrysostom the Bishop of Constantinople 349-407 C.E.</i> <i>Theodore the Interpreter; Bishop of Mopsuestia 350-428 C.E.</i> <i>Augustine of Hippo 354-430 C.E.</i>	58

*Cyril of Alexandria 378-444 C.E.*

*Modern Interpretations of John 20:22*

*The Symbolic View*

*The Empowerment for Ministry-An Ordination Gift*

*The Power of Proclamation*

*The Johannine Pentecost*

*The Embryonic Paraclete*

*The Breath of Life given as Salvation*

*A New Relationship with the Spirit*

*Conclusion*

Chapter 5: Exegesis of John 20:22 Conclusion and Application	87
Bibliography	91

## Abbreviations

ANF	<i>Ante-Nicene Fathers</i>
CSCO	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i>
DBI	<i>Dictionary of Biblical Imagery</i>
DJG	<i>Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels</i>
DNTB	<i>Dictionary of New Testament Background</i>
DLNTD	<i>Dictionary of the Later New Testament and Its Developments</i>
HSB	<i>Hard Sayings of the Bible</i>
IVPBBCNT	<i>The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament</i>
IVPBBCOT	<i>The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament</i>
LF	<i>A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church</i>
LXX	Septuagint
NBC	<i>New Bible Commentary</i>
NBD	<i>New Bible Dictionary</i>
NDBT	<i>New Dictionary of Biblical Theology</i>
NPNF	<i>Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church</i>
QS	Qumran Scrolls
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>



### **Abstract**

John 20:22 is an obscure and mysterious text where Jesus is represented as breathing upon his disciples in a manner that appears to resemble the insufflation of humanity by God, or the breathing of the “breath of life” in Adam’s nostrils in Genesis 2:7. Through an exegetical study of Johannine text and the Greek term ἐμφυσάω in relationship with the LXX, Apocrypha and Qumran Scrolls, a direct correlation is established between the theology of John and the theology in the LXX. The relevant historical, Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers, and modern interpretations are examined in order to discover what crucial issues are of the utmost importance for the interpretation of John 20:22. The conclusion of this exegetical study is that during its writing the author of the Gospel of John had in mind a creation motif and a new covenant theology born out of Genesis 2:7, which is represented through Jesus’ action of breathing the “breath of life” into the disciples.

## Introduction

Within the corpus of the New Testament, there are few texts with imagery as vivid as that found in John 20:22. In this pericope, which John alone attests to, Jesus lays his breath upon his disciples saying, “Receive the Holy Spirit.”<sup>1</sup> The act of Jesus breathing upon his disciples raises some significant questions from the simple, “What does it mean” to the more extreme question, “Is this act John’s unique presentation of the Pentecost? The text, which can be problematic for some scholars, is considered a *crux interpretum* (difficult or impossible to interpret and resolve).<sup>2</sup> The purpose of this study is to explore the theological nuances behind the Greek term ἐνεφύσησεν (vb. *breath upon or in*) that describes the boldness of Jesus’ action of breathing upon his disciples and what it means to the theology of John. The obscurity surrounding this verse has produced a number of volumes that seek to answer the perplexing questions the text produces. Scholars have sought to draw out from this text the intent of the author and his theology concerning Jesus and the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, scholarship also endeavors to define the unique nature of the relationship between Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and the disciples, which rises from this event and what it means for the application of New Covenant Theology.

Studies examining John 20:22 have discovered themes behind this scene that connects the text with the Septuagint (LXX). This connection comes to us through the

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture quotations are the New Revised Standard Version.

<sup>2</sup> For reference, these scholars are, C.K. Barrett, Cornelis Bennema, Raymond Brown, Gary M. Burge, D.A. Carson, J.D.G. Dunn, Howard M. Ervin, Thomas R. Hatina, David Earl Holwerda, Felix Porsch, J. Reumann, Sandra M. Schneiders, J. Swetnam, Max Turner, and H. Windisch, who will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four, which engages in a discussion concerning modern interpretation of John 20:22.

use of a relatively obscure Greek term, ἐνεφύσησεν (lexical form: ἐμφυσάω). Because the Johannine Gospel was written in Greek this study examines the Greek version of the Old Testament, which is the LXX. By using this term, a connection is made between the act of Jesus breathing upon his disciples and the creation motif from Genesis 2:7. In Genesis 2:7, God breathes the “breath of life” (ἐνεφύσησεν) into the nostrils of Adam signifying humanity’s entrance into being, which some scholars such as James D. G. Dunn, have considered a theological parallel to the act of Jesus laying his breath upon his disciples.<sup>3</sup> In declaring that this action is reminiscent of humanity’s creation, denotes a sense of parallel with the Johannine text, which gives us a new sense of creation, or a new birth, a new humanity, and the establishment of the new covenant.<sup>4</sup> With this thematic element being bound up within the vivid imagery of creation laid out in John 20:22, also brings with it the possibility of a unique representation of the church’s beginning – through the disciples receiving of the Holy Spirit (John 20:22b).

The goal of this study is to examine the context, interpretations, and the significance of this specific action by Jesus in connection with the inauguration of a new covenant relationship between God and humanity. The following study has been arranged within a format that allows the critical issues surrounding the text to unfold. Chapter One will present a detailed examination of the background surrounding the gospel of John. It will address questions and theories concerning the origin, authorship, and dating of the text in order to establish its credibility. In addition, the exegesis of the

---

<sup>3</sup> For more on this concept, which will be discussed more fully in Chapter Two, please see: James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970).

<sup>4</sup> The creation motif elicits a sense of recreation within humanity, which will be developed more in later chapters.

Johannine text contained within this chapter will look more closely at the elements of literary style, location, setting, the themes developed in the Johannine Gospel, and an examination of the Greek text.

Chapters two and three will include an examination of the pertinent texts for this pericope contained with the LXX, the Apocrypha, and the Qumran Scrolls.<sup>5</sup> The depth of examination in these two chapters is limited in its scope to those texts that scholars' such as C.K. Barrett, Cornelis Bennema, Raymond Brown, Gary M. Burge, D.A. Carson, and J.D.G. Dunn correlate with John 20:22. Their involvement with John 20:22 is usually due to the use of the Greek term ἐμφυσάω. Background pertaining to the use of the Greek term ἐμφυσάω is an important part of this study, for it reveals the basis of interpretation of the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament by the translators of the LXX into Greek, helping to establish a theology behind the Hellenistic Jewish interpretation of Old Testament texts.

The first half of the Chapter Four, will be devoted to offering up interpretations rendered by Early Church Fathers, such as Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem; Gregory of Nazianzus; and Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia during the Nicene and Post-Nicene period. This will give us a first look at early exegesis of this passage and thereby setting the stage for an historical understanding of John 20:22. The second portion of the chapter will examine some of the more primary interpretations proposed by modern scholarship that represents a wide breadth of theologies. The goal of this chapter is to seek answers to questions raised by the uniqueness of this Johannine pericope, and to frame them

---

<sup>5</sup> The material contained within Chapter Three is limited in its scope due primarily to the number of texts that relate to this study. However, a brief examination of a reference contained within the Qumran Scrolls is included as a representation of new information that has come forward in recent years. It is included here because of the development surrounding the Intertestamental period and First Century Judaism.

within a historical horizon of thought that exists in reference to both Easter and Pentecost, with Pentecost often referred to here as a “Johannine Pentecost.” The variety of theologies posed upon the concept of a Johannine Pentecost presents a high level of scholarship endeavoring to answer the central question of this work; “What significance is found within the action of Jesus laying his breath upon his disciples, and what does it mean for the concept of a new covenant relationship between God and humanity?”

Chapter Five presents a synthesis of the materials examined within the preceding chapters. By delineating the history of interpretation on this Johannine text, this work demonstrates a plausible answer for scholars’ *crux interpretum* as a valid label for this particular text, yet it does not mean that we cannot gain insight into the theology of the author of the Johannine text. However, as in all things, at the end of this study, it will ultimately be the reader who will decide whether or not a reasonable answer concerning the various theories surrounding John 20:22 has been presented. This work sets down the argument that the breath of life Jesus gives his disciples is the inauguration of a new covenant through the receiving of the Holy Spirit and the mystery that is contained within it. Yet, the acceptance of this theory is laid upon the readers’ shoulders, for we cannot first know that which we do not feel.

*“If you know me, you will know my Father also.  
From now on you do know him and have seen him.”*  
- John 14:7

## Chapter One

### Important issues of introduction to the study of John 20:22

John 20:22 is part of a series of post-resurrection stories chronicling Jesus' appearances. The first post-resurrection appearance is narrated in John 20:11-18. There Jesus appears to Mary Magdalene in the garden and initially she mistakes him for the gardener.<sup>1</sup> John 20:22 is in the midst of the second post-resurrection appearance of Jesus to his disciples. John 20:22 in the Nestle-Aland reads, καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐνεφύσησεν, translated "and having said this he breathed upon [them]."<sup>2</sup> This passage is unique to John, with no other reference to it appearing in the synoptic gospels.<sup>3</sup> The Greek word ἐμφυσάω, "to breathe on," is a *hapax legomenon*, meaning this particular word appears only once in the New Testament corpus. Because of the unique nature of this Greek term, and the history behind it, many questions surrounding its use here in the Gospel of John need to be addressed. The two most important questions for this exegetical study being, "Why would the author use this specific term to describe the actions of Jesus?" And, "What is the author trying to communicate by the use of ἐνεφύσησεν to describe the act of Jesus laying his breath upon his disciples?"

Before an in-depth study of these questions can begin, there are few important introductory issues that need to be addressed, which affect the overall value of this study.

---

<sup>1</sup> John 3:8 "The wind blows where it chooses, and you hear the sound of it, but you do not know where it comes from or where it goes. So it is with everyone who is born of the Spirit." Unless otherwise noted all English Scripture references are from the New Revised Standard Version.

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all Greek quotations are from the *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece 27<sup>th</sup> edition*

<sup>3</sup> Kurt Aland, *Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition of the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, on the Basis of the Greek Text of Nestle- Aland 27th Edition and Greek New Testament 4th Revised Edition, the English Text Is the Second Edition of the Revised Standard Version*, 11th ed. (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 2000), 330.

The issues that this first chapter will focus on will be the authorship of the Johannine text, the source(s) of this particular gospel, its literary style, theories upon the dating of the text, and its historicity. The establishment of this foundation for the Johannine text will serve to lend credibility to later arguments addressed by this study. These issues have been the subject of much scrutiny since the eighteenth century when F. C. Baur asserted at the “Tübingen School” that John’s gospel was written in the second century.<sup>4</sup> The traditional position, and the assumption that John was the author, became the subject of intense study resulting in more than a few theories. Tradition holds that John, the son of Zebedee, one of the twelve disciples of Jesus, was the author of this gospel.<sup>5</sup> Many scholars, such as B.F. Westcott, have held that there exists both internal and external evidence to support this conclusion. Yet, in spite of this evidence, other scholars, such as Rudolf Bultmann, have questioned the assumption that the disciple, John, was the author.<sup>6</sup> Theories on the remaining issues including the dating of the gospel, the literary structure, and the possible development of the gospel, have been proposed by several other scholars and will be discussed more fully as this chapter unfolds.

Part of the difficulty in developing a source theory for John’s Gospel is the fact that it is not a synoptic gospel; it has very few parallel pericopes, thereby, limiting the number available to compare and verify.<sup>7</sup> Some of the source theories available address plausible explanations as to the validity of John, asserting that by examining the literary

---

<sup>4</sup> For further discussion of F.C. Baur’s examination of the Gospel of John see: Geoffrey R. Treloar, *Lightfoot the Historian: The Nature and Role of History in the Life and Thought of J.B. Lightfoot (1828-1889) as Churchman and Scholar*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 103 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1998), 292-297.

<sup>5</sup> Bruce Wilkinson and Kenneth Boa, *Talk Thru the Bible* (Nashville, TN: Nelson, 1983), 336.

<sup>6</sup> Rudolf Karl Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971).

<sup>7</sup> For a demonstration of this theory see: Aland, 330.

evidence within the gospel, we can find evidence that several sources may have been used in the creation of this gospel. In addition, these same scholars often claim that the Johannine text was developed throughout several editions.<sup>8</sup> However, before we begin a discussion on source theory, we will first take a look at the arguments surrounding the authorship of John's Gospel. Since we do not have confirming pericopes for this text within the synoptic gospels, different theories on the authorship of John will bring into question the historicity of the event that transpires in John 20:22.

### ***Authorship of John's Gospel***

Identifying the author of John's Gospel is a daunting task. Therefore, because of the unique scope of this work, only a summary of the prevailing positions will be discussed. The more traditional position holds that the Apostle John, the son of Zebedee, is the author of this gospel. Support for this position appears through early external evidence from the patristic fathers Irenaeus (c.115-142 C.E. – c. 200 C.E.) and Eusebius (c. 275 – 339 C.E.). Irenaeus, a noted disciple of Polycarp, who in turn had been a disciple of John the Apostle, writes in *Against Heresies*:

But it is not possible that the Gospels can be either more or fewer in number than they are. For since there are four zones of the world in which we live, and four principal winds, while the church has been scattered throughout the world, and since the "pillar and ground" of the church is the Gospel and the spirit of life, it is fitting that she should have four pillars, breathing in corruption on every side, and vivifying human afresh.<sup>9</sup>

Irenaeus, in addition to supporting that John's gospel is on an equal level with the synoptic gospels, also writes in *Against Heresies* that the author of John's gospel was

---

<sup>8</sup> David Wenham and Steve Walton, *Exploring the New Testament* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001), 255.

<sup>9</sup> Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 3.11.8.



indeed John the disciple of Jesus and states that he collected this information from his mentor Polycarp.<sup>10</sup> Eusebius confirmed Irenaeus' testimony that he had received this information concerning John's authorship from Polycarp in *Historia Ecclesiastica*.<sup>11</sup> Eusebius claims that in a letter to a childhood friend, Florinus, Irenaeus recalled their conversations with Polycarp, the disciple of John.<sup>12</sup> This testimony of Irenaeus, which is supported by Eusebius, appears to present a solid argument for the authorship of John's gospel, but one issue still allows for the probability of other authors. The lack of any previous record or additional testimony before Irenaeus does not appear to exist, or at least has not been discovered to date. Some scholars have simply dismissed Irenaeus' testimony as not being plausible because of the structure and literary evidence within the gospel.<sup>13</sup> In support of Irenaeus and Eusebius' claim to John's authorship, other early church fathers including Tertullian (c.155 – 230 C.E.), Clement of Alexandria (c.150 – 211/216 C.E.), and Origen (c.185 – c.254 C.E.), appear to accept Irenaeus' testimony without doubt.<sup>14</sup>

Bruce Wilkinson and Kenneth Boa take an even more conservative position within the traditional theory by citing evidence from the Ryland Papyrus, a fragmentary piece of the gospel of John, noting an earlier date for the text as their support for apostolic authorship.<sup>15</sup> The Ryland Papyrus appears to push the dating of the gospel to the late first century, or early second century, but it does not definitively establish

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> *Historia Ecclesiastica* [*The History of the Church*] 3.23.3. ff. and 4.14.3-8.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 5.20.4-8.

<sup>13</sup> Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 75-81.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> The Ryland fragment will be discussed later in this chapter, for more on this see: Wilkinson and Boa, 336-337.

authorship. However, it does present the possibility of John being the gospel's author; at least it brings it closer to the life of the Apostle John.<sup>16</sup> B.F. Westcott in the late nineteenth century presents a lengthy argument in support of traditional Johannine authorship. He concludes this through a series of deductions relating to John as the son of Zebedee.<sup>17</sup> However, literary evidence for apostolic authorship appears to be lacking in Westcott's conclusion. His argument, while it appears to place the authorship squarely on John, in structure and literary styling within the gospel raises enough questions to open up the possibility of other theories of authorship.<sup>18</sup> Nevertheless, for the purpose of this study, we will examine theories against apostolic authorship and theories in support of it through the lens of literary criticism, before we narrow our scope to any one position on authorship.

### ***The Literary Considerations on Authorship***

Within the traditional position, it is held that John, "the beloved," wrote the gospel in response to the synoptic gospels. Wilkenson and Boa write, "John was no doubt familiar with the synoptic gospels and created this fourth gospel as a spiritual supplement to the others."<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, that argument has been refuted by Raymond Brown, who writes, "A more critical mind-set recognized that there is in John not the slightest sign that its author intended a supplement, nor has he supplied any key as to how

---

<sup>16</sup> John Paul Hozvicka, *A Primer on Biblical Studies* (Victoria, BC: Trafford, 2006), 8.

<sup>17</sup> Brooke Foss Westcott and Arthur Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1980), v-xxviii.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. Also see: Raymond Edward Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 1st ed., The Anchor Bible Reference Library. (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 362.

<sup>19</sup> Wilkinson and Boa, 337.

his material could be fitted together with the synoptic material to which he makes no reference.”<sup>20</sup>

Another theory that emerged concerning the writing of John’s gospel is that it was written independent of the synoptic gospels.<sup>21</sup> This theory looks to the composition of the text, which appears to have come from sources containing material that *was* known to the synoptic writers, yet most of the material supplied for the Johannine text comes from sources that were assumed *not* known by the writers of the synoptics. Brown supports a modern version of “Bultmann’s theory of three sources” as evidence for this position.<sup>22</sup> Bultmann theorized that three closely related styles are discernable within the text of John’s gospel. Supporting the three-fold theory, Brown refers to the studies of E. Schweizer and E. Ruckstuhl when he writes, “...the same stylistic peculiarities in all three sources proposed by Bultmann, an observation leading to the ironic suggestion that the author of the fourth gospel would have to write all three sources himself. The theory gained followers that John was a Gospel not unlike the others, undergoing three stages of development even as they did – a theory that I espouse.”<sup>23</sup> Brown supports this theory, or he at least leaves the question of authorship open when he writes, “One who regards himself in the tradition of the disciple whom Jesus loved. If one posits a redactor, he too may have been in the same tradition. Plausibly there was a school of Johannine writing disciples.”<sup>24</sup> The implications here are that the gospel developed through three editions.

---

<sup>20</sup> Brown, 362.

<sup>21</sup> P. Garner-Smith, *St. John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge, UK: 1938) found in Brown, *INT*, 362.

<sup>22</sup> Brown, 363.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 334.

Concerning authorship, Brown supports the theory that John, the son of Zebedee, was at least an influence through the Johannine community, he writes:

Scholars (with whom I agree) theorize that the Beloved disciple was a minor figure during the ministry of Jesus, too unimportant to be remembered in the more official tradition of the Synoptics. But since this figure became important in the Johannine community history (perhaps the founder of the community), he became the ideal in its Gospel picture, capable of being contrasted with Peter as closer to Jesus in love.<sup>25</sup>

The support of the three-source theory for the authorship of John's gospel eliminates the ability to establish the author with any definitiveness, allowing for several additional proposed theories to come forward. The list of candidates has expanded from the traditional John, the son Zebedee, to the non-apostolic, John the Elder in Ephesus, Nathaniel, Lazarus, Matthias, Theophilus, and the Johannine community as a whole through the traditions passed on by John, and even John Mark is presented as a possible author.<sup>26</sup> The authorship of this gospel may never be firmly established through these theories, but supporting scholars base their theories on three assumptions. First, scholars assume the dating of John's gospel is difficult to establish. Second, the lack of synoptic agreement is problematic. And third, the literary variations prevent any single author from being identified. It would appear that despite the arguments rendered, that the traditional theory is either null or merely inconclusive. Nonetheless, the strength of the traditional theory, which this work adheres to, appears to have ample support from ancient sources including the early church fathers, recent archaeological discoveries, as well as internal evidence for John being the author of this gospel. In support of the traditional theory, Craig G. Keener writes:

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 369.

<sup>26</sup> Pierson Parker, "John and John Mark," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960).

The arguments that nineteenth-century scholar B. F. Westcott raised for John's authorship (based on internal claims for an eyewitness, and internal evidence that narrows the possible author to only one member of Jesus' inner circle) are still sound, although many scholars today are not persuaded by them. (One mediating solution has been the proposal that a Johannine "school" composed the Gospel using traditions John had passed on to them; most famous teachers had disciples to pass on their teachings in such settings.) Archaeological discoveries since Westcott have further demonstrated the appropriateness of the Fourth Gospel's traditions to a Palestinian Jewish milieu.<sup>27</sup>

The authorship of the gospel may not be conclusive, but the weight of support for the argument is in favor of the traditional theory that the main contributor of the gospel is John, the son of Zebedee, a disciple of Jesus, or at least someone within the tradition of the Johannine community. To further our discussion on the background of the Johannine text, we turn to scholars' debate over the issue of dating.

### ***Dating John's Gospel***

Generally, scholars date the Gospel of John to 80-110 C.E. Brown writes, "Those who think that the Gospel was redacted (edited) by another hand after the main writer composed it may place the body of the Gospel in the 90s and the additions of the redactor *ca.* 100-110, about the same time as III John."<sup>28</sup> Wilkinson and Boa, on the other hand, argue for a broader position concerning the authorship of John's Gospel. They place the composition at the same time as the writing of the synoptic gospels, 60-90 C.E. Their evidence for an earlier date stems from recent archaeological discoveries. Wilkinson and Boa write:

---

<sup>27</sup>Craig S. Keener, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993), John.

<sup>28</sup>Brown, 334.

Until recently, it was popular to propose a second-century date for this book. The discovery of the John Rylands Papyrus 52 containing portions of chapter 18, verses 31-33, 37-38, has overthrown this conjecture. This fragment has been dated at about A.D. 135, and a considerable period of time must have been required for John's gospel to be copied and circulated before it reached Egypt, where this papyrus was found.... the probable range for this work is A.D. 60-90. By this time, John would have been one of the last surviving eyewitnesses of the Lord.<sup>29</sup>

J.A.T. Robinson also supports an earlier dating for John's gospel that corresponds with the writing of the synoptics. He argues that after observing the recent developments in Johannine studies that "...I am now persuaded in fact that *all* the Gospels were coming into being over a period more or less simultaneously."<sup>30</sup> The dating is generally accepted to be c.90 C.E., but a broader dating would place it as early as 60 C.E. to as late as 110 C.E. The importance of dating lends to the establishment of the gospel's relationship to John or the Johannine community, and for the intent of this work, we will hold to a date of c.90 C.E. since it is the generally accepted date.

### ***Location and Setting***

Depending upon the theory of authorship held, the location for the writing of the gospel varies from Ephesus, to Palestine, to Syria.<sup>31</sup> The theory that John the Elder authored the gospel would place its composition in Ephesus.<sup>32</sup> The theory of a Johannine community of writers places the possible location of the gospel's composition in Syria.<sup>33</sup> Though the locations vary greatly, the content of the gospel alludes to the author having a thorough knowledge of the geography and topology of Palestine, as well as a broad

---

<sup>29</sup> Wilkinson and Boa, 336.

<sup>30</sup> John A. T. Robinson and J. F. Coakley, *The Priority of John* (London: SCM Press, 1985), 4.

<sup>31</sup> Brown, 370.

<sup>32</sup> Keener, John.

<sup>33</sup> Brown, 370.

understanding of Jewish customs. It is not unreasonable therefore to place the most likely location of the composition in Galilee or Syria.<sup>34</sup> By placing the setting of the text with the most commonly accepted date of c.90 C.E., it would appear the gospel was composed after the fall of Jerusalem in c.70 C.E. This means that the Jewish community was still trying to recover from the devastation caused by the destruction of the temple. The Jewish people would have been distancing themselves from their Jewish Christian counterparts in hopes of a continuance of the legal recognition that they enjoyed within the Roman Empire before the war. Concerning this setting for John's gospel, Keener writes:

After...A.D. 70, many Jews in the Roman Empire wanted to distance themselves from sects emphasizing Messiahs, the kingdom and prophecy. The Johannine Christians (John's readers) had been made unwelcome by local synagogue authorities, treated as if their very Jewishness was held in question because they believed in Jesus as the Messiah and kingdom-bringer...John writes his gospel to encourage these Jewish Christians that their faith in Jesus is genuinely Jewish.<sup>35</sup>

For our purposes, the location and setting of this gospel is assumed to be in the Palestinian and Syrian regions, thereby placing the gospel composition in the Jewish milieu of the first century. With this in mind, the study now shifts to the crucial issues of theme and purpose of the gospel.

### ***Theme and Purpose***

John's gospel appears to possess a wide-ranging number of interwoven themes. Even a quick examination of the text would reveal that the author possessed an extensive knowledge of imagery and symbolism from both a Greek and Jewish perspective. Craig

---

<sup>34</sup> Keener, John.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

R. Koester writes, “The symbolic language of John’s Gospel has long engaged the imaginations of its readers. The evocative references to light and darkness, bread, living water, and other images have elicited a steady stream of exegetical, theological, and artistic comment.”<sup>36</sup> Amongst the many thematic elements of John’s gospel are light and darkness, belief, love, abiding, faith, unbelief, water, and the Spirit, are references that allude to the Hebrew testament, particularly the LXX. The evidence for the author’s knowledge of the Pentateuch within the text may possibly bring some understanding to the pericope of John 20:22. From the first line of John, it becomes evident the author is familiar with Genesis. The Greek words, ἐν ἀρχῇ, in the prologue are thought to be taken directly from the LXX. Koester writes:

The opening line, “In the beginning was the Word,” would have transported many readers back to the dawn of time, when God, “in the beginning,” created the heavens and the earth by uttering his word (Gen1:1-3). The Genesis text was well known among Jews, Samaritans, and even some Greeks; in synagogues it was often recited from memory like a corporate confession of faith.<sup>37</sup>

This is just one of the many references that form thematic theories on the Johannine text’s use of the creation story. The motif of Moses as the prophet and God feeding the people with manna from heaven is seen in John 6. The people’s response to this event is to say, “This is indeed the prophet who is to come into the world” (6:14). Koester points out that this scene reflects the expectations of the general populace by interweaving their familiarity with the Moses and manna motif. He writes, “Deut. 18:18, where God told Moses, ‘I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brethren; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I

---

<sup>36</sup> “It is important not to assume that an allegorical interruptive method based upon the use of symbolism and imagery that exists within the gospel of John.” Craig R. Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995), xi.

<sup>37</sup> Koester references “On the recitation of the creation account in synagogues,” see *m. Ta’an.* 4.2-3; *t. Ta’an.* 3.3-4, as quoted in *Ibid.*, 126.



command him' (promises us a) connection between the crowd's response and traditions about Moses..."<sup>38</sup>

It is evident that many Old Testament motifs fill John's gospel, but for this study, the two that are of the greatest importance are the creation and Spirit motifs. Koester devotes a fair amount of his scholarship to the relationship of water and Spirit. He establishes a clear connection between the LXX and the motif of the Spirit. The delineation of Koester's pneumatology connects the messianic expectations with First Century Judaism and expounds upon them with the anointing of the Spirit upon the Kings of Israel, in particular, the anointing of Saul and David, in order to reflect what was in the minds of the readers of the first and second centuries.<sup>39</sup>

The purpose for this exegetical task is outlined in John's gospel within the pericope of John 20:31, "These are written so that you may come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the son of God, and that through believing you may have life in his name." There are manuscripts available to us confirming that this purpose statement was indeed part of the original text, or at least was part of an early edition, and therefore we will hold to it one more layer upon which we base our work on this text.<sup>40</sup> Now that we have established this study's positions on authorship as likely to John, the son of Zebedee, or the Johannine community, dating at c. 90 C.E., setting in the greater Palestinian region and the central theme and purpose of this work – namely creation motif, we will now delve into a discussion on the context of our Johannine pericope.

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 90-92.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 155-183.

<sup>40</sup> Brown, 369-370.

### *The Context of John 20:22*

The pericope of John 20:22, is set within a post-resurrection scene. Throughout John's gospel, the slant towards a post-resurrection understanding takes shape. Several passages demonstrate this theory, for example, in John 2:22 it states, "After he was raised from the dead." John 12:16 reads, "His disciples did not understand these things at first; but when Jesus was glorified, then they remembered that these things had been written of him and had been done to him." Finally, in John 20:9 we have "...for as yet they did not understand the scripture, that he must rise from the dead." These three verses demonstrate not only the post-resurrection perspective, they also indicate that the disciples did not understand the importance of the events when they had transpired. These verses operate as parenthetical comments by the author to supply a viewpoint held by the author, which allows the reader an insight into the context and understanding of the text.

The event, which takes place in John 20:22, holds a distinct element of time within this pericope. The first of the two time elements appears in John 20:1, which reads, "Early on the first day of the week." A more literal translation of the Greek, *Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων*, would be, "but on the first of the Sabbaths." The second time marker appears in 20:19, *οὔσης οὖν ὀψίας τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων*, "When it was evening on the same day, the first of the Sabbaths." These events are established within the same day – the day of the resurrection –and they form the basis for a Johannine understanding of time.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Schneiders refutes Hatina's conclusion that this is the Johannine Pentecost with the assumption that the number of disciples is indiscriminate in the text as inappropriate and forces the text to indicate

However, some scholars, such as Archimandrite, would argue that the text is not clear concerning the delineation of this generally accepted view of time stating, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ should be translated as “on that day” instead of “on the same day,” therefore, it would not present a same day chronology of events.<sup>42</sup> Joost Van Rossum notes that Archimandrite’s position is helpful, but that his conclusion is not accepted in favor of the expression “on the same day.”<sup>43</sup> Scholars, such as Brown, J.D.G. Dunn, and Wilkenson, accept the “same day” chronology for the events contained within the Johannine texts as taking place on the day of the resurrection.<sup>44</sup>

The setting for these events place the disciples gathered together in a house with the door closed and “locked for fear of the Jews” (20:19). John 20:24, indicates that the disciple Thomas was not present with the other disciples. Some scholars, such as Hatina make the assumption that an undisclosed number of disciples were present, except for Thomas and Judas, but that the text is not clear concerning this. The text does qualify that, at the very least, ten were present (20:19 and 24), but if this text is “the Johannine Pentecost” a possible parallel to Luke 24:36-40 and Acts 2, the number of disciples present may be significantly greater. The point here is that the text does not identify a specific number of disciples, except for the absence of one – Thomas. Depending on the

---

something it does not. Sandra M. Schneiders, “The Raising of the New Temple: John 20.19-23 and Johannine Ecclesiology,” *New Testament Studies* 52, no. 3 (2006): 345.

<sup>42</sup> Joost van Rossum, “The ‘Johannine Pentecost:’ John 20:22 in Modern Exegesis and in Orthodox Theology,” *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 35, no. 2-3 (1991): 151.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Raymond Edward Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, vol. 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1970). Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, and Wilkinson and Boa.

number of disciples present this may present a basis for the argument of the “Johannine Pentecost,” which we will discuss more fully in later chapters.<sup>45</sup>

What transpires is complex, with several potential themes emerging. First, in 20:19 the entrance of Jesus into the room and his greeting as he stood amongst them, “Peace be with you,” may reflect a Jewish premise. J. M. Ford examines this text as part of the Jewish theme of “Shalom.”<sup>46</sup> Secondly, E. Coye Still, finds another possible key theme contained in v 20 where Jesus presents his wounds for examination. Still views Jesus’ presentation of his wounds as a way of demonstrating the nature of their mission, they are being sent “to suffer in their proclamation of him to the world.”<sup>47</sup> Third, in v 21, during the commissioning of the disciples as a continuation of his own ministry, Jesus repeats the “shalom” greeting and then says, “As the Father has sent me, so I send you.” Marianne Thompson writes, “...it focuses attention not only on what the disciples are to do but also on the one who empowers and charges them to do it.”<sup>48</sup> Lastly, George Beasley-Murray makes a case for an eschatological theme that refer to this event as Jesus as preparing to ascend to the Father.<sup>49</sup> These various themes lead toward a potential overall missiological theme for the context of 20:22, which is that Jesus commissioned his disciples to continue the ministry he began.

---

<sup>45</sup> Rossum: 149-167.

<sup>46</sup> For further information on the concept of “shalom” see: J. Massyngberde Ford, “Shalom in the Johannine Corpus,” *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 6, no. 2 (1984): 67-89.

<sup>47</sup> E. Coye Still, III, “Sent to Be Scarred: John 20:19-23,” *Expository Times* 113, no. 6 (Mar 2002): 190-191.

<sup>48</sup> Marianne Meye Thompson, “The Breath of Life: John 20:22-23 Once More,” in *Holy Spirit and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004). Graham Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton, *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D.G. Dunn* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 76.

<sup>49</sup> George Raymond Beasley-Murray, *Gospel of Life: Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 66.

### *An Examination of the Greek Text*

Most modern translations of scripture conclude that the basic translation of 20:22, καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐνεφύσησεν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον<sup>50</sup> should be “And saying this, He breathed on *them* and said to them, Receive *the* Holy Spirit,” with only some nuanced variations. The participial phrase, καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν, translated, “and having said this,” serves as a connection to the context of the previous verse. Jesus in v 21 said, καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέν με ὁ πατήρ, καὶ γὰρ πέμπω ὑμᾶς, “As the Father has sent me, so now I send you.” The tone sets a missional context for this pericope. Jesus indicates that he is passing on his mission to his disciples. In v 22 the participle, εἰπὼν, (an aorist active nominative masculine singular), in this phrase serves to indicate an important background information for the reader. Participles are verbal adjectives that may act as other parts of speech. Here, in this phrase, it is acting in a temporal fashion and describes the chain of events and the relationship between vv 21 and 22.<sup>50</sup> It is an important chronological feature accentuated by the participle εἰπὼν, because in v 21, Jesus is sending the disciples and the participle εἰπὼν in v 22, indicate how with an official anointing or commissioning.

The text then describes Jesus breathing upon (ἐνεφύσησεν) the disciples. ἐνεφύσησεν is the third person singular aorist active indicative form of ἐμφυσάω, “to breathe on.” This unusual word makes discerning its theological significance difficult.

---

<sup>50</sup> Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, Biblical Languages: Greek, vol. 2 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 190-191.

BDAG translates the verb as “*breathe on*,”<sup>51</sup> while Cleon Rogers translates it as “*breathe upon*,”<sup>52</sup> and Koester suggests that properly translated it should be “*breathed into*.”<sup>53</sup> William Hendriksen denotes proper translation as simply “*blew upon*,”<sup>54</sup> while Rudolf Schnackenburg writes that the literal translation of ἐμφυσάω is “*blowing in*.”<sup>55</sup> The nuances of these various definitions present some theological repercussions that affect interpretation of the text. The action of breathing *on* or *upon* is a commissioning or anointing, while breathing *in* or *into* is representative of the insufflation (the breath of life), and *blew upon* appears to nuance *on* and *upon*. Nevertheless, most translations of the bible and many commentaries use the translation “breathed on,” however “breathed in/into” appears to be a more appropriate translation as illustrated by extra biblical materials.<sup>56</sup> Henry George Liddell et al in their *Greek-English Lexicon* indicates the verb ἐμφυσάω appears in several texts outside of the biblical material. They demonstrate the lexical use of the term is nuanced toward *in* or *into*. They make references to Aretaeus, Aristotle, Aristophanes and to the Hippatrica, who specify that the action of the verb is to “blow in, breath into, blow up, inflate or swollen.”<sup>57</sup> Considering the broader extent of the use of ἐμφυσάω, as demonstrated by Liddell et al, the better choice for the definition

---

<sup>51</sup> William Arndt, Frederick W. Danker, and Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 258.

<sup>52</sup> Cleon L. Rogers and Fritz Rienecker, *The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998), 226.

<sup>53</sup> Koester, *Symbolism*, 161.

<sup>54</sup> William Hendriksen, *New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1953), 461.

<sup>55</sup> Schnackenburg, 325.

<sup>56</sup> C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978). Brown, *The Gospel According to John*. D.A. Carson, *New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition*, 4 ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1994).

<sup>57</sup> Henry George Liddell and others, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 551.

of the term is “breath in/into,” which elicits a probable connection with the creation motif found in Genesis 2:7, and will be used as the preferred translation for the exegetical thrust of this study.

This then leads us to a discussion of the thematic elements of the text. ἐμφυσάω, provokes a sense of the creation theme from Genesis 2:7 and of a restoration theme in Ezekiel 37:9. Most exegetical studies of John 20:22 support this conclusion.<sup>58</sup> The general consensus is that the writer of the Johannine text had a biblical and theological understanding of the LXX.<sup>59</sup> He weaves the creation theme from Genesis 1:1-3 into the resurrection appearance of John, thereby setting Jesus up as the agent of the original creation, and as the agent of the new creation through the disciples in the John 20:22 pericope. It also indicates the connection between John and the LXX.<sup>60</sup>

The translation of the phrase, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, is simply “and he said to them.” This phrase should not be overlooked, nor understated, since the verb is in the present active indicative, which signifies that the author intends the action to be understood as

---

<sup>58</sup> The obscurity of this word is demonstrated through the extent of the few biblical and non-biblical sources listed below, including classical Greek references and Hellenistic sources in order to verify the use and translation, as well as presenting scripture references in relationship to the author’s intent to form a parallel with Gen. 2:7 and Ezek. 37:9. BDAG, 258; Barrett’s opinion is that it is the intention of the author to depict the creation motif purposely. See also: Barrett, 570. Keener concurs that most scholars agree that when Jesus breathes on the disciples, he is alluding to thematic aspects of Gen 2:7. See: Keener, John. Ernst Haenchen, Robert Walter Funk, and Ulrich Busse, *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, Hermeneia--a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 2:211. Dunn, “*Spirit*,” 703. Francis J. Moloney and Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of John* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1998), 535.

<sup>59</sup> George Raymond Beasley-Murray, Craig S. Keener, Rudolf Schnackenburg, and William Hendriksen are a few of the scholars who support the theory that the LXX is referenced within the Johannine text, and their positions will be discussed throughout this study.

<sup>60</sup> Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 232.

being in the foreground and of greater importance. Porter writes about this in the “*Planes of discourse*.”<sup>61</sup>

The intent of the writer is to draw together the aorist active participle and aorist active indicative verb, εἰπὼν and ἐνεφύσησεν, that have supplied the background for the action that follows, to bolster the importance of the phrase, λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον, “Receive the Holy Spirit.” The verb λάβετε, is a second person plural aorist active imperative of λαμβάνω, meaning to take or receive, and it follows the pattern of being a directive or command to the disciples, which is literally translated, “you (plural) receive.”<sup>62</sup> The issue of time in relationship to the tense does not appear to be the focus of the writer, rather the certainty of the event is the main focus. It is as if the author is taking a snapshot of the event in order to show it as a completed event.<sup>63</sup> The tense and the mood of the verse indicate here that the disciples received the Spirit according to Jesus’ command. The word λάβετε is very common in relationship to the reception of the Holy Spirit, e.g. acts 8:15 and 19:2. It is used in Mark 14:22 in relationship to the institution of the Lord’s Supper, and we should not be hard-pressed to find a connection between the reception of the Holy Spirit and the Eucharist due to the common use of the word.<sup>64</sup>

With the second part of the phrase, πνεῦμα ἅγιον, the question for many scholars is whether the absence of the direct article should dictate the translation as either “Holy

---

<sup>61</sup> “The aorist is the background tense, which forms the basis for this discourse; the present is the foreground tense, which introduces significant characters or makes appropriate climatic references to concrete situations; and the perfect tense is the foreground, which introduces elements in an even more discrete, defined, contoured and complex way.” Porter, *Idioms*, 23.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 53.

<sup>63</sup> For more on this see: Porter, *Idioms*.

<sup>64</sup> John N. Suggit, “The Eucharistic Significance of John 20:19-29,” *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* no (1976): 55.



Spirit” or “the Holy Spirit.” This discussion has major theological significance in identifying the Holy Spirit or referring to the quality or character of the Spirit. George Johnston argues that due to the absence of the direct article, the action depicted is not the bestowal of the Holy Spirit – the second person of the Trinity – but rather that the disciples received the spirit as the vital power springing forth from God to fulfill the commission of Jesus’ ministry.<sup>65</sup> Scholars, such as Dunn, Schneiders, and Hanita,<sup>66</sup> disagree with Johnston’s conclusion concerning the direct article because Greek is “an inflected language ...its syntax has a certain kind of flexibility not present in non-inflected languages” such as English.<sup>67</sup> Porter addresses the presence, or absence, of the Greek definite article as misunderstood due to the tendency of some scholars who attempt “to make the Greek article do the same things as the English article.” He writes, “In translation, one may have to supply the English articles ‘the’ or ‘a’ to render the presence or absence of the Greek article (but there is not a one-to-one correlation).”<sup>68</sup> Porter argues the issue of translating an anarthrous noun (without the article) from Greek to English must be decided through an examination of the context.<sup>69</sup> From this perspective, the phrase λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον, is substantive, anarthrous, and an individual formulation supporting the translation “receive the Holy Spirit.” Dana and Mantey note

---

<sup>65</sup> George Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1970), 10.

<sup>66</sup> Dunn, *Baptism*, 184; Schneiders, *Raising*, 348; Thomas R. Hatina, “John 20:22 in Its Eschatological Context: Promise or Fulfillment?,” *Biblica* 74, no. 2 (1993): 213.

<sup>67</sup> Porter, *Idioms*, 286-287.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 103.

<sup>69</sup> “When the article is not used, the substantive may refer to the non-particular or qualitative character of an item, or it may refer to an individual item...Matters of particularity and individuality are established not on the basis of whether the article is present, but on the basis of the wider context.” Porter, *Idioms*, 104.

that the absence of the article may be due to the expression being technicalized or stereotyped.<sup>70</sup> Usually the absence of the definite article would indicate that the noun is indefinite. Here the general consensus is the overall context of the phrase would indicate the noun is definite.<sup>71</sup>

### ***Conclusion***

The exegesis thus far, indicates that although the authorship of the text may not be absolute, there is enough evidence to indicate that the probable author was the Apostle John, son of Zebedee, a disciple of Jesus. The secondary authorship theory of the Johannine community, with its traditions and sayings may also be a valid source of the text either in one edition or possibly within several layers or editions within the body of the work. Therefore, for this work, further reference to the text's author will simply use the word, Johannine, to describe its authorship. The Johannine text is assumed to be authentically Christian and is placed within the Canon of Christian scriptures. The value of the text to the formulation of Christian dogma should not be understated. The text is filled with thematic elements reflecting the LXX and demonstrates, as we shall see in the following chapters, that the author possessed knowledge of the LXX. By drawing together the various motifs from the LXX, with the creation motif being the most influential concept within the gospel. The action of Jesus breathing on his disciples represents the beginning of the new creation, a new birth, and the establishment of a new covenant. It may be that here the disciples were born of the spirit as projected from the

---

<sup>70</sup> H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Macmillan, 1957), 149-150.

<sup>71</sup> Dunn, *Baptism*, 184; Schneiders, *Raising*, 348; Hatina: 213.

narrative of Jesus' interaction with Nicodemus in John 3:5-8, which states, "...what is born of the Spirit is spirit," but we shall discuss this in more detail later on.

The text is correctly considered a *crux interpretum*, and in concluding this portion of the study, many more questions have developed around the extent of what that means, and will be addressed in more detail in the next chapter. Next, we must ask ourselves the question, "Was the intent of the author to bring together Pentecost with the Parousia?" We must also ask ourselves the question "What about the chronological horizon of the text and the intent of the author, which brings together into one event both the Easter resurrection and the Pentecost, thereby creating the 'Johannine Pentecost?'" The text, which does not indicate the ascension of Jesus – events in the synoptics that appears to be on Easter and fifty days later at Pentecost – therefore, suggest for us that there may be an apparent discrepancy in chronology. This leads us to our third question, "Are the accounts of Luke, Acts, and John parallel or not within the context of Pentecost?" Certainly, many more questions arise from a study of this pericope, but predominantly, the historical, theological, and thematic elements appear to be of the greatest concerns for our study. Furthermore, an examination of the use of the term ἐμφυσάω is needed to help delineate the interpretive locus of 20:22. A discussion of this will be addressed in the next two chapters, where an examination of the LXX, the Apocrypha, and the Qumran Scrolls will shed light upon the biblical interpretation surrounding the Greek term ἐμφυσάω.

## Chapter 2

### An Examination of ἐμφυσάω in the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament

#### *Investigating the Septuagint's use and interpretation of ἐμφυσάω*

The Septuagint was composed in the beginning of the third century B.C.E. and is a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into the Greek language. Because of the rare use of ἐμφυσάω in the LXX, including within John 20:22, we must first look at where else this word was used. Jobes and Silva exam the use of ἐμφυσάω in the LXX in their work, *Invitation to the Septuagint* in order to delve into the issues that arise from translating one language into another and to discuss the probability of finding a correct interpretation.

When discussing the difficulty of translations Jobes and Silva note two problems – linguistic challenges and conceptual factors – as important issues that need to be addressed before a work can be conceived of as a proper translation. For instance, a linguistic challenge stems from the fact that a translator has to understand the original text including both its unique syntax and grammar. They must know how to keep a sense of that original syntax and grammar intact within the translation, and finally, they have to make key decisions based on whether or not figurative expressions, such as that found within the John 20:22 text, should be translated into the new language with a more literal focus.<sup>1</sup>

As far as conceptual factors are concerned, Jobes and Silva suggest that we keep in mind that a translator is intimately connected to the concept of “re-expressing the subject matter in a different language.” They also implore us to remember, “When the

---

<sup>1</sup> Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2000), 86.

Greek text differs from the Hebrew, the variations sometimes provide access to theological and hermeneutical concepts present in the translator's Jewish Hellenistic culture."<sup>2</sup> Therefore, we must then look to our reading of the texts with eyes open to the possibility that the text in question may need to be examined for these linguistic challenges and conceptual factors before we can begin to properly exegete the passage.

After setting down an understanding on the linguistic and conceptual issues that arise from a translation of a text from one language into another Jobes and Silva then move on to examine the LXX through what they consider to be the second most important set of issues concerning proper exegesis of biblical texts. These issues are first, that we need to be aware of the fact that in the Greek version we may find that translators have omitted certain phrases or have added new words or phrases that do not exist in the Hebrew Scriptures.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, we may find that the translator has expressed "anthropomorphic expressions, eschatology, and messianic expectations" into their translation.<sup>4</sup> Thirdly, the translator, who may have been influenced by a particular exegetical tradition, may thereby employ that understanding to their translation as a means of clarifying the position their theology demands.<sup>5</sup> And finally, we must be aware of what Jobes and Silva call "sociopolitical considerations," which can motivate a translator's work, therefore, "all attempts to draw interpretive inferences from the Greek texts...must be made with great caution, in light of the complexities and subtleties

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> "In theory, the Septuagint should allow scholars to reconstruct that earlier Hebrew text, though in practice this activity is fraught with difficulties. Already within the first chapter of the Bible, we come across some interesting examples where the Greek differs from the Hebrew. This is not receptive news for the textual critic, who wants to reconstruct its Hebrew parent text, yet is what has been done." For a more thorough discussion on this issue see: Jobes, *Invitation*, 21.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 86.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

involved.”<sup>6</sup> Jobes and Silva conclude then that students and scholars who use the LXX as a translation document, in light of the aforementioned issues must take precautions when exegeting passages.

Frederick Danker agrees with Jobes and Silva in principle, but also takes into consideration that the LXX provides additional insight into New Testament interpretation of the Johannine text. Danker argues that a translation of biblical material is more than merely a translation and that, in the case of the LXX, he notes that it is evidence of how the Alexandrian translators struggled with making subtle changes to the texts in comparison with their Hebrew counterparts.<sup>7</sup> By examining the Hellenist context, it may help clarify possible theological predilections that influenced the Greek translators of the LXX and, in turn, influenced the New Testament writers. Lastly, Danker establishes a connection between the LXX and the New Testament in regards to the Johannine text. Danker asserts that the writer of the Johannine text was heavily influenced by the LXX as noted within what appears to be allusions to the LXX within it.<sup>8</sup> An example of this can be seen through Danker’s discussion of John 6 and Ps. 146. He writes:

A study of John 6:1-13 suggests that the writer of the fourth Gospel was steeped in the LXX. The phrase ἦν δὲ χόρτος πολὺς (6:10) appears at first view redundant, but a check of the LXX via Hatch and Redpath indicates that Ps. 146:8 (147:8 MT) may have suggested the evangelist’s wording. The LXX reads τῷ [θεῷ] ἐξανατέλλοντι ἐν ὄρεσι χόρτον. The fact that other allusions to the Greek version appear to be present in this section helps confirm the probability of a septuagintal reminiscence in 6:6.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Frederick W. Danker, *Multipurpose Tools for Bible Study* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993), 77-78.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 84.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 84-85.

Danker goes on to discuss another allusion from John 20:28, where Thomas asserts “My Lord and my God!” which is a closely related to the text of John 20:22, that appears to reflect Ps 34:23 (35:23 MT). Danker writes, “Through the use of these words from the Psalm 34 LXX the evangelist is able to give subtle dramatic expression to the meaning of Jesus’ death.”<sup>10</sup> The combination of these illustrations establishes a tentative relationship between the writer of the gospel and the LXX, which will be further demonstrated later in this chapter.

By examining the LXX references related to John 20:22, and the surrounding sections, it will demonstrate that the writer of John was familiar with the LXX and its theological predilection, and that it had a significant influence upon the fourth Gospel. The most significant LXX reference is Genesis 2:7, and as we shall see, in many ways scholars feel that John 20:22 is an echo of that verse, which is the depiction of God breathing the “breath of life” into the nostrils of Adam. This theory may not be established absolutely, but it does present an argument that has merit for the interpretation of John 20:22.

### *An Examination of the context and use of ἐμφυσάω in the Greek Old Testament*

Scholars such as Raymond Brown, J.D.G. Dunn, and Sandra M. Schneiders, believe the text in John 20:22 is connected to the LXX due in part to its parallel uses of ἐμφυσάω. This unusual use of the word in itself alludes to the fact that the Johannine writer may have possessed a significant knowledge of the LXX. By examining the use of ἐμφυσάω and the theological implications of it within the LXX, we will then be better able to understand the Johannine text. Typical scholarship on John 20:22 most often

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 85.

reference the LXX's parallel texts as being Genesis 2:7, 1 Kings 17:21, and Ezekiel 37:9.<sup>11</sup> The following portion of this chapter will focus on an examination of these three texts and the interpretive influence that they exert upon John 20:22.

### ***Genesis 2:7***

The text of Genesis 2:7 in the LXX is the most prominent text paralleling John 20:22. Genesis 2:7 uses the verb ἐμφυσάω, “to breathe.” In the aorist form, the word reads, ἐνεφύσησεν, the same form found in John 20:22. The phrase καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωτον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, is translated, “and he breathed into his face the breath of life.” The major difference here is the use of πνοή instead of πνεῦμα, though it does not appear to create an issue for BDAG concerning the meaning of πνοή. “It passes over to the meaning of πνεῦμα.”<sup>12</sup> According to BDAG, the two terms, πνοή and πνεῦμα, are equivalent to each other in their respective contexts. Hatina argues the use of ἐμφυσάω in the text of Genesis 2:7 means “to describe the life-giving breath of God which generates the inanimate carcass of man.”<sup>13</sup> The imagery of Genesis 2:7, tells us God is the only one who is able to confer life upon humanity, and the use of ἐμφυσάω, “blowing in or breathing into,” establishes that purpose. Allen Ross expands on Hatina’s position by stating, “The very breath of God is being given in a moment of inspiration. This breath brings more than animation to the man of earth; it brings spiritual

---

<sup>11</sup> Hatina: 217. However, Sandra Schneiders writes that ἐμφυσάω occurs only substantively twice in the Septuagint referencing Genesis 2:7 and Ezekiel 37:9, For more on her scholarship see: Schneiders: 351.

<sup>12</sup> BDAG, 680.

<sup>13</sup> Hatina, “John 20:22,” 217.



understanding and a functioning conscience.”<sup>14</sup> Thompson will also sit within this camp asserting, “In the Septuagint of Gen. 2:7... the context has in view not only the divine breath, but the divine breathing of the Spirit to impart life.”<sup>15</sup>

The relationship between the Johannine text and Genesis 2:7, appears to be even deeper than just the use of ἐμφυσάω though, it also includes a creation motif. The creation of the universe including humanity has been one of the central thematic elements of scripture. Specifically, scholars and commentators refer to Genesis 2:7 as the intended imagery behind the writer of the Johannine texts use of ἐμφυσάω, and seek to connect it with the events of John 20:22.<sup>16</sup>

The content of Genesis 2:7 indicates that the giving of the Spirit is only available from God. In explaining how the text of Genesis 2:7 is to be understood, LaSor et al write, “it was intended to explain the unique nature and dignity of human beings by virtue of their divine origin.”<sup>17</sup> They later state that the literary style of this text is theologically predisposed to this interpretation, and therefore, was not meant to serve as a definitive explanation of the origin of humanity. However, this position largely counters the general historical treatment of the text. LaSor et al, defend their position by stating, “The unique relationship of humans to God is captured by the deliberately ambiguous phrase ‘the image of God.’ The reason for their choice of words lies in the uniform Old

---

<sup>14</sup> Allen P. Ross, *Creation and Blessing : A Guide to the Study and Exposition of the Book of Genesis* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988), 122-123.

<sup>15</sup> Thompson, 71.

<sup>16</sup> Kaiser, *Hard Sayings*, 508. Wilkinson and Boa, *Talk*, 336. Wenham and Walton, *ETNT*, 253. Brown, *AITNT*, 359. Westcott, *The Gospel*. Keener, *IVPBBCNT*, John. Koester, *Symbolism*, 126. Schnackenburg, *John*, 325. Hendriksen, *NTC*, 461. Barrett, *John*, 570. Dunn, “Spirit,” 703. Moloney and Harrington, *John*, 535.

<sup>17</sup> William Sanford LaSor and others, *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 22.

Testament abhorrence of the representation of God in any form.”<sup>18</sup> By focusing upon the animation of Adam in Genesis 2:7, they indicate that humanity occupies a special position in relationship with God, which is best illustrated by the following:

Into the lifeless form that he has shaped, Yahweh breathes the ‘breath of life.’ Man then becomes a ‘living being.’ The word ‘breath’ is literal. The text thus says that man is ‘body and life,’ not ‘body and soul.’ A person has a two-part nature. One is of the earth, earthy. The other is a life principle that comes from God. The composite nature does not set humanity apart from the animals. They are also identified as ‘living beings (1:20; 2:19) and as having the breath of life (6:17, 7:22). These vivid word pictures, however, stress that humans are the object of God’s special attention. God’s relationship to humankind is personal and intimate.<sup>19</sup>

The text of Gen. 2:7 makes a direct connection between God and humanity. God is the source of the Spirit that breathes life into all humanity as represented with Adam. This connection places God in a position of having authority over all creation – including all of humanity. The breath imagery in Genesis reveals God – and only God – as the origin of creation and that he animated humanity through the impartation of his divine breath, in which he alone conveys the Spirit upon humanity. This theological position behind the Genesis text is strongly connected to the action of Jesus imparting this “life giving breath” upon his disciples as evidence of a “new creation.” It is not yet conclusive with regards to this study that these actions of Jesus fully represent the establishment of a new creation or a new birth, for that we must look at a few more texts of the Old Testament. It does however, project divine origin onto Jesus with the use of ἐνεφύσησεν, and thereby making it seem as if Jesus was a participating agent within creation.

---

<sup>18</sup> LaSor, *OTS*, 23.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 24.

### **1 Kings 17:21**

While some scholars do not automatically make the natural connection between 1 Kings 17:21 and John 20:22, the translators of the LXX chose to use ἐμφυσάω to describe the prophet Elijah raising up of the widow's son. In Genesis, the main motif of the text was the creation of humanity. In 1 Kings 17:21, the motif is resurrection and restoration. The LXX text of 1 Kings 17:21 reads, καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν τῷ παιδαρίῳ τρίς καὶ ἐπεκάλεσατο τὸν κύριον καὶ εἶπεν Κύριε ὁ θεός μου, translated as, "And he stretched himself on the child three times, and called to the Lord and said, Lord my God." In Mordechai Cogan's opinion, the translators of the LXX did not have an adequate reference point for translating the Hebrew into Greek. He writes, "This looks like a contextual guess for the unique Hebrew word."<sup>20</sup> He suggests that translators sought out and used the term as an interpretation of Elijah's actions of stretching himself out upon the boy. Schnackenburg, however, writes the term ἐμφυσάω in this context means, "conferring of life."<sup>21</sup> It may be that the LXX translators viewed the resurrection of widow's son within the interpretational use of ἐνεφύσησεν and used it to communicate the wonder of such an event, for it seems that they knew only God was capable of conferring life to a dead body.<sup>22</sup> Marvin Sweeney, in support of this position which is also held by Hatina, writes that the reason for the use of ἐμφυσάω by the LXX translators, "*kai enephusēsen*, 'and he breathed,' attempts to explain Elijah's stretching

---

<sup>20</sup> Mordechai Cogan, *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st ed. (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 429.

<sup>21</sup> Schnackenburg, *St. John*, 325.

<sup>22</sup> As previously stated concerning this use, Hatina argues that, "Texts use ἐμφυσάω to describe the life-giving breath of God which generates the inanimate carcass of man." Hatina, "John 20:22," 217.

out upon the boy.”<sup>23</sup> Sweeney translates the MT of 17:21 as, “And he stretched himself out over the boy three times.”<sup>24</sup> Sweeney argues that the LXX translator’s use of ἐνεφύσησεν to describe Elijah’s actions is appropriate. The word appears to have been selected due to the strength it communicates concerning the dire condition of the widow’s son and the prophet’s action to revive him. The use of ἐνεφύσησεν here also reminds us of the creation scene in Genesis 2:7. However, some scholars such as Sweeney are not convinced the event is a resurrection scene.<sup>25</sup> Nonetheless, this study will hold to the position of Sweeney for the exegetical task at hand. Despite Sweeney’s doubt as to the matter of resurrection, his contribution in explaining the use of ἐνεφύσησεν is of great assistance in interpreting John 20:22.

The story in 1 Kings 17:21 takes place during the “battle of the gods,” between Baal and Yahweh, which creates the prevailing theme of Yahweh’s power to preserve life. In the midst of the battle, Yahweh is able to “breath new life” into the widow’s son, through the Prophet Elijah. Sweeney explains what the text surmises as “the mythos of Baal” while establishing Yahweh as the giver of life and who is, therefore, greater than the Canaanite gods. In reference to this concept Sweeney states, “The contention that YHWH restores the lifeless boy plays upon this mythic pattern, and undermines contentions that Baal or his consort Astarte, Asherah, or Anath plays a role in granting life/rain to the land.”<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Marvin A. Sweeney, *I & II Kings: A Commentary*, The Old Testament Library (Louisville, KY: Westminster, 2007), 208.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Sweeney writes, “Although some view this narrative as a depiction of the boy’s resurrection, it is never clear that he was actually dead. Rather, the narrative portrays the boy as gravely ill and near death, with no breath left in him. Elijah’s action therefore is one of healing.” Sweeney, *Kings*, 215.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 214-215.

Given that understanding, we can conclude that Jesus' action of laying his breath upon his disciples does resemble the action of the prophet Elijah, in that it denotes a sense of the restoration of life – or the conferring of new life – to his disciples. The imagery of 1 Kings 17:21 firmly states that the only one who is capable of conferring life is Yahweh and by using that same Greek term of ἐνεφύσησεν, “he breathed into” the Johannine author claims divinity for Christ, therefore, revealing his Christological premise of Jesus as God's son.

### ***Ezekiel 37:9***

Another strong connection between texts through the use of ἐμφύσσω can be seen within Ezekiel 37:9. In Genesis, the main motif of the text was the creation of humanity. In 1 Kings 17:21, the motif was one of resurrection and restoration. In Ezekiel, several motifs are intermingled, yet they hold considerable value in the interpretation of ἐμφύσσω in terms of resurrection, recreation, reconstruction, and restoration. In Ezekiel, ἐμφύσσω is found in the phrase ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων πνευμάτων ἔλθε καὶ ἐμφύσησον εἰς τοὺς νεκροὺς τούτους, καὶ ζήσάτωσαν, translated as, “come from the four winds and breath into these dead ones, that they may live.”

Ezekiel, for most scholars, takes place during the Babylonian exile and is a text which contains Ezekiel's visions while in Babylon, although the scenes transpire in a variety of locations.<sup>27</sup> LaSor et al, place the prophetic vision of Ezekiel 37:1-14 within the greater context of Ezekiel 33-48 concerning the restoration of Israel.<sup>28</sup> The scene we

---

<sup>27</sup> LaSor et al places Ezekiel in Babylon after 597 B.C.E. living “at Tel Abib near the Chebar Canal” by Nippur Babylon. It is from this location that Ezekiel is supernaturally exported out of exile in Babylon to Jerusalem and then back again to Babylon. See: Ezekiel 40-48 and LaSor, *OTS*, 367-368.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 360.

find is graphically described as one of total and complete desolation. The leading question Yahweh asks the prophet is, “Can these bones live?” The question appears to be rhetorical in nature and assumes one of a definitive “no” for an answer. However, Ezekiel’s answer καὶ εἶπα Κύριε, σὺ ἐπίστη ταῦτα, which is “I said, ‘Lord, only you know,’” makes a clear argument that, according to his perspective, the bones are dead, yet Yahweh alone is able to determine whether or not they may live again. Nevertheless, for further clarity we must ask ourselves the question, “Whose bones are in Ezekiel’s midst?” The text’s answer to this question in verse 11 is that Ezekiel is among the bones of Israel.<sup>29</sup> In regards to this, Christopher Seitz writes that there is no other choice for us but to assume that because of the “abstract vision, vaguely displayed to the prophet’s inner eye” that “the question ‘can these bones live?’ must be answered in the manner of Ezekiel: ‘Lord, you know’(v.3), (for the) alternative would be a flat no. ‘These bones are dead.’”<sup>30</sup>

The description of this scene is one of complete hopelessness, but the events that follow demonstrate the ability of God to create life – even from what first appears to be utterly devoid of life. Ezekiel is instructed to prophesy to the breath. Here the translators of the LXX chose to use the Greek word πνεῦμα (spirit, wind) to translate the Hebrew *ruah*, in relationship to the use of ἐμφυσάω. The use of πνεῦμα here appears to be both general “for the winds,” but also specifically for the breath of God conferring life, as was indicated in Genesis 2:7. The theological implication is that πνεῦμα is God’s spirit, his breath, and the winds, yet this scene illustrates here that the breath of God is not the

---

<sup>29</sup> “Then he said to me, ‘Mortal, these bones are the whole house of Israel.’ They say, ‘Our bones are dried up, and our hope is lost; we are cut off completely.’” Ezekiel 37:11.

<sup>30</sup> Christopher R. Seitz, “Ezekiel 37:1-14,” *Interpretation* 46, no. 1 (1992): 53.

winds; it only indicates that the breath comes as the wind comes and goes as God commands.<sup>31</sup> This scene is also reminiscent of the creation story in Genesis, with the main similarity being the inanimate carcasses and the introduction of the breath of life as available from Yahweh only.<sup>32</sup>

The carcass's state of decay reveals to us that they are dry bones, or rather dust in the last stages of decay; a hopeless and total destruction. A more vivid description of the scene brings forward the imagery of Genesis 2 in the creation of humanity from the dust of the earth, coupled with the curse upon humanity in Genesis 3 that states that they will also return to the dust in death. Yet, just as he did in the creation of life, God can breathe the "breath of life" back into the bones and reanimate them. The scene has all the elements of Genesis 2:7. Seitz argues, "Without God's spirit, there is no life. The biological reality is inherently a theological reality."<sup>33</sup>

The majority of scholars view this scene in Ezekiel as best understood symbolically as the restoration of Israel. The hope of Israel is that Yahweh has not abandoned his covenant with them, but will restore their nation with the "breath of life" that only God can give. Further interpretation reveals that the translators of the LXX viewed this event in Ezekiel in light of Genesis 2:7, because the choice to use the Greek term ἐμφύσησον communicates the ability of God to reanimate the bones as it did in the familiar text of Genesis 2:7.

---

<sup>31</sup> The use of wind here in Ezekiel appears to be the source of the words Jesus employed in his conversation with Nicodemus in John 3:8, τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνέει καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει· οὕτως ἐστὶν πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, "The wind blows where it chooses, and you hear the sound of it, but you do not know where it goes. So it is with everyone who is born of the Spirit."

<sup>32</sup> "The scene of humankind's creation comes to mind. That scene is similarly graphic: Yahweh forms human creatures from the dust and breathes the breath of life into the nostrils (Gen. 2:7-8). Without God's Spirit, there is no life." Seitz, "Ezekiel," 53.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

## Conclusion

The texts of Genesis 2:7, 1 Kings 17:21, and Ezekiel 37:9 each contribute substantively to an interpretation of John 20:22. The primary indicators being the creation motif in Genesis 2:7, and the resurrection motifs surrounding ἐμφυσάω, in both Ezekiel and 1 Kings. The translator's decision to use the unusual Greek term ἐμφυσάω in these particular instances indicates a hermeneutical strength behind their use of it. The creation and resurrection motifs appear to have become the locus surrounding any interpretations of scripture that contain ἐμφυσάω as demonstrated by its limited use within all three of these Old Testament texts and within John 20:22.

In all three passages, the term carries a strong presence through the retention of ἐν, indicating the intent is the breath blowing in or into, implying that the term ἐνεφύσησεν is directly associated with the creation motif as in Genesis 2:7, as well as to the ideas of restoration and resurrection in both 1 Kings 17:21 and Ezekiel 37:9. As we have seen, these texts lend a powerful theological legacy of interpretation and implication for ἐμφυσάω. Furthermore, this legacy continues afresh in John 20:22 with Jesus laying upon his disciples the “breath of life” – the one that contains the power to give life and to restore life in the form of a new covenant creation.



### **Chapter Three**

#### **An examination of ἐμφυσάω in the Apocrypha and the Qumran Scrolls**

##### ***Examining the Apocrypha***

Apocryphal texts are rich in imagery, cultural background, political insights, ethics, moral teachings, and give us a unique religious background of some of the people who were contemporaries of Jesus. A general overview of the Apocrypha reveals a series of writers who come from the same diverse background as the authors of the canonical scripture. There are poets, hymnists, military leaders, and community leaders who have participated in the composition of these books. The importance of these writings for this particular exegetical study is that these books were composed during the intertestamental period, in many cases, they were written in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, during a period of writing which parallels that of the LXX. Therefore, translations of the apocrypha are an important indication of how a translator understands the Hellenistic writings and their culture. The exegetical intent in this section is the interpretation of ἐμφυσάω as understood within the intertestamental period of Apocryphal writings. In Wisdom 15:11, we will see the apocryphal writers use of ἐμφύσσω as our primary example.<sup>1</sup>

##### ***Wisdom 15:11***

Scholars suggest several proposals for the date and origin of the composition of the Wisdom of Solomon, which is or simply known as, Wisdom. Bruce Metzger

---

<sup>1</sup> Some scholars, such as Thomas R. Hatina and Sandra Schneiders, reference several other texts, but upon examination, the additional texts do not provide a specific reference to ἐμφυσάω and therefore do not have relevance to this study. Some of these are found within Hatina, "John 20:22," and Schneiders, "Raising."

however asserts that it “appears to have been composed in Greek sometime between about 100 B.C. and A.D. 40.”<sup>2</sup> As far as what we know about the writer of Wisdom, Metzger states that “many names have been proposed, ranging from Philo of Alexandria to Apollos before he became a Christian.”<sup>3</sup> For Metzger and Ernest Clarke, “The most that can be said with any certainty is that the author of Wisdom was an orthodox Hellenistic Jew of Alexandria with a philosophical education”<sup>4</sup>

Metzger’s conclusions place the composition of the text in the latter portion of the intertestamental period, and if his assertions are correct, Wisdom’s author may have been a contemporary of Jesus. The idea that Philo may have been the author of the text also presents an interesting debate. However, most scholars will note that there is no evidence to the contrary that would go against the held belief that Philo had no inhibitions when it came to using his name openly in his writings. Nonetheless, whether Philo is the author or not, the text still reflects the culture and theology of the period. Ernest Clarke proposes another theory for the date, authorship, and composition of the text, he claims that, “Since he chose to write under Solomon’s name rather than his own he probably lived earlier than Philo (20 B.C. – A.D. 45). Most scholars date the book to the mid-second century B.C.”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Bruce Manning Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Oxford University, 1957), 67.67.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. Also see: Ernest G. Clarke, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, Cambridge Bible Commentary: New English Bible. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1973), 1.

<sup>5</sup> “The title of this book, based on the original Greek, is intended to indicate both the subject and the authorship. In the Septuagint, it was placed among the wisdom books, between Job and Ecclesiastes. As for the authorship, in ancient times it was more important to have one’s writing accepted than to get personal recognition. Solomon was regarded as the fount of all wisdom and was credited with being the author of the Old Testament wisdom books. To assign the authorship of a book to him ensured its acceptance. Furthermore, to assign the writing to an ancient sage suggested its importance and indicated

The debate between the positions held by Metzger and Clarke deal primarily with the character of the text and issues that surround it. Clarke's theory appears to be a more substantive conclusion concerning date, authorship, and composition of Wisdom. However, this does not cancel out Metzger's conclusion, but it is not the preferred conclusion for R.H Charles, Clarke, and David Desilva. Therefore, based upon the evidence Clarke brings to this discussion, it will be the preferred scholarship, in keeping with Charles and Desilva for this study of John 20:22, because it more accurately reflects the culture and theology of the mid-intertestamental period.<sup>6</sup>

In Wisdom 15:11, we find the word ἐμφυσάω used in the midst of a dialogue concerning the foolishness of idolatry. Wisdom 15:10-11 reads ὅτι ἠγγνόησεν τὸν πλάσαντα αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς ἐμπνεύσαντα αὐτῷ ψυχὴν ἐνεργοῦσαν καὶ ἐμφυσήσαντα πνεῦμα ζωτικόν. This is translated as "Their heart is ashes, their hope is cheaper than dirt, and their lives are of less worth than clay, because they failed to know the one who formed them and inspired them with active souls and breathed a living spirit into them."

This dialogue, which is quite articulate, concludes that the idolater has essentially traded

---

that its message was Universal. Neither the language nor the content of the book gives any hint to the date of the authorship, except in the broadest of terms. Since the author used the Septuagint version of the Old Testament books, such as Job and Isaiah, he must have composed his book some time after those books were translated into Greek (after 200 B.C.). Since he chose to write under Solomon's name rather than his own he probably lived earlier than Philo (20 B.C. – A.D. 45), the Jewish scholar of Alexandria, who used his own name. In addition to this, the ideas of this book are earlier than Philo, who developed concepts which are found here only in seminal form. Most scholars date the book to the mid-second century B.C.E." See: Clarke, *Wisdom*, 1.

<sup>6</sup> For more information surrounding the discussion of the Jewish milieu of the intertestamental period and more recent development in the understanding of the culture and theology of the intertestamental period, which favors Clarke's view, See: Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament: The Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism*, Oxford Bible Series. (Oxford: Oxford University, 1983). David Arthur DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002). Frederick James Murphy, *Early Judaism: The Exile to the Time of Jesus* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002). W. O. E. Oesterley, *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha* (New York: Macmillan, 1935).

the relationship with God, the source of the breath of life for a lifeless lump of clay. Clarke asserts, “The writer condemned the potter for ignoring his end and judgment and expending his energy in the manufacture of counterfeit gods for profit. The potter’s *life is cheaper than his own clay* because he failed to equate his own frail nature.”<sup>7</sup>

The author of Wisdom brings in the creation motif by alluding to Genesis 2:7, as evident by the use of ἐμφυσάω. The reason for the folly of idolatry is the false sense of security the maker receives from the idol, since idols are not able breathe the breath of life into a person. We can find this meaning of ἐμφυσάω in the phrase, καὶ ἐμφυσήσαντα πνεῦμα ζωτικόν, which is the aorist active participle. This use of ἐμφυσάω appears to focus – not upon the type of participle – but upon the aspect of it, which is that it is imperfective, indicating the event is to be seen as fact and pushed to the foreground. This done as a way of stating that this is how it really is; God created you and placed the breath of life in you, not the idol you form with your own hands.<sup>8</sup>

The creation motif is the foundation for the argument presented by Wisdom’s author and the use of ἐμφυσάω establishes this direct link to Genesis 2:7. Interpretation of ἐμφυσάω within the Wisdom of Solomon is best understood through the Genesis action of God giving life to the human, who is “an active soul” with a “living spirit (breathed) into them,”<sup>9</sup> thus illustrating for us the type of relationship known through the creator to his creation. The dependence of human beings as a created entity upon the

---

<sup>7</sup> “Furthermore, *His heart is ashes* as the Septuagint of Isa. 44: 20 says. The idea that *life* was a *game*, and the emphasis on profit, were current concepts in the writer’s day. As we can see these arguments run counter to the Hebraic concept of man and so are rejected by the writer;” Clarke, *Wisdom*, 101.

<sup>8</sup> Blenkinsopp, 169-172.

<sup>9</sup> Clarke, *Wisdom*, 101

living God, who is able to impart the breath of life, is emphasized as well in Wisdom through the vision of the lifeless clay the idolater creates that is incapable of imparting anything.<sup>10</sup> Scholarship for both Bennema and Turner draw upon a discussion of Wisdom and the fact that the allusion to the creation motif within Wisdom is demonstrated best in reference to Genesis 2:7. Also in support of this widely held theory, Thompson writes, “The Greek word ἐνεφύσησεν (“he breathed”) recalls Gen. 2:7, Ezek. 37:9, and Wisd. 15:11, in which the divine breath brings life to that which was otherwise a corpse.”<sup>11</sup> Therefore, an examination of Wisdom 15:11, assists this exegetical task through once again giving us valuable insight into the reason why the Greek word, ἐνεφύσησεν, found in the text of John 20:22, should be viewed from the standpoint of a creation motif, as Jesus breathes upon his disciples with the “breath of life.”

### ***Examining the Qumran Scrolls***

The discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls has greatly enriched the textual knowledge for scholars concerned with the Old Testament and other documents from the intertestamental period. The study of these texts have not produced any New Testament or Christian documents, although there is one fragment, 7Q5, that has been argued to be part of the gospel of Mark, yet a reconstruction of the fragment only reveals the Greek

---

<sup>10</sup> Bennema writes, “Such an interpretation is virtually assured by allusions to Genesis 2:7 and Ezekiel 37:9 (cf. Wisdom of Solomon 15:11).” Cornelis Bennema, “The Giving of the Spirit in John’s Gospel—a New Proposal?” *Evangelical Quarterly* 74, no. 3 (Jul 2002): 206.

<sup>11</sup> Thompson, *Breath*, 71. Colin Brown and David Townsley, as well, agree with Bennema and Turner’s argument for the use of ἐμφυσάω in Wisdom 15:11, as an echo to the Genesis text, and thus elicits the creation motif. See: Colin Brown and David Townsley, *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1986), 787.

word καί.<sup>12</sup> The ability to make a definitive case for the fragment belonging to any specific document or text is next to impossible. However, concerning this study, some prominent scholars have suggested that a possible relationship between John and the Qumran scrolls community may have existed. This concept can be seen through the scholarship of James Charlesworth who discusses John in conjunction with the discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls. Charlesworth maintains, “many experts on the origins of Christianity suggested that John was the most Greek of the gospels,” and now because of these scrolls we can conclude that within “social conflicts reflected in the Gospel of John and the Johannine epistles there is a consensus among New Testament experts that John is the gospel most clearly engaged with Judaism.”<sup>13</sup>

This is a significant statement for the reorientation of the Gospel of John from a Greek context to Jewish one. The previous schools of thought concerning John had firmly placed it within a Greek framework. However, the interpretive support for this theory suggests that a reexamination of Johannine texts should be pursued.<sup>14</sup> The evidence for the association with Judaism is represented in the common sayings present in the Qumran and Johannine texts. Charlesworth writes, “Many terms once seen as unique to John, and other Christian literature, were discovered in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Some of these are ‘the sons of light,’ ‘the Spirit of Truth,’ and ‘the Holy Spirit.’”<sup>15</sup> These

---

<sup>12</sup> James C. VanderKam and Peter W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*, 1st ed. (San Francisco, CA: Harper Collins, 2002), 314.

<sup>13</sup> James H. Charlesworth and Raymond Edward Brown, *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Christian Origins Library (New York: Crossroad, 1990), xiii.

<sup>14</sup> For more on this see: C. D. Elledge, *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Archaeology and Biblical Studies, vol. 14 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005).

<sup>15</sup> Charlesworth and Brown, xiii.

common phrases lend to the theory that a possible relationship is suggested, or may in fact exist, between the Johannine community and the Qumran community. Rudolf Schnackenburg also agrees this connection, he states “some association between John and the Dead Sea Scrolls must be seriously considered...by means of the disciples who came to Jesus from the school of John the Baptist, or by Qumran Essenes who later entered Christian, Johannine communities, or through the author’s meeting such circles, which influenced his theological thinking.”<sup>16</sup> For further study into this theory, we turn now to the texts themselves, specifically 1QS 4:21.

### *An Examination of 1QS 4:21*

Many scholars refer to one particular scroll, 1QS 4:21 as relating to the interpretation of John 20:22. However, what is interesting here is the lack of comments concerning the relationship of this particular text and its interpretive meaning for John 20:22. This text is part of the War Scroll containing the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness and is a guide to military strategy and organization. This connection between the scroll and John 20:22 appear as an indication of the Spirit’s action in a cleansing/purification event, which leads to a sense of greater knowledge. A. R. C. Leaney writes:

For the men of Qumran the final *dénouement* of the story of creation was to be the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, enacting on earth a decision in the good versus evil battle which has throughout the ages proceeded in both earth and heaven, sometimes thought of as armed conflict, sometimes as a scene in a court of law. In the Fourth Gospel this final clash is similarly enacted

---

<sup>16</sup> Rudolf Schnackenburg quoted in Charlesworth and Brown, *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, xiv.

on earth but not in the form of a battle; it is enacted in the form of the crucifixion. Part of the final action of God according to 1QS 4:21 will be the cleansing of the righteous by the aspersion of 'a spirit of truth like waters for purification.' As the passage which follows shows clearly, it is after this apparently eschatological act that those who receive this benison from God begin to 'understand knowledge of the highest.'<sup>17</sup>

Scholarship's interpretation of this event is mainly focused on the aspersion of the spirit, or a sprinkling of the spirit. The connection scholars assume in John 20:22 is of Jesus' aspersion of the spirit upon his disciples with the intent of purification, which leads to a superior knowledge of the highest order. However, since there are far more differences than similarities between these two texts, the text of 1QS 4:21 is of minimal help in interpreting Jesus' action in John 20:22. However, it is mentioned here because of the expansion in the area of studies surrounding the Qumran Scrolls, which are revealing information that may aide in the further development of the study of the gospel of John.

### ***Conclusion***

The significance of Wisdom 15:11, indicates ἐμφυσάω is used within the context of a creation motif. This pattern of interpretation agrees with the other occurrences of this word in the LXX. As for the 1QS 4:21 scroll, it is at this time of no value in the interpretation of Jesus breathing upon the disciples. The value of studying the scrolls appears to have more significant value in the development of the theology of the Spirit during the intertestamental period, rather than what it means for this exegesis. However, as more manuscripts, scrolls, and fragments are examined new information may become

---

<sup>17</sup> A. R. C. Leaney, *The Johannine Paraclete and the Qumran Scrolls*; Ibid., 44.



available and expand upon this study. In the next chapter, we will be examining the historical and modern interpretations of the text of John 20:22. It is here that the development of an interpretive method surrounding the text will be examined, which will help direct this study's exegetical task toward a cohesive conclusion on the significance of Jesus laying his breath upon the disciples and what it means for the interpretation of it is as a new covenant.

## **Chapter 4**

### **Historical and Modern Interpretation of John 20:22**

#### ***The Early Church Fathers from the Nicene and Post Nicene Period***

The examination of historical interpretations of the text of John 20:22 is of immense importance in establishing the theological intent that the Johannine author was seeking to communicate. The historical interpretations in this section of the study focus upon the main contributors to an examination of this gospel. The description of these historical interpretations will follow a timeline based upon their birth order, since it would be extremely difficult to establish the exact date each one wrote about the issues pertaining to the Gospel of John. Most of the contributors noted in this chapter are contemporaries of one another, while some were even close companions.

#### ***Cyprian the Bishop of Carthage c.a?- 258 C.E.***

Cyprian is the earliest known contributor to the interpretation of this pericope. Justo González, notes that Cyprian was forty years-old when he became a Christian and that his rise to the position of Bishop came shortly after his conversion.<sup>1</sup> Concerning Cyprian's abilities as a writer and defender of the Christian faith, González writes, "His favorite theologian was Tertullian, whom he called 'the master.' Like Tertullian, his training was in rhetoric, and he easily overwhelmed his opponents with his arguments. His writings are among the best Christian literature of the time."<sup>2</sup> Roger Olson, when discussing Cyprian states, "No single Christian leader or thinker of Rome or any other part of Europe stands out as their equal (Tertullian and Cyprian) in profound thought and

---

<sup>1</sup> Justo L. González, *The Early Church to the Dawn of the Reformation* (San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1984), 88-89.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

influence during this transitional and transformative period of early Christian Theology.”<sup>3</sup>

Cyprian’s interpretation of John 20:22 seem to reflect upon John through the lens of Cyprian’s fight with the Donatists, as he tried to address the restoration of apostates to the church after a period of open persecution.<sup>4</sup> His interpretation of our Johannine pericope comes from his writings on *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, or “The Unity of the Church.” Cyprian argues:

To all the apostles, after his resurrection, he gives an equal power and says, ‘As the Father has sent me, even so I send you: Receive the Holy Spirit. Whoever’s sin you remit, they shall be remitted to him. And whoever’s sins you retain, they shall be retained.’ And, yet that he might promote unity, he arranged by his authority the origin of that unity, as beginning from one . . . so that the beginning proceeds from unity. And this one church, also, the Holy Spirit in the Song of Songs designated in the person of our Lord, saying ‘My dove, my spotless one, is but one. She is the only one of her mother, elect of her that bore her.’<sup>5</sup>

Cyprian’s focus upon the apostates overshadows his interpretation of the text, though this does not mean that what he contributes here is not of value to this study, rather it indicates that he perceived the value of the text as an essential component within the argument he was involved in with the Donatists. One important element of Cyprian’s interpretation of Jesus’ act is that Cyprian unifies Jesus’ action by positioning all of the apostles under Jesus’ authority as a continuation of his ministry.<sup>6</sup> This theological perspective was of great value during the Donatist debate in supporting Cyprian’s position. Nonetheless, it does not appear that Cyprian had the positions of either gospels

---

<sup>3</sup> Alexander Roberts and others, *Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 5:422. For more information on Cyprian see: Roger E. Olson, *The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition & Reform* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999), 82.

<sup>4</sup> An apostate is defined as “consciously abandoning ones allegiance or loyalty to Christ and/or the church.” For more on the Donatist controversy see: Olson, *Story*, 237-8.

<sup>5</sup> Roberts and others, 5:422.

<sup>6</sup> González, *The Story*, 88-89.

or Acts in view as part of his interpretation, and he does not make the same associations modern scholars have made with John 20:22 to other texts.<sup>7</sup> He does make a connection to the Song of Songs, thereby making the view of the Holy Spirit as the unifying agent of Christ in the Church.<sup>8</sup> Cyprian had an ecclesiological interpretation of Jesus' act of giving the Holy Spirit in John 20:22, which were also held within the context of the Donatist controversy. Therefore, Cyprian's interpretation enhances the overall value of the text and the relationship of the disciples with Jesus and the Spirit. His interpretation of this greater context assumes Jesus had in view the falling away of believers under persecution and the need to restore them to fellowship within the church.<sup>9</sup>

*Athanasius the Bishop of Alexandria 293-373 C.E.*

Athanasius became the Bishop of Alexandria during the turbulent time when the defining of Christian dogma was at a critical juncture. The Arian controversy was focused on the Trinity, and Athanasius, along with the Great Cappadocian Fathers, staunchly supported the Trinitarian position. In fact, González refers to Athanasius as the most famous supporter of Nicene orthodoxy.<sup>10</sup> Olson agrees with González that Athanasius is a hero of early Christian faith for his defense of the Trinity.<sup>11</sup> In his discourse against the Arians, Athanasius references the text of John 20:22:

[He gave the Spirit] to the disciples, demonstrating his Godhead and his majesty and intimating that he was not inferior but equal to the Spirit. And so, he gave the Spirit, saying, "Receive the Holy Spirit," and "I send him," and "he shall glorify

---

<sup>7</sup> For an example of a modern scholar who makes the connection between John and Acts see: Thomas R. Hatina, "John 20,22 in Its Eschatological Context: Promise or Fulfillment?" *Biblica* 74, no. 2 (1993): 196-219.

<sup>8</sup> Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, A. Cleveland Coxe and Allan Menzies, ANF 5:422

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> González, *The Story*, 164.

<sup>11</sup> Olson, *The Story*, 20.

me,” and “Whatever he hears is what he shall speak.” . . . Though whom then and from whom is it that the Spirit should be given but through the Son, to whom also the Spirit belongs? And when were we enabled to receive it, except when the Word became man?<sup>12</sup>

Several observations become critical for an examination of Athanasius’ reference to the Johannine text. First, Athanasius was in the midst of the Arian controversy that intimately dealt with the struggle over the deity of Jesus Christ. Second, his treatment of the text is Christological in nature. Lastly, the connections he establishes with other texts indicate that he possessed a developed pneumatology that is distinctly Trinitarian.<sup>13</sup>

As we have thus far indicated, the Arian controversy is at the center of Athanasius’ argument. In his interpretation, Athanasius does not make a connection between the LXX to John 20:22, and neither does he specifically address the action of Jesus breathing on the disciples. However, from his writings we can see that Athanasius is clearly focused on the text of John 20:22 as one that supports the deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit.<sup>14</sup> Athanasius was completely absorbed in the Arian controversy, and it is through this devotion, diligence, and self-sacrifice that Arianism is not part of Christian dogma today. He sets forth that Jesus’ action is the actual giving of the Holy Spirit to the disciples and he viewed the Johannine event as a transaction that is substantive. Since he does not directly connect John 20:22 with Genesis 2:7, it may only be assumed that Athanasius’ argument for the deity of Christ had the creation motif in mind.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 4:336.

<sup>13</sup> See “Athanasius Stubbornly Keeps the Faith,” Olson, *The Story*, 161-172.

<sup>14</sup> González, *The Story*, 173-180.

<sup>15</sup> Olson, *The Story*, 155-6: Athanasius was deeply entrenched in the Arian controversy, which is evident by the lack of references to the Gospels, Acts, and the Old Testament, because he may have considered them to be non-substantiated by the text of John 20:22.

***Cyril the Bishop of Jerusalem 315-386 C.E.***

Cyril, the Bishop of Jerusalem, was a staunch supporter of the Nicene Creed and its dogmatic themes. As a contemporary of Athanasius, he was also deeply involved in the Arian controversy through his Catechetical Lectures. These documents give us a great deal of theological consideration to the connection between the gospels and the LXX.<sup>16</sup> Unlike Athanasius, Cyril makes a connection between the texts of Genesis 2:7 (LXX) and John 20:22. In the Catechetical Lectures, Cyril writes:

This was the second time he breathed on human beings - his first breath having been stifled through willful sins....But though he bestowed his grace then, he was to lavish it yet more bountifully. And he says to them, I am ready to give it even now, but the vessel cannot yet hold it. For a while therefore receive as much grace as you can bear. And look forward yet more. 'But stay in the city, until you are clothed with power from on high.' Receive it in part now. Then, you shall wear it in its fullness. For the one who receives often possesses only a part of the gift. But the one who is clothed is completely enfolded by his robe.<sup>17</sup>

Several observations can be made concerning Cyril's Catechetical Lectures. First, the theological content is definitively orthodox. In Eastern Orthodoxy, Cyril's view is considered established teaching for neophytes who have been baptized and are in preparation for their first communion.<sup>18</sup> Second, Cyril had a clear knowledge of the LXX and he demonstrated his knowledge through establishing a connection with the LXX by the Greek term ἐμφυσάω in Genesis 2:7, and its relationship with John 20:22.<sup>19</sup> Third, by his reference to Luke 24:49, it is evident that the content of the other gospels are part

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 212-217.

<sup>17</sup> NPNF, 2 7:127

<sup>18</sup> Olson, *The Story*, 218-9.

<sup>19</sup> NPNF, 2 7:127.

of his interpretation. Lastly, Cyril also appears to have considered the theological ramifications of this text in relationship to the Luke and Acts accounts.<sup>20</sup>

Cyril's interpretation of this pericope indicates that he connects Jesus' actions with what transpired in Genesis 2:7. He not only makes the connection, but also reveals his Christological perspective by making the statement, "This was the second time he breathed on human beings."<sup>21</sup> Cyril has in view the deity of Jesus Christ as a creator and giver of the "breath of life" to the first human beings, and views this event in John as a repeat of that first "breathing upon." He also establishes his dogma and defines what he considers correct concerning an interpretation of Jesus' action of breathing upon his disciples in John.<sup>22</sup> The bestowal of the Holy Spirit here served a twofold purpose. First, Cyril considered a proper interpretation to be in view of the creation motif. Here, therefore for Cyril, is the beginning of the Church – a new humanity – a new creation. The original creation account is the blueprint for his theological perspective and here the recreation, or new creation, of humanity through Jesus' disciples, is evidenced within Cyril's writings.<sup>23</sup> Second, Cyril's interpretation illustrates the fact that he does not view this as the Pentecost event of Acts as he connects this pericope with Luke 24:49. Cyril offers the explanation that the giving of the Holy Spirit was a partial bestowal in order to give the disciples the necessary grace that would carry them through to the day of

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid. See: Daniel A. Keating, *The Appropriation of Divine Life in Cyril of Alexandria*, Oxford Theological Monographs (London: Oxford University, 2004), 24, 54-56, 140, 166.

<sup>22</sup> NPNF, 2 7:127.

<sup>23</sup> Keating, *The Appropriation of Divine*, 24, 54-56, 140, 166.

Pentecost. His interpretation assumes the disciples received in part what they would receive in full later. This view has a relational undertone.<sup>24</sup>

Cyril's interpretation appears to be the first exegetical examination of the text in light of the LXX. Through this interpretation, Cyril viewed the event in John 20:22 where Jesus breathed on the disciples, as inaugurating a new creation, and that quite possibly it was of a new church or a new humanity. He did not view the text as the same event recorded in Acts, but as a prelude, a receiving of the Holy Spirit as a pre-Pentecost preparation, to the baptism of the Spirit at Pentecost where the disciples were "clothed" in the Holy Spirit. Cyril's interpretation is concerned with more than ontology and functionality of the Spirit, but has in view the relationship of the disciples with the Spirit in preparation for participation in the divine life after Jesus ascended to the Father.<sup>25</sup>

#### ***Gregory of Nazianzus 329-389 C.E.***

Gregory of Nazianzus is best known as one of the three Great Cappadocian Fathers and is widely considered one of the greatest theological minds of his time.<sup>26</sup> He received a classical education in rhetorical speaking and argument and his main contribution was to dispel the Arian controversy, which was instrumental in helping to shape Trinitarian dogma, and to establish the Nicene orthodoxy of the church.<sup>27</sup> This of course, flavors his writings on the Johannine pericope. Gregory is also renowned for his studies in pneumatology, since he made significant contributions concerning the nature of

---

<sup>24</sup> NPNF, 2 7:127.

<sup>25</sup> For more on Cyril please see: Johannes Quasten, *Patrology* (Allen, TX: Christian Classics, 1986).

<sup>26</sup> Olson, *The Story*, 186-195.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.



the Holy Spirit, during his life.<sup>28</sup> In his oration “On Pentecost,” he addresses the event that transpires in John 20:22:

[Christ’s disciples] were able to receive [the Spirit] on three occasions: before he was glorified by the passion, after he was glorified by the resurrection and after his ascension....Now the first of these manifests him - the healing of the sick and casting out of evil spirits and so does that breathing on them after the resurrection, which was clearly divine inspiration. And so, too, the present distribution of the fiery tongues. But the first manifested him indistinctly, the second more expressly, this present one more perfectly, since he is no longer present only in energy but...substantially, associating with us and dwelling in us.<sup>29</sup>

Gregory interprets this pericope as a partial bestowal of the Spirit in a threefold progressive manifestation. His interpretation has in view three distinct manifestations of the giving of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. The first degree of manifestation occurs before the passion when the disciples experienced the Spirit in limited measures as they participated in the activities and life of Jesus.<sup>30</sup> Second, the disciples experienced the next giving of the Spirit after the resurrection when Jesus breathed upon them, which is the pericope we have been so intimately involved within understanding. Finally, the disciples experienced the full gift of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.<sup>31</sup> His examination of the text is very brief and does not appear to have made any link to the LXX, but from the internal references within his writings, it appears he did consider the other gospels. His view expressed that the Johannine pericope was not the event of Pentecost as described in Acts, but rather a completely different and unique event.<sup>32</sup> This is important, because it presents the argument that the corpus of the New Testament

---

<sup>28</sup> Olson, *Story*, 177-9; González, *Story*, 186-188.

<sup>29</sup> NPNF, 2 7:383.

<sup>30</sup> “. . . before he was glorified by the passion.” Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> “. . . after he was glorified by the resurrection . . . that breathing on them after the resurrection, which was clearly divine inspiration.” Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> “. . . after his ascension. And so, too, the present distribution of the fiery tongues” Ibid.

Gospels were consulted in his study and considered related to one another, yet the accounts were allowed to stand on their own without unnecessary harmonization. Gregory does not force historical conflict upon the texts of John and Acts, rather his basic insight comes from the exegetical and hermeneutical practices of the Cappadocian Fathers. Unfortunately, Gregory does not answer questions relating to a possible link with LXX or of any thematic elements surrounding the Johannine pericope. Nonetheless, the value of Gregory's interpretation is within the view of the early church, and that the event in John is not representative of the event of Pentecost in Acts.<sup>33</sup> For Gregory, the indwelling of the Spirit works as a progressive movement from Jesus to the disciples. Gregory appears to view this as a substantial presence of the Spirit, allowing for the association of the Spirit with a new generation of believers, as well as indwelling with them.<sup>34</sup>

***John Chrysostom the Bishop of Constantinople 349-407 C.E.***

John Chrysostom is best known by his reputation as an orator, a controversial personality, and especially in regards to his relationship to the Empress Placidia.<sup>35</sup> Chrysostom's career as Bishop of Constantinople was tumultuous. It was a difficult assignment, he was either fearless or tactless in his handling of the social and religious issues of his time, and his theology displays much of the Antiochian school of thought.<sup>36</sup> In his Homilies on the Gospel of John, he addresses John 20:22:

---

<sup>33</sup> Brian Daley, *Gregory of Nazianzus The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2006), 117-127.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 125.

<sup>35</sup> Olson, *Story*, 294-6.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

How it is that, he says elsewhere, 'If I do not go away, he will not come,' and yet he gives them the Spirit here? Some say that by breathing he did not give them the Spirit but prepared them to receive the Spirit by breathing on them. For Daniel's senses were so overpowered by the sight of the angel, how would they have been overwhelmed in receiving that unutterable gift, if he had not first prepared them for it! . . . It would not be wrong, however, to say that they received the gift of a certain spiritual power, not to raise the dead and do miracles but to remit sins. For the gifts of the Spirit are of different kinds.<sup>37</sup>

Chrysostom's interpretation of the text indicates that it was debated amongst his peers. The first observation we can make is that John Chrysostom appears not to be overly certain about the interpretation of the text, but considering the fact his training was in the rhetoric style, this would counter any uncertainty that may be apparent to us.<sup>38</sup> Second, he appears to use other scriptures to interpret the Gospel of John. In particular, he references John 16:7 concerning Jesus' statement that he must leave in order that the comforter may come.<sup>39</sup> Chrysostom is also concerned with the text's dealing with the Paraclete promises, and John's theology of the Spirit.<sup>40</sup> Third, considering the reference to John 16:7, Chrysostom views Jesus' action of breathing on his disciples as a preparatory action for the receiving of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Though he does not allow room for the interpretation of the text as the Johannine Pentecost, he does view the event John describes as a separate incident.<sup>41</sup> Finally, Chrysostom makes a connection to John 20:22, as the action of Jesus breathing on his disciples as a transfer of the Spirit, but only in the giving of a partial gift – the ability to remit sin. He addresses the issue that the gifts of the Spirit are diverse, with the gift bestowed in the Johannine

---

<sup>37</sup> NPNF, 1 14:325.

<sup>38</sup> Wendy and Pauline Allen Mayer, *John Chrysostom The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2000), 26-28.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 98.

<sup>40</sup> NPNF, 1 14:325.

<sup>41</sup> Mayer, et al, *Chrysostom*, 189.

pericope upon the disciples as the ability to remit sin.<sup>42</sup> Chrysostom views Jesus' action as the symbolic nature of preparing the disciples to receive the Baptism in the Spirit on Pentecost, and if any transference of the Spirit did take place, it is viewed as a partial gifting for a particular task. This view has some agreement with Gregory of Nazianzus.<sup>43</sup>

***Theodore the Interpreter; Bishop of Mopsuestia 350-428 C.E.***

Mopsuestia was a city located in what is now modern day Turkey. Theodore, also known as Theodore of Antioch was a contemporary, companion, and friend of John Chrysostom. Theodore's training was also in the Antiochian school of thought, exegesis, and hermeneutics and he was held up as "the leading biblical commentator and theologian" of his time.<sup>44</sup> Roger Olson writes the following statement concerning Theodore's works and his method, "Theodore wrote many commentaries on Scripture and always shied away from the allegorical method of interpretation unless clear evidence in the text itself directed him to it."<sup>45</sup> Theodore makes the most extensive interpretation of the text of all the Ancient Fathers, he writes:

With these words, he teaches them the identity of the giver and the distributor of all these goods. His 'breathing' convinces them to have no doubt about this because the body was created in the beginning as immobile and inanimate but received life, which it did not have in itself when the soul entered into it through 'breathing,' as the blessed Moses said. After Jesus breathed for the first time, he mentioned the Spirit in order to show that, as then nothing prevented the body from living even though it did not by nature possess [life], which the soul by entering gave it, so now they had to believe that the body of human beings was made imperishable through resurrection, because the Spirit who gives it this strength is powerful. Therefore, he said to them, you must truly believe in what has been said to you and must have no doubts about the resurrection. You must

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 190.

<sup>43</sup> NPNF, 2 7:127.

<sup>44</sup> Olson, *Story*, 203.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

not reject the honor of the apostolate because you are scared of being sent as messengers of a new doctrine into the world. You will indeed receive the effect of the Spirit, which, at the right time, will confer on you resurrection and immortality. Through the Spirit, you will receive in this life an amazing, supernatural strength to perform unheard-of miracles by a mere word. You will be able to face easily any afflictions that may befall you because of those who oppose your preaching. And even though there were many other things to be accomplished in them through the Spirit, without mentioning them, he mentioned the most important argument of all. Here, he says, is what will clearly demonstrate to you the strength of the Spirit. Indeed, as soon as you receive it, you will be able to absolve the sins of whomever you want, as well as to pronounce a sentence of condemnation against anyone. If you, who are human, after receiving the gift of the Spirit, will be able to do all those things that are of God – indeed, only he has the power to judge – I leave to you to consider what the effectiveness of the Spirit is. Once you have received it, you must no longer doubt.<sup>46</sup>

Theodore's interpretations of the text build upon each other and appear to be based upon assumptions rather than upon exegesis. The first level of interpretation appears to have an exegetical examination of the text as it relates to Genesis 2:7.<sup>47</sup> His interpretation of ἐμφυσάω is in direct view of the creation motif where God breathed life into the inanimate body and it became a living soul. He then ties this directly to the resurrection of Jesus.<sup>48</sup> His perception is that the body does not live without the breath of life within it. Jesus presented himself as alive to his disciples and needed to provide them with the evidence of his resurrection. Breathing upon the disciples was the simplest action, which verified his status amongst the living, and proved that he had indeed returned in his resurrected body.<sup>49</sup> Just as the "breath of life" animated the inanimate body in the garden, so then Jesus, who was dead and inanimate, had received the breath

---

<sup>46</sup> CSCO, 4 3:354-55.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> Frederick G McLeod, *The Roles of Christ's Humanity in Salvation: Insights from Theodore of Mopsuestia*. (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 2005).

<sup>49</sup> As noted in Theodore's words "After Jesus breathed for the first time, he mentioned the Spirit in order to show that, as then nothing prevented the body from living . . ."

from God to reanimate him.<sup>50</sup> Theodore focused upon the importance of the resurrection as evidence for the action Jesus takes in John 20:22. He places the emphasis upon Jesus as the new creation – the first fruit of the resurrection; however, the disciples are not experiencing a new birth, or new creation, in this view.<sup>51</sup>

Theodore's second level of interpretation brings into view his theology concerning the resurrection and immortality of the human body. Theodore did not view this event as Pentecost or the actualization of receiving the Holy Spirit by the disciples. Rather, he viewed the event as a promise to the disciples. When the Spirit came, they would be endowed with the same life force that Jesus had received through the resurrection.<sup>52</sup>

Theodore interpreted the Easter event as a symbolic giving of the Spirit and suggested that the creation theme is at the heart of this interpretation: a new humanity has come into being through the reanimation of Jesus. The receiving of the Holy Spirit conferred the promised effects of the new creation to the apostles, but the effects would not be actualized until the Pentecost.

Theodore contributed to the interpretation of ἐμφυσάω in his commentaries, but his assumptions are far reaching and do not have definitive evidence in the text to legitimize his view. The reference to Genesis 2:7 indicates a trend in the interpretation of the text toward a view of creation. Theodore espoused a symbolic interpretation of the text and his view has the distinct honor of having been condemned in 553 C.E.<sup>53</sup> This

---

<sup>50</sup> CSCO, 4 3:354-55.

<sup>51</sup> McLeod, *Roles*, 112.

<sup>52</sup> CSCO, 4 3:354-55.

<sup>53</sup> Keener, John.

interpretation is still well received amongst conservative scholars who favor the apparent symbolism in John 20:22. Burge writes:

John stresses the symbolic nature of Jesus' acts. His miracles are signs, but even in his other actions a parabolic undertone is evident (e.g., washing the disciples' feet, John 13). Just like the Synoptic cursing of the fig tree, this may be an eschatological sign depicting a climactic event to come.<sup>54</sup>

The benefit of this view is that it allows the events of John, Luke, and Acts to stand historically as individual entities. This allows a harmonization of the texts without doing harm to the context.

#### ***Augustine of Hippo 354-430 C.E.***

Augustine is considered to be one of the greatest Christian philosophers of his era. His volumes of writings illustrate the adeptness of his mind in the perceptions of issues surrounding orthodoxy. He was also no stranger to the Arian controversy and wrote extensively in opposition to this heresy.<sup>55</sup> However, it appears that even though he was not able to escape the contextualization of his era. Concerning John 20:22, he writes:

But the reason why, after his resurrection, he both gave the Holy Spirit, first on earth and afterward sent him from heaven, is in my judgment this: that 'love is shed abroad in our hearts,' by that gift itself, whereby we love God and our neighbor, according to those two commandments, 'on which hang all the law and the prophets.' And Jesus Christ signified this by giving them the Holy Spirit once on earth because of the love of our neighbor and a second time from heaven because of the love of God. And if some other reason may perhaps be given for this double gift of the Holy Spirit, at any rate we ought not to doubt that the same Holy Spirit was given when Jesus breathed on them, of whom he says, 'Go, baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,' where this Trinity is especially commended to us. It is therefore he who was also given from heaven on the day of Pentecost, that is, ten days after the Lord ascended into heaven.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 117-118.

<sup>55</sup> For a full discussion on Augustine's work see: Peter Robert Lamont Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1967).

<sup>56</sup> NPNF, 1 3:224.

Augustine presents several arguments for debate of the Johannine pericope. Through his presentation, he demonstrates that he is aware of the various theories of interpretation on this text and the difficulty it represents for harmonization. His view of the event is not synonymous with Pentecost, even as he takes into consideration the conflict the text presents as a separate event.<sup>57</sup> He instead allows the events to stand alone as separate entities, and views them within a twofold giving of the Spirit. There is no diminishing of the Holy Spirit in either event according to Augustine's evaluation, but the same Holy Spirit is given in equal manner and amount in both events.<sup>58</sup> Augustine appears to leave the discussion open for further examination by stating this evaluation of the text was "in my judgment." This qualifier does not appear to place his position concerning the text as definitive. Augustine does not attempt to do damage to the text of John nor the Luke and Acts by trying to harmonize them, allowing them to be in tension with each other.<sup>59</sup>

In summary, Augustine assumes the event of Jesus breathing upon his disciples after the resurrection is not synonymous with Pentecost, rather he sees both events as standing on their own merits. Augustine also does not appear to attempt a harmonizing of the texts in order to explain the apparent conflict with the chronological horizon of the Johannine text and the book of Acts. When Jesus breathed upon his disciples, he imparted the Holy Spirit to them. Augustine does not assume to know the answer, but

---

<sup>57</sup> NPNF, 1 3:224.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., The action of Jesus breathing upon his disciples is an actual event that transmits the Holy Spirit for Augustine.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.



gives an explanation that appears to be reasonable in his view and allows the paradox and mystery of the text to remain.

***Cyril of Alexandria 378-444 C.E.***

Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, was a scholar and a prolific writer.<sup>60</sup> His participation in the Arian and Nestorian controversies led him to produce volumes of writing on the Christological issue. His contribution to the Christological studies of his era is the basic outline “of the *hypostatic union*.”<sup>61</sup> He produced his exegetical, *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*, with his perspective on how the gospel reveals itself in light of the Trinitarian debate of his time. The struggle with the Arian heretics, which had affected Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus was still a major factor in his writings. Cyril of Alexandria writes:

The Son, sharing the same nature as God the Father, has the Spirit in the same manner that the Father would be understood to have the Spirit. In other words, the Spirit is not something added or which comes from without, for it would be naïve – even insane – to hold such an opinion. But God the Father has the Spirit, just as each one of us has our own breath within us that pours forth from the innermost parts of the body. This is why Christ physically breathed on his disciples, showing that as the breath proceeds physically from the human mouth, so too does Christ, in a manner befitting God, pour forth the [Spirit] from the divine essence.<sup>62</sup>

Cyril interprets the action of Jesus breathing upon the disciples and the bestowing of the Holy Spirit upon them as evidence of Jesus’ divinity as he tended to focus upon the Christology and Trinitarian debate of his era. His concern is with the person of Jesus as the embodiment of God on earth. This theological view holds that Jesus of Nazareth was

---

<sup>60</sup> For a complete biography of Cyril see: Normand Russell, *Cyril of Alexandria*, The Early Church Fathers (London: Routledge, 2000).

<sup>61</sup> Olson, *Story*, 218.

<sup>62</sup> LF, 48:303, as quoted in Joel C. Elowsky, *John 11-21*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. New Testament, vol. 4b (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2007), 362.

God walking amongst us.<sup>63</sup> When he references Genesis 2:7, by alluding to the meaning that surrounds the *breath* of Christ the ἐμφυσάω, he directs attention to the divine agency of creation – the source – that bestows the “breath of life,” and in this case, identifies that source as Jesus Christ.<sup>64</sup> Cyril assumes the event of Jesus breathing upon the disciples is the full giving of the Holy Spirit and this undertone assumes that what has transpired is the giving of the Spirit for the restoration and new birth of humanity.<sup>65</sup> What is useful to glean from Cyril is the reaffirmation of the doctrine of the Trinity, a fully developed Christology, and a more concrete Orthodoxy. His efforts also assist with the development of pneumatology and the understanding of the Trinity.

### **Modern Interpretations of John 20:22**

John 20:22, has been the subject of many exegetical studies that have attempted to render a modern interpretation. The following section will examine the relevant modern views, including the *Symbolic*, the *Empowerment for Ministry*, the *Johannine Pentecost* and *The Breath of Life Given as Salvation*. These will be developed more fully below, starting with the *Symbolic View* held by D. A. Carson. The purpose of this study is to examine the broader context and various interpretive methods applied to John 20:22.

#### ***The Symbolic View***

This interpretation views the event of Jesus breathing upon the disciples as completely symbolic. It first appears in the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia who is

---

<sup>63</sup> D.A. Carson, “Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John” (Cambridge University, Autumn, 1975), 9.

<sup>64</sup> LF, 48:303.

<sup>65</sup> Russell, 123-146.

credited as the originator.<sup>66</sup> Theodore perceived the event as a symbolic gesture, in which the promise of the Holy Spirit would be given at Pentecost. Modern day proponents of this particular view are generally from the more conservative interpretative theological position, and include D.A. Carson, who revives this view in his commentary on the Gospel of John.<sup>67</sup>

One of the main reasons why this view is so attractive is the symbolic nature of John's Gospel through its use of signs, wonders, parabolic tones, and the eschatological nature of the work itself. Another reason is that Jesus uses the imperative in the text of John, yet within the text, there appears to be no way for the imperative to be completed. However, a tension appears to exist between the unmet imperatives in John, which place future expectations onto the present. An example behind this thought can be seen in John 7:37 with the imperative, as "come and drink" (John 7:37), which is immediate in nature, but is not able to be fulfilled immediately.<sup>68</sup> Scholars, who hold this view, see a possible parallel between Luke 24 and John 20. The reason for this parallel is that in Luke 24:49, an expectation of the Spirit on Easter is alluded to, which some hold as a possible source for the John 20:22 pericope.<sup>69</sup>

J. D. G. Dunn writes, "The symbolic interpretation is an unsupported speculation which does little justice to the text."<sup>70</sup> Burge agrees, "The symbolic interpretation gives no genuine significance to the event within the Johannine economy."<sup>71</sup> Second, this view

---

<sup>66</sup> Carson, *New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition*.

<sup>67</sup> D.A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 651.

<sup>68</sup> Carson, "Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John", 9.

<sup>69</sup> Burge, *Anointed*, 117-118.

<sup>70</sup> Dunn, 178.

<sup>71</sup> Burge, *Anointed*, 118.

ignores the connection existing between the promise in John 14:26 and the realization of the Spirit in John 20:22.<sup>72</sup> Third, the argument surrounding the imperatives in John is not consistent with the text. On this Burge states, “The ‘anticipatory imperative’ in John points to the time of Jesus’ glorification; but in chap. 20 this process is already underway. Thus the Spirit insufflation stands at the opposite side of the crucial theological mid-point for John.”<sup>73</sup>

### ***The Empowerment for Ministry—An Ordination Gift***

The ordination view of interpreting the pericope of John 20:22 sees the action of Jesus breathing upon the disciples as an endowment of power enabling them to minister as an Apostle, a special ordination or *donum superadditum*.<sup>74</sup> The Holy Spirit is given here in a special dispersal to enable, empower, equip, and qualify the disciples for the position of Apostle, specifically with the ability to forgive or retain sins, as noted by David Holwerda.<sup>75</sup>

In addition, this interpretation depends upon a view Jesus’ action that is exclusively for the Apostles, which poses another difficulty, since Thomas is absent from this meeting of the disciples. Holwerda views this event in reference only to the Apostles, he states, “This special gift of the Spirit was received by the apostles alone...and thus these verses report the renewal of the apostolic office and the power of keys” (cf. Mt. 18:18).<sup>76</sup> Proponents of this view also include H. Windisch, J. Reumann,

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> David Earl Holwerda, *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John* (New York: Doubleday, 1959), 21.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> Holwerda, 21.

Holwerda, and J. Swetnam. Windisch in particular supports another interpretation of the text. He takes the view of *donum superadditum* concerning the Spirit-Paraclete.<sup>77</sup> The thought here is that the Holy Spirit is a gift endowed upon the disciples to enable them to continue the supernatural ministry of Jesus on earth.<sup>78</sup>

The difficulty of this view is that the context of John 20:21 states that the message is for the greater Christian community – those being “sent,” and not exclusively the Apostles καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέν με ὁ πατήρ, καὶ γὰρ πέμπω ὑμᾶς. It would be more fitting for those who take this position to uphold apostolic succession, and to confer the authority of apostleship to one generation to another. It is difficult to give validity to this view when the Paraclete in the Johannine text is assumed to be with the greater community of believers.<sup>79</sup> Burge is correct by writing, “the narrow limits imposed by this interpretation must disqualify it.”<sup>80</sup>

### ***The Power of Proclamation***

The Power of Proclamation view is very simple and addresses the ability of the disciples to proclaim the gospel message; it is also thought of as a pre-Pentecost anointing of the disciples.<sup>81</sup> In this view, Jesus’ action is seen as endowing the disciples with the power, or anointing, to proclaim the message that will lead to eternal life. In other words, the disciples received the gift of inspired preaching, or the Spirit as a *donum superadditum*. The event in John 20:22, is not seen as the Pentecost, but as a precursor to

---

<sup>77</sup> Windisch, *Paraclete*, 2-3.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> Koester, *Symbolism*, 183.

<sup>80</sup> Burge, *Anointed*, 120.

<sup>81</sup> Schweizer, ‘Πνεῦμα πνευματικός,’ TDNT, 6.442-44.

the Pentecost, where the manifestation of the Spirit would transpire. Schweizer holds that this view is the giving of the Holy Spirit specifically for the ability to preach. He concludes, “*Pneuma* is simply the power of proclamation/preaching that leads to eternal life.”<sup>82</sup> This view also has difficulties, which are refuted by scholars such as C. K. Barrett and Raymond Brown, who state that it assumes an over simplistic interpretation of the text.<sup>83</sup>

### ***The Johannine Pentecost***

The view of Johannine Pentecost appears to be the most accepted interpretation of the text. A major portion of biblical scholarship fall into this interpretive camp, but it is not without its difficulties. This particular interpretation views the text as a parallel and abridged version to Luke’s account of the Pentecost in Acts 2 and states that the action Jesus takes is a full giving of the Holy Spirit and the new birth of the disciples, therefore combining Easter and Pentecost into one event.<sup>84</sup> The difficulty for this interpretation is the glorification of Jesus, since it is a prerequisite for the coming of the Holy Spirit, therefore, for historical chronology of combined events, it does not present a solid argument, as Brown and Dunn contend.<sup>85</sup> The proponents of this view see John’s eschatology as a realized event resulting in the combining of the resurrection and Pentecost events, and thereby placing the glorification of Jesus on the moment he was

---

<sup>82</sup> Schweizer, ‘Πνεῦμα πνευματικός,’ TDNT, 6.442-44.

<sup>83</sup> Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:1038-39. cf. C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel of John and Judaism*, 1st American ed., Franz Delitzsch Lectures (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 570.

<sup>84</sup> Rossum, Johannine Pentecost, 149-150.

<sup>85</sup> Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 572. Dunn, *Baptism*, 177.

upon the cross.<sup>86</sup> This assumption does not agree with the context of John 20:22, and indicates that the event transpired on the resurrection day and not fifty days later at Pentecost.

The other difficulties arising from this interpretation stem from the fact that it allows far-reaching assumptions that do not culminate in the context of the Johannine pericope. First, the supporters of this view assume the author's eschatology is realized in the present and, thus, removed future hope.<sup>87</sup> Second, here Jesus' action does not have any value for symbolism within the text and does not make any connection with the LXX, thereby ignoring the uniqueness of the Greek word, ἐμφυσάω.<sup>88</sup> Third, it combines into a theological unit the death, resurrection, and ascension in order to represent Jesus' glorification as one theological unit, as represented in the chronology of John and therefore is not complete.<sup>89</sup> Burge addresses this apparent chronological problem, he argues, "John is either using a different chronological tradition in his sources or he has disregarded chronology altogether for the sake of theological emphasis. To be sure, nothing in John forces us to call 20:22 partial or provisional."<sup>90</sup> Raymond Brown comments as well, "It may be poor methodology to invent harmonizations when there are so many pointers to the contrary."<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Hatina, as one of the most prominent supporters of the Johannine Pentecost, he views the action of Jesus not as the giving of the Holy Spirit – the new birth – but, rather the action of imparting his words of eternal life to the disciples. Hatina also believes that the disciples were already expressing belief in Jesus and experiencing the Spirit as the agent of life and, therefore, he clearly presents this argument for the eschatological fulfillment as the Johannine Pentecost. Thomas R. Hatina, "John 20, 22 in Its Eschatological Context: Promise or Fulfillment?" *Biblica* 74, no. 2 (1993): 218.

<sup>87</sup> Schneiders: 350.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

<sup>89</sup> Rossum: 152.

<sup>90</sup> Burge, *Anointed*, 123.

<sup>91</sup> Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:1038.

### *The Embryonic Paraclete*<sup>92</sup>

The main proponent of the embryonic Paraclete view is Felix Porsch, who considers the context of the Johannine pericope to be part of the Paraclete promises, but in itself does not fulfill those promises. His position is that this event is a real “giving of the Spirit,” but only as kernel, or at an embryonic stage, that will be developed further in the future life of the church. In other words, this process of development, or a metamorphosis, is of the Spirit as Paraclete.<sup>93</sup> Porsch argues for this position because the ascension has not taken place before, therefore, “20:22 does portray a real gift of the Spirit and because there is no evidence for a gift of the Spirit beyond the horizon of John’s Gospel.”<sup>94</sup> Bennema writes, “Porsch suggests that 20:22 depicts the Spirit which would in the future *become* the Paraclete, and function as such.”<sup>95</sup> Porsch argues his position with the texts of John 19, specifically 19:30 and 34. He states that while on the cross, Jesus is exalted and glorified, and therefore gives over the Spirit to the disciples. He continues to argue this point by explaining the resurrection day appearance of Jesus as the resurrected Christ bestowing that Spirit on his disciples.<sup>96</sup>

In general, scholars have rejected this interpretation of John 20:22 stating the major difficulty of this view is ontological. First, it is difficult to render Porsch’s assumption that John 19:30, 34, and 20:22 represent the same event, “. . . only from a

---

<sup>92</sup> Burge is credited with designating Porsch’s view as the Embryonic Paraclete, Burge, *Anointed*, 122.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.

<sup>94</sup> Felix Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort: ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums*, Frankfurter Theologische Studien, vol. Bd. 16 (Frankfurt am Main: J. Knecht, 1974), 364-376. As quoted by Bennema: 195-213.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 204



different perspective and with different aspects.”<sup>97</sup> Most scholars view the references as separate events in a sequential order.<sup>98</sup> Second, Turner refutes Porsch’s view as being essentially the symbolic giving of the Holy Spirit that was examined earlier.<sup>99</sup> Third, Bennema addresses the ontological issue when he writes, “It seems that if the disciples received in 20:22 the Spirit as Paraclete (ontologically) who only starts to function as Paraclete later, Porsch perhaps makes an unnatural distinction between ontology and functionality.”<sup>100</sup> Porsch attempts to create a new perspective for this pericope, but he only succeeds in presenting what is essentially a rendition of the symbolic interpretation.

### ***The Breath of Life Given as Salvation***

This position has several debated aspects, but is held, or at least considered, a viable interpretation of the pericope by several renowned scholars. The essential view of this particular interpretation is that the action of Jesus breathing on the disciples is clearly within the theme of regenerating a new creation. The disciples are viewed as the first fruit of this new creation and the action Jesus takes by breathing on the disciples is considered a regenerative act of literally giving “new life.” Therefore, as in the beginning, the agent of creation, Jesus, once again creates a new humanity and he begins this new creation through the church. The action is then considered salvific in nature by his giving of the Holy Spirit.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

<sup>98</sup> See: Brown, Dunn, Schnieders, and Rossum

<sup>99</sup> Max Turner, “Concept of Receiving the Spirit in John’s Gospel,” in *Vox Evangelica X* (London: London Bible College, 1977), 33.

<sup>100</sup> Bennema: 210.

<sup>101</sup> Howard M. Ervin, *Conversion-Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Critique of James D.G. Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984), 134-136.

Several variations exist within this view. First, Howard Ervin views the event within the classic Pentecostal position, which considers it as the regenerative or new birth moment where the disciples receive salvation. He will also hold that while the baptism of the Holy Spirit is an empowerment for ministry, it is still yet to come at Pentecost; it is a two-stage view of the giving of the Holy Spirit.<sup>102</sup> Ervin assumes a natural separation of the Paraclete sayings by establishing that John 14:16, where the Spirit is given in comparison to the other sayings, indicates that the Spirit is sent.<sup>103</sup>

Second, Dunn views this interpretation as one possibility for John 20:22, but makes a weak commitment to this position. His perspective is that John 20:22 depicts Jesus' action as a new creation established when the disciples receive regeneration, while the event of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit took place later at Pentecost.<sup>104</sup> Included in this perspective is his view that John 20:22 represents an ontological giving of the Spirit, and in Acts 2, the Spirit is sent for a functional purpose. He assumes, of course, that the author of John knew of the two Spirit bestowals.<sup>105</sup> First, the one recorded in John 20:22 and again later, though not recorded by John, at Pentecost in Acts 2.<sup>106</sup> Dunn argues that the event holds a greater significant value than represented by the Pentecostal view and states that Gospel of John had that chronological landmark in view, which represents the transition between dispensations.<sup>107</sup> He views the evidence for the transition from the old to the new dispensation through the incarnation, the cross, and Pentecost. The event on

---

<sup>102</sup> Ervin's view is the classic Pentecostal position: Ibid.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid., 134.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., 137.

<sup>105</sup> Idem, *Spirit-Baptism: A Biblical Investigation* (Peabody, 1987), 68-69.

<sup>106</sup> Dunn, 177-180.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

resurrection day is also viewed as an experience of regeneration for the disciples, but the experience of the Holy Spirit would not transpire until after the ascension of Jesus, which sees the acts of John 20:22 as *terminus a quo*.<sup>108</sup>

Though the semantics are very similar between these two arguments, the difficulties are numerous. Ervin's position of separating the Paraclete sayings based on the verbs "given" versus "sent" is weak and does not present a conclusive position.<sup>109</sup> Another failure of Ervin is the examination of the disciple's experience while participating in the life and ministry of Jesus. Dunn's evaluation of John 20:22 attempts to place the event in a very rigid framework that appears to challenge the eschatology of the overall text of the Gospel. It appears the eschatology of John is inaugurated during Jesus' ministry and not in John 20:22, as implied by Dunn.<sup>110</sup>

### *A New Relationship with the Spirit*

In this interpretive view John 20:22, becomes the culmination of a theology developed throughout the Gospel of John concerning the disciples' relationship with the Spirit, and Bennema is the main proponent. Essentially, this view states the disciples have progressed with Jesus through developing relationship with him, but in John 20:22, they experience a "new relationship" with the Holy Spirit in preparation to fulfill the missiological tones of the greater text found in 20:21, and 23.<sup>111</sup> Beyond the

---

<sup>108</sup> Dunn, *Baptism*, 181.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid.

<sup>111</sup> Bennema, *Giving*, 208-11.

missiological, the tone Bennema focuses upon is the experience of preparing the disciples for Jesus' departure.<sup>112</sup>

The basis for his conclusion is from Turner's argument, and Bennema confirms this himself, stating, "An ambivalent expression demarcating the beginning of some relationship between an individual...and God's Spirit."<sup>113</sup> The focus is upon a relational interpretation and not upon an ontological or functional evaluation of the text. Bennema sees the term "receive the Holy Spirit" as a *donation metaphor* and writes, "The gift of a new relationship with the Spirit rather than the Spirit's having become a property of someone."<sup>114</sup> He states that Jesus gave the Spirit symbolically at the cross in John 19:30 and it became a realized salvific experience in John 20:22. He sees the text as indicating that part of the intent of the author was to reveal the theology of a new creation, or new birth, and sees that it represents an authentic salvific experience for the disciples. He writes, "20:22 secures and sustains the adequate belief and the life-giving relationship the disciples already had with Jesus through the Spirit."<sup>115</sup>

Bennema's relational reception of the Spirit, contrary to the ontological and functionality proposals, allows for a further eschatological relationship of the Spirit with future generations of believers. He states:

Later generations of believers will not 'receive' the Spirit in two stages (as did the disciples); the only way to experience the Spirit is as Paraclete (cf. Dunn and

---

<sup>112</sup> Bennema writes of this position that the preparation of the disciples for the continuation of the ministry of Christ without his physical presence amongst them, but would be present through the Holy Spirit. Bennema, *Giving*, 212.

<sup>113</sup> Turner, *Concepts*, 26.

<sup>114</sup> Bennema, *Giving*, 212.

<sup>115</sup> FN# 67 Bennema writes, "With 'adequate' we mean authentic and sufficiently salvific. The purpose of Jesus' resurrection appearances to Mary, the disciples and Thomas in John 20 is to evoke (continuous) adequate belief (cf. 20:30-31)" Ibid., 208.

Turner). However, this does not exclude any further experiences or ‘receptions’ of the Spirit, in the sense of the Spirit starting new activities in relation to people.<sup>116</sup>

Bennema’s presentation of this proposal holds many elements from the previous view, except he grasps the eschatological relationship of the believer in tension with the event that transpired in the Johannine pericope, and its continual effect on future generations. This view is appealing and merits further consideration.

## Conclusion

The synthesis and evaluation of the many theories surrounding the text of John 20:22 definitely prove it is *a crux interpretum*. Many excellent scholars have ventured into the examination of this problematic text, and those debates cover a broad scope of interpretations. Each of the participants in our discussion of the Johannine pericope approach the text from their particular theological predisposition. Some of these involve serious theological ramifications such as the Arian conflict, while other scholars attempt to give a semblance of an answer without producing a substantive one.

Overall, the element of creation appears in many of the theories surrounding John 20:22. There is not a clear and definitive conclusion amongst the scholars in most cases, except for noting the connection with Genesis 2:7, 1 Kings 17:11, and Ezekiel 37:9 due primarily because of the obscure Greek term ἐμφυσάω. Instead of following the probable lead the term appears to suggest, scholars have opted for theories that do not take into consideration the theological predilection of the Gospel of John; they have not understood its intent or theology. The apparent fondness for the Johannine Pentecost serves more as a distraction. It leads scholars on a quest for a historical horizon that must

---

<sup>116</sup> Bennema, *Giving*, 213.

be assumed, because it does not exist in the text.<sup>117</sup> In conclusion, the text illustrates a clear connection with new covenant theology and the action of Jesus breathing on the disciples, as seen in the relationship to the new covenant. Jesus is represented as breathing new life into the disciples, and is essentially a repeating of the creation scene in Genesis 2:7 by the creation of a new humanity. This overview of both the historical (Early Church Fathers) and modern scholarship was essential to this study because it brings to light the scope of historical and modern interpretations. This gives us insight into the influences of historical exegesis and presents the predispositions of modern interpretation upon the event of John 20:22. Allowing us to glean what is apparent and theologically sound in reference to this text, which then allows us to move on to our last chapter, where we will discuss a synthesis of the information gathered in order to determine what the relationship is between Jesus and the “breath of life.” With this in mind, a practical application will be suggested as to how John 20:22 may be best used in a pastoral presentation.

---

<sup>117</sup> Van Rossum’s position on the chronology of the Easter event is helpful in establishing a chronological horizon for the text: Rossum: 162-163.

## **Chapter Five**

### **Exegesis of John 20:22 in Conclusion and Application**

#### ***Conclusion***

The intent of this study was to make an examination of the text of John 20:22, and thereby describe the act of Jesus laying his breathe on his disciples in relation to the “breath of life” found in the Genesis text of the Septuagint (LXX), which was the goal of the first chapter. An initial examination of John revealed that the background of the text has been significantly debated, and we will briefly discuss here where our exegesis on the background of this passage has taken us.

The theories of authorship range from John the disciple of Jesus, the Johannine community recording the Johannine tradition, or a pseudonymous writer in the second century. The evidence assumes the most plausible argument is twofold. The first and preferred position is the conservative stance, which states that John the disciple is the author, yet the evidence given is inconclusive. The second plausible answer is that the text is the product of the Johannine community recording a tradition directly handed down to them from the disciple, John.

The more widely held view of a date c.80-110 C.E. for the Gospel of John incorporates the evidence found within the Ryland Papyrus 52. This is significant in that the earlier dating of the document brings the text closer to the date of its assumed origin, as the first chapter addressed. The deduction of the date does not squarely place John as the author, but it does indicate the document definitely has a closer relationship to John as the probable source.

Our Exegesis indicated that thematic elements are interwoven in the Gospel of John, in relation to Genesis 2:7, Ezekiel 37:9, and 1 Kings 17:21. The evidence supporting this theory begins at the introduction of the text with the creation theme applied to the logos in John 1:1-3. These themes appear to allude directly to the theology of John's author, and therefore has been an intrinsic part in this study. It does not appear to be coincidental, but rather deliberate. Moreover, it establishes a link between the writer of John and the LXX.<sup>1</sup>

As we saw in our discussion of the Johannine Pentecost, the context of John 20:22 appears to be positioned firmly on the day of the resurrection, Easter day, which is fifty days before the Pentecost recorded in Acts. The majority of scholars support this position and only one is found opposing this view.<sup>2</sup>

Through our exegesis, we have discovered that the use of ἐμφυσάω, “to breathe on,” is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament. It is an obscure Greek word that appears only once in the corpus of the New Testament – within John 20:22 – and very few times within the Septuagint. The translation of this term is generally defined as indicated in BDAG, as “breathe on,”<sup>3</sup> which is the most widely accepted translation of ἐμφυσάω. Liddell et al, state that a more accurate translation of the term, ἐμφυσάω, is “breathe in/into” according to extra biblical texts. The character of the word, ἐμφυσάω, led us to a discussion of the source of the word and its proper translation, as well as the theology behind its use. This word is intentionally selected by the Johannine author because of its relationship to the “breath of life” and the animation of humanity found in

---

<sup>1</sup> Schneiders.

<sup>2</sup> Archimandrite, Bennema, Carson, Hatina, Dunn, Holwerda, Schneiders, Van Rossum.

<sup>3</sup> BDAG, 258.



Genesis 2:7. C. K. Barrett writes, “John intended to depict an event of significance parallel to that of the first creation of man cannot be doubted; this was the beginning of the new creation.”<sup>4</sup>

The conclusion of Chapter One, is that the creation motif is the intended view within the text. With this in mind, the assessment of the LXX references of ἐμφυσάω expressed the contextualization, or locus, of the term. The examination of the three key verses in the LXX relating to the text of John 20:22 included Gen 2:7, 1 Kings 17:21, and Ezekiel 37:9. Genesis 2:7 is definitively locked within the creation motif. God is breathing the “breath of life” into Adam – resulting in his animation. The choice of the Septuagint’s translator to use ἐμφυσάω in Gen 2:7 indicates the term is best understood within the context of the “breath of life.”

The text of 1 Kings 17:21, has a variation on the creation motif in the revivification of the widow’s son through the action of the prophet Elijah. The greater context of 1 Kings places the event in the middle of the “battle of the gods,” between Yahweh and Baal, which focuses on the representation of Yahweh as the source of life, or the “breath of life.” The translators of the LXX in this passage chose the term ἐμφυσάω to represent the action of the prophet. This denotes a familiarity with Genesis in the minds of the translators because the term appears here as one that adequately represents the action of the prophet in the revivification of the boy. Several other themes appear to be represented in this text, as well, including creation, resurrection, revivification, and restoration. Each of these themes appears to fit the contextual use of the term ἐμφυσάω.

---

<sup>4</sup> Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, 570.

The text of Ezekiel 37:9 appears to have a natural connection with Genesis 2:7. The scene plays out the resurrection of the dead in the valley of dry bones. Within this context, the dry bones are Israel. The use of ἐμφυσάω clearly denotes a dominating recreation theme, or the giving of life once more to what is now lifeless. The contextual use of the term fits the developing pattern of creation, resurrection, revivification, restoration, and now recreation. The translators of the LXX appear to have established a concrete pattern for the use of the obscure term ἐμφυσάω found in John 20:22. The review of the LXX's use of this obscure word gave us a glimpse into the theology behind ἐμφυσάω within the context of creation and restoration.

By looking at the Apocrypha and the Qumran Scroll references containing ἐμφυσάω, presented us with a positive contribution to this issue. In the text of Wisdom 15:11, the term ἐμφυσάω comes within a creation motif. The text is a restatement of Gen. 2:7. In reference to this, Bennema writes, "Such an interpretation is virtually assured by allusions to Genesis 2:7 and Ezekiel 37:9 (cf. Wisdom of Solomon 15:11),"<sup>5</sup> thereby confirming the pattern of interpretation within this text.

The examination of the Qumran text IQS 4:21, led us to discover a more tentative relationship. Leaney assumes the view of this text is of the aspersion of the spirit for cleansing or purification in relationship to John 20:22.<sup>6</sup> He seeks to draw the theology of the Qumran community into the discussion, yet until further study is completed; it remains to be a rather speculative argument, and does not add to the conclusion of this study. It is possible that with further study of the Qumran Scrolls, they may reveal more

---

<sup>5</sup> Bennema, *Giving*, 206.

<sup>6</sup> Leaney, *Johannine*, 44.

about the theology of the intertestamental period, and may someday bring more to the table in a discussion of this Johannine pericope.

The historical interpretation of the text of John 20:22 revealed that the pneumatology of the patristic period was still in a formative state. Here John 20:22, was used in confronting such issues as the Arian and Donatist controversies and other quarrels that were forefront in the minds of the church Fathers. Many of the Fathers were not able to, or did not, separate themselves from their life situations in order to perform an exegesis of the Johannine text, yet nevertheless, their level of scholarship and exegesis is outstanding. The observations we made concerning the patristic interpretations were that the Early Church Fathers made a distinction between the events in John 20:22 and the day of Pentecost in Acts. The idea of a Johannine Pentecost was not in the minds of the Fathers, yet they did not see the events as the same, nor did the Fathers seek to harmonize the text of John 20:22, with either Acts 2, or the synoptics. Exegesis amongst the Fathers for John 20:22 is in relation to Genesis 2:7 on the issue of it being the “breath of life,” and focused on the deity of Jesus; an issue that was uppermost in their minds when synthesizing their conclusions on this pericope.

The relevant contributions made by the Fathers for our discussion were from Cyril of Jerusalem, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Cyril of Alexandria. First, Cyril of Jerusalem viewed the event of Jesus breathing upon the disciples as best understood within Genesis 2:7. His comments indicate he viewed the event in John 20:22 as a parallel event that witnessed Jesus as the source of the “breath of life” in Genesis 2:7, and reenacts that scene in the Johannine text. He views what transpired as the new creation of humanity, and that the giving of the Holy Spirit was done for this redemptive action.

An action that can be construed of as only a partial giving of grace in order to sustain the disciples until the full giving of the Spirit at Pentecost. He does not suggest the event in the text is related to the events of Acts 2, and therefore, he does not combine the events into one Pentecost.

Theodore of Mopsuestia also focused upon the “breath of life” in relationship to Jesus in John 20:22 and Genesis 2:7. His interpretation is a reflection of the creation theme, but his interpretation assumes the reference to the “breath of life” is in view of the resurrection of Jesus, and not Pentecost. The source of Jesus’ reanimation is the “breath of life,” as humanity was animated in the garden, so too Jesus is reanimated by receiving that breath. This allowed Jesus to present himself amongst the living, namely his disciples, by breathing upon them.

Cyril of Alexandria indicates that the text is in direct relationship with the creation theme of Genesis 2:7. Cyril’s view assumes the “breath of life” in Genesis 2:7 as synonymous with the “breath of Christ” and his conclusion is that the event of Jesus’ breathing upon his disciples is the new creation, the restoration of humanity, or the new birth. The view Cyril presents is the most definitive of all the patristic Fathers. He does not combine the event with the Pentecost, but does see the Holy Spirit as given fully here and later fully manifested at Pentecost. He does not consider the giving of the Spirit in degrees or sequentially, but rather, he allows it to manifest at different times for different purposes.

The Patristic Fathers did not possess a conclusive answer to questions surrounding this text. The consensus of the Fathers who engaged in study of John 20:22 struggled with its mystery, the obscurity of ἐμφυσάω, and then connected it to the text of

Genesis 2:7. This assumes that a creation theology surrounds the Johannine text as the proper goal of interpretation for Jesus' action.

Modern interpretations of the John 20:22 are as diverse as the interpretations offered by the Patristic Fathers. The theories of modern exegetes propose, in some instances, nothing more than reiterating the Patristic Fathers' interpretations. The theory referred to as the *Johannine Pentecost* has received support from scholars, but difficulties surrounding the combining of events in John 20:22 with Acts 2, is a huge assumption, and one that is not within John's historical horizon. The two theories, *The Power of Proclamation* and *The Power of Ministry*, are slightly nuanced versions of the *Johannine Pentecost* theory and do not appear to address the full implications of the Johannine text, by ignoring the allusion to the creation motif. The theory of the *Embryonic Paraclete* has the flavor of Cyril of Alexandria's theology, while the theory of *The Breath of Life Given as Salvation* takes into consideration the connection to the LXX. This latter view also takes into account the moment in time when Jesus enacted the "New Covenant" by imparting to his disciples the Holy Spirit. This idea holds that Jesus is performing a new creation by breathing the "breath of life" into his disciples. The theory of a *New Relationship with the Spirit* assumes the symbolic giving of the Spirit occurring on the cross in John 19:30 and its realization is within John 20:22. However, this theory does necessitate the view that the action of Jesus was any indication of a new creation.

The attempts to render an interpretation of the text in John 20:22 has been numerous and conflicting. The majority of scholarship will see a connection with Genesis 2:7, Ezekiel 37:9, and Wisdom 15:11. J. D. G. Dunn, a renowned scholar on the Johannine text, affirms that these verses should not be dismissed in light of John 20:22

and should be allowed into an interpretation of the text. He holds that these verses are related, due to the “breath of life” being insufflated into inanimate corpses and concludes, “John presents the act of Jesus as a new creation: Jesus is the author of the new creation as he was of the old.”<sup>7</sup> Schneiders echoes Dunn’s conclusion when she writes, “In this Easter scene, Jesus, in an act of New Creation, breathes the promised Spirit of the New Covenant into the community of his disciples.”<sup>8</sup>

The definitive conclusion of this work is that the text of John 20:22 should be viewed and interpreted in connection with the theology of the LXX and its creation motif. The LXX texts examined establish that the author had this theology in mind as he recorded the event in John 20:22, and it is evident that the author had the intent to associate Jesus with the “breath of life.” This theology also indicates Jesus is the agent of creation, the source of the “breath of life,” and the Johannine author here brings a conclusion to this pericope of a theology rooted within a creation motif, which he began in John 1. The majority of evidence from both ancient and modern scholars, views that the Johannine text is best interpreted in context of the LXX’s use of ἐμφυσάω within the creation motif. Therefore, the action of Jesus laying his breath upon his disciples may best be understood as the “breath of life,” the inauguration of the new creation, a new covenant, and the establishment of a new humanity.

### ***Application***

The one issue remaining for the presentation of this text from the pulpit is the decision of how to address it. The Minister will have to choose to display it from either a

---

<sup>7</sup> Dunn, *Baptism*, 71.

<sup>8</sup> Schneiders, *Raising*, 351.

historical or a traditional view, or from the standpoint of a mysterious text that represents a deep theology steeped in the creation motif. The opportunity the text affords the presenter is one that can engage the congregation in the beauty and the imagery of Jesus' interaction with his disciples. Here is an event that is life altering, and not just for the disciples, but also for the church. For if indeed, this event represents, a new creation or a new birth, the inauguration of a new covenant with a new humanity, the theology that comprises the background of this text is beautifully crafted in its desire to see Jesus as the "breath of life." The Johannine author displays a vibrant theology, which flows throughout the text of this gospel. The most discernable time to present this message would be during Easter, and not Pentecost. A Pentecost presentation of this would convey a shift from the traditional use of the text to a more inappropriate context that fits into a modern mission-based theology. Despite the fact the text does yield a significant amount of material that would be appropriate for Pentecost, the preservation of the historical horizon and chronology of the Easter/Pentecost relationship would better serve the incredible value and richness of this text in the life of the body of Christ – the church.

This text in John 20:22 presents an opportunity to view the cross and the resurrection from a vantage point of a new covenant, and it enables us to draw out aspects of covenantal theology present through the connection with the LXX, and the overarching theme of the creation motif found within the Gospel of John indicating the creation covenant. Jesus is the giver of the "breath of life," the agent of covenantal restoration. This view is more consistent with the theology behind this gospel, and it better serves the theology of the church.

## Bibliography

- Aland, Kurt. *Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition of the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, on the Basis of the Greek Text of Nestle- Aland 27th Edition and Greek New Testament 4th Revised Edition, the English Text Is the Second Edition of the Revised Standard Version*. 11th ed. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 2000.
- Allen, Leslie C. *Ezekiel 20-48*. Vol. 29 Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1990.
- Arndt, William, Frederick W. Danker, and Walter Bauer. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Ashton, John. *The Interpretation of John*. Vol. 9 Issues in Religion and Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Barnes, Albert. *Notes on the Old Testament, Explanatory and Practical*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1949.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel of John and Judaism*. 1st American ed. Franz Delitzsch Lectures. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2d ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.
- Bauer, David R. "On the Occasion of the Retirement of Robert a Traina from the Faculty of Asbury Theological Seminary." *Asbury Theological Journal* 43 (Spr 1988): 7-85.
- Beare, Francis Wright. "Risen Jesus Bestows the Spirit: A Study of John 20:19-23." *Canadian Journal of Theology* 4 (Apr 1958): 95-100.
- Beasley-Murray, George Raymond. *Gospel of Life: Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Bennema, Cornelis. *The Power of Saving Wisdom: An Investigation of Spirit and Wisdom in Relation to the Soteriology of the Fourth Gospel* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe. Tübingen: Mohr, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Giving of the Spirit in John's Gospel--a New Proposal?" *Evangelical Quarterly* 74, no. 3 (Jul 2002): 195-213.



- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament : The Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism* Oxford Bible Series. Oxford: Oxford University, 1983.
- Borgen, Peder, Kêare Fuglseth, and Roald Skarsten. *The Philo Index: A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, and Helmer Ringgren. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Brown, Colin, and David Townsley. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1986.
- Brown, Peter Robert Lamont. *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1967.
- Brown, Raymond Edward. *The Gospel According to John*. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. 1st ed. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Bultmann, Rudolf Karl. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- Burge, Gary M. *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Interpreting the Gospel of John*. Vol. 3 Guides to New Testament Exegesis. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1992.
- Carson, D.A. *Exegetical Fallacies*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition*. 4 ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John." Cambridge University, Autumn, 1975.
- Casey, Maurice. *Is John's Gospel True?* London: Routledge, 1996.
- Casurella, Anthony. *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers: A Study in the History of Exegesis*. Vol. 25 Beitrage zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.

- Charles, R. H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
- Charlesworth, James H., and Raymond Edward Brown. *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* Christian Origins Library. New York: Crossroad, 1990.
- Clarke, Ernest G. *The Wisdom of Solomon* Cambridge Bible Commentary: New English Bible. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1973.
- Cogan, Mordechai. *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 1st ed. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Collins, John Joseph. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. 1st ed. The Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Cook, James I. "John 20:19-23: An Exegesis." *Reformed Review* 21 (1967): 2-10.
- Daley, Brian. *Gregory of Nazianzus* The Early Church Fathers. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Dana, H. E., and Julius R. Mantey. *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. New York: Macmillan, 1957.
- Danker, Frederick W. *Multipurpose Tools for Bible Study*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993.
- De Vries, Simon John. *1 Kings*. Vol. 12 Word Biblical Commentary. Waco, TX: Word, 1985.
- Delitzsch, Franz, and Sophia Taylor. *A New Commentary on Genesis*. Minneapolis, MN Klock & Klock, 1978.
- DeSilva, David Arthur. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1955.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.
- Elledge, C. D. *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 14 Archaeology and Biblical Studies. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

- Elowsky, Joel C. *John 11-21*. Vol. 4b Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. New Testament. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2007.
- Ervin, Howard M. *Conversion-Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Critique of James D.G. Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984.
- Evans, Craig A. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005.
- Ford, J. Massyngberde. "Shalom in the Johannine Corpus." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 6, no. 2 (1984): 67-89.
- Fuller, Reginald Horace. "John 20:19-23." *Interpretation* 32 (1978): 180-184.
- Garcia, Alberto L. "Spiritual Gifts and the Work of the Kingdom." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 49 (1985): 149-160.
- González, Justo L. *The Early Church to the Dawn of the Reformation*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1984.
- Gray, John. *1 & 2 Kings: A Commentary* Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.
- Green, Joel B., Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1992.
- Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 21-37: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Haenchen, Ernst, Robert Walter Funk, and Ulrich Busse. *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John Hermeneia--a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Hals, Ronald M. *Ezekiel*. Vol. 19 The Forms of the Old Testament Literature. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Hatina, Thomas R. "John 20:22 in Its Eschatological Context: Promise or Fulfillment?" *Biblica* 74, no. 2 (1993).
- Hawthorne, Gerald F. *The Presence & the Power*. Dallas: Word, 1991.
- Hawthorne, Gerald F., Amy M. Donaldson, and Timothy B. Sailors. *New Testament Greek and Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Gerald F. Hawthorne*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.

- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1989.
- Hendriksen, William. *New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1953.
- Holwerda, David Earl. *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John*. New York: Doubleday, 1959.
- Hozvicka, John Paul. *A Primer on Biblical Studies*. Victoria, BC: Trafford, 2006.
- Hunter, Archibald Macbride. *According to John: The New Look at the Fourth Gospel*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.
- Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2000.
- Johnston, George. *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1970.
- Keating, Daniel A. *The Appropriation of Divine Life in Cyril of Alexandria* Oxford Theological Monographs. London: Oxford University, 2004.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Function of Johannine Pneumatology in the Context of Late First-Century Judaism*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Gift and Giver: The Holy Spirit for Today*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Kendall, Daniel, and Gerald O Collins. "The Uniqueness of the Easter Appearances." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54 (1992): 287.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Geoffrey William Bromiley. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Klein, Ralph W. *Ezekiel: The Prophet and His Message*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 1988.

- Koester, Craig R. "The Passion and Resurrection According to John." *Word & World* 11 (1991): 84-91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995.
- Lampe, G. W. H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- LaSor, William Sanford, David Allan Hubbard, Frederic William Bush, and Leslie C. Allen. *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Lind, Millard. *Ezekiel* Believers Church Bible Commentary. Scottdale, PA: Herald, 1996.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *The Gospel of John*. Greenwood, SC: Attic, 1972.
- Louw, J. P., and Eugene Albert Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Lyon, Robert W. "John 20:22: Once More." *Asbury Theological Journal* 43 (1988): 73-85.
- Manz, Charles C. *The Wisdom of Solomon at Work: Ancient Virtues for Living and Leading Today*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler, 2001.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *History & Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. 2d ed. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1979.
- Matthews, Victor Harold, and Don C. Benjamin. *Social World of Ancient Israel (1250-587 B.C.E.)*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Mayer, Wendy and Pauline Allen. *John Chrysostom* The Early Church Fathers. London: Routledge, 2000.
- McLeod, Frederick G. *The Roles of Christ's Humanity in Salvation: Insights from Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 2005.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning. *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York: Oxford University, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament. Rev. Standard Version*. New York: Oxford University, 1965.

- Moloney, Francis J., and Daniel J. Harrington. *The Gospel of John*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1998.
- Murphy, Frederick James. *Early Judaism: The Exile to the Time of Jesus*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Newman, Barclay Moon, and Eugene Albert Nida. *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John*. London: United Bible Societies, 1980.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha*. New York: Macmillan, 1935.
- Olson, Roger E. *The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition & Reform*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999.
- Parker, Pierson. "Two Editions of John." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 75, no. 4 (1956): 303-314.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John and John Mark." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960): 97-110.
- Porsch, Felix. *Pneuma und Wort: ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums*. Vol. Bd. 16 Frankfurter Theologische Studien. Frankfurt am Main: J. Knecht, 1974.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Vol. 2 Biblical Languages: Greek. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. Allen, TX: Christian Classics, 1986.
- Ridderbos, Herman N. *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Roberts, Alexander, James Donaldson, A. Cleveland Coxe, and Allan Menzies. *Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Robinson, John A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.
- Robinson, John A. T., and J. F. Coakley. *The Priority of John*. London: SCM Press, 1985.
- Rogers, Cleon L., and Fritz Rienecker. *The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998.
- Ross, Allen P. *Creation and Blessing: A Guide to the Study and Exposition of the Book of Genesis*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988.

- Rossum, Joost van. "The 'Johannine Pentecost:' John 20:22 in Modern Exegesis and in Orthodox Theology." *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 35, no. 2-3 (1991): 149-167.
- Russell, Normand. *Cyril of Alexandria The Early Church Fathers*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Ryken, Leland, Jim Wilhoit, Tremper Longman, Colin Duriez, Douglas Penney, and Daniel G. Reid. *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998.
- Sarna, Nahum M. *Genesis = Be-Reshit: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation Torah Commentary*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Schneiders, Sandra M. "The Raising of the New Temple: John 20.19-23 and Johannine Ecclesiology." *New Testament Studies* 52, no. 3 (2006): 337-355.
- Seitz, Christopher R. "Ezekiel 37:1-14." *Interpretation* 46, no. 1 (1992): 53-56.
- Simonetti, Manlio, Marco Conti, and Thomas C. Oden. *Job Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. Old Testament ; 6*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006.
- Smalley, Stephen S. *John: Evangelist & Interpreter New Testament Profiles*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998.
- Smith, Jerome H. *The New Treasury of Scripture Knowledge*. Nashville, TN: Nelson, 1992.
- Stanton, Graham, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton. *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D.G. Dunn*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Still, E. Coyne, III. "Sent to Be Scarred: John 20:19-23." *Expository Times* 113, no. 6 (Mar 2002): 190-191.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *The Gospel and the Gospels*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Suggit, John N. "The Eucharistic Significance of John 20:19-29." *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* no (1976): 52-59.

- Sweeney, Marvin A. *I & I Kings: A Commentary* The Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster, 2007.
- Swetnam, James. "Bestowal of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel." *Biblica* 74, no. 4 (1993): 556-576.
- Tenney, Merrill Chapin. *John: The Gospel of Belief: An Analytic Study of the Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1948.
- Thompson, Marianne Meye. "The Breath of Life: John 20:22-23 Once More." In *Holy Spirit and Christian Origins*, 69-78. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Treloar, Geoffrey R. *Lightfoot the Historian: The Nature and Role of History in the Life and Thought of J.B. Lightfoot (1828-1889) as Churchman and Scholar*. Vol. 103 Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr, 1998.
- Turner, Max. "Concept of Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel." In *Vox Evangelica X*, 24-42. London: London Bible College, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: In the New Testament Church and Today*. Rev. ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005.
- VanderKam, James C., and Peter W. Flint. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*. 1st ed. San Francisco, CA: Harper Collins, 2002.
- Wallace, Daniel B. "John 5:2 and the Date of the Fourth Gospel." *Biblica* 71, no. 2 (1990): 177-205.
- Waltke, Bruce K., J. I. Packer, and Sven Soderlund. *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000.
- Walton, John H., Victor Harold Matthews, and Mark W. Chavalas. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2000.
- Wenham, David, and Steve Walton. *Exploring the New Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss, and Arthur Westcott. *The Gospel According to St. John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1980.



Westermann, Claus. *The Gospel of John in the Light of the Old Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998.

Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. Vol. 35 Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1993.

Whitacre, Rodney A. *Johannine Polemic: The Role of Tradition and Theology*. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982.

Wifall, Walter R. "Breath of His Nostrils: Gen 2:7b." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 237-240.

Wilkinson, Bruce, and Kenneth Boa. *Talk Thru the Bible*. Nashville, TN: Nelson, 1983.

Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 1st ed. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979.

Witherington, Ben. *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. 1st ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1995.

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Anthropology of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.

Wood, Irving Francis. "The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature: A Study in the History of Religion." 1904.

Wright, N. T. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1992.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2003.

Yonge, Charles Duke. *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993.

Zimmerli, Walther, Frank Moore Cross, and Klaus Baltzer. *Ezekiel : A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Hermeneia--a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.