

John 20:22, Once More

ROBERT W. LYON

According to the Fourth Gospel, on the Sunday evening of the Resurrection--on Easter evening--Jesus appears to His disciples behind closed doors. After His greeting of peace, He confirms His identity by showing them His hands and His side. Then, following a commissioning word the text records that "He breathed upon them and said, 'Receive the Holy Spirit.'" This, in turn, is followed by the logion granting authority to the community with respect to the promise of forgiveness (John 20:21-23).

The question that always arises in the examination of this text is how this Easter evening event of the insufflation of the Spirit relates to the Pentecost experience recorded in Acts 2:1-4. Three general types of explanations are commonly offered, though with significant variations within these three types.

To begin with, many speak of two separate bestowals of the Spirit: the first one on Easter evening as recorded in the Fourth Gospel, and the second at Pentecost as we find in Acts 2. The two events are separated by fifty days during which the Ascension took place. At first glance this seems to be the most natural interpretation. But for those advocating this interpretation, the agreement ends immediately. The purpose, meaning and impact of the two events are variously explained. Chrysostom (fourth-fifth century) related John 20 to the forgiveness of sins, while the event of Acts 2 empowered the church to perform miracles and to raise the dead.¹ Others propose that John 20 concerns individuals in their relationship to the Father, whereas Acts 2 is characterized as ecclesiastical and missionary.² James M. Boice sees John 20 as especially for the apostolate, while Acts 2 is the promised general outpouring upon the Church.³ H. B. Swete views the latter experience as the sending of the person of the Paraclete, while the Easter event meant the "inspiring" of his life.⁴ Westcott concurs with the distinction set out by F. Godet: John answers to the power of the Resurrection, the other to the power of the

Robert W. Lyon, Ph.D., is professor of New Testament interpretation at Asbury Theological Seminary.

Ascension.⁵ That is, one brought the grace of quickening, the other that of enduement. Regarding the two-fold bestowal, E. C. Hoskyns writes, "What the Lord will do invisibly from heaven He here does visibly on earth. The mission is inaugurated but not actually begun....The actual beginning of the mission lies outside the scope of the Fourth Gospel. There remains, therefore, room for the Pentecostal outpouring."⁶ Leon Morris does not define the difference between the two events, but says only that John tells us of one gift and Luke another.⁷ J. A. Bengel, followed not surprisingly by John Wesley, sees John 20 as transitional and anticipatory, an *arrha* of Pentecost.⁸ James D. G. Dunn, in a very thorough and judicious discussion, concludes that for the disciples--and only for them--the baptism of the Spirit (Acts 2) "was a second and distinct work of the Spirit in the spiritual experience of the first disciples."⁹ He further delineates the distinctions between the two experiences by saying that the former enables the disciples to experience the recreative breath of God (which, he says, was only possible after the Crucifixion/Resurrection), whereas Acts 2 is the giving of the Spirit according to promise and after the Ascension.

These proposals all have one thing in common, namely the recognition that only Acts 2 represents the actual fulfillment of the promise first declared by John the Baptist¹⁰ and repeated by Jesus¹¹ that the followers of Jesus would be baptized in the Holy Spirit. The particular appeal of this way of interpreting the two passages is the way the two accounts by John and Luke dovetail so well, thereby removing many historical and other problems.

A second approach to the two texts was offered as early as the sixth century by Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose view was later condemned by the Second Council of Constantinople in A.D. 553.¹² It was suggested that in John 20 the disciples did not really have an experience of the Spirit. Rather, Jesus acted only figuratively and by way of promise. The words were purely symbolic of a future gift. The expression was proleptic. For some representatives of this interpretation, part of the argument has involved the suggestion that the aorist *labete* equals the future *lēmpesthe*, though those who advocate this approach would not rest their case entirely on that proposal. This understanding of John 20 was espoused also in the seventeenth century by Hugo Grotius¹³ and a century later by August Tholuck.¹⁴ Two more recent conservatives have also sought to maintain this position. Theodor Zahn suggested that the anarthrous expression *pneuma hagian* points to the symbolic form of the gift.¹⁵ "The symbolic event (Ger., *Handlung*) is, therefore, only a drastic renewing of the promise given earlier in words that the exalted Jesus would

send them the Holy Spirit.”¹⁶ In our own time, G. E. Ladd has asserted that there was only one gift, the one recounted in Acts 2, and that John 20 is “acted parable promissory and anticipatory to the actual coming of the Spirit at Pentecost.”¹⁷ He derives this in part from the meaning of John 7:39 that the Spirit could not be given until after the Ascension, as well as from the fact that there is no evidence that the disciples entered into their mission until after Pentecost.

This second option is particularly attractive because it supports all the rest of the New Testament witness that there is only one bestowal of the Spirit, though that bestowal is described through a variety of metaphors. Those who support this interpretation of John 20 tend to view all explanations of the two-fold bestowal as artificial, unconvincing and unnecessary. The historicity of Acts 2 is not challenged. Therefore, John 20 is to be seen as something other than an actual bestowal.

This leads us to the third option, namely, that we have only one bestowal of the Spirit upon the disciples and that John 20 is the writer’s own highly theologized version of Acts 2, what is called “the Johannine Pentecost.” This view is seldom espoused by conservative scholars who tend to view the historical problems as insurmountable. On the other hand, it seems to be a view assumed as obvious or inevitable by others. C. K. Barrett,¹⁸ C. H. Dodd,¹⁹ R. H. Fuller,²⁰ C. F. D. Moule,²¹ Adolf Schlatter²² and Kirsopp Lake²³ are representative of those who regard the two texts as divergent traditions of the same event, though some would see different emphases in each. Alfred Loisy goes a step farther when he suggests that John is correcting Luke by substituting the Resurrection gift for the Pentecostal gift.²⁴

To Barrett, it is impossible to harmonize the two accounts, a view which probably explains why few conservatives have supported the idea that John and Luke can both be reporting the same event. The historical incongruencies are quite obvious: (a) the Johannine event takes place Easter evening, whereas in Acts it takes place fifty days later; (b) the Johannine bestowal is by the risen but not yet ascended Lord, while for Luke the Spirit is given after Jesus is seated at the right hand of the Father (2:33); (c) Thomas is present in Acts 2 but absent in John 20; and (d) it is also quite possible that the *hoi mathētai* of John 20:19 refers only to the inner circle of the immediate disciples (as at the Last Supper) whereas Luke has 120 gathered at Pentecost.²⁵ Do these incongruencies doom the prospects of this option? We shall come back to that question.

How do we choose from among these three options? To resolve the problem of this passage and its relation to Acts 2, we

must begin with one fundamental principle of interpretation, namely, *that we must read John according to John and not through Lukan lenses*. We cannot impose one author on another; we must let John speak for himself. Though we will still have to face the task of relating the text of John to that of Acts, we must first read John according to John.

With this principle in mind, it seems that the second of the three options has the least appeal precisely because it is an attempt to understand John's text within the framework of Acts 2. Neither the argument that *labete* = *lēmpesthe* or the suggestion that the anarthrous *pneuma hagian* carries a special significance has been convincing. But beyond that, this particular reading of the text is not suggested by anything in the text nor by any literary, philological or theological feature of the Fourth Gospel. It derives entirely from the existence of the account in Acts 2. Reading John by itself, as the primitive Johannine community and perhaps others might have done, we probably would not even propose this explanation of the text. It is proposed entirely in the light of Acts 2. Nothing in the text itself would indicate that on that Easter evening the disciples did not receive the Holy Spirit. Perhaps the only thing that commends this option is that it rightly recognizes the witness of the rest of the New Testament in acknowledging only one bestowal of the Spirit. And it rejects the idea that the case of the disciples was different. As we shall see, there is another and better way of interpreting the text while endorsing the "one bestowal" motif of the New Testament.

The popularity of the first option, namely, of two separate bestowals or experiences of the Spirit, suggests it must be taken seriously. It cannot be dismissed simply because it is looked at as a necessary approach in view of the desire to preserve the authenticity of the historical narratives of Scripture. This first option (two bestowals) is not purely an apology for Scripture, though for some interpreters this may well be a large part of what motivates their approach. James D. G. Dunn, who surely has no desire to protect the historicity of the narratives, cautiously adopts this interpretation.²⁶ Though he acknowledges the real possibility of the third option, ultimately his conclusion seems to be rooted largely, though not exclusively, in John 7:39: "for the Spirit had not yet been given, because Jesus had not yet been glorified." The same theme is conveyed in 16:7; the departure of Jesus is important, it is "for your good" because only then can the Spirit be given. Though many have argued for an ascension of Jesus between 20:17 and 20:19, so that the insufflation of verse 22 would indeed be by the ascended Lord (and so dovetailing with Acts 2), Dunn is not persuaded that the Ascension has taken place

in John's narrative. Therefore 20:22 cannot be the fulfillment of the promises in chapters 14-16.

Dunn regards 20:22 as the moment of new birth for the disciples. This could take place, he maintains, only after the Resurrection. He rightly views the disciples as the people of the transition between dispensations. In this transition period, he identifies three decisive milestones. Prior to the death/Resurrection of Jesus, the Word dominated their experience and by it they were cleansed (13:10; 15:3). But until the Resurrection they could not experience new birth, which occurs in 20:22. Then in the third milestone at Pentecost they experience the promise of the Father. The first milestone, then, is before the death/Resurrection of Jesus; the second, new birth, is after the Resurrection when for the first time they become Christians; the third, at Pentecost, is when they truly experience the promised baptism of the Spirit. This construct of the disciples' experience has much to commend it, but it raises several serious questions.

First, it employs the language and categories of later Christian theology to treat the experience of the disciples. Dunn acknowledges that from Acts 2:38 on we have only the one experience of new birth--incorporation into the Body of Christ, salvation--upon the occasion of receiving, or being baptized in, the Holy Spirit. But then he employs the term "conversion" (p. 179) and notes that the cleansing spoken of in 13:10 and 15:3 cannot mean that the disciples were converted. Conversion, he affirms, took place in 20:22 at the experience of "new birth." But it is surely a vexing question as to when the disciples were converted. As to the metaphor of cleansing, E. P. Sanders has noted that in some places in rabbinic literature the term "cleanse" means "atone."²⁷ This would suggest some sort of relationship between the disciples and Jesus (and the Father), perhaps involving forgiveness, reconciliation and other terms more associated with Paul. Can one be forgiven, in terms of the new dispensation in Christ, and not be a Christian? Further, John 17:9 suggests that they are Christians before Jesus' death. "I pray for them; I am not praying for the world but for those whom you have given to me, because *they belong to you*" [italics mine]. In addition, the word "already" in 15:3 prevents us from interpreting the verse proleptically. Can it be said that people who, through the ministry of Jesus, belong to God and who have been cleansed by the Word are not in some sense of the word Christians?

Again, it is said that prior to the death/Resurrection of Jesus the cleansing is by virtue of the Word (*dia ton logon*), and that this is a qualitatively different experience from the new life and new birth through the receiving of the Spirit. While it is true that

the language of "life" is linked with the Spirit and with the Resurrection of Jesus, in which He overturns death and makes available the life of the age to come, yet at the same time we must also draw attention to the fact that John also links "life" with the Word. "The words which I have spoken to you are both spirit and life" (6:63). Similarly, Peter, speaking for the twelve, says, "You have the words of life" (6:68). And throughout the Fourth Gospel life is linked with believing: whoever believes has eternal life (3:15f, et al.). We cannot say that John links life only with the receiving of the Spirit. The almost monumental diversity of language and metaphor in John's Gospel prevents us from mechanically limiting the concept of conversion and new birth to the receiving of the Spirit--even in spite of the exclusive tone of 3:5.

Dunn acknowledges (p. 179) that they are believers, but believers without having received the Spirit. This seems to put a severe limitation on the significance of believing. Dunn is to be followed wholeheartedly when he speaks of the entry on the part of the disciples into the blessings of the new dispensation as "staggered" (p. 182), while at the same time not necessarily supported in his "three milestones" interpretation of the Johannine witness. Though not without its own conundrums, it seems much better to suggest that those who believed and who followed, who had been cleansed by virtue of the Word, who belonged to the Father, were indeed what we could today call Christians, that is, followers of Jesus.

We may also add that it is possible to suggest that in some nascent sense they may also have had the Spirit, if we consider John 14:17, a notoriously difficult text about which to have any degree of certainty. To begin with, we run into a text-critical problem in determining whether *estin* (present) or *estai* (future) represents the primitive text and whether *meni* should be accented as a present or future verb. So, for the three verbs in this text we have the possibility of one, two or no future tenses. The first one, *ginōskete*, is clearly present and either of the other two, or both, may also be.²⁸ The problem is further compounded by the fact that, even if we decide text critically for the present tenses, any or all of the three verbs may be regarded as proleptic, as futuristic present tenses, so that even with all present tense verbs the text might be rendered, "You will know Him for He will abide with you and will be in you." Certainly in *erchomai* in verse 18 we have such a futuristic present. Though the latter two verbs of verse 17 will remain in doubt, less doubt surrounds the first one: "You know him."²⁹ However, R. E. Brown³⁰ and other commentators prefer the proleptic understanding. Still it may very

well be that we can understand the present tense “know” in the sense that by virtue of their identification with Jesus and their participation in His ministry they “know” the Paraclete, as it were, by “proxy.” In knowing and following Jesus they also know the Spirit by which Jesus performs His miracles (Matt 12:28).

If we may appeal to another writer not in the Johannine tradition, we note that Luke (10:9,17) records the disciples as performing the same healings and exorcisms. Through their following Him they were, might we say, under the umbrella of the Spirit. In that sense they do know the Spirit; and in that sense they bore witness to the power of the Spirit. None of this accords with subsequent Christian experience. Their experience cannot be ours, as Dunn says so well. But it is their experience we are trying to understand. Because life is connected with the receiving of the Word and with believing, it is quite possible to say that the disciples “had the life of the age to come” prior to the death/Resurrection of Jesus. As we have noted (John 17:9) they are said to “belong to the Father.” And a certain reading of 14:17 may also allow us to affirm that even before receiving the Spirit (20:22) they do indeed know the Spirit—even though, as we have said, only by proxy.

That we should even discuss these matters in these terms assumes that John had, or ought to have had, our questions in mind. In point of fact it is quite difficult to answer the question of when the disciples were “converted.” We find no indication from his narrative that this question was part of his agenda.

Other considerations cause us to reject Dunn’s “three milestones” perspective. He connects the insufflation of 20:22 with the new birth of the disciples, in accordance with 3:5 and 6:63, as well as Genesis 2:7 where *emphysaō* is also used. However, our context seems to relate to matters other than life and new birth. The preceding verse suggests the motif of this appearance to the disciples has to do first with the confirmation of His aliveness, but then with mission and the power to carry out that mission. “Just as the Father has sent me, I also am sending (or, am about to send) you” [emphasis mine]. And the verse after the insufflation has to do with the transferring of His own authority regarding forgiveness of sins over to them: “Whoever’s sins you forgive they are forgiven....” To interpret the insufflation as the inbreathing of life, rather than the conveying of authority and power, is to do violence to the context. In fact, it is remarkable how similar the context here is with that of Acts 2:4, where the fullness of the Spirit is linked with mission and the power to engage in mission (Acts 1:8; cf., Luke 24:49).

For Dunn and others, the verb *enephysēsen* carries considerable weight. It means "to breath into" and is said to carry the idea of imparting life. Gen 2:7, which describes God as breathing into Adam with the result that he becomes a living being, is cited as the inspiration for John 20:22. Concurring support is elicited from Ezek 37:9, where the breath of God brings life back into the dry bones. On the other side, elsewhere this same Greek verb bears a destructive note (Job 4:21; Ezek 21:26, 22:21). And in *Tobit* 6:8 and 11:11 it relates to a miraculous recovering of sight. So, it does not necessarily mean the imparting of life. Furthermore, Michal Wojciechowski has recently brought our attention to the Targums of Gen 2:7 in which the breath of God is not so much the source of life as of the "word" (Fr., *parole*).³¹ He notes that according to the Targums of Neofiti, of Onqelos and of Pseudo-Jonathan, the insufflation of Adam means that he has been given the gift of speech. Though these texts are later than the New Testament, they may reflect a tradition that existed in the first Christian century.

This line of evidence supports one common stream of New Testament witness of the Spirit which links the Spirit with speech and communication. At Pentecost the gift of speech is obvious. So also is the promise in the first chapter of Acts: "You will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you and you will be witnesses to me..." (v 8). Acts 4:31 concurs: "And all of them were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak the Word of God boldly." Again, Acts 4: "Then Peter, filled with the Holy Spirit, said to them" (v 8; cf., Acts 13:9). Though 3:5 and 6:63 link the Spirit with birth and life, the primary significance of the promised gift of the Spirit in chapters 14-16 is that of truth and communication. Three times the Paraclete is referred to as the "Spirit of Truth." In 14:26 the Spirit will teach them everything. In 15:26 He will bear witness to Jesus. He will convict the world of sin, righteousness and judgment (16:8). He will guide them into all truth (16:13). This is how, we propose, John 20:22 must be understood when we see it in the context of verses 21 and 23. To interpret the insufflation of 20:22 in terms of 3:5 and 6:63 is to ignore its own context.

One other note: the verb *elabete*, as Bultmann³² and others have noted, is almost a technical term in the early Church for that definitive reception of the Spirit which incorporates one into the Body of Christ (cf., John 1:16; 14:17; Acts 2:38; 8:15, 17; 1 Cor 2:12).³³

We suggest, then, that our passage has exactly the same theological significance for John's narrative that Acts 2:4 has for Luke's. In both, the bestowal of the Spirit is linked with mission,

power and authority. Both may be seen as the culminative act of the incarnate Jesus following His glorification. As C. H. Dodd has said, "Accordingly, the gift of the Spirit to the Church is represented...as the ultimate climax of the personal relations between Jesus and His Disciples."³⁴ This is as true of 20:22 as of Acts 2:4.

But what of the historical disparities between the accounts? R. E. Brown has noted, "A willingness to neglect temporal implications for theological significance is not unusual in John."³⁵ He adds, "If John's purpose is forgotten, the attempt to dramatize in temporal scenes what is *sub specie aeternitatis* creates confusion."³⁶ Historical conundrums abound in the Fourth Gospel. But they must be faced in a way that does justice to Johannine criteria for "truth" and "gospel." While Dunn would agree up to a point, at the same time he reminds us that John's narrative is not history gone amuck. "Although we cannot deny John's concern to impress a theological scheme on a chronological sequence of events, it would not be true to say that the former completely ignores and suppresses the latter."³⁷ This caveat is important, but so, too, is his acknowledgment. In view of John's frequent reference to the coming of the Spirit (7:39 and chapters 14-16), it is much more likely that John would provide us with an account of that bestowal than that he would narrate an otherwise not previously mentioned experience. Dunn's suggestion that John would know of two bestowals, record the promise of one of them, and then narrate the other³⁸ seems less than convincing. Much the more natural understanding is that which sees our pericope as the fulfillment of that promise which is otherwise so important to John's scheme of things. The historical problems are there, as in so many sections of this Gospel, but they cannot rule over what otherwise seems clearly to be the thrust of John's message.

The themes of John's Gospel, the terminology, (especially) the context, as well as the fact that at every theological point this pericope answers to Acts 2:4, all support the view that we do indeed have here a Johannine Pentecost. It is a highly theologized version of that inceptive experience which gave birth to the Church and perfected the work of the incarnate Son.³⁹

This understanding of the pericope makes it very much the culmination of John's record. So we may be permitted to ask one more question. Is it possible that at one stage of the production of this Gospel it was indeed the end of the text? This is not the first time such a question has been asked of the Fourth Gospel. Many have suspected that at some point in the process that produced this Gospel, 20:30f served as the close and that chapter 21 was added either by the author or an intimate colleague. Others have gone

even further by pointing out various redactional elements throughout the Gospel--including dislocations.⁴⁰ More recently, R. E. Brown has offered a thorough assessment of the matter and has proposed that the Gospel passed through five stages to reach its present form.⁴¹ It is not our purpose here to evaluate such efforts at reconstructing the history of this Gospel, but only to note the common sentiment that more than one hand may have helped in producing our Gospel in its present form. At some point in the process, then, could our pericope have served as the final words of the narrative?

If we suppose for a moment that this was so, and if we compare this pericope with Matt 28:16-20, we find the similarities to be striking. Both record a definitive appearance to the disciples. Both include an indication of doubt (Matt 28:17; John 20:20). The Great Commission of Matthew is repeated in John (vv 21-23). The promise of the continued presence of Jesus in Matthew corresponds to the bestowal of the Spirit in John. And both Gospels, significantly, end with a saying of Jesus rather than with some sort of summarizing narrative (Luke) or statement of purpose (John 20 and 21). E. Bammel finds precedent for this in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*⁴² and mentions John as having the same kind of ending. In fact, Bammel refers to 20:24-29 as "a first supplement" (Ger., *ein erster Nachtrag*).⁴³ Everything after 20:23 is anti-climactic and appears to be elaborations of resurrection themes, including the element of apostolic doubt (20:24ff), the corporeality of the risen Jesus (21:1ff) and the restoration of Peter (21:15ff).

John 20:1-23 includes all the elements of what we may call "the resurrection package": the tomb is found by women to be empty on Sunday morning (Matt 28:1ff; Mark 16:1ff; Luke 24:1ff; John 20:1ff); some interpretive word is provided by angelic representative(s) (Matt 28:2ff; Mark 16:3f; Luke 24:4ff; John 20:20); the doubt of the disciples is noted (Matt 28:16; Luke 24:11; John 20:20); the appearance of Jesus to the disciples as a group (Matt 28:16ff; Luke 24:36ff; John 20:19ff); a Great Commission (Matt 28:19f; Luke 24:47; John 20:19ff); and finally, the promise of power for mission through the promised Holy Spirit who will continue the Lordship of Jesus within history (Matt 28:20; Luke 24:49; John 20:22). To be sure, the Resurrection narratives include other features such as the attempt in Matthew to bribe the people, and in Luke the walk to Emmaus. But the above mentioned items represent the core of our Resurrection accounts. John 20:19-23 may well have served as a culminative word, if not of this particular Gospel, then of some *Vorlage* which was incorporated at some stage of the redactional process. It is enough

to note that nothing is missing from the heart of the Resurrection records when Matthew ends as it does, and if John had once ended as I have proposed.

Notes

1. John Chrysostom, *Johannem Homil.* 87, in Migne, *Patrologia Graecae*, Vol 61, p. 472.
2. E.g., B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), p. 295.
3. James M. Boice, *Witness and Revelation in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970), p. 120.
4. H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* (London: Macmillan, 1910), p. 166.
5. Westcott, *The Gospel of John*, p. 350; F. Godet, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1886) 2:422.
6. E. C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. by F. Noel Davey (London: Faber and Faber, 1940), p. 547.
7. Leon Morris, *Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), p. 847. Morris appeals, in part, to common Christian experience: "Rather, the Spirit is continually manifesting Himself in new ways" (p. 847). This, however, it should be noted, is not a "manifestation" of the Spirit but a concrete "bestowal" of the Spirit by Jesus.
8. J. A. Bengel, *New Testament Word Studies* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1971) 1:726. (Wesley: "This was an earnest of Pentecost.")
9. James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975), p. 178. (Cf. his *Jesus and the Spirit* [London: SCM Press], p. 96.)
10. Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33.
11. Acts 1:5; 11:16.
12. Henry Denzinger and Adolf Schonmetzer, eds., *Enchiridion Symbolorum* (New York: Herder, 1965), p. 150. (*ou dedoken utois pneuma hagion, alla schēmati monon enephsēsēn.*)
13. Hugo Grotius, *Opera omnia Theologica in Tres Tomos*, Tomi 2, Vol. 1, n.p., 1679, p. 570. ("Sicut passionem suam futuram signis aptus praefiguravit, ita & missionem Spiritu Sancti, qui vento comparatur Actorum ii.2.")

14. According to R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John, 13-21* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1970), p. 1038.
15. Theodor Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1912), p. 679.
16. Ibid.
17. G. E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), p. 289.
18. C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John* (London: SPCK, 1955), p. 474f. Cf. his *The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1958), p. 159.
19. C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1953), p. 227; *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1963), p. 144.
20. R. H. Fuller, *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives* (New York: MacMillan, 1971), pp. 140, 214.
21. C. F. D. Moule, *The Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), pp. 31, 76.
22. Adolf Schlatter, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, Vol. 3 in *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament* (Tubingen: Calwer, 1962), p. 296. Schlatter does not mention Acts 2 in connection with John 20, but the nature of his comments indicates clearly that John 20 represents the bestowal of the promised gift.
23. Kirsopp Lake, Additional Notes in Vol. 5 of *The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1966), p. 121.
24. A. Loisy, *Le Quatrieme Evangile* (Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1903).
25. Others who equate John 20 with Acts 2 include: George T. Montague, *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition*; R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*; Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*; Leonhard Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament*; R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John, 13-21*; Eduard Schweizer, "pneuma" in Kittel, *TDNT*; Helmut Thielicke, *The Evangelical Faith*, Vol. 3; R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, Vol. 3. The list could be extended considerably.
26. See Chapter 15, "The Johannine Pentecost?" in *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, pp. 173-182.
27. E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (London: SCM, 1977), p. 161, n. 66.
28. The options on the basis of the tenses are:
 - (a) You know Him, for He abides with you and is in you.
 - (b) You know Him, for He abides with you and will be in you.
 - (c) You know Him, for He will abide with you and will be in you.

29. So almost all translations; that of Monsignor R. Knox is an exception.
30. R. E. Brown, *Gospel*, p. 639.
31. Michal Wojciechowski, "Le Don de L'Esprit Saint dans John 20:22 selon Tg. Gn. 2:7," *New Testament Studies* 33(April, 1987): 291.
32. R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971) pp. 76, 616.
33. Similarly the words *didōmi* and *dechomai*.
34. Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 227.
35. Brown, *Gospel*, p. 1015.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 1014. The entire paragraph may well be read carefully with much profit.
37. Dunn, *Baptism*, p. 176.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 177.
39. R. Schnackenburg supports John's dating of the event and says that Luke has placed the event at Pentecost to pick up on certain motifs. Hence, he says, "Johannine Pentecost" is an anomaly and misnomer. It is not our purpose here to pursue that question, but only to speak for the identity of the two events.
40. See W. F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*, revised by C. K. Barrett (London: Epworth, 1955), pp. 166ff; 297ff.
41. Brown, *Gospel*, pp. xxiv-xl.
42. E. Bammel, "Das Ende von Q," in *Veritas Verborum*; FS Gustav Stählin. ed. Otto Böcher and Klaus Haacker (Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, 1970), p. 47.
43. *Ibid.*

