‘TRINITARIAN’ PNEUMATOLOGY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT?—TOWARDS AN EXPLANATION OF THE WORSHIP OF JESUS

MAX TURNER

Members of the British New Testament Society have spent considerable time and energy on the important questions of when, how and why Jesus came to be worshipped as God. Very much less time has been spent on the status of the Spirit, and a trawl through the massive secondary literature of our discipline catches relatively few relevant fish. There are I think at least two obvious explanations for this. One is what Professor Hurtado has called ‘the binitarian shape of early Christian worship’—that is, it appears that in the apostolic church cultic veneration was offered to the Father and to the Son, but not apparently to the Spirit. We have to wait for the 2nd Century Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah (9.33-36) before we encounter worship addressed to the Spirit. Second, debates about the personhood of the Spirit are understood to be secondary to and even largely parasitic on the Christological debates. One first settles the question of the divinity of Jesus, this establishes the all-important principle of plurality within the unity of God; then one can set about the relatively minor mopping up operation with respect to the Spirit. Arthur Wainwright comments: ‘The Spirit seems to have been included in the doctrine of God almost as an afterthought about which men had no strong feelings, either favourable or hostile’. Wainwright was speaking, of course, about Patristic developments, but one could apply it (mutatis mutandis) to NT scholarship.

So what excuse have I got for addressing you on this subject today? Those of you who have read the Festschriften for Donald Guthrie and Howard Marshall will know that I think the Spirit has much more to do with the explanation of the rise of divine Christology and worship of Jesus than is usually allowed. In a nutshell, I argue that Jesus’ exaltation giving of the Spirit marks a defining moment of divine Christology. I also briefly argued that the very same ‘moment’ thereby also gives pneumatology a significant ‘trinitarian’ aspect. Such claims, of course, give pneuma-
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tology a much more central place than it usually receives, and it is to aspects of that claim that I wish to return today.

I. ASSESSING THE TRADITIONAL ARGUMENTS FOR THE PERSONHOOD OF THE SPIRIT.

Those New Testament scholars who have devoted attention to the issue have usually done so in the context of more wide-ranging works on 'trinity'. Arthur Wainwright's is probably the most comprehensive and nuanced account. Like the Fathers, he first attempts (in ten chapters) to settle the binitarian nature of God revealed through the incarnational Christ-event; only then does he turn to the Spirit. He analyzes the subject in three short chapters. First he treats 'the nature of the Spirit and his relation to Christ' (ch 11). Like the Fathers, he finds 'abundant evidence that the Spirit was regarded as a personal being, who was capable of experiences of grief and giving approval, who could forbid and be lied to, who could guide and inspire'. He is aware (through his reading of E.F. Scott and Bultmann) that the NT also appears to conceive of the Spirit 'impersonally as a divine energy which is at the same time a sort of substance'. But as several passages (esp. Acts 2.4, 11.16, 13.2-9) innocently combine both animistic ('personal') and dynamic (fluid/potentially impersonal) language of the Spirit it is unlikely that this means the writer is working with two completely different conceptions of the Spirit without some attempt at harmony. Accordingly Wainwright argues that while the impersonal metaphors can be accommodated within a more generally personal conception, the reverse would be far more difficult. He concludes 'the more the Christians meditated about the Spirit, and the more they experienced his activity in their own lives and in the life of the community, the more they were conscious of his personal nature'. The crucial question then becomes how we explain this 'personal' nature.

The first possibility he considers is that the Spirit came to be identified with the risen Christ. On such a view, some or all the personal traits of the Spirit might simply be derived from the risen Lord. But despite the attempt of Bousset and the History-of-Religions School to prove this in Paul (relying especially on 2 Cor 3.17; Rom 8.9-11 and 1 Cor 15.45), Wainwright was able to show that the Pauline texts did not bear the weight placed on them, and that within his epistles there was sufficient additional evidence of the distinctness of Christ and the Spirit to overturn Bousset's claim. And if the case were weak in Paul, it was hopeless in the Gospels (including especially the Fourth Gospel), where the distinction between Christ and the Spirit was crystal clear. If anything, it is the distinction between the Father and the Spirit that is more blurred.

With that, Wainwright turns to discuss 'the Spirit and God' (ch. 12). He argues that the Spirit is not actually called God, nor simply identified with Yahweh—even 2 Cor 3.17, which asserts 'the Lord is the Spirit', nevertheless also makes some distinction when it subsequently refers to the Spirit as the 'Spirit of the Lord'. The Spirit is neither prayed to nor worshipped, and in contrast to the Son—the Spirit is not described as performing the unique functions of deity, such as judgment, creation and salvation. So (he concluded) the Spirit is probably distinct from the Father. If the New Testament contains many triadic passages (specifically including Father, Son and Spirit in redemptive work, these describe how the three are encountered in salvation history and Christian experience, but on the whole do not address the question of the inner relationships of the Spirit to Father and
Son. Paul does confront the binitarian question, but not the trinitarian (cf. the exclusively diadic confession of 1 Cor 8.6). The Fourth Gospel alone begins to do this. For John, the Spirit-Paraclete is a distinct divine person sent from the Father, through the Son. Quoting Barrett, with approval, he concludes: 'more than any other New Testament writer [John] lays the foundation for a doctrine of a co-equal Trinity'.

Even this, however, has been questioned. In a short but incisive report in the 1976 volume of *Expository Times*, Professor Moule put his finger on the essential question. 'What is not clear' he writes 'is that the Spirit is distinguishable from God in a way in which Christ is distinguishable from both God and the Spirit'. For Moule, talk of the Spirit of God is perhaps simply metaphor like the 'hand' or 'finger' of God, and so not something that invites hypostasis. In that case, the Spirit may be 'personal' merely because it is the vital extension of Yahweh's own personhood and action—that is, because the Spirit is the immanence of God himself. 'What is there,' Moule asks, 'to suggest that “the Spirit of God” means more than simply, “God at work”, “God immanent”, or that “the Spirit of Christ” means more than “God at work in a way made possible by Christ”?' He concludes that New Testament Theology was essentially binitarian rather than trinitarian.

It is the challenge of those last two questions that I wish to take up in this paper, as well as the relation of the emerging pneumatology to worship of Jesus within the Christian communities. Because of constraints of space I will confine myself to the three major New Testament witnesses, Paul, Luke-Acts and John.

II. 'TRINITARIAN' PNEUMATOLOGY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT?—PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

Let me begin with five contextual preliminaries that set the agenda.

First, let me agree with Professor Moule that for the Judaism out of which Christianity sprang, to speak of the Spirit of God was to speak of Yahweh himself in action—in person, as it were, as opposed to his action through mediating beings from within the order of creation. The Spirit is even more intimately associated with Yahweh's own being and with the extension of his life, vitality and activity, than Wisdom or Word. The latter two may be personified (and be portrayed as acting distinctly from Yahweh), but the Spirit is more usually synecdoche for God. There is a relatively minor but potentially important tradition in which the Spirit is portrayed with angelomorph characteristics, but not in way that threatened to turn Jewish monotheism into binitarianism (far less into trinitarianism). But essentially, the Spirit is the self-manifesting, transforming and empowering presence of God himself. The Spirit is so intimately God himself that it can be described as the very 'breath of his mouth' (Job 33.4; 34.14; Ps 33.6; Wisd 11.20, etc.). Josephus thus represents a quite typical Jewish view, when he has Solomon pray, at the dedication of the temple, 'I entreat Thee also [O God] to send some portion of Thy Spirit to dwell in the temple, that thou mayest seem to us to be on earth as well [as in heaven]' (AJ 8.114; pace Levison; this is not stoic panentheism). For 2 Baruch 75.34, the Spirit is God's inner intelligent being; and for Philo, the same is often true.

Second, it should follow from what we have said how very difficult it would be for a Jew to conceive of any person, however exalted, as using the same Spirit as his own executive power, stamped with his own char-
acter. There simply is no such example, or anything approaching it, in the whole ITP literature. This is not surprising, for such a view would appear to make the person concerned somehow ‘Lord of the Spirit’ (I am leaving that title deliberately ambiguous), and, unless this was accompanied by a fundamental change in the perception of the relation of God and Spirit, it would risk the blasphemy of asserting that the exalted person in question had become ‘Lord’ of God himself, at least in his immanent activities.

Third, and as a corollary, of the above, unless the Spirit were demoted to an impersonal force, or to a personal (e.g. angelic) power of the created order, it is difficult to see how the person acting as ‘Lord of the Spirit’ could himself be conceived as less than God. Within a monotheistic pneumatology, there is no place for a mere creature to become ‘lord of the Spirit’.

Fourth, the above notwithstanding, our three main New Testament witnesses appear at first glance to put Jesus in precisely the position, with respect to the Spirit, that raises all these difficulties in their sharpest form. If first appearances are right, then all three witnesses have embraced something approaching a ‘trinitarian’ pneumatology. We need, however, to re-examine the witnesses. First impressions may have misled us. On second scrutiny we may find our authors have adopted subtle strategies for reducing the problem, whether demoting the Spirit, or reducing the exalted Jesus’ relation to the Spirit to acceptable limits, or whatever.

Fifth, if communities came to recognise Jesus as ‘Lord of the Spirit’ in the ‘trinitarian’ way a first reading might suggest, we need to ask how they justified such conclusions, and what part such beliefs played in the inauguration and sustenance of their worship of Jesus as God. It has to be said that convincing explanations of the regular cultic worship of Jesus are still thin on the ground. To what extent might the communities’ experience of Jesus as ‘lord of the Spirit’ contribute to the explanation?

I propose (unwisely?) to start with what might be regarded as the easiest case, that of the Fourth Gospel.

III. ‘TRINITARIAN’ PNEUMATOLOGY IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL?

A. THE TRADITIONAL ARGUMENTS for the distinct divine personhood of the Spirit in John are well-known, and were of greatest import in the decisions leading up to the Council of Constantinople (381) which asserted the full divine hypostasis of the Spirit. The Spirit-Paraclete promised in John 14-16 has strongly personal features. Thus the Spirit is subject of many verbs involving personal activities, such as teaching (14.26), bringing to remembrance (14.26), bearing witness (15.26), convicting (16.8), guiding into truth (16.13), speaking and declaring about Christ and glorifying him (16.13-14), etc.

It was also noticed that the masculine pronoun is regularly used in conjunction with the Spirit, though this should not be overplayed as it may simply agree with the masculine noun parakletos and in any case in 14.17 John uses a neuter pronoun collocated with the Spirit (pneuma).

Perhaps most significant is the fact that ‘personification’ of the Spirit such as one finds in ITP and Rabbinic Judaism, to a very extended personal of the Spirit as the personal parallels between Christ and the Spirit-Paraclete suggest the latter is equally distinctly per-
sonal. But could not this all be an illusion? Could we not, as Professor Moule perceptively asks, explain it all as 'God at work in a way made possible by Christ'.

B. FOUR OBSERVATIONS—WHEN TAKEN TOGETHER—SUGGEST THAT JOHN WOULD HAVE HAD DIFFICULTY IN KEEPING WITHIN THE LIMITS OF SUCH A STATEMENT.

First, there is the sheer christocentricity of the Spirit's saving work. As is well known, the fundamental task of the Spirit-Paraclete promised within John 14-16 is to reveal the content and implications of the Christ-event, from incarnation to ascension (cf. especially 14:26; 15:26; 16:8-10, 12-14), and to do this in a way that mediates salvation to the disciple. This appears to go a little beyond 'God at work in a way made possible by Christ' (as I think Moule would agree) to 'God at work with a binitarian Christocentric focus'. And while that observation does not as yet help us towards an understanding of the Spirit as any kind of divine person, it will come back to us more usefully at a later stage.

Second, there are two passages in John, which could be taken to portray Christ as the very source of the Spirit: 7.37-39 and 20.22. But while I would consider both of them potentially fruitful for our topic, the discussion of them would take us into a level of complexity and detail that we can barely afford.

Third, we take a step towards a more genuinely trinitarian pneumatology when we observe that for John the Spirit does not merely unpack the Christ-event to the believer, but also lies at the heart of the crucial on-going relation of the believer with the Father and the exalted Lord. For the Johannine community, to know the Father and the Son is eternal life (17.3). But this knowledge does not consist merely in adoring understanding of the Christ-event and the nature of Israel's God revealed in it, interpreted by the Spirit—important as that is. For the community, 'salvation' is actually a communion with the Father and the Son (as 1 Jn 1.3 asserts), shaped, launched, and continually renewed by the Spirit—given understanding of the Christ-event.

It might just still be plausible to squeeze this into a definition of the Spirit as 'God at work in a way made possible by Christ'. It could be argued that John understands the Spirit as synecdoche for God the Father (exclusively) but has come to understand the unity between the Father and the Son as so close, that the Father's Spirit inevitably also discloses the one with whom he is in such intimate union.

On consideration, I would be inclined to counter that interpretation by suggesting it accords too passive a role to the exalted Christ in his relationship to the Spirit. The Johannine Jesus is not content to say the Spirit-Paraclete will bring the presence of the Father and the Son to the disciple. Rather the accent is on Jesus' active role—'I will not leave you desolate; I will come to you' (14.18), and he promises of the obedient disciple, 'I will love him and manifest myself to him' (14.21). To be sure, the context clarifies that this self-manifestation is the coming of the Father and the Son to abide in the disciple, and through the giving of the Spirit-Paraclete, but the emphatic first person singular pronouns and the active voice indicate the Spirit is the Son's self-manifesting presence and executive power as much as the Father's.

This, of course, could still be understood in binitarian fashion. One could posit the Spirit is the extension of the vitality and personhood of Father & Son, without necessarily concluding the Spirit is a distinct divine person. Clearly, though, the Spirit is no longer
merely the Spirit of the Father, but (in a very real way) the ‘Spirit of Christ/the Son’ too, even if John does not use that precise terminology. And we cannot be content with speaking of the Spirit merely as ‘God at work in a way made possible by Christ’, we are forced to something more like the assertion that the Spirit-Paraclete is ‘the Father and the Son at work’. In this connection we may note that Jesus promises that he himself will answer the disciples’ prayers in his name, when he has been exalted, by working greater signs through them than he himself had accomplished (14.12-13). The Christian community will understand that he does this too through the Spirit. In this respect also, the Spirit is his executive power. But in all this we have not yet got a clearly distinct personhood of the Spirit.

Fourth, two Johannine motifs, however, potentially push us still further in a ‘trinitarian direction’.

(a) In John 16.13-14, Jesus asserts

When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all truth; for he will not speak of his own authority, but whatever he hears he will speak, and he will declare to you the things that are to come. 1141 He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine and declare it to you.

This hardly comports with the view that John perceives the Spirit merely as an extension of the vitality and personhood of God himself, rather than as a distinct person. The contrast ‘οὐ γὰρ ... ἑαυτὸν, not of himself, but what he hears [from the Father and the Son]’ would be meaningless if Spirit is merely synechdoche for the Father or the union of Father&Son. V.14, taken with what went before, implies a further Johannine contrast—while the Father can glorify himself and the Son (12.28), the Son cannot glorify himself, only the Father (8.54). Similarly, here, the Spirit will not glorify/speak of himself, but glorifies the Son. If the Spirit is not a distinct person, but to be understood as essentially an extension of the Son’s own vitality and personhood, the contrast would once again prove disingenuous.

(b) Even more important, however, are the sayings which speak of the ascended Jesus ‘sending’ or ‘commissioning’ the Spirit from the Father. In 15.26, Jesus states, ‘When the Advocate comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth who comes from the Father, he will testify on my behalf (cf. 14.26), Similarly, in John 16:7, he says, ‘But if I go [to the Father], I will send him [the Spirit-Paracletel to you’.

We have perhaps grown too familiar with these words to recognise how startling they would have sounded in a first-century context with an informed knowledge of Judaism. In the Old Testament, and there only twice (Isaiah 61:11; Joel 2:28), God is the only one who ‘sends’ his Spirit in 48.16; Ps 104.30; 102.17; Ps-Philo 31.9; Jos Aj 8.114 and 4Ezr 14.22. On a unique occasion, in the much later PesRab 3.4, God can even put some personal ‘distance’ between himself and the Spirit; here, in a retelling of the story in Gen 48.13-14, God
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cajoles an apparently reluctant Holy Spirit to foot it speedily down to Jacob and help him prophesy over his grandson Ephraim. But this would probably have been viewed as humorous literary personification, rather than a move towards binitarianism, or the demotion of the Spirit to creaturely status.

By and large, it would be quite unthinkable for anyone other than God himself to 'send' the Spirit, because the Spirit is too closely identified with himself. But the remarkable formulations in Jn 15.26 and 16.7 (and similar ones in Luke-Acts) make just that sort of claim about Jesus. Astonishing as that claim is, it would become all but incomprehensible were we to assert that John regards the Spirit as synecdoche for God the Father—no more than a way of speaking of the extension of his own vitality, personality, and activity, into the cosmos. For that would be tantamount to the claim that Jesus somehow 'commissioned' the Father, or his animus, and that Jesus in some way became Lord over the Father's own and most immediate and personal power of influence.

If we were to represent John's message in spatial metaphors, we might say that according to 15.26 and 16.7, Jesus is portrayed as stepping between the Father and the Spirit, remaining subordinate to the Father, while nevertheless commissioning and sending forth the Spirit as an executive power he will henceforth share with the Father. He thus becomes (in some qualified way) 'lord of the Spirit', while the Spirit nevertheless proceeds 'from the Father' (παρά τοῦ πατρός; 15.26), and is sent from the Father, just as was the Logos. Jesus' commissioning of the Spirit thus brings to light some sort of hitherto unsuspected bifurcation between the Father and the Spirit, which Judaism had largely regarded as different ways of speaking of the same being.

(c) This 'distance' between the Father and the Spirit, however, does not result in any loss of 'personality' in the Spirit. So it now becomes all the more difficult to explain the personal traits of the Spirit simply as the extension of the Father's personhood and vitality. Rather, the strong traits of personhood in the Spirit-Paraclete are now best understood to belong to the Spirit himself, as he relates (differently) to the Father and the Son. In short, John appears to have come to understand the Spirit as a distinct personal being in some kind of intimate unity with the Father (and with the Son), not merely as a way of speaking of the Father at work in ways made possible by the Son, or even as a shorthand for 'the Father and the Son at work'.

(d) What we have said does not of itself necessarily lead to what we would call a fully 'trinitarian' pneumatology. John could have avoided such a conclusion by reducing the Spirit to a powerful being, but one somehow less than God—perhaps something like the angel of the Name, or Michael, or the Spirit of truth at Qumran. But while there are clearly important angelomorph features to the Spirit-Paraclete, and while it is true that John does not explicitly call the Spirit 'qeoj', as he does the Logos and the risen Christ (Jn 1.2; 20.28), there is no evidence that he took the radical step of pushing the Spirit outside the habitual circle of divine self-identity. Indeed, the exalted Son, who may rightly be hailed 'lord and God' according to 20.28, must nevertheless petition the Father to send the Spirit (14.16, 26), which implies a closeness and delicacy of relationship between Father and Spirit, which would more naturally belong within the circle of divine self-identity.
1. While John shares with Qumran and T12P the terminology of the ‘Spirit of truth’, the conceptions are quite different. The ‘Spirit of truth’ is a complex ‘sphere of influence’ provided by a variety of inputs, including the Prince of light(s), God himself, angel(s) of truth, etc. All people share in different degrees in this ‘spirit of truth’ and the contrasting ‘spirit of error’, and they do so at all times. This contrasts with the Johannine gift, built on Ezek 36, which is purely eschatological (cf. Jn 7.37-39), and corresponds more with the different perception of the Spirit of truth which begins in 1QS4.20f.

2. The powerful angels—such as the angel of the Name and Michael—provide only relatively weak analogies for the Spirit-Paraclete, who is a permanent mediator of the self-revealing presence of the Father and the Son to all obedient disciples in all places.

3. If the Spirit is not called ‘God’, God is nevertheless called ‘Spirit’, and it is deduced from this that appropriate worship can only be enabled by the Spirit (4.21-24).

4. The remarkable parallels between Jesus and the Paraclete, combined with the assertion that it is to the disciples, advantage that Jesus depart (16.7), so the Spirit-Paraclete may be given to them, suggests the Paraclete is a fully divine presence, not merely a creaturely mediator.

The exaltation gift of the Spirit by Jesus, then, appears to reflect a genuinely ‘trinitarian’ pneumatology in John, even if a somewhat implicit one. But we may question whether this is a theology of significance for John and his community, or whether it is simply something of an aside, or appendix. We must ask what part trinitarian pneumatology plays in the spirituality of the community, including its worship.

C. ON THE SPIRIT’S PLACE IN PROMOTING WORSHIP OF JESUS AS GOD

It is clear that John’s churches worship both the Father and the Son—and most probably (pace Casey) as the one God of Israel. How did the community come to offer the Son worship as one God with the Father? The details are of course lost in the mists of time. A widespread older explanation finds its starting point in the Gospel’s Logos Christology: Jesus is worshipped because he is identified with the pre-existent divine word. On such a view, the ‘trinitarian’ pneumatology of John could be seen as an appendix to such a move. If Jesus is the divine Logos from within the circle of God’s self-identity, then he can be supposed to have a share with the Father in the giving of the Spirit. There are three problems with this explanation.

First, it simply pushes the problem one step further back, leaving unexplained how the community concluded that Jesus was the Logos.

Second, all our evidence suggests that acknowledgement of Jesus’ sharing in the giving of God’s Spirit precedes and was much more widespread than the affirmation of him as the Logos. Indeed, it is striking that the only saying shared by all four Gospels is the
promise Jesus will baptise Israel with Holy Spirit. And the Gospels probably interpreted this as a sending of the Spirit, not merely powerful acts performed by the Messiah endowed with the Spirit.

Third, it ignores precisely the dynamic of the Spirit that the Johannine Gospel and letters offer. It is this third point on which I wish to expand here.

For John it is the experience of the Spirit in the community which inspires and shapes the worship, and gives it its Christocentric focus. For John, the ministry and teaching of Jesus—including in his view the climactic teaching in John 14-17—did not lead to the conviction Jesus was the Logos or theos. Before the gift of the Spirit his followers had only fragmentary and fleeting insights into his true identity, and of the kind and degree of his unity with the Father.

If I may put it provocatively, there is very little indeed in what Jesus says or does within the ministry (as described by John) that in itself unequivocally points to Jesus as Logos or theos (rather than as a powerfully endowed messianic agent). Indeed, ironically, it is perhaps Jesus’ claims that he will give the Spirit from the Father, and that he will come with the Father to the disciple in and through the Spirit, that provide the firmest single basis for equating him with the divine Logos, though John will have seen many other traits pointing in the same direction.

But from John’s perspective the important thing is that the disciples had not yet grasped all this. That is why they needed the Spirit-Paraclete. For most Jews, the promised eschatological Spirit would bring charismatic revelation, wisdom and inspired speech. The Spirit-Paraclete is a tailor-made christocentric revealer-teacher within this tradition! But, as such, he is also the driving force of Christian worship of Jesus. For John, it is the Spirit who leads the disciple into the truth Jesus has incarnated, and allows him to enter it and inhabit it.

Part of what John means is that the Spirit affords the incisive spiritual insights into the accounts of what Jesus did and said, and the fruitful interconnections between them, that together provide the overall coherence, and striking power of the story of Jesus. It is the Spirit who knits together, in the mind and heart of the believer, the authentically Christian symbolic universe and metanarrative, of which the Fourth Gospel itself is a powerful example. John perceives that even what he regards as the central saving event—the cross itself—will for some seem little but an ugly execution, a scandal rather than a revelation (6.60-63). It is only through the illumination of the Spirit that it becomes both the very exaltation of Jesus and simultaneously the glorification of the Father, the epitome of his loving wisdom. For John it is the revelatory, wisdom-creating, Spirit which brings the disciple to grasp—or rather be grasped by—the saving nature and full depth of the unity of the Father and the Son.

To say that is of course not enough. It could suggest the Spirit’s role is primarily concept-construction. As Cor Bennema has shown, what John envisages is something which is indeed conceptual, but at the same time also deeply personal and liberatingly experiential. The Spirit is experienced as bringing communion with the Father, the abiding of the Father and the Son in love with each other, and the self-manifestation of Jesus to the disciple (1 John 4.16). John himself says that he has both the Father and the Son (1 John 1.10), as enabling the disciple (Jn 14.23), and as the means (4.21). Those who ‘confess the Son’ have the Father also (2 John 1.9). Reciprocally, obedient disciples abide in the Son and the Father (note the order in 1 John 2.24).
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These and other examples suggest that the revealer-Spirit confronts the disciple in a variety of ways with a divine presence which is profoundly shaped by the Christ-event, and by the unity of the Father and the Son which it expresses.

This spiritual 'confrontation' might encompass a wide variety of distinct expressions. At one extreme we might point to the kind of dramatic visionary phenomena depicted in the Apocalypse, including the opening prophetic addresses of the risen Lord to the seven churches and the throne vision of chs 4-5. These were perhaps not so commonplace. At the other extreme we might locate a multitude of experiences where individuals are challenged, moved, encouraged, receive a sense of forgiveness, or whatever, as the Spirit 'illuminates' a gospel story or teaching, bringing it 'alive' as a 'word' from the Father&Son addressing the individual and her situation. All this is encompassed in what John means by asserting that the Spirit will 'teach the disciples' all things, bring to 'remembrance' all that Jesus has said to them (14.26), lead them into all truth (16.13), and 'glorify' Jesus by taking what pertains to him and 'declaring' it to the believers (16.13-15), and so forth.

For the writers of the Gospel and Johannine epistles the Spirit was a robust and intrusive divine presence. The writer of 1 John has such confidence in the Spirit that he can assure his readers: 'you have no need that anyone should teach you; as his anointing teaches you about everything, and is true... just as it has taught you, abide in him' (2.27). And if anyone presses the question, 'How do we know he abides in us' the writer's answer is as simple as it is unequivocal: 'We know by the Spirit which he has given us' (3.24).

All this has consequences for the tightly related issues of worship and the basis of Christology. Let me offer some ill-disciplined and speculative comments.

In the Johannine context, worship of God is not something humans do in their own resources on the basis of logical deductions about the divine status of the object and the human duty of the subject. It would not have been a question of the community agreeing, for example, that now that they recognised Jesus as Logos and theos they should probably add some prayers to him too. For John, authentic worship is worship 'in Spirit and truth' (Jn 4.23)—that is, worship prompted and enabled by the Spirit and shaped by the truth he reveals. Given the profoundly 'trinitarian' shape of the theology and spirituality of the community, we may suppose its worship reflected this. It would be worship offered to the Father and to the Son, in and through the Holy Spirit.

It is unlikely that worship to the Spirit would have been encouraged, though occasions of it cannot be absolutely excluded. The Spirit was fundamentally understood as what Bishop Taylor nicely called the Go-Between God; the two-way personal organ of communication between the believers on earth and the Father&Son in heaven. The Spirit was conceived of rather as acting at the subjective pole of a believer's experience, but orientating him or her towards the Father and the Son, glorifying them, rather than himself.

If worship in the Johannine communities, as in the Pauline and Lucan churches, or more like enthusiastic and charismatic forms of Christianity in the early century, we might envisage the focus of the worship and praise depending on how charismata of the Spirit prophetic word from the risen Lord, a vision of
addressed to Jesus, including, no doubt, such charismatic acclamations as ‘Jesus is Lord’, and ‘Lord, come’, but by no means restricted to these. If charismatic teaching highlighted the Father’s love in sending the Son, corresponding worship, prayer and praise might be expected to focus more on the Father—and the latter would certainly be the case in connection with the reading of Scripture. If for John, ‘grace, mercy, and peace will be with us from God the Father and from Jesus Christ the Father’s Son’ (as 2 John 1.3 puts it), praise and thanksgiving would naturally be offered to both. The overall shape of the community’s worship would reflect (and so sustain) its conviction that the community was one of communion with the Father and the Son.

We need not doubt that Christological polemics with non-believing Judaism and with schismatic Christians highlighted the Christocentric focus in the worship of the Johannine communities. But it is quite a different matter to suggest that there was an earlier form of Johannine worship that was addressed exclusively to the Father alone (in the name of Jesus) rather than to the Father and to the Son. To get back to such a position, one would need to tear out the heart of John’s ‘trinitarian’ pneumatology. And while attempts have been made to bracket out the Paraclete sayings, they have proved less than convincing.

**D: On the Relation of Logos/Theos to Spirit-Christology in John.**

Finally, within this Johannine section we may turn to the basis of Johannine Christology.

Logos Christology is important to John, but we may question whether it is central in the sense of being generative. Walter Kasper has argued that it is John’s Spirit-Christology which more fundamentally motivates his Christo-theology, including the Logos theology. There is reason to take this seriously. Giving Logos theology primary place has tended to leave interpreters wondering why the Johannine Jesus needs the Spirit at all. The incandescent Christ glows by virtue of his hypostatic union. And, as we have pointed out, it then becomes unclear why and how John adopted such a Christological foundation. Walter Kasper argues per contra that it is actually the Spirit-Christology that explains Jesus’ identification with the Logos. More precisely, he argues that Jesus can only ‘become’ (to the world) the Logos incarnate because he is given the Spirit without measure, and he then gives the Spirit as his own Spirit. Important as the prologue of John is and as important as Thomas’ climactic confession of Jesus as Lord and God is, you could remove these from the pages of the Fourth Gospel without significantly changing its essential divine Christology. The prologue and Thomas’s confession most distinctly express that Christology, but it is driven from elsewhere—it is driven by the Church’s multifaceted experience of the Spirit as simultaneously the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ. Not merely the Father’s empowering presence, but very much that of Christ as well. This kind of trinitarian and Christocentric pneumatology is not, however, a Johannine distinctive. It is neither the product of polemics, far less the result of an alleged adoption of Gentile self-understanding. It is clearly there in Luke and Paul as well, and it is to these which we now turn, perforce briefly.


As I have presented most of the detailed argument elsewhere I can confine this sketch to summary statements of conclusions, and amplification of areas not previously covered. For Luke, as for John, the uniqueness of Jesus’ ministry is a result of the Spirit with him.
(Lk 1.35; 4.18-21; Acts 10.38). But the crowning point of Luke's Christology comes through post-resurrection exaltation to the right hand of God (in accordance with Ps 110.1) and the pouring out of the gift of God's Holy Spirit Acts 2.33-36). The Pentecost account—in the co-text of Acts—represents 'trinitarian' pneumatology, including divine Christology, in most of its major traits. In this respect I make 7 brief observations:

(1) Professor Bauckham has made a strong case that the position at God's right hand in NT uses of Ps 110.1 refers to the divine throne itself, not to merely to some more distant seat of honour, and that only figures included within the self-identity of God could take their place there.\(^{15}\)

(2) The Holy Spirit given thence is emphatically the divine Spirit—Luke has Peter deliberately emphasise that it was God who said 'I will pour out my Spirit (as the Spirit of prophecy) ... on my servants' (2.17). Yet Peter goes on to assert that Jesus had received this Spirit as gift and has now himself 'poured out' the startling Pentecostal prophetic charismata (2.33). These activities of Christ through the Spirit are identified (at 2.33, 36) as the beginning of his messianic rule promised in Lk 1.33-34). They mark the beginning of the fulfilment of the Baptist's promise that the coming one would 'baptize' Israel with Holy Spirit and fire (Lk 3.16; Acts 1.5; 11.16). And they undergird Jesus' own claim that he will himself send the promise of the Father, the power from on high (Lk 24.49). In the light of this Jesus is identified as one with Yahweh as the 'Lord' (2.36) upon whose name one is to call for salvation, and in whose name one is baptised (2.38-40).

(3) If Jesus is hereby identified in some sense as 'Lord of the Spirit' it must be observed that there is no consequent distancing of the Spirit from God. The Holy Spirit remains the Spirit of the Lord God (5.9; 8.39); God is the ultimate source/giver of the Spirit (5.32; 15.8); to lie to the Spirit is to lie to God (5.3-9); to be anointed with the Spirit is for God to be with one (10.38), etc.

(4) Nor does Jesus' 'co-lordship' of the Spirit with the Father lead to any attempt to make the Spirit 'impersonal' (contra Jervell). Indeed a wider range of verbs of personal action are collocated with the Spirit than anywhere else in the New Testament. And the very lexemes Bultmann cited as pointing to an impersonal, dynamistic, concept of the Spirit—e.g. 'pour out', 'fill with', etc., are actually elsewhere used in strongly 'personal' contexts. With respect to 'pouring out' we might compare Yahweh's handling of Dame Wisdom in Sirach 1.9, 'The Lord himself created wisdom; he saw her and apportioned her, he poured her out upon all his works. She dwells with all flesh according to his gift, and he supplied her to those that love her'. That fill with/full of language, collocated with HS, need not imply lack of personhood, as perhaps most dramatically instanced in Shepherd of Hermas, Mandate II, 15: 'the angel of the prophetic Spirit (προφητικός πνεῦμα)the man, speaking to the multitude, according to the Lord's will. For the language of people
being filled by divine persons, or their influence, see e.g. the more contemporary Col 1.19; 2.9 and Eph 1.23; 3.19, etc.

(5) Taking the above points together, we appear to have a similar picture to that in John. The Spirit is the self-revealing personal and empowering presence of God, but Jesus' exaltation reception of the Spirit from the Father, and his consequent 'lordship' of the Spirit, implies a distinct personhood in the Spirit, which can no longer be that of the Father.

(6) As in John, too, the Spirit has now become not merely the Spirit of the Lord God, but also the Spirit of Jesus—a point confirmed by exactly that usage as a synonym for the Holy Spirit at Acts 16.6-7. To speak of 'the Spirit of Jesus' cannot simply mean 'God at work in a way made possible by Jesus'—for the Spirit here is the revelatory Spirit of prophecy, and from Luke's perspective had always been so. What is meant, rather, is that Jesus is the lord of the messianic mission, which he prosecutes through the Spirit, as 'lord of the Spirit'. He does so by granting the charismata normally associated with the Spirit of prophecy, namely revelation, wisdom and inspired speech. Typical here, is the example of Stephen. According to 6.10 his hearers and opponents cannot resist the wisdom and the Spirit with which he speaks. But the careful reader knows this redactionally combines the promise of the Spirit's aid in Luke 12.10 and Jesus' words in 21.15: 'I will give you a mouth and wisdom which none of your adversaries will be able to withstand or contradict'. In short, Stephen is an example of Jesus acting through the wisdom-giving Spirit of prophecy. For Luke, as for John, all this means Christ is an active presence in the Church. It is he who is baptising the church with Holy Spirit, in accordance with the Baptist's promise.

(7) The extent which the Spirit affords encounter with and presence of Jesus in the church is well illustrated in Acts. Stephen, full of the Spirit sees the glory of God, and Jesus, as the Son of Man, standing at the right hand (7.55). His declaration of this precipitates his ensuing execution. Near to expiry, his prayer is not the exclusively monotheistic 'Father, into your hands I commit my spirit', but 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit' followed by a prayer to Jesus as Lord for the forgiveness of his executioners (7.59-60). The vision of Ananias in Acts 9.10-15 is another case in point, as are those to Paul in Corinth (18.9-10) and Jerusalem (22.17-21). In each case the co-text clarifies that the 'Lord' who appears is Jesus, directing the mission that witnesses to him, and bringing comfort and encouragement. As O'Toole and Buckwalter have argued, Acts does not provide an absentee Christology; but a Christology of divine omnipresence through the Spirit, well captured by the words of the risen Lord to Paul in Acts 18.10: 'I am with you...'.

To Conclude: Acts 2 and beyond depicts the same kind of 'trinitarian' pneumatology that we observed in John. The Son, subordinate to the Father, gives the Spirit of God as uniquely identified with God as 'Lord of
all' (10.36). The Spirit brings the self-revealing empowering presence of the Father and the Son, and evokes prayer and worship usually addressed to God the Father, but also to the Son. The direct evidence of the latter is slim, but due importance should be accorded to Stephen’s prayer, given the solemnity and finality of the moment. A martyr’s last words would be taken as exemplary. In addition, it should be noted that in Acts Christians are referred to, both by believers and by Jewish opponents, as ‘those who call on the name of Jesus’ (9.14; 21), which strongly suggests the regular worshiping invocation of the type allowed exclusively to God in the Old Testament and IT Judaism. Even if the term applied primarily to baptismal epiclesis (cf.22.16; 2.21,38), and there is no reason to believe it was, it would still be a highly significant act of worship. For Luke, it would constitute a plea to ‘the Lord’ for salvation, rooted in the programmatic Joel passage (Joel 2:32; Acts 2.21, 38). Within the context of Peter’s Pentecost speech, calling on the name the Lord Jesus in baptism (2.38) functions as calling on the name of Yahweh for eschatological salvation (2.21).17

V. ‘TRINITARIAN’ PNEUMATOLOGY IN PAUL? A SKETCH.

Paul offers the same kind of trinitarian pneumatology. Here my first two major points largely draw on the results of my student Mehrdad Fatehi’s work, The Spirit’s Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul.18

(1) The Spirit is inalienably the Spirit of God—not merely by name,19 but by nature. God’s Spirit is his own personal indwelling of his eschatological temple, the people of God (1 Cor 3.16, etc.). Remarkably, in 1 Cor 2.10-12, Paul compares the relation of the Spirit to God with how a person’s spirit relates to himself or herself, i.e. as the self-aware, self-scrutinising ego that can alone intimately search and reveal one’s deepest being. This might almost suggest that ‘Spirit’ is a way of speaking not merely of the extension of God’s vitality and personality, but of the very centre of the Father’s own personhood—as in 2 Baruch 75.

(2) In view of what we have just said, it is all the more surprising that Paul can also speak of the Spirit as the ‘Spirit of (Jesus) Christ’, and the ‘Spirit of God’s Son’ (Rom 8.9; Phil 1.19; Gal 4.6). Fatehi has shown we misunderstand these expressions entirely if we restrict them to mean ‘God, as Spirit, at work in a way made possible by Christ’ or ‘the Spirit recapitulating the sonship of Jesus in us’, or the like. The Pauline concept certainly includes such ideas, but it moves beyond them to express Christ’s own lordship of the Spirit, and the Spirit as the executive power of the risen Christ.

It is true, as Professor Dunn observes, that (unlike Luke and John) Paul does not say Spirit—such things are said only of God.20 It is however (and in any case both John and Luke) ‘the Spirit’ of the Spirit; the Son only gives the Spirit that in all other respects the Spirit is portrayed as the executive power of the risen Christ. This may be illustrated time and again, but let us briefly mention some obvious examples.
(a) In Romans 15.18-19, Paul portrays his whole ministry as something the exalted Christ (not the Father) has wrought through him, and specifically by the power of the Holy Spirit. Similarly, in 1 Cor 12.7-10 charismata of the Spirit are identified simultaneously as ‘workings’ of God and ‘services or ministries’ granted by the Lord (a point emphasised even more directly in Eph 4.7-11). Once again, in 2 Cor 3.3, and echoing the new-covenant of Jer 31 and Ezek 36, the Corinthian church is described as a letter from Christ, written by the Spirit of God—not on tablets of stone but on human hearts. We might rather have expected ‘God’ to be named the author of such Spirit-written letters. And the church is transformed from one degree of glory to another by the Spirit, as it gazes at the glory of the Lord in Christ (3.17-18). Similarly, in Rom 1.3-4, the phrase ‘according to the Spirit of holiness’ most probably characterises the Spirit as the executive power of Jesus, post-resurrection sonship and of the activities that flow from it.

(b) If we return for a moment to 1 Cor 2.11-16, we have already noted how the Spirit is portrayed as the discerning and self-revealing centre of God’s personhood. In v.16, however, Paul effectively equates this with the unsearchable ‘mind of the Lord’, whom no man can instruct (quoting Isa 40.13), and remarkably goes on to assert, ‘but we have the mind of Christ’. In short, by the Spirit the spiritual man does know the mind of God, and that is ‘the mind of Christ’. The Spirit searches and reveals the deep things of the Father and the Son.

(c) A number of passages in Paul link 3 Old Testament covenantal themes: those of God’s people belonging to him, his dwelling in/amongst his people, and the Spirit’s mediation of this indwelling, see e.g. 1 Cor 3.16; 2 Cor 6.16, Eph 2.11-22, etc. These build largely on such texts as Lev 26.11-12, Jer 31 and Ezek 36-37. Rom 8.9-11, develops the same three themes, but exchanges Christ for God, and uses ‘Spirit of Christ’ for, and in direct parallel to, ‘Spirit of God’.

(d) In Gal 4.6, the Spirit is called ‘the Spirit of God’s Son’, because the passage (3.23-4.7) is part of Paul’s elucidation of the probatio, especially of Gal 2.19-20, with its central claims that ‘it is not I who live, but Christ who lives in me’, and ‘the life I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God who loved me’. The Spirit lies at the heart of the rich Christ-mysticism that pervades Paul (see e.g. 2 Cor 4-5; Phil 1.21; 3.10, etc.).

In sum, Jesus relates to the Spirit in much the same way that Yahweh relates to Spirit in the Old Testament literature. And indeed the genitive in the expression ‘Spirit of Christ’ Gal 4.6 and Phil 1.19, are most probably modelled on the Old Testament expressions ‘Spirit of God’ and ‘Spirit of the Lord’. It indwells his people, brings them new covenant
‘life’, addresses them in prophetic oracles (e.g. 2 Cor 12.9), acts amongst them and through them—and does all this by the Holy Spirit, in the same way as can be said of God himself.

(3) How can Paul make such a claim—especially in the light of 1 Cor 2.10-16—without making Christ’s lordship through the Spirit sound too much like a bizarre and blasphemous ‘lordship’ over the interiority and personhood of the Father? How can the Father’s Spirit simultaneously be the Son’s self-revealing personal presence and executive power?

The conception of the precise relationship of the one God to the Spirit he sends had been hazy in the Old Testament and ITP literature, but the relationship of Christ to the Spirit would have made it difficult for Paul to think in terms of synechdoche. The answer, as with John and Luke, appears to be that he understands all the personal language used of the Spirit to mean the Spirit had some kind of distinct personhood in union with Christ and the Father, and ‘sent’ jointly by them (the parallel between the sending of the Son and the sending of the Spirit of the Son, in Gal 4.4-6, might readily suggest such).

Paul can thus even come to portray some kind of dialogical relationship between God and the Spirit in Rom 8. In a move that partially parallels 1 Cor 2, Paul can say the Spirit intercedes to God through the believer, when she herself has come to the end of speech, and that God who searches the believer’s heart understands the intercession, because God knows the ‘mind of the Spirit’ (Rom 8.26-27). The complementarity is noted: on the one hand the Spirit searches the mind of God and of Christ and reveals the deep things of God to believers; on the other, God knows the mind of the Spirit as he intercedes from the groaning depths of believers. Here we seem to have at least interesting evidence that Paul pneumatology had developed in a trinitarian direction.

(4) We may now briefly comment on the development of divine Christology and worship of Jesus in Paul and the pauline churches. In an intriguing section on 1 Cor 15.45, Professor Dunn argues that Paul all but fully identifies Christ with the Spirit when he speaks of Jesus as a pneuma zōopoion. He glosses the apparent theological significance of the passage as follows: ‘Christ is experienced in and through, even as the life-giving Spirit’. But, surprisingly, Dunn appears to treat this rather as an uncharacteristic break from the Pauline christological ‘reserve’; one parallel to Rom 9.5, if the latter passage should be read to bless Christ as ‘God over all’. Both passages, he appears to suggest, should be regarded as rather marginal to Paul’s thinking; perhaps more expressions of his momentary lack of thought.

With Fee, I would question the particular exegesis of pneuma zōopoion. I do not think it is a direct reference to the Holy Spirit, though I would heartily agree that were one to pose to Paul the question how Jesus can be life-giving spirit (with a small ‘s’), he would undoubtedly answer through the Holy Spirit, even if Dunn’s interpretation of 1 Cor 15.45 is correct, I submit it might be misleading to suggest the latter with which he appears to gloss it is ‘uncharacteristic’, or that we should treat it with reserve. As Fatehi has shown, what Dunn attributes to 1 Cor 15.45 is
in fact thoroughly 'typical' of Paul (except, perhaps, in the extent of the 'identification' implied, and the mode of expressing it).

Dunn goes on to suggest that the sort of experience of Christ through the Spirit implicit in his understanding of 1 Cor 15.45 may ultimately have led to divine Christology. Or, more precisely, early Christian experience of the Spirit leading them on the one hand to cry 'Abba, Father!' (Rom 8.15) and on the other to proclaim Jesus is Lord! (1 Cor 12.3), may have 'found its most lasting expression in a trinitarian understanding of God' (264). The implication is that Paul's own 'reserve' did not allow him to take this (rash?) step himself. But we may doubt this.

As we have just seen in our discussion of his pneumatology, Paul, as easily as the writer of 1 John, could have written 'our communion is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ'—and both could have added 'through the Spirit'. As is well known, the salutatory prayer-blessings which open most of Paul's letters bid grace and peace on the readers from God and from the Lord Jesus. More remarkably, some six of the closing benedictions single Jesus out as the source of grace, and five of them lack any corresponding mention of God (Gal 6.18; 1 Thess 5.28; 1 Cor 16.23; Phil 4.23; Philem 1.25 and cf. Rom 16.20). The five could almost seem blatant lèse majesté. Again, the diadic nature of the Christian experience of God and Christ through the Spirit is neatly represented in the prayer of 1 Thess 3.11-13.24 A seventh closing benediction is triadic, and may perhaps best serve as an epigram summing up Pauline spirituality: 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship in the Holy Spirit be with you all' (2 Cor 13.13). This pattern of prayer only underscores what Dunn calls the 'double relationship'—to God as Father and Jesus as Lord—which characterised the church's experience of the Spirit. But the pattern also sets the essentially 'trinitarian' relationship firmly within Paul's own theological horizon.

Because the Spirit is experienced as the active presence of Christ, it is also natural for Paul to pray to Christ, both individually (as at 2 Cor 12.8-10) and in the corporate worship of the church. The maranatha invocation of 1 Cor 16.22 is but one expression of this; we have also noted the grace salutations and benedictions which would be read within the context of worship, and provide a model for prayer there. Paul can even characterise Christian communities as 'those who call on the name of the Lord Jesus' (1 Cor 1.2; cf Rom 10.12-13), which seems to imply cultic veneration of Christ was typical.

That Paul also regularly expressed a more hierarchical model of prayer and thanksgiving to the Father, in and though Jesus, or in his name (cf. Rom 16.25-27; Col 3.16-17, etc), need not surprise us. It accords with his belief that God, who sent both Son and Spirit, is the ultimate source of salvation. But it does not necessarily express any reservation about whether thanksgiving and adoration should be offered to the Son.25 Phil 2.11 envisages an eschatological and universal worship of Jesus as 'the Lord' in accordance with the vigorously monotheistic Isa 45.23; yet I believe he thought this would only become appropriate at the End, and should not be anticipated in the church. Against any such a reservation, the matching joyful acclamation 'Jesus is Lord' that Paul anticipates in the congregational worship at Corinth (1 Cor 12.3). His readers, whether Jew or Gentile believers, could barely take these as other than a declaration...
tion of some kind of divine status for Jesus, yet Paul offers no hints that he fears such an understanding!

It comes then as no surprise that Ephesians 5.19-20 specifically includes 'singing and making melody to the Lord' as part and parcel of worship offered 'in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ 'to God the Father'. If it be insisted that this is the voice of a disciple rather than of Paul himself, I can only suggest that in that case he saw Paul's logic more clearly than Paul himself. It may be noted that in 1 Cor 12.3 the worship of Christ is portrayed as the direct inspiration of the Spirit and in Eph 5.19-20 as an expression of being 'filled with the Spirit' (5.18). It would seem, then, that experience of the Spirit drives the worship of Jesus at every level—in understanding who he is (he is 'Lord of the Spirit'), in bringing his presence and activity which evoke the response of prayer and worship, and in direct inspiration of that worship.

Professor Dunn thinks that Paul suffered a Christological 'reserve' that prevented him from taking the final step towards the kind of trinitarian pneumatology that later disciples embraced. I think he has rested his case a little too much on exquisite distinctions of the sort of 'worship' that might be offered to God and to Christ, and on Paul's failure explicitly to call Jesus theos, Rom 9.5 being a possible aberration. While I admire the distinctions, I am not sure they face the central question. They may point to a quite different type of trinitarian theology from that which was developed by the great Councils, but still one worthy of the name. Let me put it this way. Had Paul stood up at the various trials in Acts 22 onwards, and he admitted the sort teaching we have been looking at, the court would have had little doubt he was saying there are not merely two, but even probably three, powers in heaven. They would also undoubtedly have concluded that in the usual sense of the word, Paul clearly 'worshipped' the Father and the Son as one God-and-Lord, whatever over-subtle caveats he himself may have protested. So might the apostle's crown of martyrdom have been much more speedily achieved. It certainly would if he had a faced a trial of post-Jamnia Jewish leaders, but that is a significantly different question.

CONCLUSION

Our three major witnesses agree that the Spirit belongs within the self-identity of God. But Christ's exaltation as Lord of the Spirit both includes him within that self-identity, and distinguishes the Spirit from the Father more sharply than had hitherto been attempted. As a result, the traditional 'personal' features of the Spirit came increasingly to be seen as belonging to the Spirit 'himself'—if I can put it that way—rather than as a mere extension of the personality of the Father. This, when combined with the strong insistence (of various kinds) on the relational unity of Father, Son and Spirit, leads to an essentially trinitarian type of theology. But I have also argued that the experience of Christ as Lord of the Spirit, and of the Spirit's glorification of Jesus, may help us explain the rapid development of the worship of Jesus. The exaltation gift of the Spirit provides grounds for belief that Jesus is one with God; experiences of God and Christ and even direct inspiration of such worship.
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22. While Dunn affirms just such of Rom 9.5, he is not as explicit as I have suggested in respect of 1 Cor 15.45.

24. ‘Now may our God and Father himself, and our Lord Jesus, direct our way to you; [12] and may the Lord make you increase and abound in love to one another...[13] so that he may establish your hearts unblamable in holiness before our God and Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus...’.
