

Biblische Zeitschrift

herausgegeben von

Dr. Erich Zenger

Professor der alttestamentlichen Exegese
an der Universität Münster

Dr. Hans-Josef Klauck

Professor der neutestamentlichen Exegese
an der Universität München

Neue Folge

1999

Jahrgang 43 — Heft 2

INHALT

- Rabens*, Volker: The Development of Pauline Pneumatology 161
Otto, Eckart: Die besiegten Sieger 180

KLEINERE BEITRÄGE

- Hoppe*, Rudolf: Aufgabenstellung und Konzeption einer
„Einleitung in das Neue Testament“ 204
Rabner, Johanna: Mißverstehen um zu verstehen 212
Weiser, Wolfram: Durch Grünspan verdorbenes Edelmetall? 220
Utzuschneider, Helmut: Text – Leser – Autor 224
Person, Raymond F.: A Reassessment of Wiederaufnahme from the
Perspective of Conversation Analysis 239

UMSCHAU UND KRITIK

- Neutestamentliche Rezensionen 249
Alttestamentliche Rezensionen 288
Bericht 317
Mitteilung 320

FERDINAND SCHÖNINGH PADERBORN

ISSN 000-2014

The Development of Pauline Pneumatology

A Response to F.W. Horn

By *Volker Rabens*, London/Tübingen

Paul significantly developed his concept of the Holy Spirit over the years of his ministry. This conclusion is reached by a major monograph in the area of Pauline studies that was published in 1992, namely, Friedrich Wilhelm Horn's revised *Habilitationsschrift* from Göttingen University, *Das Angeld des Geistes. Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie* (FRLANT 154). This monograph is, together with Gordon Fee's monumental work *God's Empowering Presence*¹, the most comprehensive treatment of Pauline pneumatology. Since Horn's work is bound to become a classic in this field, I would like to make his findings more easily accessible as well as offer an extensive evaluation of his thesis. Moreover, my critique will challenge past NT-scholarship in general, because its method for establishing Judaism's and Paul's concept of the nature of the Spirit disregards important insights from the study of linguistics.

With his treatise Horn primarily intends to provide modern academic readership with an overview of Pauline pneumatology in its totality. Nevertheless, Horn has also taken up the suggestion of his supervisor, Professor Georg Strecker, that he should establish specifically the relationship between Spirit as power (or function) and Spirit as substance of the new existence within Paul's pneumatology. Horn's dissertation is argued with great erudition in lively interaction with the scholars before him (unfortunately with some neglect of Anglo-American scholarship, though). It provides significant contributions to the study of the Spirit in Paul. Firstly, Horn sheds new light on the pneumatology of Judaism and Hellenism as well as on that of the pre-Pauline church. Secondly, his careful investigation of Paul's individual pneumatological statements in their respective contexts enables Horn to arrive at an innovative and detailed developmental model of Pauline pneumatology. Thirdly, on the basis of his chronological analysis of the Pauline Epistles Horn challenges previous scholars who had assumed within Paul a juxtaposition

¹ *God's Empowering Presence. The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*, Peabody 1994.

of two different lines of thought respecting the nature of the Spirit (function or substance). And, finally, Horn elucidates how these two notions could be interconnected in Paul's eschatological motif of the Spirit as a 'down payment'.

In order to understand how Horn reaches these results I will outline in the first part of this article the main sections of Horn's work, namely, 1) the presuppositions, 2) the development, and 3) the results of Pauline pneumatology. In the second part I will try to evaluate the major components of Horn's thesis.

PART I

Professor Horn introduces his thesis with a number of methodological considerations. Since the impact of Hermann Gunkel's *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*² in 1888 is still evident in modern studies of Pauline pneumatology, Horn presents his methodological assumptions mainly in interaction with this important monograph.

In contrast to idealistic (Baur) and rationalistic (Ritschl, Wendt) exegetical approaches to NT pneumatology, Gunkel emphasizes that the study of πνεῦμα has to begin by investigating the *effects* of the Spirit, rather than start with the teaching as 'biblical-theological' scholarship did. For Gunkel, the investigation of the pneumatic's experience of the Spirit will not produce trustworthy results unless the interpreter first puts herself in a position to share the feelings of the pneumatic³.

Horn disagrees fundamentally with Gunkel's approach. (a) Only a few of the NT texts that describe effects or experiences of the Spirit can be taken as first hand records. Consequently, truly 'living the pneumatic's inner states after him'⁴ is not possible. (b) Gunkel's imperative that one must first put oneself in a position to share the feeling of the pneumatic leaves the grounds of controllable exegesis because of the subjectivity of the individual's experiences. (c) Gunkel sharply separates pneumatic experiences from the teaching about the Spirit. Such a contrast is not justifiable because of the existing interdependence of experience and interpretation.

Contrary to Gunkel and scholarship after him, Horn wants to establish on the basis of textual analysis of the early Christian – especially Pauline – writings that the claim of possessing the Spirit is primarily a *theoretical conclusion* of early Christian theology resulting from the interdependence of perception and interpretation (pp. 13–24).

² (translated from the German by R.A. Harrisville and P.A. Quanbeck), Philadelphia 1979.

³ Influence (n. 2) 9, 5, 3.

⁴ Influence (n. 2) 3.

I. 1. *The Presuppositions of Pauline Pneumatology*

In order to grasp by which forces this interdependence of perception and interpretation was shaped, it is important first of all to look at the seedbed of early Christianity, namely the Judaism of the time. After that, Horn wants to investigate the horizon of early Christian pneumatology by scrutinising the pre-Pauline formulas, motifs and traditions in their relation to the historical origins of early Christianity.

Horn suggests that statements of contemporary Judaism show the Spirit of God in Palestinian Judaism to have been primarily conceived as a power of end-time conduct, whereas Hellenistic Judaism understood the Spirit primarily as ‚the substance of the new being‘⁵. Horn observes that the study of *Palestinian Judaism* suggests that early Christian pneumatology developed against the backdrop of the Jewish ‚doctrine of the Spirit-less era‘ which expected the power of the Spirit, presently withdrawn, to return only in the end times⁶. However, Horn is also aware of that strand of NT-scholarship that maintains (on the grounds of various accounts of prophetic-charismatic incidents such as SOR 30; BB 12) that early Christian pneumatology did not merely tie itself to the OT prophetic tradition but was also sustained by contemporary pneumatic movements. While this discrepancy seems to point towards a contradiction within (ancient) literature, Horn wants to argue that the theological *theory* of the disappearance of the Spirit since the completion of the (inspired) canon by the last prophets was so strongly adhered to that the reality of pneumatic-charismatic incidents could not shake its validity (pp. 26–36).

In contrast to this future expectation of the Spirit, *Hellenistic Judaism* postulated that people can actually participate now in the divine Spirit, in the *pneuma*-sphere of the world above. The transition into this sphere is achieved, for example, through ecstasy (Philo, Her 259–65) or conversion (e.g. in JosAs, immortality is transmitted sacramentally as substance [‚sakramental-substanzhaft‘] by means of ritual elements [8,5.9; 15,5; 16,16; 19,5; 21,13f]) (pp. 40–48).

Horn now asks how these two different lines of pneumatological statements within Judaism were received in the NT. He is eager to highlight the fact that one cannot divide early Christianity into two groups that would correspond with these two different pre-Christian strands (one group understanding the Spirit predominantly as a power, the other one understanding it predominantly as a substance) (pp. 54–59). This is clear, for example, from the variety of concepts of

⁵ P. 25. Horn is careful to point out, however, that both notions – i.e. Spirit as function and Spirit as substance – were present in Palestinian as well as in Hellenistic Judaism. For instance, 1QS 4,2–6.9–11 draws out the functional aspect of the Spirit as ethical power by which believers are charged to live. But at the same time the Qumran community believed in the bestowal of a new existence/participation in the heavenly world (e.g. 1QH 11,3–14) and in the Spirit as a substance (1QH 7,6f; 12,11–13; 17,26; 1QS 3,3–9) (54–59; cf. 43–45). Horn defines his locution ‚the Spirit as the substance of the new being‘ more closely only in the context of his discussion of 1 Cor: ‚Paul...presupposes that the church is familiar with the fact that the Spirit is comparable to a substance or fluid which has been incorporated sacramentally into the believer; it has thus become the new substance of his existence.‘ (175; cf. 400).

⁶ See, e.g., tSot 13,2–4; syrBar 85,3; Mk 1,8//; Jn 7,39; 20,22; Acts 19,2; 2 Cor 3,16–18; Gal 3,14.

the Spirit that we can find in Paul's letters: According to Horn, (a) a *functional* concept of the Spirit is employed by Paul where the Spirit is seen as the cause of a specific expression or action of the believer (Gal 5,22; 1 Cor 12,11; 14,2; 1 Thess 1,5f; etc.).⁷ (b) The Spirit is understood as a *substance* when the Spirit takes up residence within the believer as ‚forma substantialis‘ (1 Cor 3,16; 6,19; Rom 8,9; 1 Thess 4,8). (c) A *material* („stofflich“) concept of the Spirit is presupposed where ‚the Spirit, through the above mentioned qualification as substance [„substanzhafte Bestimmung“], enters into such close junction with matter that the Spirit becomes bound to it‘, as in the sacraments (1 Cor 10,4; 12,13; etc.), amalgamation with fire (Acts 2,3) and light (1 Cor 15,43; 2 Cor 3,8) or connection with water (Rom 5,5; 2 Cor 1,21f). (d) The Spirit is comprehended as a *hypostasis* where Paul assigns to it/him(?) a specific function that portrays the Spirit as God's partner („Gott gegenüberstehend“) or as mediator between God and the believer (Rom 5,5; 8,26f)⁸.

Before Horn begins his actual analysis of Paul's letters in their chronological order, however, he still wants to investigate the early Christian claim of possessing the Spirit in its relation to the historical events at the dawn of Christianity. The early church's belief they had received the Spirit is best reflected in the pre-Pauline formulas („God has given us the Spirit“ [Acts 5,32; 15,8; Rom 5,5; 11,8; 2 Cor 1,22; 5,5; 1 Thess 4,8; etc.]; „You have received the Spirit“ [Acts 2,33.38; 10,47; Rom 8,15; etc.]) and motifs (namely the indwelling motif and the temple motif) (pp. 61–75). The concise, thetic form of the formulas suggests as a *Sitz im Leben* the proclamation of the early (Hellenistic Jewish-Christian) church. Horn contends that ‚it requires no explanation that these are much more likely the „expression of a religious theory“ and thus a „religious postulation“ than that they would represent a direct reflex to pneumatic experiences⁹. Consequently, Horn understands the different accounts of the timing of the initial outpouring of the Spirit (Mk: pre-Easter; Jn: at Easter; Lk: post-Easter) to be later creations of the church, dominated by ecclesiological and christological interests. Horn is sure that the early church did arrive at the formulaic assertion that they have the Spirit neither on the basis of mass ecstasy (Acts 2), visions of the resurrected Jesus in connection with the Spirit, the teaching of Jesus, traditions about the Spirit-empowerment of Jesus, nor on the basis of traditions about baptism as transferral of the Spirit (pp. 89f). But, one may now want to ask, how did the early church arrive at this assertion? What was the basis of their claim to possess the Spirit? Or, to phrase it in Horn's words, what was the ‚horizon of early Christian pneumatology‘?

Horn answers by highlighting the fact that the basic Christian formula communicating the resurrection of Jesus was extended by the early church on the basis of the second of the *Eight Benedictions* and a few other texts of the Old Testament and of Intertestamental Literature to include the Spirit as the cause of Christ's resurrection (as, e.g., in Rom 8,11; 1 Cor 6,14). The resurrection of the

⁷ For Horn, this is to be distinguished from those statements where the Spirit as *power* of God achieves something functionally for the believer, like justification (1 Cor 6,11; Gal 4,6; etc.).

⁸ Horn further mentions (e) a *normative* and (f) an *anthropological* concept of the S/spirit (60), but these receive less attention in his specific inquiry into the nature of the Spirit according to Paul.

⁹ P. 64 n. 7, building on Bousset and Bultmann.

dead was interpreted as a sign of the return of the Spirit. Consequently, the kerygma of Christ's resurrection was the decisive foundation for the belief in the presence of the Spirit and the driving force behind the eschatological awareness of the early Christians. Horn concludes that it was precisely this eschatological awareness of the disciples which led them to apply the Spirit-endowment of Christ to themselves with the statement 'God has given us the Spirit', thus connecting the expected end-time endowment of the Messiah with the endowment of the elect expected in the context of the 'doctrine of the Spirit-less era' (pp. 90–115).

How would this starting-point be developed in the course of Paul's writing about the Spirit?

I. 2. The Development of Pauline Pneumatology

According to Horn, the development of Pauline pneumatology is divided into three epochs: 1) early Pauline proclamation, 2) dispute with pneumatic enthusiasm, 3) dispute with the Jewish-Christian counter-mission. The outcome of Pauline pneumatology (which one could probably call the fourth stage of Horn's developmental model) was gained on the basis of these phases, on the basis of the early Christian understanding of the Spirit with which Paul became acquainted in the churches prior to and immediately following his conversion, and on the basis of his own traditional views as a Hellenistic Jew. All other statements that do not have religion-historical parallels in Hellenistic Judaism (e.g. the πνεῦμα–σάρξ antithesis) took shape in the disputes mentioned above (p. 116).

2.1. The Pneumatology of the Early Pauline Proclamation

Paul's first interpretation of the gift of the Spirit evolved in the period between his conversion and his first mission. Early Pauline theology – as it is manifested in 1 Thess, Paul's earliest epistle – is inspired by the expectancy of the imminent parousia (pp. 119, 429). Horn maintains that the pneumatological statements of the letter present a unified picture in that the Spirit is understood as the functional enabling for eschatological conduct *ad interim*: empowering preaching (1,5), producing joy in affliction (1,6), giving power to realize the new standing ἐν ἁγιασμῷ (4,7f)¹⁰, and enabling prophecy which reveals the will of God (5,19f) (pp. 131–33). Already at this early stage Paul transcends the view that the Spirit is merely an occasional empowering. As the statements of indwelling (*Einwohnungsaussagen*) (1 Thess 4,8; 1 Cor 3,16; 6,19) demonstrate, he considers the Spirit to be a permanent indwelling. Nevertheless, one cannot deduce from 1 Thess that the Spirit was thought of as *stofflich* (p. 429), as the epistle is independent of traditions such as 1 Cor 6,11 and 10,4 in which the Spirit is

¹⁰ Pp. 125, 133; Horn here stands in tension with himself when he later argues that in Paul's view the Spirit's enabling is limited to love of one's neighbour and brother and does not encompass the whole ethical life of the believer (*Wandel im Geist. Zur pneumatologischen Begründung der Ethik bei Paulus*, in: *KuD* 38 [1992] 149–70).

sacramentally transferred through water or bread and wine (pp. 142–46, 151). The double orientation of the early Pauline theology respecting the functional relation of the Spirit to preaching and prophecy on the one hand (Acts 8,40; 21,8f; 1 Thess 1,5; 5,19), and sanctification on the other (1 Cor 1,30; 3,16; 6,11.19), however, remains constitutive of Paul's theology in his disputes with pneumatic enthusiasm (in 1 Cor) and with the Jewish-Christian countermission (in 2 Cor, Gal, etc.) (pp. 156f).

2.2. *The Dispute with Pneumatic Enthusiasm*

The longest section of Horn's book is devoted to an analysis of Corinthian and Pauline pneumatology in 1 Cor (140 pages as opposed to less than 20 pages on Rom!)¹¹. Horn elucidates that in the church at Corinth the functional aspect of the Holy Spirit as end-time power had been superseded by the idea of present participation in the heavenly sphere of πνεῦμα, in which πνεῦμα constitutes the substance of the new existence and enables a behaviour which reckons itself to be free from the sphere of σάρξ. This conception of the Spirit and its influence on the church in their magical understanding and practice of baptism, *glossolalia* and their self-portrayal as πνευματικοί, Horn calls 'pneumatic enthusiasm' (pp. 160f, 175–79, 219).

In reaction to pneumatic enthusiasm, Paul is forced to state his pneumatology more precisely. Horn recognizes that, while Paul does develop new arguments, his essential pneumatology is still the same as in 1 Thess (pp. 262f). For example, the functional work of the Spirit is still emphasized, especially in view of the neglected aspect of οἰκοδομή, in the Corinthians' pneumatology (pp. 287–91). Horn observes that Paul begins his response by expounding his 'pneumatic epistemology' (1 Cor 1,18–3,4). The grounds and the means of ἀποκάλυψις have been given to all Christians (and not just to those who were given prominence as 'glossolalics'): τὸ πνεῦμα (pp. 268–74). The locus of Spirit-transferral and incorporation into the salvific sphere ἐν Χριστῷ is baptism. Paul thus takes up the Corinthians' theology of baptism and their resultant concept of the Spirit as a material substance¹². At the same time, however, Paul criticizes the magical implications of these conceptions from the standpoint of his ecclesiology (ch. 12), eschatology (ch. 15) and his principle of holiness. An integrative feature of these Pauline emphases is Paul's σῶμα-terminology (which he inserts for paraenetic purposes, for instance, in 6,19). The unusually frequent use of this terminology is only comprehensible in the context of the emerging understanding of the Spirit as a down payment, which maintains (,festhält') the believers in their historical existence, ,um dort die Gabe des Geistes im individuellen und ekklesiologischen Bereich zu ,verleiblichen' (pp. 301, 162–80, 298–301).

¹¹ For a more detailed summary of this and the next stage of Pauline pneumatology, see *F.W. Horn*, Art. Holy Spirit, in: ABD III, 260–80, 272–75.

¹² Pp. 399f, 430. Horn freely presupposes that what he believes to be true for the history of religions would also apply to Hellenistic Christianity, namely that the Spirit is thought to utilize assistant materials (,Hilfsstoffe') like water or food for the Spirit-transferral (57; cf. section I.1. above). Horn is aware, however, that a number of scholars disagree that one could infer that on this basis a conceptual ,materialization of the Spirit' was induced in Paul's mind (169f, n. 27; see, e.g., *H. von Soden*, Sakrament und Ethik bei Paulus, in: K.H. Rengstorff [ed.], *Das Paulusbild in der neueren deutschen Forschung* [WdF 24], Darmstadt 1969, 338–79, 364–69; *A.J.M. Wedderburn*, Baptism and Resurrection. Studies in Pauline Theology against its Graeco-Roman Background [WUNT 44], Tübingen 1987, 241–48).

2.3. *The Dispute with the Jewish-Christian Countermission*

Horn assumes that the opponents against whom Paul reacts in 2 Cor are Jewish Christians. Paul finds himself facing two evils – the standards of pneumatic enthusiasm which are partially still in effect and the Jewish Christian missionaries who came from outside.

Horn focuses his treatment of the pneumatology of 2 Cor on the relationship of letter and Spirit in chapter 3. He regards 3,7–18 as a literary unit which was created by Paul in the situation of his apologetic against the superapostles. Paul underlines that his proclamation is exercised by the Spirit in immediacy (,Unmittelbarkeit‘) to God which demonstrates itself in *παρρησία*. His proclamation is authorized by God. Paul’s opponents, by contrast, need letters of recommendation. Their service is only indirect (,mittelbar‘) – it is orientated by *γράμμα*, the time of the Old Covenant (3,7) and the Mosaic service. Consequently, *παρρησία* is not possible on their behalf (pp. 309–13).

Horn concludes that the antithesis of letter and Spirit in 2 Cor 3 remains on a purely historical level. The ,obliterated past and the present opened up by God‘ are placed in opposition to each other. By means of this antithesis Paul clarifies his apostleship and places the Jewish-Christian opponents in the ,already obliterated past‘ (p. 324).

The Galatian church also has to face Jewish-Christian opponents. Because of the opponents’ intention to establish circumcision and the law¹³, Paul emphasizes in his *exhortatio* the importance of the church’s relationship with the Spirit. He first clarifies that the relationship of Spirit and law from the perspective of soteriology is one of mutual exclusion (3,1–5,12) and then challenges the church to orientate itself towards *πνεῦμα* also in the realm of ethics (5,13–6,10) (pp. 352–65).

The aim of the teaching about the Spirit in Gal, therefore, is to strengthen the believers’ trust in the Spirit. Obedience to the requirements of the law, *per contra*, means falling back into *σάρξ* which is the sphere hostile to *πνεῦμα*. But the church will not be defeated by *σάρξ* because *πνεῦμα* fights for them. Nevertheless, Paul does not promote a naive trust in the Spirit (*pace* H.D. Betz) since this would mean that the work of the Spirit and the work of the believer are identical. Instead, Paul stresses in 3,5.14 and 4,6 the ,precedence of the Spirit in the sense of a promise and emphasizes this as the determining reality‘. Therefore, trusting in the Spirit is not naive but consistent (,konsequent‘) (p. 364).

In his ensuing excursus on the Spirit–law principle (which Paul first developed on the basis of his conflict with the Jewish-Christian countermission¹⁴), Horn argues that the thesis that Paul exchanges the law for the Spirit as a new rule of life (,Lebensordnung‘) is untenable. Nonetheless, he agrees that it is also impossible to talk of a total continuity of the law. For Paul it is the *fundamental* requirement of the law (i.e. the love command) which is important, not the Torah *in toto*. Furthermore, in Rom 8,4 Paul dissociates himself from a new ethic of

¹³ Circumcision is also an issue in Phil. However, while Paul deals with the question of circumcision as a question of law in his letter to the Galatians, he demonstrates in Phil that the requirement of circumcision is to be rejected since the church as a Spirit-gifted entity has experienced the end-time circumcision already (374–379).

¹⁴ The same holds true for the *πνεῦμα*–*σάρξ* antithesis (see Horn’s excursus, 274–81).

works since love is the work and fruit of the Spirit. Speaking of a *tertius usus legis*, therefore, does not capture Paul's theology adequately (pp. 369, 373f).

We will now turn to the last part of Horn's thesis in which he intends to draw out the contribution of Pauline pneumatology.

2.4. *The Outcome*

Horn believes that it is methodologically mistaken to regard a summary of the individual aspects of Paul's theology of the Spirit as the outcome or contribution (,Ertrag') of Pauline pneumatology. This would be centred too greatly on a division into individual dogmatic *topoi* and would run the danger of not taking into account sufficiently the specificity of the situation that called forth Paul's statements (p. 384).

Nevertheless, Horn tries to crystallize some overarching statements in Paul's letters which are independent of the different disputes in the early and late Pauline phases. He assumes that these statements were part even of the pneumatological framework of the pre-Christian Paul because of their frequent occurrence and their lack of ,Christian-ness' or (rather) their positive Jewish and Hellenistic Jewish parallels: (a) The proclamation of the gospel is wrought by the Spirit; (b) The gift of the Spirit causes prophecy; and (c) The gift of the Spirit causes and demands sanctification (pp. 385–89). It was Paul's special achievement to unfold these starting points and relate them to the developing early Christian theology with respect to Christology and eschatology, sacraments and ethics (p. 429).

The best way to capture Paul's pneumatology, however, is by understanding his concept of down payment (2 Cor 1,22; 5,5; Rom 8,23). Horn is able to demonstrate that the insights won in the different disputes converge in this terminology – the dangers of enthusiasm and of Jewish-Christian legalism are conceptually defeated by it. The terminology contains both the future and the present aspect of Paul's pneumatology and eschatology as the Spirit is not the end-time gift itself but the power that conveys the right of eternal life. The life of the church is and should be defined (functionally) by the Spirit as the norm and power of eschatological conduct *ad interim*. Moreover, in this concept of first instalment there is no incompatibility of the notions of Spirit as function and Spirit as substance but a conjunction of the two. Because the ἀρραβὼν τοῦ πνεύματος is transferred sacramentally (2 Cor 1,22; 5,5) it provides a material basis for the resurrection body (1 Cor 15,46). ,But as one is concerned here with a down payment, the new nature is not yet perfect in a magical sense; on the other hand, the down payment motif is only then meaningful (from the point of its own *Begriffsgeschichte*), when, together with the juridical, a material aspect is also ascribed to it' (pp. 393f, 400).

While the juridical term ,down payment of the Spirit' functions primarily as an embracing of the Christian life from its sacramental to its eschatological side, it will be impossible to overlook the specific work of the Spirit in time. In late Pauline theology as reflected in Rom (mainly ch. 8) the Spirit does not merely functionally initiate individual expressions of church life (like the χαρίσματα) or act substantially (,substanzhaft') as the baptismal gift to the church. Rather, the Spirit now appears as a hypostatic entity that attests and appropriates to the believer salvation in Christ, God's love and the status of sonship; the Spirit intercedes for the believers before God, helps them in weakness and transforms them towards δόξα (pp. 404–428). Insofar as in these definitions (,Bestimmungen') the

relation to the Christ event is established, and as these effects of the Spirit are hardly found in Paul's religion-historical presupposition pool, ‚ist hierin neben der Konzeption des Geistes als eines Angelds auf das Eschaton der spezifische Erkenntnisgewinn innerhalb der pl Briefe und so also der Ertrag der Pneumatologie zu sehen‘ (pp. 430f).

PART II

Professor Horn has been eminently successful in delineating Pauline pneumatology in its full breadth. *Das Angeld des Geistes* has provided crucial contributions to the study of Paul's view of the Spirit, and I have singled these out in the introduction to this essay. In the remainder of the article I seek to engage critically with Horn's thesis, especially with his analysis of the presuppositions of Paul's pneumatology, his assumed chronology of the Epistles and his developmental model of the Pauline view of the Spirit.

II. 1. Horn's Analysis of the Presuppositions of Pauline Pneumatology

Apart from his general intention to provide an overview of Pauline pneumatology in its totality, the main focus of Horn's dissertation is an investigation of Paul's concept of the nature of the Spirit. Horn rightly starts this investigation with Paul's *religionsgeschichtlich* background, concerning which he establishes that the assumption of an antithesis between a ‚Hellenistic‘ πνεῦμα as substance and a ‚Jewish‘ πνεῦμα as function is an oversimplification.

However, one may want to question whether Palestinian or Hellenistic Judaism, as well as Paul, ever embraced the idea of the Spirit as a material substance at all. As far back as 1878 H.H. Wendt contended in reply to Otto Pfleiderer¹⁵ that in speaking of the Holy Spirit Paul did not have any other words at his disposal apart from those that could in a different context also be used of a material essence. One cannot infer from the notion of the Spirit as being *poured out* into the hearts of the believer (Rom 5,5), for example, – although it is used in analogy to the outpouring of water in Paul's OT source (Joel 3,1f and Isa 44,3) – that the Spirit was thought of as material in the same way as water since *šfk* 'l is also used of God's wrath¹⁶. And this observation of Wendt (to which further parallels can be added: the outpouring of grief [Lam 2,11], blessing [Isa 44,3] and lust [Ezek 23,8]) leads me to my main contention: The

¹⁵ O. Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*. I, London 1877, 201.

¹⁶ H.H. Wendt, *Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im biblischen Sprachgebrauch*, Gotha 1878, 140–45. Wendt was built upon by various scholars. The majority of scholarship, however, followed Pfleiderer. See Horn's history of research (*Angeld*, 49–54).

Jewish and Christian writers that we are dealing with encoded their experiences and thoughts concerning the Spirit in metaphorical language. In order to decode metaphors properly, however, we need to understand that metaphors in a given context do *not* have two meanings, one literal and one metaphorical, but one meaning; the alternative is semantically absurd, as J.M. Soskice points out¹⁷. Consequently, we will either understand (metaphorical) passages about the outpouring of the Spirit like Isa 32,15f and 44,3f as having nothing but metaphorical meaning or we will misunderstand them¹⁸. Soskice continues that a speaker usually has one intended meaning for an utterance – otherwise speech would be impossibly ambiguous. The truth or falsity of a metaphorical claim can thus only be assessed, at the level of complete utterance, taking context into consideration¹⁹. Applied to the Qumranian texts that Horn believes portray a substantial understanding of the Spirit it seems logical to infer that a metaphorical wording, as in 1QH 7,6f (‘you have upheld me with your strength, and your Holy Spirit you have poured over me so that I will not stumble’), is *only* designed to express the writer’s thanksgiving for God’s act of strengthening through his Spirit. The conclusion that the Spirit is a physical substance like water, *per contra*, cannot be drawn from this usage of the locution²⁰.

¹⁷ Metaphor and Religious Language, Oxford 1989, 85. Cf. U. Eco, Die Grenzen der Interpretation, Munich 1992, 215.

¹⁸ That the anticipated restoration of Israel is expressed *metaphorically* in these passages is especially obvious from the juxtaposition of a number of different images in these passages. Such juxtaposition is a mark of the linguistic awareness of a writer that he is using metaphors, as G.B. Caird elucidates (The Language and Imagery of the Bible, London 1980, 190). – For further uses of water-imagery (e.g. for the Torah) and the metaphor of drinking (e.g. for the student–teacher relationship), see Str–B II, 433–36.

¹⁹ Metaphor (n. 17) 85f. Cf. U. Eco, Grenzen (n. 17) 200, 204; see further 215.

²⁰ The other texts from the Essenes specified by Horn (Angeld, 59) are also either metaphors or comparisons (in the case of the latter, see, e.g., 1QS 3,3–9). Likewise, the passages from JosAs which Horn quotes in support of his theory (Angeld, 44f, 59) should be classified as metaphorical depictions according to C. Burchard (Joseph and Aseneth. A New Translation and Introduction, in: OTP II, 212). – Concerning the metaphorical nature of the phrase ‘being filled with the Spirit’ (as, e.g., in Sir 39,6; referred to in Angeld, 59), see M.M.B. Turner, Power From On High. The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke–Acts (JPTS 9), Sheffield 1996, 165–69.

Also for Philo πνεῦμα was not a material substance. Although Philo was educated in Hellenism and thus acquainted with hylozoistic metaphysics which could indeed attribute a material basis to the Spirit (see, e.g., Anaxim., Frgm. 3; Zeno, Frgm. 127; Chrysippus, Frgm. 1009; Plut., Def Orac 40–51), Philo did not himself adhere to such immanentism. His Jewish belief in the gulf between humans and God meant his insistence upon the immaterial nature of the divine, as Mary Isaacs explains. Consequently, Philo asserts that it is because of the incorporeal and moral nature of πνεῦμα that it cannot remain a permanent possession of man, who is corporeal and sinful (Gig 19, 28, 53; Imm 2; Quaest in Gn 1,90; M. Isaacs, The Concept of the Spirit. A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and its Bearing on the New Testament, London 1976, 19, 28–31; cf. H. Leisegang, Der Heilige Geist. Das Wesen und Werden der mystisch-intuitiven Erkenntnis in der Philosophie und Religion der Griechen, Leipzig/Berlin 1919; Darmstadt 1967, 28–30). While Philo does

With metaphors like ‚poured out‘ Jewish (and Christian) writers do not, therefore, intend to convey insights about the nature of the Holy Spirit; rather, they are a means of reference to a (new) nexus of the Spirit's activities in the persons concerned²¹. Moreover, even if the phenomenological language of the oldest strata of Jewish thought were to be proof of a material concept of the Spirit for the period in which they emerge (as Gunkel boldly claims), in a generation centuries later these metaphors may have become mere ‚phrases‘, i.e., a fixed way of speaking, the original meaning of which was long forgotten²².

I thus suggest applying to the Spirit-locutions mentioned above a synchronic approach in which the meaning of a word/metaphor is determined by its usage in a particular context. Such an approach will also call into question Horn's diachronic approach regarding the interpretation of ἄρραβών. Horn reasons that ‚the down payment motif is only then meaningful (from the point of its own *Begriffsgeschichte*), when together with the juridical also a material aspect is ascribed to it‘. However, the concrete situation of a down payment of money is used by Paul to express the more abstract concept of the eschatological Spirit as ‚now and not yet‘ of the eschaton. Horn himself has very helpfully demonstrated that this is indeed Paul's purpose in using the word. Consequently, as Paul does not discuss in this metaphor's contexts the material/immaterial nature of the Spirit but eschatology, it is illegitimate to retrieve the literal impact of the monetary down payment.

From these linguistic considerations we can conclude that Horn's method of establishing a material notion of the Spirit within the different strands of Judaism (and Pauline Christianity) on the basis of a literal rendering of what were more probably metaphorical locutions is not

think of the Spirit as a substance (see, e.g., Gig 22, 67), he thus maintains that this is an *incorporeal* substance (e.g. Op 29 speaks of God creating εἶθ' ὕδατος ἀσώματον οὐσίαν, καὶ πνεύματος, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐβδόμου φωτός...; cf. Quaest in Gn 1,92). We need to be clear, however, that such language is found nowhere else in Judaism apart from Philo. Neither is it evident in Paul. The idea of πνεῦμα as a substance has its genesis in the Greek philosophy of metaphysics. Judaism (with the exception of Philo), *per contra*, is primarily interested in the functionality of the Spirit rather than in its ontology. (On Philo's marginal place within Judaism, see S. Sandmel, *Philo's Place in Judaism. A Study of the Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature*, New York 1971, 210f; C. Rowland, *Christian Origins. An Account of the Setting and Character of the most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism*, London 1985, 84; on Philo's [lack of] relationship with Paul, see E. Brandenburg, *Fleisch und Geist. Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit* [WMANT 29], Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968, 227f; A. D. Nock, *St. Paul*, London 1938, 237-41, followed by B. Witherington III, *The Paul Quest. The Renewed Search for the Jew of Tarsus*, Downers Grove 1998, 14f).

²¹ Cf. M.M.B. Turner's insightful: *Spirit Endowment in Luke-Acts. Some Linguistic Considerations*, in: VE 12 (1981) 45-63; H.-D. Wendland, *Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes in den Gläubigen nach Paulus*, in: *Pro Veritate. Ein theologischer Dialog* (FS L. Jaeger/W. Stählin), Münster 1963, 133-156, 136f.

²² H. Gunkel, *Influence* (n. 2) 64. Cf. M.M.B. Turner, *Spirit* (n. 21) 50.

legitimate²³. This resolution obviously casts doubts on the existence of a material concept of the Spirit in these circles at all. Nevertheless, we will only try to draw some more definite conclusions regarding Paul's understanding later on in our discussion of Horn's developmental model. Next, however, we must look at Horn's second main contention with respect to Paul's background, namely that the 'horizon of early Christian pneumatology' was not one of experience but of dogma.

Horn appears very keen to counter every notion of authenticity of the early Christian experiences of the Holy Spirit²⁴. For him, those 'experiences' are mainly later creations of the editors of the NT-sources or they are completely exceptional (as, e.g., *glossolalia* at Corinth [which Paul, according to Horn, understands as heathen ecstasy/manticism, given the Hellenistic background of the Corinthians²⁵]).

However, when Paul bases his ethical exhortation on the assumption that the churches have received the Spirit (see, e.g., 1 Thess 1,5f and Gal 3,1-5)²⁶, surely this reception of the Spirit has been more than just a dogmatic assertion. Paul's argument is hardly valid without an experiential side to the Pauline churches' relation to the Spirit²⁷.

The logical consequence of what Horn regards as his 'justified scepticism' (p. 21) of the biblical narratives that describe an experiential dimension of the Spirit is that Horn very strongly emphasizes the predominance of 'theory' and doctrine among the early Christians²⁸.

²³ In order to establish such a *stofflich* view of the Spirit inside Jewish and Christian circles it would be necessary, for instance, to provide evidence from Jewish and early Christian literature of such plain statements as are found in Hellenism: See the examples given in notes 42 and 20.

²⁴ See, e.g., Angeld, 61f, 77-90, 113f, 201-06.

²⁵ Angeld, 214-19. This view, however, has recently come under heavy attack from C. Forbes, *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and its Hellenistic Environment* (WUNT II/75), Tübingen 1995.

²⁶ Horn disclaims the experiential basis of these passages (Angeld, 122, 114).

²⁷ Cf. O. Kuss, *Der Römerbrief*, II, Regensburg ²1963, 551f; H.D. Betz, *Galatians* (Hermeneia), Philadelphia 1979, 30; J.D.G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, Philadelphia 1970, 105, 113; H.T. Neumann, *Paul's Appeal to the Experience of the Spirit in Galatians 3.1-5*, in: JPT 9 (1996) 53-69; F.C. Synge, *The Spirit in the Pauline Epistles*, in: CQR 119 (1934) 79-93; H.R. Lemmer, *Mnemonic Reference to the Spirit as a Persuasive Tool* (Galatians 3:1-6 within the Argument, 3:1-4:11), in: Neot. 26 (1992) 359-88; D. J. Lull, *The Spirit in Galatia. Paul's Interpretation of Pneuma as Divine Power* (SBLDS 49), Chicago 1980, 53-95.

²⁸ Horn's 'love for theory' is well illustrated by his adherence to the belief that the Jews of the Intertestamental Period (ITP) developed a doctrine of the withdrawal of the Spirit although the phenomena of the Spirit of prophecy still continued. 'Accounts of contemporary sources demonstrate clearly that the „dogma“ was not a general expression of reality but of theological theory' (Angeld, 33). Horn is correct that the charismatic phenomena of the Spirit did not cease over the so-called Spirit-less period. But his over-estimation of the predominance of 'theory' and dogma among the Jewish groups in the ITP prevents him from questioning whether he is perhaps misinterpreting either the sources upon which the theory is established or the literature that testifies to the continuing reality of charismatic phenomena (or whether the literary evidence was fabricated by

One only wonders whether – and if so, why – the different groups that Horn refers to were really so prone to put their trust in theories, especially if their theoretical claims had no (experiential) foundation. It is surely possible to adhere to a certain religious dogma, e.g. ‘God is omnipresent’, without having any conscious experience of the reality of that particular theoretical belief. However, it seems problematic to claim that an *action* or *event* has *happened to me* while knowing that I have no experience of what I claim to be an event in my personal history. This would be the case in respect to the pre-Pauline formulas (‘God has given us the Spirit’, ‘You have received the Spirit’) if Horn was right. However, Horn himself has explained the process of developing declarations concerning one’s experience with discerning insight: ‘Experiences can only be interpreted in the context of a pre-existing self-consciousness or framework of expectation. Historically, a process of interpretation moving back and forth between faith and experience is likely.’ (p. 113). In correspondence with Horn’s elucidation, someone may well adhere to the religious belief ‘God has sanctified me at my baptism’ without having any immediate experiential awareness of this event. This does not cause any problems for the person if he or she does not understand sanctification to be a tangible experience. In the case of the early Christians (e.g. in Acts 2; 8; 10), however, the pre-existing framework of expectation of pneumatic instances is characterized by the Jewish concept of the Spirit of prophecy. Within this conception of the Spirit it is not possible to separate the Spirit from works of power and from his prototypical gifts²⁹. Therefore, when the early Christians arrived at the statement ‘God has given us his Spirit’, one has every reason to doubt that this was merely a ‘religious theory’³⁰. Because within their framework of expectation of the promised outpouring of the Spirit of prophecy a non-phenomenological outpouring of the Spirit would not be identified by them as the Holy Spirit.

a later editor, etc.). *J.R. Levison* has shown that the former is the case: the doctrine of the withdrawal of the Spirit is more a creation of NT-scholars than a belief of the Jewish writers of the ITP; it rests upon a misreading of tSot 13,2–4 and a few other texts (Did the Spirit Withdraw from Israel? An Evaluation of the Earliest Jewish Data, in: NTS 43 [1997] 35–57). Cf. *M.M.B. Turner*, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts – Then and Now*, Carlisle 1996, 193–96.

²⁹ On this Jewish framework of the Spirit, see *M.M.B. Turner*, *Power* (n. 20) chs. 3–5; see even Horn himself: *Angeld*, 386f.

³⁰ This is especially so as the reliability of the statement that Horn elects as the cause for the awareness of the return of the Spirit has been questioned. Horn believes that the early Christians deduced the return of the Spirit from their religious postulation that Christ’s resurrection was wrought by the Spirit. However, if this hypothesis were wrong, as for example Fee claims (Presence [n. 1] 552f, 808–10, *pace J.D.G. Dunn*, *Jesus – Flesh and Spirit. An Exposition of Romans 1.3–4*, in: JTS 24 [1973] 40–68, 67; *et al.*), Horn would be left with no sign of the return of the Spirit at all.

II. 2. Horn's Assumed Chronology of Paul's Epistles

The main premise of Horn's developmental model of Pauline pneumatology is his assumed chronology of the Epistles. As Horn's thesis stands or falls by the accuracy of this presupposition we should examine it briefly.

Horn's declaration that 1 Thess represents the first stage of Paul's pneumatology, which is least developed, especially with regard to the notion of the Spirit's nature, evidently builds on the traditional supposition that 1 Thess was Paul's earliest epistle. Similarly but more significantly, Horn's assignment of the great Pauline antitheses (Spirit–flesh, Spirit–law) to the late phase of Paul's dispute with the Judaizers (and here even after 2 Cor)³¹ requires a late date for Gal. However, this late dating of Gal (which is built upon the so-called 'North Galatian' hypothesis) may be questioned from the perspective of the 'South Galatian' theory which estimates that Paul visited the province of Galatia already on his 'First Missionary Journey' mentioned in Acts 13–14 (so, e.g., E.d.W. Burton, J.M. Scott, C. Breytenbach, M. Hengel and A.M. Schwemer)³². On the grounds of this theory, numerous scholars have argued for a much earlier date for the epistle, in fact that it precedes even 1 Thess (e.g. Th. Zahn, W. Michaelis; more recently, F.F. Bruce, C.H. Hemer, R.N. Longenecker, D. Guthrie, R. Riesner and B. Witherington, to name but a few)³³. While not everyone who supports the South Galatian theory would wish to affirm the absolute priority of Gal, another set of scholars maintains that the epistle was written between 1 Thess and 1 Cor (e.g. P. Stuhlmacher and J.D.G. Dunn)³⁴. Moreover, various adherents of the North Galatian hypothesis also defend such an early dating of Gal (e.g. H.-M. Schenke and K.M. Fischer, R. Jewett, H.D. Betz, F. Watson, H. Hübner, E. Lohse, J. Murphy-O'Connor, J.L. Martyn)³⁵. We can therefore conclude that too many

³¹ Angeld, 275, 324, 369.

³² E.d.W. Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (ICC), Edinburgh 1920, 1980, xxi–liii; J.M. Scott, *Paul and the Nations. The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul's Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of Galatians* (WUNT 84), Tübingen 1995; C. Breytenbach, *Paulus und Barnabas in der Provinz Galatien. Studien zu Apostelgeschichte 13f.; 16, 6; 18, 23 und den Adressaten des Galaterbriefes* (AGJU 28), Leiden 1996; M. Hengel / A.M. Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch. The Unknown Years*, London 1997.

³³ Th. Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament. I* (translated from the third German ed.), Edinburgh 1909, 173–202; W. Michaelis, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Bern 1961, 190; F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (NIGTC), Exeter/Grand Rapids 1982, 3–18, 43–56; C.H. Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (WUNT 49), Tübingen 1989, chs. 6–7; R.N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC 41), Dallas 1990, lxxii–lxxxviii; D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, Leicester 1990, 465–81; R. Riesner, *Paul's Early Period. Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology*, Grand Rapids 1998, 289–91, 394–96; B. Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia. A Commentary on St Paul's Letter to the Galatians*, Edinburgh 1998, 2–13.

³⁴ P. Stuhlmacher, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments. I*, Göttingen 1992, 226f; J.D.G. Dunn, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC), London 1993, 5–19; id., *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, Edinburgh 1998, 731.

³⁵ H.-M. Schenke / K.M. Fischer, *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments. I*, Gütersloh 1978, §§3–5; R. Jewett, *Dating Paul's Life*, London 1979, 103; H.D. Betz, *Galatians* (n. 27) 12; F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles* (SNTSMS 56), Cambridge 1986, 58f; H. Hübner, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments. II*, Göttingen 1993, 30;

serious scholars argue for an early date of Galatians for this view simply to be dismissed.

However, it is not only external evidence that makes Horn's assumed chronology of Paul's Epistles so hard to prove. Horn's argument from 'internal evidence', namely his affirmation that there is a 'close kinship between Gal and 2 Cor 10–13, and the theological argumentation of Paul proceeds from the letters to the Corinthians to Gal and then to Rom' (p. 117), is also debatable. To give just two examples: John Drane and Hans Hübner argue on the basis of Paul's alleged development of his position towards the law that Gal must pre-date the Corinthian correspondence³⁶. And F.C. Syngé even believes Paul's 'more fluid' pneumatology in Gal to speak for the letter's absolute priority³⁷.

It seems that Horn is right, however, with regard to his position that the 'pneumatology' of 1 Thess is less nuanced than that of Gal. Nevertheless, Horn appears to place too much weight on this *argumentum e silentio*. It can hardly be proven that everything that is not mentioned in 1 Thess for whatever reasons was therefore also missing in the early Pauline theology and proclamation', as Hans-Josef Klauck highlights³⁸. On a more general level one may therefore want to heed Dunn's caution: 'The shortness of the time span covering the main letters (at most less than ten years), and our lack of knowledge of the circumstances that called them forth, and therefore the degree to which Paul's argument in each letter will have been conditioned by these circumstances, should make us wary of drawing firm conclusions regarding their chronological relationship and the development of Paul's theology from one to other.'³⁹

In conclusion, then, we can say that the scholarly opinions quoted above point towards a different sequence of the Pauline Epistles (i.e. 1 Thess, Gal, 1–2 Cor) from that presupposed by Horn. And whatever sequence one assumes – it will always be methodologically hazardous to base an evolutionary model of Pauline pneumatology on such vague evidence. Nevertheless, even if we were to allow Horn's chronology, his account of the development within Paul's pneumatology remains problematic.

II. 3. Horn's Developmental Model of Pauline Pneumatology

It has been argued above that it is likely that neither Judaism nor Paul understood the Spirit as a material substance. It remains to add a short

E. Lohse, Paulus – eine Biographie, Munich 1996, 98f, 126f; *J. Murphy-O'Connor*, Paul – A Critical Life, Oxford 1996, 180–02, 114, 280; *J.L. Martyn*, Galatians (AncB 33A), New York 1997, 20.

³⁶ *J. Drane*, Paul – Libertine or Legalist?, London 1975, 140–43; *H. Hübner*, Theologie (n. 35) 30f.

³⁷ Spirit (n. 27) 84–91.

³⁸ *H.-J. Klauck*, review of F.W. Horn, Das Angeld des Geistes, in: BZ NF 37 (1993) 283. In fact, important scholars like Stuhlmacher, Hübner and Lohse maintain that Paul's early proclamation was much more mature than is recognized by those who believe in a strong theological development of Paul.

³⁹ Galatians (n. 34) 12. Cf. *J.C. Beker*, Paul the Apostle. The Triumph of God in Life and Thought, Edinburgh 1980, 33, 94; *F.F. Bruce*, Galatians (n. 33) 54.

note on the plausibility and coherence of Horn's model of evolutionary development of Paul's concept(s) of the nature of the Spirit.

Horn points out that Paul commences his theological writing with a *functional* view of the Spirit. While the Spirit is already thought of as resident within the believer at this stage, 1 Thess does not yet convey a *stofflich* conception of the Spirit⁴⁰. At the same time Horn lists 1 Thess 4,8 among the verses that portray the Spirit as substance⁴¹. This lays bare a weakness of Horn's work with respect to terminology. Not only is the definition of substance as ‚forma substantialis‘ and its differentiation from *Stoff* extremely vague; but the relation of Spirit as function to Spirit as substance and *Stoff* is also not spelled out⁴². It seems, then, that at least on the grounds of 1 Thess there is no developmental difference between Spirit as function and Spirit as substance – Paul employs both concepts from the very beginning.

The new thing that Horn believes Paul to learn from the Corinthians is that the Spirit – while still being understood as function (and substance) in a number of places in the letter – is *Stoff* because it is transferred sacramentally. However, it is exegetically hazardous to argue for a sacramental Spirit-bestowal, as Markus Barth, J.A. Brown, Dunn and others have demonstrated⁴³. For instance, the metaphorical references in 1 Cor 12,13 to the reception of spiritual baptism and drink by all (πάντες) Corinthians are used by Paul to stress the unifying effect of the activities of the *one* (ἐνί/ ἐν) Spirit; to establish conclusions for the nature of the Spirit or the mode of the Spirit's reception from the literal vehicles of these metaphors is illegitimate⁴⁴. However, even if the Spirit were imparted by the sacraments this would still allow for a functional,

⁴⁰ Angeld, 131, 429.

⁴¹ Angeld, 60.

⁴² Especially as at least in Hellenism power is said to be substance anyway. See, e.g., Nemesius, *De natura hominis* 30 and 40: ‚Power (δύναμις) is matter (ὕλη τις)‘; Diog. L. 7.56: πᾶν τὸ ποιοῦν σῶμά ἐστιν (as quoted by E. Schweizer, *Art. πνεῦμα, πνευματικός*, in: TDNT VI, 389–451, 392).

⁴³ M. Barth, *Die Taufe – Ein Sakrament? Ein exegetischer Beitrag zum Gespräch über die kirchliche Taufe*, Zollikon–Zürich 1951; J.A. Brown, *Metaphorical Language in Relation to Baptism in Pauline Literature*, Edinburgh: Unpublished PhD Thesis 1982; J.D.G. Dunn, *Baptism* (n. 27) ch. 11; G.D. Fee, *Presence* (n. 1) 179–82, 860–63. It is most unfortunate that Horn does not interact with other (viz. non-sacramentalist) positions regarding this crucial point of his thesis.

⁴⁴ Cf. W.F. Orr / J.A. Walther, *I Corinthians* (AncB 32), Garden City 1976, 284f; A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism* (n. 12) 246. On the metaphorical expression ‚baptized by the Spirit‘, see M.M.B. Turner, *Spirit* (n. 21) 50–53.

The religion-historical parallels to which Horn refers in support of his allegation that Hellenistic Christians were well-acquainted with the idea that the Spirit was transferred through physical substances are illicitly interpreted literally as well. For example, it should be clear from the apocalyptic paradise-imagery in the context of TestLev 18,11 (mentioned by Horn, Angeld, 170) that the author is here *not* concerned with a *physical* fruit of the tree of life that would impart the Spirit. Cf. notes 12 and 18 above.

substantial *or* material conception of the Spirit⁴⁵. Furthermore, even if the Spirit *were* understood as *Stoff* on this basis, Horn would be faced with the question: on what grounds would Paul *now* attribute this new aspect to the Spirit if he had not done so before? Why would Paul need the Corinthians to make him adopt a view of the Spirit that he should have been familiar with from his Jewish upbringing? Horn's present thesis does not seem to provide a satisfactory answer to this fundamental query.

The same question needs to be raised concerning the last stage of Pauline pneumatology. Why should it be only at the time of writing Rom that Paul would ascribe activities to the Spirit that, according to Horn, assume the Spirit to be a hypostasis? The way in which Paul describes some activities of the Spirit at the time of 1 Cor, however, might suggest that he was already attributing personal traits to the Spirit then (2,10–13; 3,16; 6,11; 12,11; cf. 2 Cor 3,6; Gal 4,6; 5,17f.22f). Fee even believes that these references, together with Rom 8 (e.g. v.27 'God knows *the mind* of the Spirit'), disclose the Spirit to be a person – and not an impersonal influence or substance⁴⁶. While one may not want to go as far as Fee⁴⁷, one will nevertheless need to acknowledge the possibility that the OT imagery which *might* originally have been developed against the background of a concept of the Spirit as substance had become a dead metaphor at Paul's time, and a personal concept of the Spirit had come more to the foreground for Paul. In order not to commit the same mistake as Horn and build our view of Paul's conception of the Spirit on his use of metaphors (or personifications), however, we should for the time being go no further than to say that – on the basis of the similarity of the nexus of activities that elsewhere is attributed to either the Father or the Son (cf. 1 Cor 12,6 and 11; Rom 8,11 and 2 Cor 3,6; Rom 8,26 and 34) and yet the clear distinction of the three (1 Cor 2,10; 12,4–11; 2 Cor 13,13; Rom 8,27) – Paul understands the Spirit as having personal traits⁴⁸. This may or may not exclude the possibility of the Spirit being a material substance (Horn sees both 'hypostasis' and

⁴⁵ Cf. the scholars mentioned in note 12 above.

⁴⁶ Presence (n. 1) 830f. Cf. *H. Bertrams*, *Das Wesen des Geistes nach der Anschauung des Apostels Paulus. Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung* (NTAbh IV/4), Münster 1913, 144–66; *V. Warnach*, *Das Wirken des Pneuma in den Gläubigen nach Paulus*, in: *Pro Veritate* (n. 21) 156–202, 184–89; *J. Maleparampil*, *The 'Trinitarian' Formulae in St. Paul. An Exegetical Investigation into the Meaning and Function of those Pauline Sayings which Compositely Make Mention of God, Christ and the Holy Spirit* (EUS 23), Frankfurt 1995.

⁴⁷ Cf. the methodological caution of *E. Schweizer*, *A Very Helpful Challenge*. Gordon Fee's *God's Empowering Presence*, in: *JPT* 8 (1996) 7–21, 13–16, and *O. Kuss*, *Römerbrief*. II (n. 27) 580–84.

⁴⁸ Cf. *A.J.M. Wedderburn*, *Baptism* (n. 12) 266f; *H.-D. Wendland*, *Wirken* (n. 21) 136f.

Stoff clearly in Rom 5,5)⁴⁹. But at least it is evident that even from within Horn's own methodology Paul's development was not as drastic as Horn proposes because Paul would already have conceived of the Spirit as a personal agent from the time of 1 Cor (or even 1 Thess [see 5,19]) onwards. If, however, Judaism and early Christianity did not think of the Spirit as *Stoff* at all, the contrary of which needs first to be proven, Horn's thesis of the evolutionary development of Paul's Spirit-ontologies collapses entirely.

Notwithstanding, Horn must be commended for his concern to take into consideration the situational character of Paul's individual Epistles. He is careful to avoid generalizations and thus may be correct, for instance, when he discerns the Pauline antitheses Spirit-law and Spirit-flesh as being created only on the occasion of (Jewish Christian) opposition. Contra Horn, however, there seems to be some evidence that Paul had already been provoked to think along these lines before his writing of Gal. In fact, the development of the Spirit-law contrast was clearly anticipated in 1 Thess, as Max Turner contends. Turner argues that Paul's usage of Ezek 37,6.14 (cf. 36,26f) (LXX) in 1 Thess 4,8 suggests that Paul had already understood the Spirit of prophecy in the congregation as the „life-giving“ recreative Spirit of Ezekiel's promised New Covenant...some time before he came to use that theologoumenon as a powerful weapon in his argument against the Judaizers in 2 Corinthians 3 and beyond⁵⁰. And one could possibly take Turner's argument still further: Ezek 36,27 suggests the purpose of the giving of the Spirit is to enable obedience of the law (which is tantamount to ‚life‘, 37,6). Also 1 Thess 4,8 speaks of the Spirit in the context of sanctification. However, as the law is now no longer mentioned in the context of the theologoumenon nor in the epistle as a whole (as argued by U. Wilckens⁵¹), this may suggest the conclusion that the Spirit has in some sense superseded the law. On a more obvious level,

⁴⁹ Angeld, 60. However, Horn has unfortunately overlooked that Rom 5,5 speaks of *love* (and not of the Spirit) as being poured into the believers' hearts.

⁵⁰ Spirit (n. 28) 109 (followed by J.D.G. Dunn, *Theology* [n. 34] 420).

⁵¹ Freedom from the law seems to have been more or less the ‚selbstverständliche Basis‘ (U. Wilckens, *Zur Entwicklung des paulinischen Gesetzesverständnisses*, in: NTS 28 [1982] 154–90, 158). Horn, *per contra*, tries to show that instead of a literal mentioning of νόμος (as in LXX Jer 38,33) as the focal point of the Spirit Paul refers in 4,9 to the law via its main demand: the love command. The gift of the Spirit therefore in no way stands in tension with the law. Rather, it enables and demands the fulfilment of the central content of the law (Angeld, 368f). Horn's deduction is untenable, though, since Paul introduces a new subject with *περί δέ* in 4,9 (cf. 5,1; 1 Cor 7,1.25; 8,1; 12,1; 16,1.12), possibly in answer to a written or oral question of the Thessalonians (so E. Best, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* [BNTC], London 1986, 170f, and C.A. Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians* [NIGTC], Grand Rapids/Exeter 1990, 159). There is therefore no connection implied between the Spirit (v.8) and the love command (v.9).

however, the gift of the Spirit is here placed by Paul in opposition to πορνεία, lustful passion and impurity (4,3–7). And this contrast clearly foreshadows what Paul would later (if Gal was indeed written so much later as Horn presupposes) formulate *expressis verbis* as the πνεῦμα κατὰ σαρκός-opposition (e.g. Gal 5,17; see already, however, 1 Cor 3,1). Hence 1 Thess indeed anticipates what Horn understands as later developments: sanctification and life granted by the Spirit apart from the law, and the Spirit as opposition to the works of the flesh⁵².

We can *conclude*, then, that the development which Horn assumes to be characteristic of Paul's pneumatology is less drastic than he has tried to prove. One will therefore be able to find more 'overarching statements' of Pauline pneumatology than Horn is willing to allow (e.g. Horn's statement 'the Spirit appropriates salvation to the believer' may no longer be restricted to Rom 8 but applied to the whole Pauline corpus). Moreover, Horn's main presupposition, namely that the Spirit was understood as a (physical) substance by Jews and Christians in pre-Pauline and Pauline times, is more than a little precarious. Nevertheless, Horn's *Das Angeld des Geistes* remains an indispensable resource for the study of Paul's view of the Spirit and indeed of NT pneumatology in general. His painstaking work of remarkable exegetical depth is guaranteed to benefit generations of scholars.

(Abgeschlossen am 10. Dezember 1998)

⁵² The same holds true with regard to 1 Cor: see 6,10f.