

The Orientation of the Teaching of the Paraclete in the Gospel of John: Retrospective or Prospective?

THOMAS TOPS

Protestantse Theologische Universiteit Groningen, Oude Ebbingestraat 25, 9712 HA Groningen, Netherlands. Email: t.tops@pthu.nl

Past scholarly literature has interpreted the orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel as either retrospective or prospective. First, I will argue that it is prospective, but that this does not imply that the Paraclete teaches things that have not yet been taught by Jesus. The Gospel text challenges us to conceive the teaching of the Paraclete as prospective, but also as repeating Jesus' teaching. A synthesis of the retrospective and prospective interpretation is thus required. Second, I will argue that this paradoxical synthesis can be obtained on the basis of Kierkegaard's category of repetition.

Keywords: the Gospel of John, Paraclete, revelation theology, repetition, Kierkegaard

1. Introduction

The present article provides a study of the relationship between the activity of the Paraclete and Jesus concerning revelation in the Fourth Gospel. The question at stake is whether it is only Jesus' teaching that can be called revelatory or whether the Paraclete also has a proper revelatory function. In the first case, the orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete is retrospective, because he only reminds disciples of the teaching of Jesus, the actual locus of revelation. The Paraclete does not have a teaching function distinct from his reminding function. In the second case, the orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete is prospective, because his teaching is not restricted to reminding disciples of the teaching of Jesus. The teaching function of the Paraclete is distinct from his reminding function.

Two texts in the Fourth Gospel provide us with information about the orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete: John 14.25–6 and 16.12–13. Sections 2 and 3 will analyse these texts. Previous scholarly literature has interpreted the two texts as representing the orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete as either prospective or retrospective. I will argue that a synthesis of these two

positions is required to make full sense of the texts in the literary context of the Gospel. Section 4 will demonstrate that Kierkegaard's category of repetition is required to obtain this synthesis.

2. John 14.25–6

- 14.25a ταῦτα λελάληκα
 14.25b παρ' ὑμῖν μένων·
 14.26αα ὁ δὲ παράκλητος,
 14.26b τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,
 14.26c ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατήρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου,
 14.26αβ ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα
 14.26d καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα
 14.26e ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν [ἐγώ].

Scholarly literature has provided two possible interpretations of the orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete in John 14.25–6. The point of disagreement between these two interpretations is whether teaching and reminding are two different functions of the Paraclete or aspects of the same function. Two criteria are used to discern this: (i) the antecedent(s) of the relative pronoun in 14.26e; (ii) the semantic value of καὶ in 14.26d.

Interpretation one: the relative pronoun in John 14.26e has both πάντα in 14.26d and πάντα in 14.26αβ as antecedent. If this is the case, the conjunction καὶ in 14.26d can only have an explicative (or epexegetical) meaning. This καὶ can then not be cumulative, because the proposition that the Paraclete will remind the disciples of everything that Jesus has said to them (14.26de) does not add additional information to the proposition that the Paraclete will teach the disciples everything that Jesus has said to them (14.26αβ, e). John 14.26 thus states that the Paraclete will teach the disciples everything that Jesus has said to them by reminding them of everything that Jesus has said to them. According to proponents of this interpretation, the teaching function of the Paraclete is restricted to reminding the disciples of the words of Jesus. Teaching and reminding are aspects of one and the same function of the Paraclete.¹

1 See e.g. M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Jean* (Études Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1936⁶) 391; R. K. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (KEK 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1950¹¹) 484–5; F. Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums* (FThSt 16; Frankfurt a.M.: Knecht, 1974) 257; I. de la Potterie, *La vérité dans Saint Jean* (2 vols.; AnBib 73; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1977) 1.367–9; J. Rahner, 'Vergegenwärtigende Erinnerung: Die Abschiedsreden, der Geist-Paraklet und die Retrospektive des Johannesevangeliums', *ZNW* 91 (2000) 72–90, at 77; L. Wehr, "Er wird euch alles lehren und euch an alles erinnern, was ich euch gesagt habe" (Joh 14,26): Die hermeneutische Funktion des Geist-Parakleten und die Kriterien der Traditionsbildung im Johannesevangelium', *Pneuma und Gemeinde: Christsein in der Tradition des Paulus*

According to Hans Klein, further support for this interpretation can be found in a parallel in Matt 28.20: διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν.² In this interpretation of John 14.25–6, the orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete is retrospective. The teaching function of the Paraclete cannot properly be called revelatory, because his teaching consists only in reminding the disciples of the past revelation that took place in Jesus.

Interpretation two: the antecedent of the relative pronoun in John 14.26e is only πάντα in 14.26d. If this is the case, the meaning of καί in 14.26d can be either explicative or cumulative. If explicative, John 14.26 states that the Paraclete will teach the disciples everything by reminding them of everything that Jesus has said to them. This is the same result as in interpretation one above. The teaching of the Paraclete is restricted to reminding the disciples of everything that Jesus has said to them. Teaching and reminding are two aspects of the same function of the Paraclete. The orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete is retrospective.³ If the meaning of καί in 14.26d is cumulative, another interpretation of the orientation of the Paraclete is made possible. The Paraclete teaches everything and, in addition, reminds the disciples of everything that Jesus has said to them. Teaching and reminding are two distinct functions of the Paraclete. As such, the teaching of the Paraclete is not restricted to reminding the disciples of everything that Jesus has said to them. This interpretation thus opens up the possibility of viewing the orientation of the teaching of the

und Johannes. *Festschrift für Josef Hainz zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. J. Eckert, M. Schmidl and H. Steichele; Düsseldorf: Patmos, 2001) 329 n. 15; C. S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (2 vols.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003) II.978; H. Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015²) 635; M. Theobald, “Erinnert euch der Worte, die ich euch gesagt habe...” (Joh 15,20): “Erinnerungsarbeit” im Johannesevangelium’, *Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie* 22 (2007) 105–30, at 126–7.

2 See H. Klein, ‘Der Paraklet als Subjekt prophetischer Rede im Johannesevangelium’, *Sacra Scripta* 9 (2011) 173–88, at 178.

3 See e.g. R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John (xiii–xxi)* (AB 29A; New York: Doubleday, 1970) 650–1; R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium* (4 vols.; HthK 4/3; Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1975) III.94–5; E. Franck, *Revelation Taught: The Paraclete in the Gospel of John* (ConBNT 14; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1985) 42; A. Dettwiler, *Die Gegenwart des Erhöhten: Eine exegetische Studie zu den johanneischen Abschiedsreden (Joh 13,31–16,33) unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Relecture-Charakters* (FRLANT 169; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995) 203; C. Bennema, *The Power of Saving Wisdom: An Investigation of Spirit and Wisdom in Relation to the Soteriology of the Fourth Gospel* (WUNT II/148; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002) 229; M. Gourgues, ‘Le paraclet, l’esprit de vérité: deux désignations, deux fonctions’, *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar* (ed. G. Van Belle; BETL 184; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 2005) 83–108, at 97–8; J. Zumstein, *L’Évangile selon de Saint Jean (13–21)* (CNT 4b; Geneva: Labor et fides, 2007) 82; A. Dettwiler, ‘La pneumatologie de l’Évangile de Jean: un essai de synthèse’, *ETR* 92 (2017) 353–77, at 365–6.

Paraclete as prospective. The Paraclete teaches not only something about the past, but also about the future. In this interpretation, it is not only Jesus but also the Paraclete who has a revelatory function. The Paraclete can reveal things that have not yet been revealed in/by Jesus.⁴

We will evaluate the aforementioned interpretations of John 14.25–6 by asking what the antecedent of the relative pronoun in 14.26e is (2.1) and what the semantic meaning of καί in 14.26d is (2.2).

2.1 John 14.26e: Antecedent(s) of Relative Pronoun?

According to Ignace de la Potterie and Felix Porsch, the following arguments can be given for the interpretation that the relative pronoun of John 14.26e has two antecedents, namely πάντα of both 14.26d and 14.26aβ: (i) the relative clause of 14.26e cannot be separated from 14.26aβ, because ἐκεῖνος and ἐγώ provide a chiasmic structure to 14.26aβ–e that does not allow such a separation;⁵ (ii) the *inclusio* between ταῦτα λελάληκα [...] ὑμῖν and εἶπον ὑμῖν

4 See e.g. B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John* (London: Clarke, 1880) 208–9; B. Weiss, *Das Johannes-Evangelium* (KEK 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902⁹) 414; T. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes ausgelegt* (Kommentar zum neuen Testament 4; Leipzig: Deichert, 1921⁵) 572–3; H. Windisch, *Die fünf johanneischen Parakletsprüche: Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag* 26. Januar 1927 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1927) 116; W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1933³) 187; J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1949³) II.553; F. Mußner, 'Die johanneischen Parakletsprüche und die apostolische Tradition', *BZ N.F.* 5 (1961) 56–70, at 60; A. Feuillet, 'De munere doctrinali a Paraclito in ecclesia expleto iuxta evangelium sancti Ioannis (Disquisitio biblica de relationibus inter scripturam et traditionem)', *De scriptura et traditione* (Rome: Pontifica academia Mariana internationalis, 1963) 115–36, at 118; C. Hoegen-Rohls, *Der nachösterliche Johannes: Die Abschiedsreden als hermeneutischer Schlüssel zum vierten Evangelium* (WUNT 11/84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996) 116–17; R. Bieringer, 'The Spirit's Guidance Into All the Truth: The Text-Critical Problems of John 16,13', *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel* (ed. A. Denaux; BETL 161; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 2002) 198–9; F. Hahn, 'Sehen und Glauben im Johannesevangelium', *Studien zum Neuen Testament, vol. 1: Grundsatzfragen, Jesusforschung, Evangelien* (ed. J. Frey and J. Schlegel; WUNT 191; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006) 521–38, at 536.

5 See de la Potterie, *La vérité*, 1.367–8; Porsch, *Pneuma*, 257. De la Potterie structures Jn 14,26aβ–e as follows:

(a)	(b)	(c)
ἐκεῖνος		
ὑμᾶς	καὶ ὑπομνήσει	ᾧ εἶπον
διδάξει	ὑμᾶς	ὑμῖν
πάντα	πάντα	ἐγώ

ἐγὼ does not permit this separation;⁶ (iii) Jesus says in 14.26c that the Father will send the Holy Spirit in Jesus' name. If the Paraclete is to reveal Jesus, it would be strange that διδάξει πάντα is detached from ὃ εἶπον ὑμῖν ἐγὼ.⁷

However, scholarly literature has also provided counterarguments to the view that the relative pronoun in John 14.26e has both πάντα in 14.26aβ and 14.26d as its antecedent: (i) according to Christina Hoegen-Rohls, a first counterargument is that the separation of 14.26e from 14.26aβ provides a much stronger parallel structure between the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of the Paraclete. Whereas the pre-Easter era is characterised by the pre-Easter revelatory teaching of Jesus, the post-Easter era is characterised by the post-Easter revelatory teaching of the Paraclete. Both Jesus and the Paraclete have a revelatory function. This, however, does not mean that the teaching of the Paraclete is detached from the word of Jesus. The parallelism between the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of the Paraclete implies that the Paraclete will reveal the word of Jesus, just as Jesus has revealed the word of the Father. Yet, this does not mean that the Paraclete only reminds of what has already been revealed in/by Jesus. The orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete is not conceived as retrospective, but as prospective. The Paraclete will teach what each time (πάντα) is to be said about Jesus and the Father in the future.⁸ This counterargument presupposes that the meaning of καί in 14.26d is cumulative; (ii) according to Theodor Zahn, a second counterargument is that if the relative pronoun in 14.26e has also πάντα in 14.26aβ as its antecedent, the use of ὑμῶς and πάντα in 14.26aβ is superfluous.⁹

In my view, it is more likely on the basis of these (counter)arguments that only the πάντα in John 14.26d is the antecedent of the relative pronoun in 14.26e. The argument of Hoegen-Rohls that this interpretation allows for a stronger parallelism between Jesus' teaching and the Paraclete's teaching is persuasive because of the strong analogies between Jesus and the Paraclete depicted elsewhere in the Gospel: (i) just as the Paraclete is sent by the Father (14.16, 26), also Jesus is sent by the Father (3.17; 5.24, 37–8; 6.38, 44); (ii) the sending of the Paraclete takes place in Jesus' name (14.26).¹⁰ Furthermore, a stronger parallelism between Jesus' teaching and the Paraclete's teaching helps us understand why Jesus is also called παράκλητος (cf. John 14.16; see also 1 John 2.1).

6 See de la Potterie, *La vérité*, 1.368; Porsch, *Pneuma*, 257 nn. 210, 213.

7 See de la Potterie, *La vérité*, 1.368.

8 See Hoegen-Rohls, *Der nachösterliche Johannes*, 116–17.

9 See Zahn, *Johannes*, 572. According to de la Potterie (*La vérité*, I.368), the adjective πάντα in Jn 14.26aβ is, however, not omitted to: (i) give to it a "légère valeur emphatique", see E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar* (London: Black, 1906) n^o 2606 for John's use of superfluous words to draw attention; (ii) keep the rhythmic balance in the chiasmic structure of (a) and (b), see n. 5.

10 See Wehr, "Er wird", 329–30.

I consider the arguments of the presumed chiasmic structure and *inclusio* in John 14.25–6 to be unpersuasive, because: (i) ἐκεῖνος is a demonstrative pronoun, whereas ἐγώ is a personal pronoun. These terms do not correspond to each other in 14.26aβ–e. It is also not clear to me how there can be an *inclusio* between ταῦτα λελάληκα παρ’ ὑμῖν μένων and ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν ἐγώ. The personal pronoun ἐγώ does not correspond to the demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα. The personal pronoun ὑμῖν is also not the same as παρ’ ὑμῖν μένων. Nor does the word order of 14.26aβ–e allow for a concentric structure; (ii) the presumed chiasmic structure and *inclusio* presuppose the reading of ἐγώ in 14.26e, which is attested by B L 060 0141 (33 ἐγώ εἶπον ὑμῖν) 127 1819, but not by P^{75vid} κ A D Γ Δ Θ f¹ f¹³ Byz.; (iii) even if one allows for this confused and complex chiasmic structure, it is hardly conceivable that an author would have constructed it with the intention of ensuring that the relative clause of 14.26e cannot be separated from 14.26aβ; (iv) furthermore, I do not even see why this presumed chiasmic structure and *inclusio* does not allow for such a separation. In sum, the chiasmic structure and *inclusio* are clearly scholarly constructs to exclude the possibility that the text would say the Paraclete will teach something that Jesus has not yet taught.

The argument that John 14.26c (ὁ πέμψει ὁ πατήρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου) implies that ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν [ἐγώ] is attached to διδάξει πάντα is also unpersuasive. The idea that the Paraclete is sent in Jesus’ name does not guarantee that the Paraclete can only remind the disciples of the words of Jesus. I admit that other texts in the Fourth Gospel do convincingly demonstrate that the teaching of the Paraclete is repeating the teaching of Jesus. According to 8.40 and 15.15, Jesus revealed everything that he had heard from the Father (cf. 15.15 πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν). The relative clause in 15.15 is non-restrictive. It is not the case that Jesus only revealed that which he has heard from the Father whereas there are still other things that the Father has not told him which can later be revealed by the Paraclete. Jesus is the truth (14.6). Jesus has revealed the name of the Father (17.6, 26).

However, the view that the teaching of the Paraclete can only repeat the teaching of Jesus does not warrant the conclusion that the teaching function of the Paraclete is restricted to reminding the disciples of the words of Jesus. Put differently, this view does not guarantee that ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν [ἐγώ] is attached to διδάξει πάντα. Even if the Paraclete can only reveal Jesus, this does not necessarily mean that teaching and reminding are aspects of one and the same function of the Paraclete. He could still have a revelatory function.

Both the first and second interpretations of John 14.25–6 presuppose that attributing a revelatory function to the Paraclete implies that revelation was incomplete in Jesus. In my view, this implication is unjustified. Instead of limiting the revelatory function of Jesus, the revelatory function of the Paraclete strengthens the analogy between the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of the Paraclete. Whereas Jesus reveals the Father (1.18; 14.7), the Paraclete reveals Jesus (14.20,

25-6; 15.26-7; 16.7-11, 12-15). In their collaboration, there cannot be a competition between Jesus and the Paraclete, because both parties depend on each other in this single revelatory process. The relationship between Jesus and the Paraclete is one of co-operation. Therefore, the claim that the Paraclete can only reveal Jesus cannot be used as an argument against the view that the teaching of the Paraclete is revelatory or that teaching and reminding are two distinct functions of the Paraclete. The interpretation of the orientation of the Paraclete's teaching as prospective is still a possibility. Yet it is also the case that the proponents of this interpretation need to be corrected, because they wrongly suggest that the prospective orientation of the Paraclete's teaching implies that the Paraclete will teach things that have not yet been taught by Jesus.

2.2 *John 14.26d: Explicative or Cumulative καί?*

The study of Vern Poythress distinguishes three different meanings of καί in the sayings of the Johannine Jesus and the commentary of the evangelist on these sayings.¹¹ Two of these three meanings can be applied to καί in John 14.26.

(1) The conjunction καί can co-ordinate two sentences or preferably short clauses that are thematically related to each other. Additionally, these clauses often have individual words in common (see e.g. John 14.21(2), 28; 15.1, 2, 16).¹² In my view, this is also the case with the use of καί in 14.26. Both 14.26aβ and 14.26d share the same topic, i.e. the activity of the Paraclete. There are also some words in common here, viz. ὑμῶς and πάντα. This first possible meaning of καί in 14.26 agrees with what we have previously called the cumulative meaning of καί. The teaching and the reminding function of the Paraclete are presented as distinct from each other. The conjunction καί in 14.26 coordinates these two functions.

(2) The conjunction καί is used when the second sentence is a step-wise addition to the first. Only one sub-category of this second use of καί in John is relevant for our discussion, viz. where the second sentence adds information about one aspect only of the first sentence (e.g. John 14.4, 30). As we have seen, this explicative meaning of καί can also apply to καί in 14.26. The teaching activity of the Paraclete is explained as the activity of reminding the disciples of Jesus' words.

The two uses of καί in the Gospel of John mentioned above do not help us to determine the meaning of καί in John 14.26. The discussion focuses on whether the meaning of καί in 14.26 is cumulative or explicative. In my understanding, the view that καί is cumulative is the better interpretation because it allows for a stronger parallelism between the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of the Paraclete. An additional condition for this stronger parallelism is that the only

11 See V. S. Poythress, 'The Use of the Intersentence Conjunctions *de, oun, kai* and *Asyndeton* in The Gospel of John', *NovT* 26 (1984) 312-40.

12 The notation John 14.21(2) indicates the second use of καί in John 14.21.

antecedent of the relative pronoun in 14.26e is πάντα in 14.26d. As demonstrated in the previous subsection, this is more in agreement with the strong analogies between Jesus and the Paraclete depicted elsewhere in the Gospel and explains why Jesus is also called Paraclete. Like Jesus, the Paraclete has a proper revelatory function. Admittedly, this stronger parallel presentation is not warranted, but only made more probable by other analogies between Jesus and the Paraclete depicted elsewhere in the Gospel. Therefore, in the next section we will examine how the orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete is presented in 16.12–13.

3. John 16.12–13

- 16.12a ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω ὑμῖν λέγειν,
 16.12b ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι.
 16.13a ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος,
 16.13b τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,
 16.13c ὀδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση.
 16.13d οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ,
 16.13e ἀλλ' ὅσα ἀκούσει λαλήσει
 16.13f καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.¹³

There are many *variae lectiones* for John 16.13.¹⁴ According to Bieringer's text-critical analysis of the external evidence, the main question is whether to read ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση + ἀκούει (κ²) or εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν + ἀκούσει (B).¹⁵ When the prepositions ἐν and εἰς are taken in their strict (i.e. classical) sense, Bieringer considers ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση as indicating the 'place where', whereas εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν expresses the 'goal to which'. According to the first phrase, the Spirit of truth guides the disciples in the full truth, where they already are. In the second wording, the Spirit of truth guides the disciples into the full truth, where they are not yet. According to Bieringer, the present tense ἀκούει links the speaking of the Paraclete closely to the revelation of Jesus. The future tense ἀκούσει, on the other hand, leaves 'more room for the newness of future developments'.¹⁶ When the prepositions ἐν and εἰς are taken

13 The text of John 16.12–13 is taken from NA²⁸.

14 Bieringer, 'The Spirit', 184–5, 190 distinguishes ten variants in the textual tradition of John 16.13c and three variants for 16.13e.

15 See Bieringer, 'The Spirit', 184–92.

16 See Bieringer, 'The Spirit', 183–4. C. Stefan, 'The Paraclete and Prophecy in the Johannine Community', *The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 27 (2005) 273–96, at 286 correctly observes that, if the fourth evangelist really wanted to present the Paraclete as 'only recalling and interpreting Jesus' earthly words', he would have 'used the past tense of the verb ἀκούω, which would imply that the Paraclete "will declare what he heard"'. This past tense is, however, nowhere attested in the manuscripts.

in their weak (i.e. interchangeable) sense, the interpretative possibilities of 16.13 remain the same.¹⁷ In that case, it does not matter whether one reads ἐν or εἰς. Both prepositions can express either the meaning of motion, direction, goal or rest, sphere, place.

I observe that the interpretation of John 16.12–13 is interrelated with that of 14.25–6. Just as for 14.25–6, scholarly literature has provided the two following interpretations for 16.12–13 concerning the orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete.

Interpretation one: when one understands teaching and reminding as the same function of the Paraclete in John 14.25–6, one interprets the prepositional phrase ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση/εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν in 16.13 as indicating the ‘place where’. The Paraclete will guide the disciples in the full truth, where they already are. He will therefore not reveal entirely new things, but only further develop or deepen what has already been revealed in/by Jesus. This development should be understood in terms of the application/actualisation of what has already been given. The Paraclete only applies to new contexts what has already been revealed in/by Jesus. According to 16.13–14, the Paraclete will declare the coming things (τὰ ἐρχόμενα) by reminding the disciples of the past, that is, in agreement with the retrospective character of his teaching. The Paraclete will not announce unknown things that have not yet taken place, but will help the disciples to understand the things that will come to pass by reminding them of the teaching of Jesus.¹⁸

Interpretation two: if one understands teaching and reminding as distinct functions of the Paraclete in John 14.25–6, the prepositional phrase ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση/εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν is interpreted as expressing the ‘place to which’. The Paraclete will guide the disciples into the full truth, where they are not yet. John 16.13c is then understood as parallel to 14.26aβ. The Paraclete will reveal things (16.12a πολλά) that have not yet been revealed in/by Jesus. According to 16.13f, he will declare the coming things (τὰ ἐρχόμενα), which God and Jesus (will)¹⁹ communicate to him (cf. John 4.25; see also Isa 41.22–3; 44.7; 45.11). His teaching is thus not oriented to the past, but to the future.

17 BDR §205 speaks about the confusion of ἐν and εἰς in the NT in the sense that ἐν can be used for εἰς and εἰς for ἐν. For this confusion in the Gospel of John in particular, see the chart in Bieringer, ‘The Spirit’, 201.

18 See e.g. Lagrange, *Jean*, 420–3; Bultmann, *Johannes*, 441–3; Brown, *John (xiii–xxi)*, 714–16; Schnackenburg, *Johannes*, III.152–4; de la Potterie, *La vérité*, 1.422–66; Dettwiler, *Die Gegenwart*, 231–6; Rahner, ‘Vergegenwärtigende Erinnerung’, 89; Wehr, ‘“Er wird”’, 330–2; Gourgues, ‘Le paraclet’, 96–9; Zumstein, *Jean (13–21)*, 138–9; Thyen, *Johannes*, 665–7; Dettwiler, ‘La pneumatologie’, 370–1.

19 Both the readings ἀκούει and ἀκούσει in John 16.13e are legitimate in this interpretation of 16.13f. The indicative present ἀκούει can be explained as expressing eternal Trinitarian relations: see Lagrange, *Jean*, 422; de la Potterie, *La vérité*, 1.441 n. 313.

Instead of being retrospective, the teaching of the Paraclete is prospective. The Paraclete is prophetic. His revelatory function is, however, not conceived as independent from Jesus. The Paraclete is the mediator of Jesus' revelation. Yet, this dependence may not be understood as if the Paraclete's teaching is a recollection of Jesus' teaching. Just as Jesus is the spokesperson of the Father, the Paraclete is the spokesperson of Jesus. Jesus' sayings are not a recollection of what the Father spoke to him. Jesus rather speaks *on behalf of* the Father. *Mutatis mutandis*, the teaching of the Paraclete is not a recollection of what the Paraclete hears (or will hear) from Jesus, but the Paraclete speaks *for* Jesus. Nevertheless, the words of the Paraclete are still perceived as Jesus' words. The Paraclete is thus bound to Jesus, but not to the past. He cannot teach something that contradicts the teaching of Jesus, but expands Jesus' teaching.²⁰

We will evaluate the two interpretations of John 16.12–13 mentioned above by engaging in the text-critical discussion of 16.12–13 (3.1), and discussing the meaning of *πάση/πάσαν* in 16.13c (3.2), *πολλά* in 16.12a (3.3) and *τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ* in 16.13f (3.4).

3.1 *John 16.13c, εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν + ἀκούσει or ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση + ἀκούει?*

According to Bieringer, the following two internal text-critical arguments can be given for the view that *ἐν* is secondary to *εἰς* and *ἀκούει* to *ἀκούσει*: (i) the stylistic argument: the combination of *ὀδηγέω* + *ἐν* is common in the LXX.²¹ The scribe was influenced by the LXX and replaced the original *ὀδηγέω* + *εἰς* with the more idiomatic *ὀδηγέω* + *ἐν*.²² The view that the fourth evangelist was influenced by the LXX²³ is less appealing, because one cannot explain on the basis of the LXX why a scribe would have changed *ἐν* into *εἰς*.²⁴ (ii) the theological argument: the scribe wanted to mitigate 'the revelatory role of the Spirit' and

20 See e.g. Westcott, *John*, 230–1; Weiss, *Johannes*, 443–4; Windisch, *Die fünf johanneischen Parakletsprüche*, 121; Zahn, *Johannes*, 593; Bauer, *Johannes*, 198; Bernard, *John*, 509–11; Mußner, 'Die johanneischen Parakletsprüche', 61–2; Feuillet, 'De munere', 119–21; Hoegen-Rohls, *Der nachösterliche Johannes*, 188–92; Bieringer, 'The Spirit'; Stefan, 'The Paraclet'; Hahn, 'Sehen', 536.

21 The verb *ὀδηγέω* occurs forty-four times in the LXX. According to my analysis, in twenty-one occurrences it is used in combination with *ἐν* + dative (Deut 1.3; Josh 24.3; Neh 9.19; Pss 5.9; 24(25).9; 26(27).11; 66(67).5; 72(73).24; 76(77).21; 77(78).14, 53, 72; 105(106).9; 118(119).35; 138(139).24; 142(143).10; Wis 9.11; 10.10, 17; 2 Esd 19.19; Ecclus 2.3). In three occurrences it is found in combination with *εἰς* (Exod 32.34; Pss 42(43).3; 106(107).7). For further semantical analysis of the combination *ὀδηγέω* + *ἐν* + dative in the LXX, see Bieringer, 'The Spirit', 195–6.

22 See also Mußner, 'Die johanneischen Parakletsprüche', 151 n. 16.

23 See Bauer, *Johannes*, 198; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (London: SPCK, 1978²) 407.

24 See Bieringer, 'The Spirit', 196–7.

avoid ‘a competition with the revelatory activity of Jesus’.²⁵ Because ἀκούει ‘is never used together with εἰς readings’ in the textual tradition of John 16.13, a first scribe must have changed εἰς into ἐν. This scribe probably understood εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν as contradicting 8.40 and 16.7. The aim of this scribe was to emphasise that ‘after Jesus’ revelatory activity ἀλήθεια can no longer be a goal’. ‘[I]n a second movement after some time, another scribe’ changed ἀκούσει into ἀκούει to stress ‘that the Paraclete’s activity does not embrace anything that the earthly Jesus has not revealed’.²⁶

Bieringer gives more weight to the second than to the first argument, because he considers it ‘an open question whether John knew and used the LXX in general and in [John] 16,13 in particular’.²⁷ According to Bieringer, the question at stake concerning the choice between ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση + ἀκούει or εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν + ἀκούσει is ‘whether revelation is complete in Jesus or whether the Paraclete also has a revelatory function’. If the Paraclete has a revelatory function, he ‘reveals new things which Jesus had not yet revealed’.²⁸ Bieringer thus presupposes that attributing a revelatory function to the Paraclete implies that revelation was incomplete in Jesus. According to my analysis, this view is generally held by proponents of both interpretations of John 16.12–13.²⁹ We have, however, demonstrated in subsection 2.1 that this view is incorrect. To attribute a revelatory function to the Paraclete does not imply weakening the revelatory function of Jesus, but rather strengthening the co-operation and analogy between Jesus and the Paraclete.

In my view, the question of which reading is more original is not important for understanding the orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete, because both ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση + ἀκούει and εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν + ἀκούσει support the view that this orientation is prospective. It makes no difference whether one reads ἀκούει or ἀκούσει. In both cases, the verb has a future meaning. Even if one reads ἀκούει, the phrase ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος provides the necessary pragmatic information to understand ἀκούει as having future meaning. Compare John 16.13 with 15.26 and 16.21:

ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ. (15.26)

ἡ γυνὴ ὅταν τίκτη λύπην ἔχει, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα αὐτῆς. ὅταν δὲ γεννήσῃ τὸ παιδίον, οὐκέτι μνημονεύει τῆς θλίψεως διὰ τὴν χαρὰν ὅτι ἐγεννήθη ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον. (16.21)

25 Bieringer, ‘The Spirit’, 206. See also Lagrange, *Jean*, 421.

26 Bieringer, ‘The Spirit’, 196.

27 Bieringer, ‘The Spirit’, 202.

28 Bieringer, ‘The Spirit’, 183.

29 For these interpretations, see above, section 3.

Both ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος and ὅταν δὲ γεννήσῃ τὸ παιδίον express a future expectation. Because of this pragmatic information, the verbs ἐκπορεύεται and μνημονεύει, although morphologically present tense verbs, have a future meaning. Comparably, the verb ἀκούει in 16.13 has a future meaning, because of the pragmatic information provided by ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος.³⁰ A correct rendering of 16.13 would then be:

When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth; for he will not speak on his own, but will speak whatever he then hears (ἀκούει), and he will declare to you the things that are to come.

The adverb ‘then’ indicates that the hearing of the Paraclete takes place in the future.

An additional argument for the view that both the *variae lectiones* ἀκούει and ἀκούσει in John 16.13 have future meaning are the phrases ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν and ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαμβάνει καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν in respectively 16.14 and 16.15. The shift from the future λήμψεται to the present λαμβάνει in these phrases does not imply a temporal division between that which the Paraclete will receive from Jesus in the future and that which he is currently receiving in the present. Both verbs have a future meaning.³¹

Because both the *variae lectiones* ἀκούει and ἀκούσει in John 16.13 have future meaning, it does not matter whether one reads ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ or εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν. The future meaning of ἀκούει and ἀκούσει implies that the teaching of the Paraclete is not a recollection of Jesus’ words. The future orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete means that the disciples are at present not yet in the full truth. The Paraclete will lead them into the full truth, where they are not yet. Consequently, the preposition ἐν has the same meaning as εἰς in 16.13. Both ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ + ἀκούει and εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν + ἀκούσει support the view that the teaching of the Paraclete is prospective. Text-critically it is more likely that the original reading was ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ + ἀκούει and that a first scribe explicated the future meaning of ἀκούει by changing it into ἀκούσει. A second scribe changed ἐν into εἰς because, in his or her understanding of Greek, the preposition εἰς is more

30 That morphologically present tense verbs express posterior information is a phenomenon that is also attested in Dutch, German, English, Italian, Modern Greek, and beyond: see H. Broekhuis and H. J. Verkuyf, ‘Binary Tense and Modality’, *NLLT* 32 (2014) 973–1009; A. Giannakidou, ‘The Futurity of the Present and the Modality of the Future: A Commentary on Broekhuis and Verkuyf’, *NLLT* 32 (2014) 1011–32.

31 The future meaning of λαμβάνει in John 16.15 has been noticed by modern translators: see e. g. KJV (‘All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take (λαμβάνει) of mine, and shall shew it unto you’); NRSV (‘All that the Father has is mine. For this reason I said that he will take (λαμβάνει) what is mine and declare it to you’).

adequate than ἐν to express the goal of future revelation, although the original ἐν already had this meaning of direction and goal because of the future meaning of ἀκούει.

3.2 *John 16.13c: The Meaning of πάση/ πᾶσαν*

According to Bieringer's analysis, the meaning of πάση/πᾶσαν in John 16.13c has been understood in two fundamentally distinct ways. 'Some exegetes' see the adjective πάση/πᾶσαν as expressing 'the idea of totality, completeness or fullness of revelation'. For Bieringer, this idea of totality suggests that the Paraclete reveals new things in comparison to what has been revealed in/by Jesus. In my analysis, this view corresponds to interpretation two of 16.12–13. Bieringer observes that, because of this allusion to new revelation, many scholars implicitly apply πάση/πᾶσαν not to ἀλήθεια, but to 'the disciples' relationship with the ἀλήθεια', which has been revealed in Jesus. Bieringer correctly claims that in this second interpretation, πάση/πᾶσαν is not seen as an adjective modifying ἀλήθεια, but as an adverb modifying ὁδηγέω: 'that one will guide you completely in/into the truth'.³² In my view, this interpretation of πάση/πᾶσαν implies that the Paraclete will guide the disciples in the truth, where they already are. He will thus not reveal entirely new things, but will only further develop or deepen what was already revealed in/by Jesus. According to my analysis, such an interpretation corresponds to interpretation one of 16.12–13. In this first interpretation of πάση/πᾶσαν in 16.13c, the emphasis is on the completeness of truth, which implies that truth was not complete in Jesus. In the second interpretation, the emphasis is on the completeness of the guidance, which implies that truth was already complete in Jesus, but that the conditions for understanding the truth were not yet given. These conditions will be accomplished by the teaching of the Paraclete.

3.3 *John 16.12a: The Meaning of πολλά*

I further observe that there is an interrelation between the interpretation of the meaning of πάση/πᾶσαν in John 16.13c and the interpretation of the meaning of πολλά in 16.12a. The word πολλά has been interpreted in two ways, as indicating: (i) additional new revelation that is more difficult and profound than the teaching provided by Jesus; (ii) a more complete explication, development, deepening of that which has been revealed in/by Jesus.³³ The first interpretation of πολλά corresponds to the first interpretation of πάση/πᾶσαν. The second interpretation corresponds to the second interpretation of πάση/πᾶσαν.

According to de la Potterie, the first interpretation of πολλά is excluded, because it cannot explain why πολλά is called a burden in John 16.12b and

³² Bieringer, 'The Spirit', 200.

³³ See e.g. Lagrange, *Jean*, 420; de la Potterie, *La vérité*, 1.429.

that at the same time the role of the Spirit is described as ‘une illumination pour aider les disciples à mieux comprendre le Christ et son message’ (14.25–6; 16.4, 25).³⁴ This description of the role of the Spirit is in opposition to the view of the first interpretation of πολλά that the additional revelation that the Paraclete will bring is more complex and, therefore, harder to bear (βαστάζειν). In my view, however, the argument of de la Potterie is circular, because it presupposes that 14.25–6 characterises the orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete as retrospective. In other words, the argument of de la Potterie assumes that the teaching of the Paraclete retrospectively explains what was already revealed in/by Jesus, whereas this is the issue under discussion.

De la Potterie argues for the second interpretation of πολλά on the basis of the observation that οὐ δύνασθε and ἄρτι in John 16.12b orient the disciples to the future and indicate their present incapacity to understand the words of Jesus.³⁵ In my view, however, John 16.12–13 does *stricto sensu* not say that the disciples are unable to bear words that Jesus has actually spoken. Although Jesus would have spoken these words if the disciples were able to bear them, he has chosen not to. The interrelation between πολλά and πόση/πάνσαν rather suggests that the words the disciples were unable to bear at that time will be spoken by the Paraclete. These words of the Paraclete thus cannot be an explication, development or deepening of the words that Jesus has actually spoken. Why would the disciples be unable to bear explanations of the words they have already received from Jesus? Explanations are always easier to understand than what is explained. Therefore πολλά cannot refer to explanations of the words that Jesus has actually spoken. This implies that the Paraclete has a teaching function that cannot be reduced to reminding the disciples of what has already been revealed in/by Jesus. Like Jesus’ teaching, the teaching of the Paraclete can properly be called revelatory. Yet, as argued in subsection 2.1, it is not the case that the Paraclete can be held to teach something that has not yet been taught by Jesus. The paradox that we face here is that πολλά in 16.12a designates the teaching of the Paraclete, which Jesus could not teach, because his disciples were unable to bear it. Yet, at the same time, the teaching of the Paraclete can only repeat the teaching of Jesus, because Jesus is ἡ ἀλήθεια (14.16) and has revealed everything there is to reveal about the Father (15.15). In section 4, we will argue that Kierkegaard’s category of repetition is the key to understanding this paradox. We will see that this category is able to conceive the teaching of the Paraclete as both new and the same in comparison to the teaching of Jesus.

34 de la Potterie, *La vérité*, 1.429.

35 See de la Potterie, *La vérité*, 1.429.

3.4 *John 16.13f: The Meaning of τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ*

The double use of λαλήσει in John 16.13de introduces the direct explanation of 16.13c. Because the meaning of καί in 16.13f is explicative,³⁶ the phrase τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν is also an explanation of ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση/εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν. There is, therefore, also an interrelation between πάση/πᾶσαν and τὰ ἐρχόμενα. The combination of ἀναγγέλλω with τὰ ἐρχόμενα has been interpreted in two ways:³⁷ (i) the prefix ἀνα of ἀναγγέλλω indicates repetition.³⁸ The Paraclete will thus only reannounce or reproclaim what Jesus has said before him. He will not announce unknown things that have not yet taken place, but will help to understand the things that will come to pass (τὰ ἐρχόμενα) by reminding the disciples of the teaching of Jesus (see interpretation one of 16.12–13),³⁹ (ii) the verb ἀναγγέλλω does not denote repetition or announcement of something that has already taken place, but the prophetic function of the Paraclete. The Paraclete is able to reveal things (τὰ ἐρχόμενα) before they take place (see interpretation two of 16.12–13).⁴⁰

In my view, the second interpretation of τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ in John 16.13f is the better one for three reasons: (i) because of the interrelation between τὰ ἐρχόμενα and πάση/πᾶσαν in 16.13, there is a parallel between τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν in 16.13f and ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα in 4.25. The verb ἀναγγέλλω occurs five times in the Fourth Gospel: three times in 16.13–15, once in 4.25, and once in 5.15. It is obvious that ἀναγγέλλω has the meaning of reannouncing or retelling in 5.15. The man healed during the Sabbath at first did not know who healed him (5.13). Only after he saw Jesus again (5.14) was he able to announce (ἀναγγέλλω) this to the ‘Jews’ (5.15). However, this meaning of reannouncing of things that happened in the past is not present in the claim of the Samaritan woman that the Messiah ‘will proclaim all things to us’ (4.25).⁴¹ Because of the parallelism between τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν and ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα, this meaning of reannouncing

36 De la Potterie (*La vérité*, 1.440) correctly observes that ἀναγγελεῖ in John 16.13f explains and specifies the double use of λαλήσει in 16.13de. The conjunction καί in 16.13f is, therefore, ‘épexégétique’.

37 Because of the indeterminate meaning of τὰ ἐρχόμενα in John 16.13f, this presentation of the interpretation possibilities of 16.13f does not include e.g. Barrett’s suggestion (*John*, 490) that τὰ ἐρχόμενα might refer to ‘the events of the passion, which was about to take place, and include perhaps both the crucifixion and the resurrection’.

38 See P. Joüon, ‘Le verbe ἀναγγέλλω dans Saint Jean’, *RSR* 28 (1938) 234–5.

39 See esp. Rahner, ‘Vergegenwärtigende Erinnerung’, 89; I. Broer, ‘ἀγγέλλω’, *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 1 (2011) 29–32, at 31; Gourgues, ‘Le paraclet’, 99; de la Potterie, *La vérité*, 1.448.

40 See esp. Stefan, ‘The Paraclete’, 273, 283, 286–7, 294–5.

41 See Stefan, ‘The Paraclete’, 281. Additionally, Brown (*John* (xiii–xxi), 708), a proponent of interpretation one of John 16.13f, doubts whether ἀναγγέλλω in 4.25 has the meaning of reannouncing or reproclaiming.

or reproclaiming is also absent in 16.13f; (ii) the Johannine Jesus too elsewhere has the ability to tell things before they happen, for example concerning his death (e.g. John 12.23-4, 32-3; 13.1), Judas' betrayal (13.18-19) and the persecution of the disciples (16.2-3); (iii) the combination of ἀναγγέλλω with τὰ ἐρχόμενα is unique in the Bible, but almost the same as the combination of ἀναγγέλλω with τὰ ἐπερχόμενα in Isa 41.23; 44.7. According to Franklin W. Young, in Deutero-Isaiah the verb ἀναγγέλλω designates 'a very significant function of God in contrast to false-gods and false-prophets of alien nations', namely, the power to announce events that are to come 'before they actually occur' (see Isa 41.28; 42.9; 44.7; 47.13; 46.9-10). The correct translation of ἀναγγέλλω in these texts is not to reannounce or reproclaim, but 'to reveal'.⁴²

However, as argued earlier in subsection 2.1, this prophetic function of the Paraclete does not imply that the Paraclete will teach things that have not yet been taught by Jesus. Both Jesus and the Paraclete have a prophetic function, yet there is not competition but collaboration between both. The next section will argue that the key to understanding this enigma is a philosophical reflection on the notion of repetition.

4. Repetition as a Key Notion for Understanding the Teaching Function of the Paraclete

The previous two sections have analysed John 14.25-6 and 16.12-13 with special attention to the orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete. Both analyses have demonstrated that this orientation can be interpreted both as retrospective and prospective. We have argued that the prospective interpretation is the better one. In this interpretation, the reminding and the teaching function of the Paraclete are considered to be distinct from each other. However, the proponents of the retrospective interpretation have correctly pointed out that the Paraclete will not teach anything that has not yet been taught by Jesus. The best interpretation is, therefore, a synthesis of the retrospective and prospective interpretations. The present section will argue that Kierkegaard's category of repetition is a key term for obtaining this synthesis.

4.1 Kierkegaard's Distinction between Recollection and Repetition

Kierkegaard contrasts repetition with Plato's notion of recollection (ἀνάμνησις). According to Kierkegaard, repetition and recollection are the same movement, but in opposite directions. Whereas recollection is retrospective, repetition is prospective. Recollection is cognitive and means 'the articulate

42 F. W. Young, 'A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel', *ZNW* 46 (1955) 215-33, at 224-6. See also Sirach's passage on Isaiah, Ecclus 48.25: ὑπέδειξεν τὰ ἐσόμενα καὶ τὰ ἀπόκρυφα πρὶν ἢ παραγενέσθαι αὐτά.

retrieval of an impression of a past actuality' from the realm of ideas.⁴³ As such, it is a movement from reality to ideality. It is immanent and static, because it deals with that which is and does not bring anything new nor change our existence. Recollection 'regards knowing the (already existing) truth'.⁴⁴ Repetition, on the other hand, is existential and means that 'a past actuality becomes actual once again: someone who repeats is *renewing* actuality'.⁴⁵ Repetition is a movement from ideality to reality. It is a transcendence, because it is a coming into being.⁴⁶ Repetition is a paradoxical movement in which nothing changes, but everything becomes new.

According to Kierkegaard, the occurrence of repetition is dependent on recollection. According to Niels Eriksen, this can be explained on the basis of Luther's distinction between law and gospel. Eriksen finds this distinction 'reflected at various levels' in Kierkegaard's thinking on repetition. He defines the law as 'the word that refers a human being to the horizon of possibilities within his own existence'. This corresponds to Kierkegaard's notion of recollection, because it is a movement from reality to ideality and has a cognitive and retrospective character. When confronted with the law, human beings seek to fulfil their possibilities and at the same time realise 'the impossibility of this fulfilment'. The law gradually closes 'the horizon of possibilities' and 'makes the individual become as nothing before God'. Human beings are in need of the gospel to 'create new life'. This corresponds to the meaning of repetition as 'coming into being'.⁴⁷

4.2 The Paraclete's Reminding and Teaching as Recollection and Repetition

Kierkegaard's distinction between recollection and repetition is useful for our understanding of the relationship between the reminding and the teaching function of the Paraclete in the Gospel of John. The category of recollection can be used to understand the reminding function of the Paraclete. It is self-evident that his reminding function is retrospective and cognitive. This is explicitly attested by the parenthetical comments, in John 2.19–22 and 12.12–16, on the resurrection of the temple and Jesus' royal entry in Jerusalem respectively. Both texts demonstrate that the reminding function of the Paraclete enables the disciples to

43 C. Carlisle, 'Kierkegaard's *Repetition*: The Possibility of Motion', *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 13 (2005) 521–41, at 525.

44 I.-A. Bårliba, 'Søren Kierkegaard's *Repetition*: Existence in Motion', *Symposion* 1 (2014) 23–49, at 27.

45 Carlisle, 'Kierkegaard's *Repetition*: The Possibility of Motion', 525.

46 See Carlisle, 'Kierkegaard's *Repetition*: The Possibility of Motion', 525–6; Bårliba, 'Søren Kierkegaard's *Repetition*: Existence in Motion', 27.

47 N. N. Eriksen, *Kierkegaard's Category of Repetition: A Reconstruction* (Kierkegaard Studies Monograph Series 5; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000) 132–4.

understand retrospectively Jesus' words and deeds. As such, the reminding function of the Paraclete is essential for opening the horizon of possibilities in the existence of the disciples.

Yet, according to the gospel story, the knowledge claims of the disciples are not sufficient. When confronted with the task to live authentically, they are at the same time hindered by their impotence. On two occasions, viz. John 6.69 and 16.29–30, the disciples confess and affirm faith. The reaction of Jesus in 6.70–1 and 16.31–2 to these confessions painfully reveals the impotence of the disciples to live authentically. Characteristic of the pre-Easter era is that Jesus opens up a new possibility of existence for the disciples, but that the disciples are unable to let this possibility come into being. Although they are told the truth, they are unable either to do what is true (cf. 3.21) or to worship the Father in truth (cf. 4.23–4). In order to have an authentic existence and let the possibility offered by Jesus come into being, the disciples have to receive the gift of the Spirit (e.g. 14.25–6; 16.12–13).

Just as the category of repetition is prospective, the teaching of the Paraclete is also oriented to the future (John 14.25–6; 16.12–13). Kierkegaard's category of repetition is useful not only for understanding the prospective orientation of the teaching of the Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel, but also for apprehending that this teaching is not in competition with the teaching of Jesus. The category of repetition is the means to being able to attribute a revelatory function to both Jesus and the Paraclete. The analogy that the Paraclete reveals Jesus, just as Jesus has revealed the Father, can only be adequately conceived on the basis of the category of repetition. According to this category, the Paraclete did not teach anything that had not already been taught by Jesus. The Paraclete repeats Jesus' teaching as a totality, nothing more and nothing less. Yet, his teaching function is not reduced to his reminding function, but is genuinely revelatory. Although his teaching does not add anything new to the old, it does renew the old. Nothing has changed, yet everything has become new.

5. Conclusion

The present study has demonstrated that the teaching and the reminding function of the Paraclete are two distinct functions. Whereas the reminding function is retrospective, the teaching function is prospective. Like Jesus, the Paraclete has a proper revelatory function. This does not mean that the Paraclete teaches things that have not yet been taught by Jesus. The reminding function of the Paraclete is restricted to the teaching of Jesus. Yet, such a cognitive recollection of Jesus' words does not enable the disciples to translate Jesus' teaching into action. This requires existential transformation. This coming into being is brought about by the teaching function of the Paraclete as a genuine form of

repetition. The Johannine believer does not only get to know the truth, but he or she is also transfigured by the truth. The reminding function of the Paraclete enables the disciples to signify the truth. The teaching function of the Paraclete transforms the disciples into a designation of the truth. One can only make an authentic image of God by becoming an image of God.