

THE CONVICTING WORK OF
THE HOLY SPIRIT
AS GIVEN IN
JOHN 16:8-11

by
Richard Van Heukelum

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Master of Divinity in
Grace Theological Seminary
May 1982

Title: JOHN 16:8-11: THE CONVICTING WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
Author: Richard A. Van Heukelum
Degree: Master of Divinity
Date: May 1982
Adviser: Dr. Brent Sandy

John 16:8-11 is by far the most quoted passage in support of a "convicting work of the Holy Spirit." The difficulty of this passage is obvious when the commentaries which deal with it are consulted. It is nearly impossible to find two commentators who bring out the same shade of meaning. In particular a minority of interpreters are vehemently opposed to the normal understanding of this passage as the subjective work of the Holy Spirit on the conscience of an unbeliever before his conversion. Although even these commentators are diverse in their understanding of the passage, it is generally true that they see this passage as in some way conveying an objective condemnation or guilty verdict performed by the Holy Spirit against the world.

Lexical, syntactical, and contextual considerations all point to the fact that more than either a totally subjective or objective condemnation is involved. This is apparent from the meaning of the key word (ἐλέγχω). The fact that its primary meaning is that of so effectively revealing or exposing the truth of a matter so that it cannot be denied supports this conclusion. The fact that the syntax demands a sense uniform to each of the three indictments as well as the basic meaning of the ὅτι clauses also supports this conclusion. Finally that this work of the Holy Spirit will occur after Pentecost, will be for the benefit of the disciples, and will be similar to the work of Christ, that this work will be performed in connection with the disciples, and that Scripture demands some such work of God to enlighten the minds of unbelievers, all support this conclusion.

Although many shades of meaning are possible, it seems that the best sense of the passage is that after Pentecost and due to the absence of Christ, the Holy Spirit will perform the task of revealing the truth concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment as Christ had done while He was on earth. This revealing will be to those who are yet unbelievers in Christ. Although performed by the Holy Spirit through objective means, it will be so effectively revealed that the one to whom he reveals it will inwardly realize the truth. In light of the obstacles facing the disciples of Christ after His departure this was truly a benefit for them as it is for us today.

Accepted by the faculty of Grace Theological Seminary
in partial fulfillment of requirements of the degree
Master of Divinity



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
Need of Study.....	2
Various Issues.....	2
Nature of the Convicting Work.....	2
Subjective.....	3
Objective.....	6
Combination.....	8
Conclusion.....	9
Meaning of the Indictments.....	9
Purpose of Study.....	10
Procedure of Study.....	11
Results of Study.....	12
Chapter	
I. LEXICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	13
ἐλέγγω	13
English Translations.....	13
Greek Meaning.....	14
Its Action: Exposure.....	15
Its Purpose: Moral Correction.....	18
Its Effectiveness: Thorough.....	21
Its Method: Confrontation.....	24
John 8:46.....	25
Conclusion.....	27
κόσμος	28
Definitions.....	28
Issues.....	29
Conclusion.....	32
II. SYNTACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	33
Uniform Sense.....	33
περί	36
III. CONTEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	38
Time Element of this Work.....	38
Method of this Work.....	40
Reasons for this Work.....	41
παράλητος	41
Natural Man's Blindness.....	45
Conclusion.....	45

IV. MEANING OF THE THREE INDICTMENTS.....	47
Various Interpretations.....	47
Explanatory.....	47
Elliptically.....	47
Causal.....	48
Combination.....	48
Conclusion.....	49
Proper Meaning.....	50
Conclusion.....	56
CONCLUSION.....	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED.....	61

INTRODUCTION

NEED OF STUDY

Essential in the systematizing and practical out-working of a personal theology is a clear understanding of the biblical teaching concerning conversion. One important element in the process of conversion is the role of the Holy Spirit. Writers dealing with this subject generally include a section entitled "The Convicting (or Convincing) Work of the Holy Spirit" and cite John 16:8-11 as the primary biblical authority for this work. George Smeaton, for example, in reference to this passage says: "It may be called, perhaps, the most conclusive passage on the Spirit's work in connection with conversion in the whole compass of Scripture."¹ Chafer, driving for his unique interpretation states: "These words of Christ . . . impart the most vital information to the child of God who would be intelligent and effective in his soul-winning service."² These statements represent the importance which many place on this passage in regards to the Holy Spirit's work in conversion. A need for a study of this passage exists not only because of this

¹George Smeaton, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1974), p. 186.

²L. S. Chafer, Systematic Theology, 10 vols. (Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948), 6:94.

importance but also because of the wide variation in its interpretation. Included in this variation are those who see no correlation between this passage and conversion. Calvin recognized this disagreement in his time and wrote: "Passing by the diversity of exposition . . . I shall only state what appears to me to be in accordance with Christ's true meaning."¹ Alford found it as complex in his time and wrote: "Of even the best commentators no two bring out exactly the same shade of meaning."² Ryle states: "There is something in it which seems to baffle all interpreters."³

Various Issues

The multitude of minor differences in the interpretation of this passage makes a thorough classification of the various views nearly impossible. It can be observed, however, that two issues are generally dealt with by interpreters.

Nature of the Convicting Work of the Holy Spirit

The primary issue centers on the nature of the conviction which the Holy Spirit does. This conviction is often classified as either subjective or objective.

¹John Calvin, Commentary on the Gospel According to John, 2 vols., translated by W. Pringle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing House, 1949), 2:137.

²Henry Alford, The Greek New Testament, 1968 ed., revision by E. F. Harrison, 4 vols. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1958), 1:867.

³J. C. Ryle, Expository Thoughts on the Gospels, reprint ed., 4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977), 4:139.

The issue is complicated both by the fact that these classifications are not consistently used by the various writers and because many writers either gloss over or fail to see the issue. The particular understanding of any individual writer will primarily be based on his definition of the Greek word ἐλέγχω as it is used in this passage and to a lesser degree on the meaning he assigns to κόσμος .

Subjective

The basic idea behind a subjective conviction is that this is an inward, subjective operation of the Holy Spirit in the conscience (or heart) of an individual prior to conversion. It is regarded as a description of the Holy Spirit's gracious function in bringing a sinner to see his need for a Savior. Smeaton, for example, writes: "The Spirit, in spite of the ignorance and resistance of the carnal mind, will bring men to such a perception of the reality and importance of saving truth that they will no longer resist its evidence."¹

An essential feature of a subjective work is that there is a convincing or realization of some truth previously unknown or unrealized. This truth is revealed in such a way that it must be acknowledged, at least inwardly, as truth. In this passage, the newly realized truth concerns sin, righteousness, and judgment with the result generally stated as being either the "conversion" or

¹Smeaton, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, p. 188-9.

"hardening and condemnation."¹ Some, however, consider this work to be done only to "those whom God has given to Christ" and therefore understand the result to always be repentance.² Nearly all interpretations under the subjective classification understand the object of the conviction to be individuals alienated from God and in need of salvation. Exceptions to this include Pache who makes the object to be the whole world³ and Brown who sees the disciples of Christ as the object.⁴

Within the subjective classification, a difference of opinion exists as to whether this work results in a feeling of guilt or merely a consciousness of truth. Most in this classification see in **ἐλέγχω** a "refutation, the overcoming of an error . . . by the truth . . . and when . . . a man becomes conscious of them--then arises the feeling of guilt which is ever painful."⁵

¹Heinrich Meyer, The Gospel of John, American Edition, trans. by W. Urick, revised and ed. by Frederick Crombie (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884), p. 446.

²E.g. James M. Boice, The Gospel of John, 5 vols. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), 4:289.

³René Pache, The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit (Chicago: Moody Press, 1970), p. 57.

⁴R. E. Brown, The Gospel According to John (xii-xxi), 44 vols., Anchor Bible Series (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Co., 1970), 29A:712-3.

⁵E.g. Friedrich Lucke, Commentor über das Evangelium des Johannes, Commentary on the Gospel of John (Bonn: ben. Eduard Beber, 1843), p. 650, trans. and quoted by Alvah Hovey, Commentary on the Gospel of John (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1885), p. 314.

Because of this pain, it has been called the "punitive office of the Holy Spirit."¹ Others are careful to state that only in the case of "some" will there be a consciousness of guilt.² Quite unique to Chafer is the view that although "this ministry is one accomplished in the heart itself by which the whole being responds to realities which had not been recognized before" it is not a part of the work of the Holy Spirit to create "sorrow or remorse."³

It should be noted that Chafer's position is part of his overall understanding that repentance is not a sorrow for sin but a change of mind about it. He is emphasizing the fact that evangelism must not stress the sinner's unworthiness in the hope that it will lead to salvation but must present the truth of Christ so the individual will make an intelligent choice of Christ as Savior.

The subjective view, then, generally states that the Holy Spirit brings to the conscience of an individual some truth concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment. The truth is presented in such a way that a decision must follow resulting in either faith or impenitence. The primary translation of ἐλέγχω is either "convince" or

¹Ibid., p. 314.

²E.g. William Hendriksen, New Testament Commentary Exposition of the Gospel According to John, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954), 2:324.

³Chafer, Systematic Theology, 3:218.

"convict" in the sense of full realization and the object of the conviction is individuals in need of salvation.

Objective

In contrast to this subjective conviction is the view that the Holy Spirit convicts in an external objective way by rebuking or condemning the world. This view is held by a minority of interpreters but the intensity with which these men denote their disagreement with the more common interpretation causes one to honestly study their work. Ryle, for example, states: "The common superficial explanation . . . that the work of the Spirit . . . is to convince them of their own sins, of Christ's righteousness, and of the certainty of judgment at last, will hardly satisfy thinking minds."¹ Pink writes: "There is hardly a sentence in this Gospel which has been more generally misunderstood It is supposed to define His work in the conscience prior to conversion."²

An important ingredient in an objective interpretation is that there is a reproof or condemning of an error previously held or a wrong previously committed. The primary translation of ἐλέγχω is either "reprove" in the sense of an objective rebuke or reprimand, or "convict" in the sense of a judicial conviction or verdict of guilty.

¹Ryle, Expository Thoughts on the Gospels, pp. 139-40.

²Arthur Pink, Exposition of the Gospel of John, 2nd ed., 3 vols. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1945), 3:49.

Another distinction of this view is that often the object of the conviction is not individuals but rather the "world" (en masse).

Many of the early writers understood this as an objective rebuke without any reference to conviction of the conscience. Chrysostom denotes this when he states: "They will not do these things with impunity . . . but . . . they will be much more surely condemned."¹ Augustine² as well as other fathers also took this as a definitive condemnation.

Luther, translating ἐλέγχο by the German word strafen (to punish),³ also understood this to be an objective rebuke. Applying this passage to the events of his own times and stressing the need for preachers to condemn wrong, he wrote:

"If it depended on them (apostles and preachers of the gospel), they would undoubtedly remain silent and not rebuke the world. But the Holy Spirit has invested them with this office."⁴

¹John Chrysostom, The Fathers of the Church, 69 vols., trans. by Sister Thomas Aquinas Goggin (New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1959), 41:341.

²Augustine, The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 14 vols., ed. by Philip Schaff (New York: Christian Literature Camp, 1888; reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervans, 1978), 7:368-371.

³Karl Breul, Heath's German and English Dictionary (New York: Heath and Co., 1906), p. 572.

⁴M. Luther, Luther's Works, 54 vols., ed. by J. Pelikan and D. Poellot, trans. by M. Bertram (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1961), 24:338.

Under the objective classification but unlike the earlier writers, Ryle understood this conviction as that process whereby the Spirit shall "silence, convince and stop the mouths"¹ of all the world. This work of the Spirit then results in a world wide transformation of the opinions of sin, Christ, and judgment. According to Ryle, although all do not become believers, this change in sentiment after the coming of the Holy Spirit has caused a higher standard of morals and made all men better.²

A third interpretation under the objective classification is that held by Pink,³ Bultmann,⁴ and others. In this view, the conviction is a judicial condemnation or verdict of guilty against the whole world. It is a legal scene in which the Spirit as "advocate" or "prosecutor" produces evidence which refutes and absolutely proves the guilt of the world.

Combination

In between these two opposing views, one will find those who see both a subjective and objective conviction. Morris directly states this when he writes:

¹Ryle, Expository Thoughts on the Gospels, p. 144.

²Ibid., p. 142-4.

³Pink, Exposition of the Gospel of John, pp. 49-54.

⁴Rudolf Bultmann, The Gospel of John, trans. by G. R. Beusley, ed. by R. W. Hoare and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), pp. 561-6.

"The Spirit convicts the world in two senses. In the first place he 'shows the world to be guilty,' i.e. He secures a verdict of 'guilty' against the world. But in the second place we should take the words to mean also that the Spirit brings the world's guilt home to itself. The Spirit convicts the individual sinner's conscience."¹

Lenski follows this idea by stating that this is both a conviction which places all as guilty criminals and also a conviction which strikes the conscience.²

Conclusion

A review of the various interpreters demonstrates that the primary issue in this passage concerns the nature and the true meaning of the conviction which the Holy Spirit does. Important in this problem is the meaning of **ἐλέγχω** (either reprove, convince, or convict) as it is used in this passage and also the identification of the objects of the conviction (either individuals or all the world).

Meaning of the Indictments

The second major issue in this passage concerns the meaning of the three indictments especially as they are given in vss. 9-11. How they are understood depends

¹Leon Morris, The Gospel According to John, in the NICNT, p. 698.

²R. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1943), p. 1091-2.

primarily on the translation of ὅτι and to a lesser degree with which word ὅτι is to be logically connected.¹ The issue expands into a multitude of interpretations as the expositors try to describe what is really meant by these particular indictments.

A full discussion of this issue will be dealt with in Chapter IV, however, it is noted that the meaning given by most interpreters can be classified as either explanatory, elliptical, causal, or a combination of these. By explanatory is meant that the ὅτι clauses explain or give the content of sin, righteousness and judgment. By elliptical is meant that the ὅτι should really be translated "in this that" (εἰς ἐκεῖνο ὅτι). By causal is meant that the ὅτι clauses give the reason, basis, or fundamental ground for the conviction. A final classification is that the ὅτι clauses shift in meaning. The solution to how ὅτι is to be translated will depend on the context and general understanding of the passage.

Purpose of Study

Recognizing the multitude of opinions in this important passage, it is the primary purpose of this thesis to determine the nature of the convicting work of the Holy Spirit. The intention is not only to evaluate whether the

¹C. F. Moule notes this problem in his work, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek (Cambridge: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 147.

conviction is objective, subjective, or a combination, but to specify the precise meaning within the classification. A secondary goal of this thesis is to determine the meaning of the three indictments. These two goals will naturally flow together with the result being a full interpretation of the convicting work of the Holy Spirit as taught in this passage.

Procedure of Study

In the quest for the proper interpretation of this passage, the study will proceed as follows. First, a study will be made of the language of the text. This will naturally include a look at the lexical meaning of key words and the syntactical relation between them. Of particular importance is the meaning of ἐλέγχω. It will be a special objective of this paper to more clearly demonstrate the limitation of the meaning of this word. Second, a look will be made at the context in which this passage is found. It seems that most interpretations are based to a large extent on the meaning of the various words. It will be the intent of this thesis to develop the particular meaning of the words in this passage in light of the context in which Christ gave them. Third, the determination of the meaning of the three indictments will be a factor in the understanding of the overall meaning of the passage. Finally, several New Testament examples will be given to substantiate the conclusion.

Results of Study

This study will show that the language of the text as well as the context in which it is found support a subjective work of the Holy Spirit on the conscience of individual unbelievers. This will be accomplished through the objective facts expressed through the disciples of Christ. The three indictments (sin, righteousness, and judgment) are to be understood in a general way with the **ὅτι** clauses giving the reason or basis for the fact that the Holy Spirit will do this work.

CHAPTER I

LEXICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Recognizing the truth that thoughts and concepts are conveyed in literature by words, it is imperative that the interpretation of this passage begin with a proper understanding of the meaning of certain key words.

ἐλέγχω

The first and most important word which must be defined is **ἐλέγχω**. It is the main verb in the entire passage and as such describes the action of the Holy Spirit in regards to the world.

English Translations

A divergence of views with respect to the proper meaning of the term is evident by the fact that it has been variously translated in this passage as "reprove" (KJV), "convict" (NIV, NASV, ASV), and "convince" (RSV).¹ To further complicate the matter an English dictionary

¹For a complete listing of its translation in each New Testament reference see the table in William Hendriksen's New Testament Commentary Exposition of the Gospel According to John, 2:32⁴-5.

reveals that these English words are elastic and can approach each other in meaning.¹

Although this elasticity requires one to be cautious in determining what a writer means when he translates ἐλέγχω it is generally understood that "reprove" means to "sharply criticize" or objectively "rebuke." "Convince" on the other hand, means to subjectively awaken the conscience to a truth and "convict" denotes either "guilt" in a judicial sense or a full realization and persuasion of some truth.

Interpreters seeking to clarify the true sense of ἐλέγχω in this passage have advanced such translations as enlighten,² prove wrong,³ and expose.⁴ All of these translations, however, fail to fully convey the meaning of ἐλέγχω and it would seem no one English word can adequately be used.

Greek Meaning

The occurrences of this word in Greek Literature, the LXX, and the New Testament can be used to demonstrate

¹See the definitions given in Webster's Third New International Dictionary (Springfield, MA: G & C Merriam Co., 1966), pp. 499, 1928.

²Chafer, Systematic Theology, 6:94.

³Brown, The Gospel According to John (xii-xxi), 29A:711.

⁴E. C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, 2nd ed., edited by F. N. Davey (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), p. 484.

that at least four elements were contained in the word in New Testament times.

Its Action: Exposure

The primary element in ἐλέγχω found in its earliest usage is that of exposure, (generally of error or wrong). This element denotes the action being done.

In Homeric use the prevalent sense of the word was to put to shame, cause disgrace, or speak with contempt about someone.¹ It was used in much the same way "rebuke" or "reprove" are understood today. Although exposure is not primarily the meaning in this early usage, it is obvious that the shame came from the revealing of some disgraceful action.

Usage in classical Greek more fully developed the concept of exposure. Xenophon used it in the sense of searching out information.² Büchsel notes that Democritus denoted the exposure of the failings of others by it.³ Aristophanes used it in Poverty's challenge that his opponents prove

¹Homer, Iliad, 9.522; Odyssey, 21.424. These definitions are given also in Homer, Iliad, with introduction, notes, a short Homeric grammar, and a vocabulary by A. F. Benner (New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, 1931), p. 435.

²Xenophon, Anabasis, III. 5. 14.

³TDNT, s.v. "ἐλέγχω," by Büchsel, footnote 18, 2:47.

his contention as wrong.¹ In Plato² and Aristotle³ the word became very important and as Link states was used by them, "of the logical exposition of the facts of a matter for the purpose of refuting the argument of an opponent."⁴ It was used in this sense in the courts of justice and the schools in distinction from ἀποδείκνυμι which simply meant "to prove," whereas ἐλέγχω meant the refuting of an opponent.⁵

The occurrence of ἐλέγχω in the LXX which will be more fully dealt with later supports exposure as being a primary ingredient.

Josephus utilized the word a number of times for the revealing of something. He used it to denote the way Philip the Tetrarch demonstrated the location of the source of the Jordan River,⁶ of God's exposure of Cain after the

¹Aristophanes, Plutus, 574.

²Plato, Sophist, 241d, 242b; Phaedrus, 273C.

³Aristotle, Sophistical Refutations, IX 170a. 24. Also note his definition of ἐλέγχος as συλλογισμός μετ' ἀντιφάσεως τοῦ συμπεράσματος (a conclusion with the refutation of the consequence) Sophistical Refutations, I, 165a. 2.

⁴H. G. Link, "ἐλέγχω," New International Dictionary of the New Testament Theology, ed. by Colin Brown, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1977), 2:140-2.

⁵Julius Charles Hare, The Mission of the Comforter (London: Macmillan and Co., 1876), note L, p. 315.

⁶Josephus, The Jewish War, 3. 512.

murder of Abel,¹ and of Joseph's true identity being revealed by his emotions to his brothers.²

In all New Testament occurrences, exposure is contained in the meaning of **ἐλέγχω** either as the primary sense of the word (John 3:20; Eph. 5:11, 13) or as an ingredient in it.

The parallel use of **ἐλέγχω** with **φανερῶ**³ is both interesting and helpful. In John 3:20-21 the deeds of an evil man are said to be "reproved" (**ἐλέγχω**) by the light while the deeds of one that does truth are "made manifest" (**φανερῶ**) by the light. When this passage is placed next to Ephesians 5:11-13, where it is clearly stated that "all things that are reproved (**ἐλεγχόμενα**) are made manifest (**φανεροῦται**) by the light, "it becomes apparent that one of the primary elements of **ἐλέγχω** must be revealing.

1 Corinthians 14:24 is another passage where this parallel occurs. Here it states that as a result of prophecy, one is "convinced (**ἐλέγχεται**) . . . and thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest (**φανερὰ**)."

This parallel between **ἐλέγχω** and **φανερῶ** is useful in

¹Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, 1. 157.

²Ibid., 2. 160.

³The primary meaning of **φανερῶ** is "to make known, to make evident, or plain." BAGD, p. 852.

seeing that one of the primary elements in the meaning of **ἐλέγχω** is that of revealing. These strong implications of exposure are the reasons Chafer suggests "enlightenment" as the best translation.¹ Certainly this concept is vital to its meaning and denotes the action being done.

Its Purpose: Moral Correction

A second element in **ἐλέγχω** involves the purpose behind the action, which is always moral in character and was used in the New Testament for correction.

In early usage, as noted previously, the purpose was to bring shame or contempt to an individual. Although the main emphasis of the word changed after Homer, the concept of shame was always contained in it. Its use in Isaiah 37:3 for **נִחַן**² is an example in the LXX while Luke 3:19 and 1 Timothy 5:20 are New Testament examples where shame is the obvious purpose. Titus 1:13 would appear to lend itself to this understanding, however, a careful look at the verse reveals the ultimate goal is a correct understanding of the truths of faith.³

In classical Greek the purpose was to refute or disprove the argument of an opponent.⁴ Titus 1:9

¹Chafer, Systematic Theology, 6:94.

²BDB lists "contempt" as the primary meaning of **נִחַן** BDB, p. 610.

³Note the **ἵνα** clauses denoting purpose at the end of the sentence.

⁴Noted on page 16.

might be given as a New Testament example of this use, however, again the context (1:13) suggests correction is in view.

As the word was used in the LXX, correction became the primary purpose. There *ἐλέγχω* is used in the majority of cases to render the Hiph'al of *נָכַח* which has a primary meaning of "to prove or correct."¹ Leaney, in a study of the relation of the Qumran texts to John, notes that the Hiph'al of *נָכַח* was used of the responsibility of a member of the community to rebuke his neighbor. This was not simply to prove an opponent wrong but to persuade him that he was wrong and should change his ways.² Its purpose was correction.

Two facts are noteworthy in the use of *ἐλέγχω* in the LXX. The first is that the occurrences are found mainly in the Wisdom Literature (Job, Psalms, Proverbs) having ethical application. The second is the parallel use of *ἐλέγχω* and *παιδεύω*.³ BAGD list "correct, give

¹BDB, pp. 406-7.

²A. R. C. Leaney, "The Johannine Paraclete and the Qumran Scrolls" in *John and Qumran*, ed. by J. H. Charlesworth (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972), pp. 45-6.

³If one includes the noun forms *ἐλέγχω* and *παιδεία*, at least 14 cases can be found. Ps. 6:2; 37:2; 93:10; 141:5; Prov. 3:11; 5:12; 6:23; 9:7; 12:1; 13:18; 15:10; 16:17; Jer. 7:19; Hab. 1:12.

guidance" as the primary meaning in the LXX for παιδεύω.¹ Thayer notes παιδεύω in classical Greek meant "to train children."² These definitions as well as the use in passages such as Proverbs 3:11, 12 leads to the conclusion stated by Link:

"The use of the words of this group comes close to the Stoic idea of education and character training. The godly man is trained by correction and discipline to follow the right path in life."³

The correction which can come from God (Job 5:17) or a righteous man (Ps. 141:5) is in the form of chastisement and although rejected by the ungodly (Prov. 9:7) is accepted and appreciated by the wise man (Prov. 9:8).

Usage more current with New Testament times also demonstrates correction as a primary element. Büchsel notes the parallel between Epictetus and the New Testament due to the "emphatically ethical application in both cases."⁴ As a Stoic Philosopher he used ἐλέγχω to emphasize the correction of the principle of life.⁵ Several of the New Testament occurrences of ἐλέγχω are clear cases where correction is the purpose.

¹BAGD, p. 603.

²J. H. Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, reprint ed., 1889 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), p. 473.

³Link, s.v. "ἐλέγχω," p. 141.

⁴TDNT, s.v. "ἐλέγχω," by Büchsel, 2:475.

⁵Epictetus, Dissertationes, II, 1, 23; II, 14, 20; II, 26, 4.

In Matthew 18:15 it is apparent that a church member is responsible to confront an erring member so that he might correct his ways.¹ Hebrews 12:5 and Revelation 3:19 both of which are New Testament examples of the parallel use of **ἐλέγχω** and **παιδεύω** also convey this corrective idea.² It is noteworthy that all New Testament cases deal with an error and in a general sense call for better living or a correction of a wrong.

It becomes apparent that a vital element in the meaning of **ἐλέγχω** especially as it is used in the New Testament deals with its purpose. In nearly all cases it denotes the revealing of facts in their true light resulting in moral requirements. The purpose is correction or a call to change in behavior. Büchsel defines it "to show someone his sin and to summon him to repentance . . . it implies educative discipline."³

Its Effectiveness: Thorough

A third element in **ἐλέγχω** concerns its effectiveness. Once again its early Homeric usage denoted little in regards to this, however, by the time of classical Greek, this had changed.

¹This is a usage similar to the Qumran usage stated earlier.

²In his paper on the Biblical Concept of **παιδεία**, Mark Willey notes: "The Old Testament concept of **παιδεία**, then, referred to training which was accomplished through the medium of hardship," (p. 14); the predominant usage in the New Testament presents the concept of "corrective training," (p. 34). "The Biblical Concept of Paideia," (unpublished Master of Divinity Thesis, Winona Lake, IN: Grace Theological Seminary, 1980).

³TDNT, s.v. "**ἐλέγχω**," by Büchsel, 2:474.

Trench states that more than a mere rebuke or reproof (as was the initial meaning used by Homer) is involved in the meaning of this word. Rather as he states, "ἐλέγχειν . . . is so to rebuke another with such effectual wielding of the victorious arms of truth, as to bring him, if not always to a confession, yet at least to a conviction of his sin, just as in juristic Greek, ἐλέγχειν is not merely to reply to, but to refute an opponent."¹

The element contained here is that the truth of the case is placed in such a clear light that it must be accepted. This does not imply that the truth is always publicly admitted as Matthew 18:15-17 makes apparent.

The crucial issue for John 16:8-11 is whether ἐλέγχω is effective in bringing the truth to one's conscience (subjective) or only into the open (objective). Does it always denote a subjective awareness of the truth?

That the word can convey the idea of a convincing of one's conscience is evident from its use by Philo the Jewish moralist. In several places, Philo connects the conscience (συνείδησις) of a person with ἐλέγχω and it becomes quite obvious that more than an external objective proof is intended.² It should be noted that in the majority of the cases it is usually stated that the "convicting" is done "by" (ὑπό) the "conscience." From the use of

¹R. C. Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing House, 1948), p. 13.

²Philo, The Special Laws III, 54; IV, 6; IV, 40.

ὑπό with the genitive it might be argued that the conscience is not said to be convicted but rather is the agent doing the convicting.¹ This could be used to support the argument that ἐλέγχω is not used for the subjective convicting of the conscience. In at least one case, however, it clearly states that the conscience is convicted (οἱ συνείδησις . . . ἐλεγχόμενοι).² Whichever way it is worded, it is quite apparent that the conscience is involved or effected by the convicting.

The variant reading of John 8:9 having manuscript evidence to at least the sixth century (ὑπό τῆς συνείδησεως ἐλεγχόμενοι) is a New Testament example where the conscience is connected with ἐλέγχω . Here again the use of ὑπό shows that the conscience is the agent doing the conviction. Also, the minimal manuscript evidence for this variant makes it impossible to dogmatically use this passage as support that John used ἐλέγχω in this way. It does, however, show that it can and was used in connection with the conscience.

Other passages might also be used to demonstrate that the action denoted in ἐλέγχω often affected the conscience. In 1 Corinthians 14:24, where because of prophecy one is "convinced" by all, it is obvious that the individual

¹ ὑπό with the genitive conveys the agent, as noted by Dana and Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: Macmillan Co., 1927), p. 112.

² Philo, Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari soleat, 146.

becomes subjectively aware of the truth. The case of Herod (Luke 3:19) resulting in the imprisonment of John also suggests that the "rebuking" had an effect on Herod's conscience. Finally, it is quite apparent in John 3:20 that the presence of fear in the one doing evil suggests that he was subjectively aware of his evil. That ἐλέγχω contains the meaning of thoroughly effective revealing of truth is apparent from its use from the Greek Philosophers on.

Its Method: Confrontation

The fourth element in ἐλέγχω involves its method. In nearly all the cases studied previously in this paper, the action takes place between two or more persons. Whether this would be true of all cases, in all literature, is impossible to know; however, a comparison of New Testament usage is most helpful.¹ In each reference the one who receives the action is present or would be present if the action could be completed. Matthew 18:15 is an example where the person wronged is to go and confront the person who wronged him. Luke 3:19 describes how John "reproved" (ἐλέγχω) Herod for his evil action. This action was done in the presence of Herod as Matthew 14:4 states. John 3:20 might first appear as a case where confrontation is not

¹A complete listing of New Testament usage is: Matt. 18:15; Luke 3:19; John 3:20; 8:46; 16:8; 1 Cor. 14:24; Eph. 5:11, 13; 1 Tim. 5:20; 2 Tim. 4:2; Titus 1:9, 13; 2:15; Heb. 12:5; James 2:9; Jude 15; Rev. 3:19.

present; however, it is obvious that should the men come to the light they would be "reproved," but until they do, it will not happen. John 8:46 is clearly a personal confrontation between Christ and the Pharisees. 1 Timothy 5:20 states the "rebuke" is to be "before all." The other passages demonstrate a similar usage so that it can be concluded that ἐλέγχω never takes place in New Testament examples except in the presence of the one who is the object of the action.¹

John 8:46

Any study of this word as used in this passage must include a consideration of John 8:46. This text comes nearest John 16:8-11 in that it has the same form of words (ἐλέγχω περί) and is by the same author (John).

The argument has been presented that Christ's challenge in John 8:46 is for the Pharisees to find them guilty in a judicial way. This would denote an objective condemnation and because of the similarity, John 16:8-11 must therefore denote the Holy Spirit as advocate in proving the world guilty in an objective, forensic way. Bultmann describes it as a "lawsuit of cosmic dimension . . .

¹This conclusion was reached by Steve Bradley in a paper for the class on the Gospel of John. Steve Bradley, "He Will Convict the World," (unpublished paper, Winona Lake, IN: Grace Theological Seminary, 1976), pp. 6-7.

before the court of God."¹ Pink concludes: "The presence of the Holy Spirit . . . brings in guilty the world."²

Two factors suggest that these passages are to be understood in a way different than this and yet maintain a similar usage of ἐλέγχω περί .

The first factor is that an objective condemnation forces a difficult understanding of John 16:8-11. Barrett,³ Lindars,⁴ and others note that although it is appropriate to understand the world as guilty in the matter of sin, it is quite difficult to see how the world could be found guilty of "righteousness" and "judgment." Only by changing the words to "unrighteousness" and "wrong judgment" would this make any sense. This change is unwarranted.

The second factor is that the primary meaning of ἐλέγχω , including the four elements discussed previously, gives a clear interpretation to both passages. In each case, the action denoted is a thorough exposure of facts through personal confrontation resulting in moral requirements. John 8:46 would then be understood as Christ's challenge for an exposure of His sin. This would involve more than

¹Bultmann, The Gospel of John, pp. 461-2.

²Pink, Exposition of the Gospel of John, p. 51.

³C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), p. 486.

⁴Barnabas Lindars, The Gospel of John, in the New Century Bible, R. E. Clements and M. Black, General Editors (Greenwood, South Carolina: Attic Press, 1972), pp. 500-1.

a mere rebuke¹ and also more than a challenge for them to bring sin home to His conscience.² Rather it is appropriate to Christ's challenge as a call for an outward objective exposure of His sin which he would be aware of subjectively. In the same way, John 16:8-11 could denote the Holy Spirit's objective exposure of the truths of sin, righteousness, and judgment which would be subjectively brought to the world's conscience.

Conclusion

In conclusion, New Testament usage of ἐλέγχω contains four elements of meaning. The primary element denoting its action is exposure. Its purpose is that of correcting, however, the concept of shame has not been totally lost. In thoroughness, it is totally effective and its method is by confrontation. This understanding fits all New Testament usages including John 8:46. It argues against a totally objective condemnation but does not eliminate an objective element. In all cases, however, one cannot eliminate the fact that the result is realized in a subjective way. To state that ἐλέγχω can only be used

¹That more than a rebuke is being called for is evident from the fact that many had and would lay sin to His charge (Matt. 9:3; Mark 3:6; John 9:36).

²Trench placed too much emphasis on the subjective element when he suggested this. Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament, p. 13.

in an objective or subjective sense is to demand more than the word actually conveys. As Hovey states: "The Greek original seems to embrace both."¹

κόσμος

The second lexical consideration is the determination of the meaning of the word which denotes the object of the convicting. Who is the "world?"

Definitions

At least three answers have been given. Some of the older writers equate κόσμος with the Jews.² Although it is true that the Jewish world would be the initial contact which the apostles would have, this definition is unacceptable in this passage and is not supported in any major lexicon. A second meaning assigned to κόσμος is "all mankind." This is a possible meaning since John often uses κόσμος in this way.³ This meaning is supported primarily by those understanding this passage as a totally objective condemnation. The most common definition for κόσμος in this passage is the "yet

¹Alvah Hovey, Commentary on the Gospel of John (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1885), p. 314.

²E.g. E. W. Hengstenberg, Commentary on the Gospel of John, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1865; reprint ed., Minneapolis: Klock and Klock, 1980), p. 281. F. L. Godet, Commentary on John's Gospel (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1886; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Kregel Publishing House, 1978), p. 869.

³John 3:16 is a prominent example.

unbelieving part of mankind."¹ This is used primarily by those supporting a subjective meaning to the passage.

Issues

Two issues surface in the definition of this word. The first involves the correct definition for this passage. Brown, in his discussion of **κόσμος** makes the observation "as the ministry advances and particularly in the second half of the Gospel, 'the world' is rather consistently identified with those who have turned against Jesus"² A look at the occurrences of **κόσμος** in this section supports his conclusion. In John 14:17 it is stated that the world cannot receive the Spirit. This must refer to unbelievers since the same verse states that the Spirit "shall be in you." The verse presents a contrast between the world (unbelievers) and "you" (followers of Christ). John 15:19 is another clear example where Christ specifically distinguishes His disciples from the "world." Other passages demanding this meaning are John 14:19, 22; 15:18; 16:20; 17:9, 14, 16. It can be concluded that in chapters 14-16, John primarily uses **κόσμος** to denote "unbelievers." It is most natural, therefore, to take **κόσμος** in 16:8-11 in the same way. Further support for

¹Hovey, Commentary on the Gospel of John, p. 314.

²Raymond Brown, The Gospel According to John, p. 509.

this meaning is the fact that the resulting meaning of this section would be a contrast between the work of the Spirit to unbelievers (v. 8-11) and to the disciples of Christ (v. 12-15). This meaning of *κόσμος* supports a subjective interpretation of this passage and those understanding this passage to teach a totally objective condemnation must give *κόσμος* a meaning different than its normal usage in this section.

The second issue in the definition of this word involves its extent. Even if the meaning "unbelievers" is accepted, those supporting a totally objective condemnation can raise the objection that if this is a subjective work in the hearts of people, where is the proof that this feeling about sin has been accomplished in all the "world." Obviously the stress of this argument is that "all" unbelievers have not sensed an inward work of the Holy Spirit on their conscience. Using this as one evidence, they claim this passage cannot describe such a subjective work. On the other hand, they claim, if the meaning of the passage is an objective condemnation against the whole world, no conflict arises.

Two answers are possible to this claim. The first is given by Pache who supports a subjective work on one's conscience and states: "there is none to whom he does not impart a sense of guilt, whether it is through the Scriptures

or simply by his conscience."¹ Pache simply states all have experienced this work of the Spirit.

The more preferred understanding is to reject both Pache's view and the objective condemnation of the whole world view. Recognizing that John is predominately using κόσμος to designate the yet unbelieving world in this section of his gospel, one must ask himself "why does this then have to mean that the Holy Spirit will convict all who are included in this designation?" When John says "If the world hates you" (John 15:18) it is quite inconceivable that every unbelieving individual is included in the hate of the disciples. In much the same way, when a person says that he will mow the lawn, does our language demand that by such a statement the person means he will mow all individual blades of grass which comprise the lawn? Can it not mean that he will mow that which has the quality of a lawn, in which case he is saying nothing of the amount which he did? As this writer understands language, both are possible understandings of the statement. The correct meaning of the statement would be determined by the context in which the statement was made. In a similar way "the world" could be used, as Hovey notes, as a "general expression denoting the sphere of the Spirit's direct and mediate operation."²

¹Rene Pache, The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, p. 57.

²Hovey, Commentary on the Gospel of John, p. 316.

Conclusion

A look at John's use of κόσμος in chapter 14-16 and particularly in this passage would suggest that the best understanding of this word is that it designates those who are yet unbelievers. This would argue against an objective condemnation or guilty verdict of the entire world. The proportion of the unbelievers whom the Holy Spirit convicts is not given in this passage and cannot be used to support either a subjective or objective condemnation.

CHAPTER II

SYNTACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Having determined the lexical meanings of two key words, the next step is to consider the syntactical relations of the passage. Two areas will be considered.

Uniform Sense

The first consideration involves the relationship of the three indictments. For syntactical reasons, it can be concluded that all three are to have a uniform sense and emphasis. One reason for this is the use of the particles μέν, δέ, δέ. When used together these are usually understood as correlative¹ and can be translated "on the one hand . . . on the other hand."² As Lenski states, they "simply place the three subjects side by side and do not intend to make the first the chief one and the other two subordinate."³ Although this is not the conclusion

¹For an adequate discussion see BDF, pp. 321-2.

²BAGD, p. 502.

³Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel, p. 1082.

reached by all,¹ it would appear to be the best in the light of syntax.

Another reason for a uniform emphasis is that all three indictments and phrases are governed by the same verb which is introduced only once.² It is appropriate then to seek an interpretation consistent with this. In a similar way the uniform grammatical structure of the sentence, including the repetition of the preposition *περί*, the particle *ὅτι* and the conjunction *καί* suggest a uniform sense. In regards to these Winer states that "the repetition of the preposition . . . is of a rhetorical nature or serves to give greater prominence to the several particulars."³ He also states that the connecting particle *καί* is frequently "repeated before each word of a whole series" partly as "an effort to secure due attention to the import of each word."⁴ It must be acknowledged that some suggest John used a uniform structure for style and

¹E.g. E. W. Hengstenberg states "Righteousness forms the antithesis to the sin; the judgment, the antithesis to the righteousness," Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, p. 281.

²G. Smeaton, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, p. 187. Morris also notes this, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 698.

³G. B. Winer, A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament (Philadelphia: Warren F. Draper, 1881), p. 421. See also A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1915), p. 566.

⁴Ibid., p. 520.

not for meaning.¹ This is a dangerous conclusion unless all else demands it because communication comes from words expressed in grammatical structure. It must also be acknowledged that a uniform sense does not eliminate Westcott's conclusion that "the subjects are placed in a natural and significant order."²

Understanding these three indictments to be taken in a uniform sense greatly adds to the interpretation of the passage. It first helps in the determination of the meaning of the indictments in that one should expect all to be understood in relation to the verb in the same way. This will be covered in Chapter IV. It also adds support to the argument that the "convicting" is more than an objective condemnation of the whole world. Although it is easy to see how the world could be found guilty in the matter of sin, it is difficult to understand how it can be found guilty of righteousness and judgment.³ If one was to understand this as an objective condemnation and maintain a uniform sense to each indictment it would become necessary to add words and make it say

¹Morris acknowledges this possibility but then rejects it, The Gospel According to John, p. 698. A. H. Stanton, "Convince or Convict (John 16:8)," suggests this as the key to understanding the passage, The Expository Times 33 (October 1921-September 1922): 278-9.

²B. F. Westcott, The Gospel According to John, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Book House, 1962), p. 228.

that the world was convicted of sin committed, of righteousness despised, and of judgment neglected.¹ This it seems is not the natural reading of the passage but can only be accepted if one allows very difficult ellipses.

περί

A second syntactical factor which will help in the interpretation of this passage is the meaning of the preposition περί. Although some understand περί to mean "in respect of"² or "in regard to,"³ which would support an objective condemnation, it seems more natural to take the normal meaning "concerning," or "about."⁴ Arndt and Gingrich state that when περί with the genitive is used with ἐλέγχω, it introduces the thing of which one is convicted.⁵ This understanding of περί is also more natural with the meaning of ἐλέγχω discussed previously. The list of three indictments can be simply understood as the three items which the Holy Spirit will reveal to the world. This meaning of περί is also supported by the fact that this is its sense in

¹Smeaton notes this as a past exposition, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, p. 187.

²E.g. Hovey, Commentary on the Gospel of John, p. 315.

³E.g. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel, p. 1082.

⁴Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek, p. 62.

⁵BAGD, p. 249.

John 8:46 where Christ is not challenging those around him to convict him "in regards to" sin (i.e. having wrong views of sin) but "concerning" sin (i.e. show me to be a sinner). This would also be the use of **περί** after **ἐλέγχω** in Luke 3:19 where Herod was convicted by John concerning Herodias.

From this look at the syntactical relations of this passage, it has been shown that the three indictments should be understood in a uniform sense. This argues against an objective condemnation or guilty verdict of the whole world and supports the idea that these three (sin, righteousness, and judgment) are the three particular items which the Holy Spirit will reveal. It has also been shown that **περί** is best understood as introducing the things of which one is convicted.

CHAPTER III

CONTEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS

Having looked at the lexical meaning of key words and the syntactical relationship between them, the context must be developed either to substantiate or shed light on the meaning developed by the language. It will be seen that the context does not support an outward objective condemnation of the world by the Holy Spirit.

Time Element of this Work

The first significant item is the aorist participle **ἐλθὼν** which helps establish the time element for this work of the Spirit. The lack of an article as well as the context of the word make it clear that this is a temporal participle.¹ The time expressed by an aorist participle is generally prior to or contemporaneous with the action of the leading verb.² This is an important consideration because it becomes clear that the convicting (**ἐλέγξει**) will come after the coming (**ἐλθὼν**) of the Spirit. When then did the Holy Spirit come? It is quite evident from verse 7 that He had not come yet and indeed would not come until after

¹This is noted by A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 1126.

²BDF, p. 174.

Christ left the disciples. Other indications from the context suggest this work will be after Christ's resurrection. In the $\delta\tau\iota$ clauses, it is stated that the conviction of righteousness will be because Christ goes to the Father, clearly a reference to the resurrection. Similarly the conviction of judgment will be because the prince of the world has been judged, also an event associated with Christ's resurrection.¹ The point being made is that the "convicting" work was yet future and was to be associated with the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost.² The importance of this time element is that it is difficult to see how a totally objective condemnation of the whole world would have happened only after Pentecost. To say that the world was not declared guilty in a judicial sense before Pentecost does not appear to be the natural meaning of this passage or the general teaching of Scripture.

Pink, attempting to relate an objective condemnation to this time element states that "the very presence of the Holy Spirit on earth 'reproves' or brings in guilty the 'world'."³ Pink's argument is that Christ is the one who ought to be here. The presence of the Holy Spirit is

¹For an excellent discussion of the use of this future passive verb, see J. H. Bernard, The Gospel According to St. John, in the ICC., 2 vols. (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1929), p. 508.

²That Pentecost is the exact date of the coming of the Holy Spirit can be determined by a comparison of Acts 1:5; 2:104; 11:15, 16; and 1 Cor. 12:13.

³Pink, Exposition of the Gospel of John, p. 51.

an evidence that Christ has been rejected and the world is guilty. It must be admitted that this handles the time element contained in ἐλθὼν but it has some serious limitations in that it fails to grasp the meaning of ἐλέγχω (discussed previously), it fails to handle the natural syntactical relations of the passage, and it will be shown that it fails to adequately treat other portions of the context.

Method of this Work

A second item in the context relevant to this passage is the method by which this will be done. Verse 7 ends with the promise that the Spirit will be sent to the disciples (πρὸς ὑμᾶς). As Godet notes, although the apostles are not named as the instruments of the work of the Spirit, "it is certainly through their intervention that it takes place."¹ It will be indirectly through the disciples of Christ that this work will be done.

One passage which must be dealt with in this section is John 14:17. This verse has been used both ways. Those supporting an objective condemnation have argued that for the Holy Spirit to work within the heart of an unbeliever is to totally contradict Christ's statement that the unbeliever cannot receive him.² In answer to this, a distinction must be made between receiving the Spirit (an

¹Frederick Godet, Commentary on John's Gospel (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1886), reprint ed. (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publishing House, 1978), p. 869. This is also noted by Meyer, The Gospel of John, p. 446 and Bernard, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 505.

²Pink, Exposition of the Gospel of John, p. 50.

impossibility for an unbeliever-- οὐ δύναται) and the Holy Spirit working with an unbeliever. In this same verse, Christ states a distinction existed even in the disciples' lives from one of "with them" (παρά with dative; beside, in the presence of)¹ to "in them" (ἐν with dative; location).

On the other hand, Barrett has tried to use this verse as support that since the Holy Spirit cannot be received by the world "we must therefore think his work is mediated through the church."² Both views read into the verse more than was intended.

On the basis of 16:7, however, it is difficult to understand how a totally objective condemnation can be the intention of this passage if a part of the requirement is that the Holy Spirit come "to" the disciples of Christ.

Reason for this Work

A third contextual factor relevant to this passage is the reason for this work of the Holy Spirit. Two items help in this area.

παράκλητος

Those favoring an objective condemnation are quick to use the term παράκλητος as evidence for their conclusion

¹Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 209.

²Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 487.

by defining it as "advocate" or "prosecutor."¹ They see the whole section as forensic and like Pink conclude "Now an 'advocate' produces a conviction, not by bringing a wrong-doer to realize or feel his crime, but by producing proofs before a court that the wrong-doer is guilty."² They support this by the fact that παράκλητος in 1 John 2:11 means an advocate.

In regards to παράκλητος it must be noted that although "advocate" is a possible meaning of the word, it is not the basic meaning. Arndt and Gingrich note that the "technical meaning of 'lawyer' or 'attorney' is rare." They state that the more general meaning is "one who appears in another's behalf, a mediator, intercessor, helper."³

Morris, discussing παράκλητος states "He is one who provides assistance that will deliver in difficult situations."⁴ He concludes by stating "He is the legal helper, the friend who does whatever is necessary to forward their

¹Bultmann, The Gospel of John, p. 562. Pink, Exposition of the Gospel of John, p. 51.

²Pink, Exposition of the Gospel of John, p. 51.

³BAGD, p. 618. See also TDNT, s.v. "παράκλητος," by Behm, 5:801.

⁴Morris, The Gospel According to John, p. 664.

best interests."¹ Goodspeed suggests "another helper" for the term in the Gospel of John.²

The basic meaning then of παράκλητος is not advocate but helper. This meaning is supported by all the lexicons, and can well fit its use in 1 John 2:1. There, where man's situation before God is depicted as responsibility before a judge, the παράκλητος is the intercessor or helper before God.

The use of παράκλητος in chapters 14 and 15 of John should also help to determine its meaning here. Other than its use in 1 John 2:1 with reference to Christ, it is used only four times (John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7). Each of these references is given by Christ on the evening before His betrayal and is in reference to the Holy Spirit. Christ, in the last major instruction to His disciples, was encouraging His disappointed, helpless, totally dependent disciples (in the face of His soon departure) that in His place God the Father would send the Holy Spirit.

Key to the understanding of what this Holy Spirit would do is the statement in 14:16 that He would be "another comforter." The word "another" (ἄλλον) means another of the same kind (in distinction from ἕτερος meaning another of

¹Ibid., p. 666.

²E. J. Goodspeed, Problems of New Testament Translations (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), p. 111.

a different kind).¹ This makes it clear that the Holy Spirit would in some way be like Christ Himself.

Although many similarities could be noted,² the emphasis in this discourse seems to be that the Holy Spirit will be a revealer as Christ was. John 14:26 and 16:13 relate how the Holy Spirit will teach and guide the disciples in recalling the past, recognizing truth, and being shown the things to come. In a similar way, Christ was a revealer to those who would listen and accept His words (7:17; 8:23, 40ff).

Not only would the Holy Spirit reveal as Christ revealed but also the content would be the same. They would both bear witness to Christ (8:14, 15:26) and reveal to the world their sin. Christ claims this in 7:7 but of particular importance is 3:20, "everyone that doeth evil hateth the light neither comes to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd [ἐλέγχω] ." In this passage it is quite apparent that Christ revealed and convicted the world of their sin. It seems that because of the similar language used in John 3:20 and 16:8-11 it is very natural to see that the Holy Spirit would reveal and convict the world of sin as Christ did. The use of παράκλητος as well as the statement of the benefit the disciples would

¹J. H. Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 29.

²i.e. Both were sent by the Father (John 14:16; 5:30; 8:16), both did not speak on their own account (John 16:13; 7:16, 12:49), etc.

receive from the coming of the Holy Spirit would seem to demand that more than an objective condemnation is the intent of this passage.

Natural Man's Blindness

A second reason for this work is the teaching of Scripture that the unbeliever is incapable by himself to understand the things of God including the truth concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment. 2 Corinthians 4:3-4 makes it absolutely clear that the natural mind is blinded by Satan and will not by itself come to a proper understanding of God's truth. To understand John 16:8-11 as denoting the work of the Holy Spirit to effectively reveal God's truth concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment fits very well with this general teaching of Scripture of the blindness of the natural man.

Conclusion

It is apparent therefore, that the context in which this passage is set demands more than an objective condemnation. That this work of the Holy Spirit will happen after Pentecost, that it will be accomplished through the disciples, that it will be for the benefit of the disciples, and that such a work is necessary to overcome man's spiritual blindness, makes it clear that more than a judicial condemnation having no effect on the inward conscience of the individual is the meaning of this passage.

The understanding of the lexical, syntactical and contextual considerations makes it clear that the meaning of this passage is that after the day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit will do for the disciples what Christ had been doing, namely reveal to those unbelievers encountered by the disciples the truth concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment. This revealing accomplished through the disciples will be to such an extent that although it might not always be outwardly admitted, the truth will be so convincingly shown that it cannot be denied. It will have a subjective effect on the minds of the world. It remains to look at the three indictments.

CHAPTER IV

THE MEANING OF THE THREE INDICTMENTS

Having determined that the nature of the convicting work of the Holy Spirit involves the subjective revealing of the truth concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment, it remains to determine the meaning of the three indictments. As stated earlier (p. 10) the issue depends primarily on the translation of ὅτι and to a lesser degree with which word ὅτι should be connected.

Various Interpretations

The various interpretations cannot be thoroughly classified but four general categories emerge based on the definition of ὅτι .

Explanatory

The first possible translation of ὅτι is "that."¹ Understood in this way the ὅτι clauses are explanatory being used to define or give the content of sin, righteousness, and judgment, and are dependent on each of the three

¹ ὅτι is taken this way by Smeaton, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, p. 187; Chafer, Systematic Theology, 3:218; Brown, The Gospel According to John (xii-xxi), p. 706; Bultmann, The Gospel of John, note 3, p. 563, and others.

substantives. The specific sin convicted of is unbelief, the specific righteousness convicted of is Christ's and the specific judgment convicted of is Satan's.

Elliptically

A second possible translation of $\delta\tau\iota$ is "in consideration of the fact that" ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \delta\tau\iota$).¹ In this way the clauses give the basis for the work of the Holy Spirit. This translation is suggested by many² but is somewhat inconsistently used. As noted in Arndt and Gingrich it is possible that "the causal force of $\delta\tau\iota$ comes to the fore."³ The difference being minor, this classification will be considered with causal.

Causal

The third possible translation of $\delta\tau\iota$ is "because" making the clauses causal.⁴ In each instance $\delta\tau\iota$ could be logically connected with either the verb, the subject or the three particulars.

¹BAGD gives this as a possible translation. Other examples in John are listed as Jn. 2:18; 8:22; 9:17; and 11:47.

²E.g. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel, p. 1082.

³BAGD, " $\delta\tau\iota$," p. 589.

⁴This is the translation suggested by J. H. Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 469.

Understood in the first way, the *ὅτι* clauses give the reason, basis, or fundamental ground for the conviction of each particular. Under the causal classification, this is the primary interpretation.¹

Another possibility is that the clauses are to be connected with the subject of the sentence, stating the reason the Holy Spirit rather than someone else (i.e. Christ) will do this work. Few, if any, commentators support this, however, it is a possibility.

Finally the *ὅτι* clauses could be connected with the three particulars stating the reason they exist. Hoskyns, taking the passage in this way, states: "Sin is caused by unbelief" by which he understands belief to be the "main spring of charity and righteousness" while the removal of faith causes "hatred and immorality."² In rejecting Christ the world deprives itself of the hope of virtue. In a similar way the righteousness of God exists or is available to men because Jesus departed from this world and judgment of the world exists because Satan has been judged.

Combination

Part of the difficulty in resolving this issue comes from the fact that it is tempting to give a different

¹This is presented by Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 229, C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, pp. 487-8, and others.

²Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, pp. 484-5.

translation to ὅτι in each case. Swete suggests the shift in meaning and supplies the translation, "in that they believe not," "by reason of the fact that I go," and "forasmuch as he has been judged already."¹ Stanton supports this non-uniform translation by suggesting that the two additional ideas (righteousness and judgment) do not exactly fit "ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον " but were added to give comfort to the disciples. He also suggests that the recorded words are a compressed and edited report of what Christ actually said.² Hengstenberg also suggests a shift in meaning but stays within the explanatory classification.³

Conclusion

The difficulty in determining the proper meaning is evident by reading the various commentators. Much variation and contradiction is evident even within the writings of one author. Lenski for example argues against the meaning "that" (explanatory) and for "in as much as" (elliptical). In usage, however, he returns to explanatory stating that ὅτι introduces the feature of sin,

¹H. B. Swete, Last Discourse and Prayer of Our Lord (London: Macmillan and Co., 1913), note 1, p. 118.

²A. H. Stanton, "Convince or Convict (John 16:8)," 278-9.

³Hengstenberg, Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, p. 281.

righteousness, and judgment which the Spirit lays bare.¹ Similarly, Westcott, defines $\delta\tau\iota$ as "because" then goes on to use it as if it were explanatory in which unbelief and Christ's righteousness are what the Spirit lays open.² Often it appears that each verse is dealt with as a single unit with no correlation of the entire section.

Proper Meaning

Several factors contribute to the proper interpretation. The first and primary factor is the syntax. Due to the grammatical structure of the sentence, a uniform sense is required for each indictment (see ch. II). This eliminates the shift in meaning suggested by Swete, Stanton and Hengstenberg.³ It also helps to decide against an explanatory interpretation. The primary support for the explanatory interpretation is generally given by the facts that $\delta\tau\iota$ can and is used this way, that these clauses offer more than a proof or reason to the world that sin, righteousness, and judgment exist,⁴ and that they are best understood to expound rather than substantiate what has been said.⁵

¹Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel, p. 1082.

²Westcott, The Gospel According to John, p. 229.

³See page 50.

⁴Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel, p. 1082.

⁵Bultmann, The Gospel of John, footnote 3, p. 563.

It is tempting to accept this view in regards to sin because as Barnes notes, unbelief in Christ is regarded as "the sin that is pre-eminently offensive to God and which, if unrepented of, will certainly lead to perdition."¹ It is more difficult, however, to see how Christ's exaltation can be considered a definition for righteousness. It is generally stated by those who understand ὅτι as explicative that the presence of Christ with His Father is "the ultimate proof that He was the perfect pattern for righteousness approved of God."² Acts 2:22 (a man approved of God) and Romans 1:4 are sometimes given as support for this.³ There is no doubt that this truth is contained in Scripture but one must question if this is the message conveyed here since it fails to adequately explain the presence of the statement "and ye see me no more."

If, however, the ὅτι clause is taken as causal, a very natural interpretation exists. By this twofold statement Christ makes clear the reason why the Holy Spirit must now reveal righteousness to the unbelievers. It is

¹A. Barnes, Barnes' Notes on the New Testament, First American reprint ed. (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1962), p. 342. Tenney also notes this, M. C. Tenney, John: The Gospel of Belief (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), p. 236.

²E.g. M. C. Tenney, John: The Gospel of Belief, p. 236.

³For an adequate discussion of this reasoning, see Hendrikson, New Testament Commentary Exposition of the Gospel According to John, p. 326.

as Walvoord states, because Christ is no longer present to reveal it Himself.¹ While Christ was here on earth, He revealed God's righteousness (Col. 2:9; John 1:1, 8; 15:22) but because He is no longer present the Spirit will do this work.

Understanding Christ's exaltation as a definition for the righteousness to be revealed is difficult; however, it is even harder to see how Satan's judgment is the judgment which the Holy Spirit will reveal. This seems the deciding factor in making these clauses causal. Satan's judgment gives the reason or basis for the Spirit's work.

The perfect tense has caused a degree of difficulty to some in that it is the tense of completed action.² The question is: How could Christ say that the prince of the world has been judged when as yet he had not died and defeated Satan? Some such as Hovey explain this problem by stating, "The point of view is naturally that of the Spirit's agency after Pentecost."³ Although this is possible, a more natural explanation is available. In John 12:31, Christ states that "Now shall the prince of this world be cast out." The use of the future passive (ἐκβληθήσεται)

¹John F. Walvoord, The Holy Spirit (Findlay, OH: Dunham Publishing Co., 1958), p. 113. See also J. Dwight Pentecost, The Divine Comforter (Westwood, New Jersey: Revell Co., 1968), p. 76-7.

²Dana and Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 200.

³Hovey, Commentary on the Gospel of John, p. 317. See also Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 488.

with now (νῦν) denotes a future action whose certainty is already determined. The context (vs. 32, 33) as well as other passages of Scripture (Col. 2:14-15; Heb. 2:14-15) denote that the death and resurrection of Christ pronounced the final judgment of Satan. In John 16:11, Christ speaks of Satan's judgment as having already been effected because His own death and resurrection are already certain.

The certainty of Satan's judgment then becomes the basis or reason that the Holy Spirit will reveal to the world the truth of judgment. In the same way that the judgment of the prince of this world is certain, so the judgment of unbelievers as followers of Satan is certain. This also fits the contextual consideration that the Spirit will continue to do as Christ had done. In the same way that Christ's work was directed toward the salvation of men but inevitably carried with it judgment (Jn. 3:16ff; 12:47f, etc.), so also the Spirit's work of convicting the world will also inevitably result in revealing a coming judgment for unbelievers.

A second factor helpful in determining the meaning is that all three nouns (sin, righteousness, judgment) lack the article. As Godet notes this "leaves to these three . . . the most indefinite meaning."¹ Objection to this general meaning has been given by the fact that the world

¹Godet, Commentary on John's Gospel, p. 869. Also see J. A. Huffman, Golden Treasures from the Greek New Testament (Butler, IN: Higley Press, 1951), p. 88.

already knows about sin, righteousness, and judgment. What they need is to know about specific cases of each.¹ Some handle this by suggesting the first list is general while the second is very specific.² Although this is possible, the lack of article tends to support a general meaning for the three particulars and therefore supports the causal interpretation.

A third factor helpful in determining the meaning is the lack of any clarifying genitives after the three nouns. This strengthens the argument that these are to have a general meaning and not be taken as explanatory. Alford suggests that the uniform structure makes the supplying of these clarifying genitives necessary. He supplies τοῦ κόσμου , and states it is the world's sin, the world's righteousness, and the world's judgment of which the Spirit will convict.³ This appears to be an over use of the uniform structure. The text does not specify the subject of the particulars but leaves them general.⁴

¹Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel, p. 1082ff.

²Westcott, The Gospel According to John, p. 228, Hovey, Commentary on the Gospel of John, p. 315.

³Alford, The Greek New Testament, p. 867.

⁴This is noted by Brown, The Gospel According to John, p. 705; Bultmann, The Gospel of John, note 1, p. 563.

Conclusion

Although many of the issues which do not pertain to the primary purpose of this paper were not dealt with, it has been shown that sin, righteousness, and judgment are to be taken in a general sense. The $\delta\tau\iota$ clauses give the reason or basis for this action of the Spirit. The reason sin will be revealed by the Holy Spirit is that Christ's rejection makes it imperative that another come and reveal sin. Righteousness will be revealed by the Spirit because Christ is no longer present to do this himself. Finally judgment will be revealed by the Spirit because just as the judgment of Satan is certain, so will be the judgment of all unbelievers.

CONCLUSION

From the above discussion it is apparent that a divergence of interpretations has been made concerning this passage. It has not been the purpose of this paper to state all the opinions because as Alford states, " . . . of even the best commentators, no two bring out exactly the same shade of meaning."¹

The major purpose of this paper was to determine the nature of the convicting work of the Holy Spirit. In particular the intent was to investigate whether this conviction was an objective condemnation of the whole world or a subjective condemnation of the conscience of individual unbelievers. Lexical considerations have shown that ἐλέγχω primarily means a revealing of objective truth which results in an effect on one's conscience. It has also been shown that κόσμος as used in this section can best be understood as the yet unbelieving part of mankind.

Syntactical considerations have shown that the particulars of which the Holy Spirit will convict the world must be understood in a uniform sense. This argues against a totally objective condemnation and supports

¹Alford, The Greek New Testament, p. 867.

the understanding that the Holy Spirit will reveal these three particulars to individual unbelievers. It also argued for a causal meaning to the three **ὅτι** clauses.

Contextual considerations have also supported the fact that this is more than an objective condemnation. These considerations include the fact that this work of the Holy Spirit occurs after Pentecost, was for the benefit of the disciples, was similar to the work that Christ had preformed, and was in connection with the disciples. These considerations as well as the scriptural demand that God must enlighten the blinded eyes of unbelievers make a subjective condemnation imperative. It must be noted that because this work will be performed in connection with the disciples, it is clear that more than a totally subjective work by the Holy Spirit on the hearts of unbelievers is also involved. Rather the Holy Spirit will effectively reveal or convict the mind (or conscience) of an unbeliever through objective messages from followers of Christ or the Scriptures.

From these considerations and in harmony with the meaning of the three indictments, it becomes apparent that the meaning of this convicting work of the Holy Spirit is as follows: After the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit will not only indwell believers but will through various means (preaching of apostles, Scripture, etc.) so effectively reveal to unbelievers the truth concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment that although they might not outwardly

admit it they will inwardly have to change their thinking concerning these things. The Holy Spirit will do the work of revealing as Christ had done while He was present on earth. This will be a great benefit to the disciples of Christ.

To demonstrate how this prophecy of Christ was actually fulfilled, one need only look at the examples given in the book of Acts. There as a result of the preaching of Peter, the Holy Spirit "pricked" those in their hearts with the result being that many were saved. In Acts 7, as a result of the preaching of Stephen, the Holy Spirit again drove the truth to their hearts but in this case none were saved (at least none recorded as immediately being saved).

Obviously this paper has not exhausted the work which can be done on this passage. The basic purpose of determining whether the convicting work of the Holy Spirit is objective or subjective has been quite adequately investigated. There is always, however, a desire to find more information on the basic meaning of words and in this case the meaning of **ἐλέγχω** could be strengthened.

A tremendous area of need exists in a clear and thorough investigation in regards to the **ὅτι** clauses. Although this might not greatly effect the conclusion of whether the conviction is objective or subjective, the determination of the precise use of these clauses would greatly help in the overall understanding of the passage.

Finally, much work could be done concerning the implications of this passage to the method of evangelism used.

This it seems is the major truth conveyed in this passage, namely, that in the process of conveying the truths of God's word to unbelievers, the Holy Spirit is not only a real source of strength but is actively engaged in unlocking the blindness of men's minds and driving home the truth concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment. Without doubt, this was an encouraging thought for the disciples and is for believers today.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

- Alford, Henry. The Greek New Testament. Vol. I. Chicago: Moody Press, 1958.
- Augustine. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 14 vols. Ed. by Philip Schaff. New York: Christian Literature Camp, 1888. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervans, 1978.
- Barnes, A. Barnes' Notes on the New Testament. A first American reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1962.
- Barrett, C. K. The Gospel According to St. John. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.
- Bauer, Walter; Arndt, William F.; and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 2nd ed. Revised and augmented by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Bernard, J. H. The Gospel According to St. John. In the ICC. A. H. McNeile, General Editor. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1929.
- Blass, F. and Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament. Trans. and revision of 9th and 10th German ed. by R. W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961.
- Boice, James M. The Gospel of John. Vol. IV. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Bradley, Steve. "He Will Convict the World." Unpublished paper. Winona Lake, IN: Grace Theological Seminary, 1976.
- Breul, Karl. Heath's German and English Dictionary. New York: Heath and Co., 1906.
- Brown, Francis; Driver, S. R.; and Briggs, C. A., editors. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1972.

- Brown, R. E. The Gospel According to John (xii-xxi). In the Anchor Bible Series. Vol. 29a. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman, General Editors. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Co., 1970.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. The Gospel of John. Trans. by G. R. Beasley. General ed. R. W. Hoare and J. K. Riches. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
- Calvin, John. Commentary on the Gospel According to John. 2 vols. Trans. by W. Pringle. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing House, 1949.
- Chafer, L. S. Systematic Theology. Vol. III, VI. Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948.
- Chrysostom, John. The Fathers of the Church. 69 vols. Trans. by Sister Thomas Aquinas Goggin. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1959.
- Dana, H. E. and Mantey, J. R. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927.
- Godet, Frederick. Commentary on John's Gospel. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1886. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publishing House, 1978.
- Goodspeed, E. J. Problems of New Testament Translations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.
- Hare, Julius Charles. The Mission of the Comforter. London: Macmillan and Co., 1876.
- Hendriksen, William. New Testament Commentary Exposition of the Gospel According to John. Vol. II. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954.
- Hengstenberg, E. W. Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1865. Reprint ed. Minneapolis: Klock and Klock, 1980.
- Homer. Iliad. with introduction, notes, a short Homeric grammar, and a vocabulary by A. F. Benner. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, 1931.
- Hoskyns, E. C. The Fourth Gospel. 2nd ed. Edited by F. N. Davey. London: Faber and Faber, 1947.
- Hovey, Alvah. Commentary on the Gospel of John. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1885.
- Huffman, Jasper Abraham. Golden Treasures from the Greek New Testament. Butler, IN: Higley Press, 1951.

- Leaney, A. R. C. "The Johannine Paraclete and the Qumran Scrolls" in John and Qumran. Ed. by J. H. Charlesworth. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972.
- Lenski, R. Ch. H. The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1943.
- Lindars, Barnabas. The Gospel of John, in the New Century Bible. R. E. Clements and M. Black, General Editors. Greenwood, South Carolina: Attic Press, 1972.
- Lucke, Friedrich. Commentar über das Evangelium des Johannes. Commentary on the Gospel of John. Bonn: ben Eduard Beber, 1843.
- Luther, M. Luther's Works. 54 vols. Ed. by J. Pelikan and D. Poellot. Trans. by M. Bertram. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1961.
- Meyer, Heinrich. The Gospel of John. American ed. Trans. by William Urwick. Revised and ed. by Frederick Crombie. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884.
- Morris, Leon. The Gospel According to John. In the New International Commentary on the New Testament. F. F. Bruce, General Editor. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing House, 1975.
- Moule, C. F. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. s.v. "ἐλεγχω," by H. G. Link.
- Pache, Rene. The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit. Chicago: Moody Press, 1970.
- Pentecost, J. Dwight. The Divine Comforter. Westwood, New Jersey: Revell Co., 1968.
- Pink, Arthur. Exposition of the Gospel of John. 2nd ed. Vol. III. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1945.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1915.
- Ryle, J. C. Expository Thoughts on the Gospels. Vol. IV. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977.
- Smeaton, George. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1974.
- Stanton, A. H. "Convince or Convict (John 16:8). The Expository Times. 33. October 1921-September 1922.

- Swete, H. B. Last Discourse and Prayer of Our Lord. London: Macmillan and Co., 1913.
- Tenney, M. C. John: The Gospel of Belief. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing House, 1948.
- Thayer, J. H. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Reprint ed. 1889. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S.v. "ἐλέγχω," by Büchsel.
- Trench, R. C. Synonyms of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Book House, 1948.
- Walvoord, John F. The Holy Spirit. Findlay, OH: Dunham Publishing Co., 1958.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Ed. by Philip Gove. Springfield, MA: G & C Merriam Co., 1966.
- Westcott, B. F. The Gospel According to John. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Book House, 1962.
- Willey, Mark. "The Biblical Concept of Paideia." Unpublished Master of Divinity Thesis. Winona Lake, IN: Grace Theological Seminary, 1980
- Winer, G. B. A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament. Philadelphia: Warren F. Draper, 1881.

