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PREFACE

The thesis presented here was researched and written mainly between the summer of 1975 and the summer of 1978, during which time I was a resident research student in the University of Glasgow. It was completed in the winter of 1979, while I served as a Presbyterian pastor in New York State. I am very grateful to the University of Glasgow for providing me with an Advanced Study Scholarship, and to the Rev Dr Ernest Best, Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism, for the unstinting advice and assistance he has given me in suggestions and criticisms regarding this thesis. Deficiencies and errors which remain in it are, of course, to be attributed to me.

In this thesis I have not considered it necessary to enter into the disputed issue of the Pauline authorship of Colossians, Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles, because I have found that, in the case of Colossians, the one reference to a human pneuma is entirely in accord with I Corinthians 5.3f; in the case of the Pastorals, the single reference parallels Galatians 6.18 et. al., and in the case of Ephesians, there are no references to a human pneuma. The purpose of this thesis is to determine what Paul understands by human pneuma; for this purpose Colossians and the Pastorals contribute nothing new and Ephesians is not relevant; therefore the issue of their actual authorship did not need to be raised.

The thesis was written because there is at present no scholarly consensus concerning Paul's understanding of human pneuma (see the Introduction). The thesis combines a thorough study of the meanings of human pneuma, ruach and neshamah in literature previous to and contemporary with Paul, and a careful exegesis of the context of statements in Paul's letters which appear to or have been taken to refer to a human pneuma, in the hope of attaining and offering reasonable and sound conclusions as to where Paul does in fact mention and what he means by human pneuma. Although some cross-references are made
between the first two parts of the thesis, they are largely separate discussions. They coalesce in the final part of the thesis, the Conclusions. This final part is quite brief. I am aware that I have cast a large net to catch a few fish. It is, however, also my intention and hope that some of the more extensive exegeses in the second and also the first parts of the thesis will be of interest and value in themselves.

All translations not identified are my own.

Steven D. MacArthur
Lyndonville, New York
March 5, 1979
SUMMARY

The purpose of this thesis is to determine where Paul refers to a human spirit in his letters and what he understands human spirit to be.

The Introduction sketches the varying views of scholars in the past century with regard to human pneuma in Pauline usage. The usual view in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, that the human pneuma was for Paul the essential aspect of the human spirit which provides him or her with the capacity to communicate with the imparted Holy Spirit of God and so to attain salvation, has been largely but not entirely abandoned of late in favor of the view that human pneuma along with other anthropological terms in Paul simply designates the whole person. A few scholars have argued that Paul never had a concept of human pneuma, and others have stated that he uses the term in a casual, unterminological fashion. Scholarly disagreement exists with regard to the fact, meaning and status of human pneuma in Pauline usage.

Part I explores the background to Paul's understanding of human spirit. In Greek usage human pneuma ranges widely in its referents from the godly to the gaseous aspect of human persons. Pneuma in this literature is a distinctively material substance which possesses enormous and manifold potency.

In the Old Testament we find that ruach has four discernible meanings: (1) the breath of life (as in Greek usage); (2) vitality in general; (3) the power behind dominant dispositions; (4) the power of thought and action. Human neshamah refers to (1), (4) and (5) the capacity for self-understanding (only in Prov 20.27). In the Septuagintal translations pneuma retains all of the four meanings of ruach, as it does in the additional literature of the Septuagint, where it also means 'ghost' (in the Greek of Sir 9.9).

Josephus' usage does not go beyond that of the Septuagint, save that he identifies 'demons' as the spirits of deceased human persons tormenting the living.
Philo combines Greek and Old Testament understandings of human *pneuma* in a distinctive way. It is conceivable but far from certain that he holds that human *pneuma*, the essence of the mind, is the principle of continuity between earthly and an eternal heavenly existence.

Greek influence on Jewish apocalyptic and the Qumran literature is discovered to have been slight. In some Jewish apocalyptic writings the conceptions of human *pneuma* do not go beyond those of the Old Testament and the Septuagint. In others the meanings of *pneuma* as the power of the dominant disposition and as a demon are combined. In some of this literature also 'spirit' meaning the power of human thinking and acting in general has come to designate the essential human self in God's sight and seems to be understood as the principle of continuity between this life and an eternal life of joy or pain.

Human *ruach* in rabbinic literature retains the meanings it has in the Old Testament. The use of *n'shamah* as a synonym for *ruach* not simply in the sense of breath of life but also more generally to cover other meanings of *ruach*, a usage nascent in the Old Testament, is taken much further, and reasons for this development are given.

Though gnostic conceptions of human spirit have clear connections with previous Jewish usage, they go beyond it in that they can unambiguously conceive of the human spirit as constituting the essential human person with a heavenly future.

In the Corpus Hermeticum human *pneuma* is a material and mundane substance, the vital breath of life which effects bodily activity.

In the Gospels and Acts we find that the meaning of human *pneuma* does not go beyond that of *ruach* in the Old Testament and *pneuma* in the New Testament (except that the use of *pneuma* in Acts 23.8 is perhaps to be understood in the light of Jos Bel 7.185). Human *pneuma* in Hebrews refers either to the God-given vital breath of life or to the mode of heavenly existence of righteous persons after death and before the *eschaton*. We also
find references to a human pneuma in James, I Peter (where 3.19 is discussed at length) and Revelation, which, however, do not go beyond previously established usage.

In Part II verses in which Paul appears to or has been taken to refer to a human spirit are examined in the light of their contexts. The exegeses of I Thessalonians 5.23; I Corinthians 6.17, and 12.10 and 14.12, 32, are particularly extensive.

We find that pneuma does not refer to a human spirit but the imparted Holy Spirit in II Thessalonians 2.13; I Corinthians 6.17; 12.10 and 14.12, 32; II Corinthians 4.13; 12.18; Romans 1.4; 2.29; 8.10; 11.8; 12.11; Philippians 1.27; Ephesians 1.17; 2.18; 4.23; 6.18; I Timothy 3.16 and II Timothy 1.7. Pneuma does refer to a human spirit in I Thessalonians 5.23; I Corinthians 2.11; 4.21; 5.3-5; 7.34; 14.2, 14-16; 16.18; II Corinthians 2.13; 7.1, 13; Galatians 6.1, 18; Philippians 4.23; Romans 1.9; 8.16; Philemon 25 and Colossians 2.5. We are not able to decide with regard to II Corinthians 6.6.

We conclude that pneuma in Pauline usage is always an aspect or part of the human person and never the whole human person. It has seven different meanings in Pauline usage, all based on previous Hebrew and Jewish usage: (1) the breath of life; (2) the seat of vitality; (3) the seat of the dominant disposition; (4) the seat of thought and volition; (5) the principle of self-understanding; (6) the vehicle of a person's invisible presence through space and time and (7) the ghost of a deceased person.
Late nineteenth and early twentieth century scholars not infrequently claimed that the human spirit was for Paul the essential aspect of the human person which provided him or her with the capacity to communicate with the imparted Holy Spirit of God and so to attain salvation. Hans Lüdemann defined the anthropological pneuma as the 'ebenso erlösungsbedürftigen als erlosungsfähigen' central core of the human person. Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer considered it self-evident that pneuma in I Corinthians 5.3 'is the highest constituent element in man's nature, and his point of contact with the Spirit of God.' Emil Sokolowski equated the human pneuma with 'der dem leiblichen Teil des Menschen gegenüberstehende \( \varepsilon\alpha\varepsilon\omega\varepsilon\Omega\rho\omega\nu\omega\sigma\) and distinguished it from the \( \kappa\rho\phi\omicron\alpha\) the seat of emotions and impulses, as 'Organ des religiösen bezw. sittlichen Lebens seines Besitzers' (he finds these instances of pneuma with this meaning: Ro 1.9; 8.16; 12.11; I Cor 5.5; 6.17; 7.34; II Cor 7.1; Gal 6.18; Phil 4.23; Phlm 25; Eph 4.23; 6.18). Very few scholars nowadays are prepared to attribute to the anthropological pneuma an essential status in the possibility and the process of salvation. Friedrich Döchsel's statement, that 'Paulus sieht in dem pneuma, das der Mensch hat, nichts, durch das er mit Gott verwandt ist,' expresses the consensus of modern scholarship on this question, against which only a few demur. Arnold Come, however, has argued recently that, if we pose the question, 'what is it, which is in the creature man, that is not in any other creature, that gives to man the potential (or certain) destiny of becoming God's covenant partner?', we are led by the Biblical evidence to conclude that it is pneuma which the human person essentially is; Paul uses pneuma, according to Come, 'to designate the unique creature that receives life from God for life with God.' M. E. Isaacs contends that anthropological pneuma in Paul represents 'man in his divine aspect'.

Scholars have occasionally denied that Paul has a concept of human pneuma. Carl Holsten held that in all Paul's writings only I Corinthians 2.11 refers to an anthropological pneuma,
and that this 'in seiner concreten bestimmtheit ist aber ψυχή, 
vouos.' According to Holsten, 'die wesenselemente des menschen 
an sich für Paulus' are only ἄγων, ψυχή and vouos.9 Ernst von 
Dobschütz concurred with this view: for Paul pneuma is 'nicht 
ein Teil des menschlichen Wesens...sondern das Neue, das Gott 
in ihn gelegt hat.'10 Most scholars have rejected this posi-
tion as being completely untenable.11 It has recently been 
revived, however, in a revised form by Robert Jewett, accord-
ing to whom,

Paul thought of the human spirit simply as 
the apportioned divine spirit. This spirit was 
thought to so enter (sic) human possession that 
it could be referred to as "mine"...A distinction 
between the human and divine spirits is worked out 
for the first time in Letter B12 (1 Cor 2.11) for 
the purpose of rejecting the gnostic assumption 
that the spirit they possessed was necessarily 
the divine spirit...This concept was worked out 
specifically for the conflict against the Corinth-
thian Gnostics in the opening lines of Letter B; 
it then drops immediately from sight, never to 
reappear in the Pauline letters.13

Hans Lietzmann acknowledged that there was a human pneuma 
in Pauline usage; he considered it simply a synonym for ψυχή.14 
According to Eduard Schweizer, when Paul uses pneuma non-
technically almost in the sense of ψυχή, this is the current 
usage of Judaism...which he naturally brings with him and has 
to employ.15 W. G. Kühmel dismisses Paul's anthropological 
use of pneuma as 'unterminological'.16 Karl Barth, however, 
saw a special significance in Paul's use of pneuma to represent 
both a divine property bestowed on Christians and a constitu-
tional aspect of every human being.

As the elected and called and to that extent 
"new" man lives in the covenant by the fact that 
God gives him His Spirit, the natural man also lives 
in the same way. The same Spirit, who is there the 
principle of his renewal, is here the principle of 
his creaturely reality. Without Spirit, without 
the absolutely free encounter between God and man 
initiated by God, and outside the relation and 
fellowship based on this encounter, there can be
no prophet or any other commissioned agent of God, and no living member of the body of Christ. But without the same Spirit man cannot in any sense be man.\footnote{17}

Some scholars distinguish amongst the imparted Holy Spirit, the natural human spirit and the natural spirit renewed by the Holy Spirit, i.e. a distinctively Christian spirit; they maintain that it is often impossible to determine to which Paul refers in a given passage.\footnote{18} A more common modern scholarly position is that Paul uses \textit{pneuma} with respect to human persons in so casual and unemphatic\footnote{19} a fashion, that it is a profoundly unimportant aspect of his thought.\footnote{20} The most influential recent definition of the term is that of Rudolf Bultmann: 'when Paul speaks of the \textit{pneuma} of man he does not mean some higher principle within him or some peculiar intellectual or spiritual faculty of his, but simply his self,' either as equivalent to a personal pronoun (e.g. I Cor 16.18; Gal 6.18) or as 'the self that lives in a man's attitude, in the orientation of his will' (e.g. II Cor 12.18) or 'the self regarded as conscious or aware' (Ro 8.16; I Cor 2.11).\footnote{21} In addition, \textit{pneuma} is sometimes taken to denote the (part of the) human person surviving death (Ro 1.4;\footnote{22} I Cor 5.5).\footnote{23}

Scholarly disagreement, therefore, exists with respect to the fact, meaning and status of the human \textit{pneuma} in Pauline usage. In this thesis we will look at human \textit{pneuma} in Pauline usage in the light of its background in Greek and Jewish usage. We will offer a thorough exegesis of all Pauline verses which have been taken with some reason to refer to a human \textit{pneuma}. We will show that there is a concept of human spirit in Paul; that \textit{pneuma} in this sense in Paul has several meanings each of which has parallels in his Jewish (and mostly Old Testament) background; that, contrary to what most modern scholars maintain, human \textit{pneuma} in Paul can in no instance be adequately or correctly described as 'a signification of self-hood',\footnote{24} but that it is always an aspect of the human person, and in a few verses a higher principle, in that it is seen as the seat of self-understanding and personal identity.
PART I

BACKGROUND TO PAUL'S UNDERSTANDING OF HUMAN PNEUMA

My interest here lies not so much in tracing historical lines of development in the conception of human pneuma, as in simply determining the various views concerning it in literature and traditions which may have been familiar to Paul of Tarsus so as possibly to influence his own understanding of human pneuma, or were at least broadly contemporaneous with him.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN GREEK USAGE

The fundamental meaning of pneuma is 'air in motion'.1 As 'wind' pneuma can represent a mild breeze (e.g. Plat Phaedr 229b) or forceful blast (e.g. Plat Phaedr 229c) of air. 'As early as Aeschylus pneuma, meaning wind, was used in figurative expressions referring to dispositions, relationship, or destiny' of human beings2 (e.g. Aesch Prom 884: 'I am carried out of my course by a fierce pneuma of madness';3 cf. Eur Iph Taur 1317; Soph Oed Col 612; Plut De virtute morali II 452b).

Pneuma as 'breath' is something humans have (e.g. Aesch Eum 568; Eur Hec 567) in common with other animals (e.g. Pseud-Xenoph Cyn 7.3, dog's pneuma; Dio Chrys Or 43.5, horses' pneuma). As 'breath' pneuma not infrequently designates the vital 'breath of life' (πνεύμα δι'ου, Aesch Pers 507; cf. Sept c Theb 981; Eur Hec 571; Or 864; Poly 31.18.4; Diog L tells of aged philosophers who bring about their own deaths by holding their breath, 6.76f; 7.28). At death this pneuma is said to ascend assimilated back into the atmosphere while the body turns to earth (Eur Suppl 531-536; Epicharmus Fr. 9 = Plut Cons ad Apoll II 110b).5 Vital pneuma is sometimes used by synecdoche for a living person, as in this
inscription: ἐγὼ Νῖκος πάλιν ποτ' ἐξενόθην πνεῦμα, νῦν δ' οὐκ ἐτευθέν, ἄλλα γὰρ πεποίημα (Athenaeus of Naucratus 530f), where personal identity after death is linked not to the ascended pneuma but to the descended corpse (cf. Job 34.14f; Ps 146.4). In Sophocles Fragment 12, ἀναθραυτός ἐστιν πνεῦμα καὶ σκιὰ μόνον, and Inscriptiones Graecae 14.769, δικρύσυνθις Πλάτων, οὐ πνεῦμα πάντως βρότεις οὐ γεμετάρι, the identification of the human person as pneuma expresses the futility, the contingency of human existence, and the powerlessness of human persons in the face of this their life-situation.

Pneuma is an important concept in medical literature. In an eclectic medical writing of ca. AD 100 pneuma is regarded as ἀναθραυτότητας καὶ κυρίωτητας ὑπολείπει τῶν ἐν ἑλίγον, εἰπείον κε παρά τὴν τοῦτον ἐχομεν ὑγεία καὶ δύναμιν, παρά δὲ τὴν δύσφορον νόσον, 'the most necessary and the supreme component in us, since health is the result of its free, and disease of its impaired passage' (Anonymous Londinesis Iatrica 6.14-18; cf. further examples of diseases attributed to constrained pneuma: Plat Tim 84d-85a, 91c; Aristot Meteor 366b 25f; Epict Diss 3.3.22). In one of the writings which make up the traditional Hippocratic corpus, De natura hominis, respirated pneuma infected with noxious materials is said to be the cause of epidemic diseases (9.11-13, 44ff). Another Hippocratic work, De flatibus, maintains that all diseases without exception are due to the content and movement of pneuma (6-15). According to Galen, imbibed pneuma is transformed within the human body into a different and suitable quality of pneuma. An earlier theory had postulated that internal human and animal pneuma distinct from that which is respirated emanates from the blood. Pneuma occasionally can be translated 'gas', 'flatulence' (e.g. Diog L 6.94).

In Aristotelian physiology pneuma which is not brought into a body from outside either by respiration or generation but which is internal to and original in every living entity,
and is called άμφότερον Πνεύμα, serves as the physical vehicle, 'organ' or 'instrument' of the ψυχή in actualizing the potentialities latent in the material which makes up the body of the organism, thus effecting form, growth, generation, movement and sensation. Certain Hippocratic writings which may antedate the Stagirite already attribute similar power and functions to pneuma. De natura puero 17, 19 regards pneuma as the agent of development of all parts of the embryo, and De morbus sacrum 10 affirms that pneuma effects τὴν φρονήσιν καὶ τὴν κυνήσιν in an organism. According to Pseudo-Galen, Erasistratus (third century BC) considered pneuma to be ψυχήν in all of the body's natural activities (εἰς τὸν ψυχών ἐπερείκης).

Stoicism identifies ψυχή as consisting of pneuma (e.g. Zeno Fr. 127, 136, 140). In the human ψυχή this pneuma is sufficiently rarified so as to be σύμφωνος ἦμιν (Diog L 7.156; Sen Ep 50.6; Scholia in Hom II 2.857). Stoicism assigns to this pneuma the functions of speech, sensation, generation and thought. According to Galen, Chrysippus (third century BC) wrote:

The soul is pneuma congenital to us (σύμφωνον ἦμιν), extending to all the body continuously as long as the due proportion of the life remains in the body. The parts of this being distributed to each portion, that portion of it which extends to the windpipe we call voice; that to the eyes, vision; that to the ears, hearing; that to the nostrils, smell; that to the tongue, taste; that to all the body, touch; also that to the testicles having such a special function, we call the spermatic (part); and that which goes where all these come together, viz. in the heart, we say is the ruling part of it (τὸ ἄρχοντος ἔργον) (cf. Diog L 7.156-159; Pseud-Plut Epitome 4.21). According to Galen, the early Stoics taught that the ψυχή composed of pneuma was nourished by the blood (De plac Hippocr et Plut 2.8).
Galen distinguishes πνεῦμα ψυχικὸν which causes motion and perception in animate beings from πνεῦμα φυσικόν which nourishes animals as well as plants, and he notes that the Stoics posit in addition to these a third kind of pneuma, τὸ ἐνεργοῦ, which, he says, 'holds together the stones' (τὸ σωματικὸν τῶν λιχοδούς, Introds med 9). Other writers show plainly that this third pneuma was considered to hold together not stones alone but every particular entity (Pseud-Gal Titre πληθούσα 3; including human bodies, Sen Naturales quaestiones 2.6.6) and the entire world itself (Alexander of Aphrodisias De mixt 216.14; Cic De natura deorum 3.28). Plutarch attributes to the Stoics the conception that the foetus inside the womb has no ψυχή but is καθαρός ψυχών; at birth the pneuma changes into ψυχή due to the cooling effect (ψυχώμενον) of the outside air (Stoic rep II 1052ef; cf. Comm nat II 1084de; De primo frigido II 946c; cf. also Tert De anima 25f). It is notable that πνεῦμα ψυχικὸν in itself is not a specifically human attribute but something all animals (ζωικόν) share which distinguishes them from plants ( φυτών). However, it is adapted in different intensities and qualities to and within different animals (Diog L 7.138f).

Stoicism considers pneuma a most subtle all-pervasive substance (Tert Apol 21: Cleaneathes affirm spiritum... permeatorum universitatis; Pseud-Aristot De mundo 394b 10f). Previous to Stoicism, Hippocrates (De flatibus) had asked of pneuma: ἂν ὑπ' ἀυτὸν τούτου ἐνοικὸν ὡς; ἢ τίνος ἀυτὸς ἀπεπέμφῃ; ἢ τίνι ὅσον συμπάρεμφῃ; ἢ πῶς ὑπ' ἄλλης ἐνεργείται; τοῖς καλοῖς πνεύματος, 'For what can take place without it? In what is it not present? What does it not accompany? For everything between heaven and earth is full of pneuma' (3.15-18). Diogenes of Apollonia (fifth Century BC) had made similar observations concerning καταρpo, and he was led to assert that it was θεός (Fr. 5). In De flatibus pneuma is acclaimed as ἄνωκτεν (15.6f). Some Stoics in turn considered self-moving, eternal, all-pervasive pneuma to be θεός (Actius Plac 1.6, 7; Stobaeus Ecl 1.1.29; Sext
Emp Pyrrh hyp 3.218: the Stoics assert that τὸν Θεὸν is pneuma which permeates 'even through things foul'\(^{30}\). The doctrine that Θεὸς is all-pervasive pneuma in itself does not necessarily lead to a particular divinization of the human being who in part consists of this pneuma, for, unless certain further distinctions are made within this universal pneuma, it may be pointed out that it links human persons also closely with beasts and even stocks and stones (Sext Emp Math 9.127ff).\(^{31}\)

Epictetus (Diss 2.8.1ff) claims that humanity possesses a portion of the divinity in distinction from all other creatures, viz. νοῦς, ἐπιστήμη, λόγος ὥρθος. Pseudo-Plato Axiochus 370bc avers that humankind 'would not have acquired and maintained so great affectiveness as to despise the violence of overpowering wild beasts, to cross seas, to build cities, to found commonwealths, to look into the heavens and discern orbits and courses of stars...if there were not really in the soul some divine breath, through which it possessed intelligence and knowledge of so great things' (ἐὰν μὴ τὰ θεῖαν ώστε τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὰ περὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ χρώματα).\(^{32}\) According to Seneca, ratio 'is nothing else than a portion of the divine spirit (pars divini spiritus) set in a human body' (Ep 66.12;\(^{33}\) cf. 120.15; 41.2). These statements show that it is νοῦς and not pneuma per se which distinguishes humanity from the rest of creation and establishes its special affinity with divinity. The Stoics consider νοῦς to be pneuma in an extremely subtle state (Diog L 7.138f; Sext Emp Pyrrh hyp 2.70).\(^{34}\) Aristotle had expressly distinguished the specially human νοῦς from the generally organic pneuma and had held that the former alone was divine: τὸν νοῦν μονὸν ὑπὸ θεὸν ἐπείσεις καὶ θεῖον εἶναι μὸνον (Gen an 736b 27f). Later Marcus Aurelius similarly distinguishes the divine νοῦς peculiar to human persons (2.1; 5.27; 11.19; 12.26) from the vital pneuma (12.14) which other creatures also possess (9.2). The profane and utter materiality of pneuma (cf. Tert De anima 5; Sen Ep 57.8) probably led him
to differentiate it from \( \text{Voc} \) as the highest and truly divine aspect of human personhood. 35

The understanding of inspiration advanced in Pseudo-Plato Axiochus 370bc is, so far as I know, unique in pre-Christian Greek literature in that it ascribes a variety of human abilities and accomplishments to the permanent inspirational influence of divine pneuma. Elsewhere in this literature divine pneuma inspires only poetry and divination. 36 In literature previous to and including Plato 37 pneuma and related words were used of divine influences more varied in their effects. 37 Pneuma in this sense in Greek literature is always a more or less material substance. 38 Inspirational or wonder-working pneuma in the later magical papyri is primarily a stuff dispensed by God, though there is some personification of pneumata here as well, probably under Jewish and Christian influence. 39

One final usage of pneuma in Greek writing which may be mentioned is as a technical term in ancient rhetoric and literary aesthetics which denotes not so much the inspiration as 'the expressive or captivating flow' of oration and poetry (Dion Hal De Demosthene 20; Luc Bacchus 7; Encomium Demosthenis 14; Longinus Sublim 9.13; 33.5; Horat Sat 1.4.46f).

In conclusion it is clear that in Greek philosophy and medicine pneuma is a distinctively material substance of enormous and manifold potency. In the human organism pneuma is the power behind the things the organism does or that happen to and in it. It is also similarly at work in other organisms and as cohesiveness even in inanimate entities. It is considered divine but \( \text{Voc} \) which is specially human is more divine than pneuma which is in other and indeed all creatures and things.
I reiterate that in the following paragraphs I do not try to trace the history of the semantic development of the words ruach and ne shamah. This would be a difficult and perhaps an impossible undertaking in any case, for in the oldest extant Hebrew literature the development of the language is already somewhat advanced, and the dating and even the interpretation of numerous Old Testament passages is uncertain and disputed. I will only mention here that scholars have often assumed that the original anthropological application of ruach referred to God's mysterious and powerful intervention in human affairs, i.e. that ruach was attributed to God before it was attributed to humanity. I am also not concerned in these paragraphs to relate ruach and ne shamah to other anthropological terms in the Old Testament, although I am aware that in many cases ruach and ne shamah are synonymous with such terms: Hebrew anthropological usage is 'not systematic, but syncretistic'. My interest lies rather in determining the different significations of human ruach and ne shamah in this literature, their relative frequency, and the overall Old Testament consensus concerning them.

The basic meaning of נֵפֶשׁ seems to be 'air in motion, particularly "wind"'. It also denotes human 'breath' (Job 9.18; 19.17). Ruach can be used of vigorous breathing or snorting to symbolize power and rage (Isa 25.4; 33.11 MT). As 'breath' ruach is synonymous with ne shamah (Isa 42.5; 57.15). The breath in human nostrils is God's breath (Job 27.3); it really belongs to God (Gen 6.3; Ezek 37.5f; Dan 5.23). Given yet still possessed by him, it becomes the principle of life in every human person. God gives this breath to every person who is born (Zech 12.1; Job 33.4, 6), preserves it during their lives (Ps 31.6(5); Job 10.12; 12.10), and takes it back again at death (Eccl 12.7). God is נֵפֶשׁ (Num 16.22; 27.16). No human
Human persons are given breath by God in common with all other living creatures (Gen 6.17; 7.15, 22; Ps 104.29f; Eccl 3.19-21). Like other creatures humans deprived of God-given breath at death become dust (י Deferred, Job 34.14f), earth (תאי, Ps 133.4). 6

Ruach is the vital power of human life (Prov 18.14). It can suffer decrease (Ezek 21.12f; Ps 77.3; 142.4(3)) and even disappearance (Josh 2.11; 5.1; I Kings 10.5 // II Chron 9.4): 'the spirit is strength itself and therefore vanishes with it.' 7 It can be revived by taking food or drink (Jg 15.19; I Sam 30.12). Jacob's ruach is revived by visible proof that his son Joseph is still alive and prospering (Gen 45.27). Psalmists concern themselves with the need for revival of their human ruchoth by God's ruach, so that they will be able in trying circumstances to prosper and to do what is right and required by him (Isa 58.16; Ps 51.10-12; 143.4, 7, 10). 8 In these Psalms we come across a further connotation of ruach, as the power behind certain 'dominant dispositions' in humankind. 9 Various sorts of dispositions are referred to ruach; for example, anger (Jg 8.3), bitterness (Ezek 3.14); distress (Job 7.11), jealousy (Num 5.14, 30), harlotry (Hos 4.12; 5.4), impatience (Prov 14.29), patience (Eccl 7.8), generosity (Ex 35.21), and trustworthiness (Prov 11.13). It would seem that the Hebrews characteristically considered the particular strength and disposition of a person's ruach as due to God's active power (Dt 2.30; Jg 9.23; I Sam 16.14-23; I Kings 22.22f // I Chron 18.21f; II Kings 19.7 // Isa 37.7; Isa 29.10). 10 God stirs up spirits to do things (Jer 51.11; Hag 1.14; I Chron 5.26; II Chron 21.16; 36.22; Ezra 1.1, 5); he also deprives people of ruach (Isa 19.3; Ps 76.12). God is always indicated or implied as the source of ruach where it is seen as the power behind certain special capabilities (Gen 41.38; Ex 28.3; 31.3; 35.3; Num 27.18; Dt 34.9; Isa 28.6; Zech 12.10; Job 32.8; 11 Dan 5.11f). Here, of course, we are not far from the entirely unambiguous attribution to God's own ruach of such things as human heroism.
Og 3.10 etc.), ecstasy (I Sam 10.6, 10 etc.) and inspired utterance (Isa 61.1 etc.); the most frequent employment of ruach in the Old Testament is as the divine source of such extraordinary capacities (cf. with reference to the Messiah, Isa 11.2). A generalization may be permitted here: whereas in Greek thought pneuma becomes largely a principle of explanation for basic bodily functions and natural processes, in the Old Testament ruach remains mainly a principle of explanation for what is sensational and unnatural.

In the Old Testament ruach -- and twice neshamah (Job 26.4; 32.8) -- is also seen as the power of human thought and action in general (Num 14.24; Isa 29.24; Ps 77.6; Job 32.8; Prov 16.2). As such human ruach can be contrary to God (Ps 78.8; Job 15.13). Its contrariety, however, is ineffective (Ezek 11.5; 13.3; 20.32; Job 15.13f; cf. Isa 30.1). Insofar as ruach represents human ruach ranged against or simply considered apart from God's ruach, it is not 'spirit' but empty 'wind' (Isa 26.18; 41.29; Jer 5.13; Mi 2.11; Ps 78.39; Job 6.26; 7.7; 8.2; 15.2; 16.3). Effective and rightly directed ruach depends on God's gracious empowering (Ezek 11.19; 18.31; 36.26). The requisite condition of human ruach vis-à-vis God is one of receptive powerlessness, repentant emptiness (Isa 57.15; 61.3; 66.2; Ps 34.18(19); 51.17).

The dominant Old Testament understanding of ruach as 'power, strength, life', then, is that all is of God, and from God; ruach is not simply at a person's disposal; it is rather 'etwas dem Menschen Fremdes, souverän über ihm stehendes'. Only Proverbs 16.32 and 25.28 teach that a person can rule (╯נ conex) and restrain (々נ conex) his powerful ruach, and the former verse allows that this is more difficult than capturing a city. Mostly in the Old Testament ruach is not represented as controllable by humankind. And even in the Wisdom Literature we read that Elihu's ruach forces him to speak (Job 32.18; cf. 20.315).

Proverbs 20.27, "In the midst of summer heat, cool is my soul."
evinces an understanding of human nešamah which is unique in
the Old Testament. For this very reason a number of scholars
suggest that נֶשַׁמָּה be read for נֶשַׁמַּה, so that verse 27a says, 'the
Lord is the keeper of a man's life'. However, since the
verse makes good sense without it, the suggested emendation,
which lacks any manuscript support, should be set aside as
'unnecessary', and the verse interpreted to affirm that God-
given nešamah allows a person the capacity for profound self-
understanding.

Four further comments of relevance to Pauline pneumatology
close this survey of human ruach and nešamah in the Old Testa-
ment. (1) Where ruach opposes 'flesh' (נֶפֶשׁ) in this litera-
ture the contrast is always between divine power and human
weakness (Gen 6.3; Isa 31.3; Joel 2.28(3.1); Job 34.14f).
(2) Ruach seems only once to represent the whole human person,
and it does so in a piece of poetic synonymous parallelism
(Isa 26.9), where ruach, which is an active subject, substi-
tutues for the נֶפֶשׁ of verses 8d and 9a; נֶפֶשׁ, usually with a
pronominal suffix, frequently represents the whole person in the
Old Testament.
(3) In II Kings 2.9 Elisha addressing Elijah
calls God's ruach specially active in Elijah 'your (Elijah’s)
ruach' (cf. v. 15). Undoubtedly God's ruach is identified
as Elijah’s ruach here because he has been endowed with it
for a long period of time (cf. I Sam 16.13; also 4.1, where
God’s נֶפֶשׁ is נֶפֶשׁ). (4) Ruach in the Old Testament
is not as in Stoicism a distinctively material substance.

Although the various meanings of ruach shade off into one
another, one can say in conclusion that human ruach in the
Old Testament refers to (1) the breath of life; (2) vitality
in general; (3) the power behind dominant dispositions; (4)
the power of thought and action. Human nešamah refers to
(1), (4), only in Job, and (5) the capacity for self-under-
standing, only in Proverbs 20.27. Ruach is usually seen as
dependent upon God and at his disposal rather than that of
the human person, and apart from God, ineffective and mis-
directed if it is not abject and wretched.
THE RENDERING OF HUMAN RUACH AND NE'SHAMAH
IN THE SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

In the Septuagint where ruach means breath or vitality it is almost always translated by pneuma, and the meaning of ruach as the seat or power of human thought and action is similarly maintained for the most part. Ne' shamah is usually translated by πνοή and is so translated where it covers the capacities for thought and action (Job 26.4; 32.8) and self-understanding (Prov 20.27); meaning 'breath' it is translated by pneuma at III (I) Kings 17.17 and -- here as Aramaic נושד -- Daniel 5.23 (cf. also Dan 10.17). Where ruach refers to the power behind dominant dispositions it is mostly translated by pneuma, but also not infrequently rendered by some form of the word ἴππος (e.g. Gen 41/8) and ὄμος (in expressions of anger, e.g. Job 21.4), or another word may be substituted for the original Hebrew expression so as to obviate a direct translation of ruach (e.g. Josh 5.11, προφήτης; Job 6.4, ἢμις; Dan 2.1, ἐνυπνίων); the fact that the conception of ruach as the power or seat of the dominant disposition was entirely unparalleled in Greek usage of pneuma explains this tendency. The translator of Proverbs used such expedients to avoid all reference to human pneuma -- he mis-translated 15.14 so that pneuma means, figuratively, 'wind'; Proverbs 'was more strongly subjected to Hellenizing influences than the translation of other books.' There are a few instances where human pneuma appears in the absence of its precise Hebrew equivalents, but in none of these does it have a meaning which goes beyond the basic meanings of human ruach in the Old Testament. The instances are: III (I) Kings 20(21).4, τὸ πνεῦμα Ἀχαβ τεταρτάγμενον (cf. v. 5), pneuma as the seat of the dominant disposition; Job 7.15, where pneuma represents the power of human reasoning and volition in the futility of its hostility toward God (Job 7.13-15: Εἰς ὅτι ἐπὶ παρακλήσεως με η σκίνη μου, ἀνοίξε με πρὸς ἐμμυϊνον ἰδία λόγον τῇ κοίτῃ μου ἐκφοβεῖς με ἐνυπνίοις καὶ ἐν
God so arranges it that Job as a purely human agent cannot effectively set his pneuma on benign nothingness; cf. vv. 16ff, especially 21b); Psalm 118(119).131, pneuma as 'breath'; Isaiah 38.12, pneuma as 'breath (of life)'; Daniel 5.4 (LXX and ), pneuma as vitality. The LXX addition to II Kings (Samuel) 13.21, 'and David did not vex (οὐκ ἔλονσεν) the pneuma of Amnon his son, for he loved him,' where pneuma is the seat of dispositions, is appropriate and perhaps original, having been omitted by scribal parablepsis. 3

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE ADDITIONAL LITERATURE OF THE SEPTUAGINT

Pneuma frequently means 'breath' in this literature, and, except perhaps in Daniel 8.64 (= the Song of the Three Young Men 64), where the righteous bless the Lord with their breath, and IV Maccabees 11.11, where a Jewish patriot being tortured on a βιτςελτωσ finds himself ὁ πνεῦμα στενοχωρομένος, 'pressed for breath', pneuma as 'breath' always directly designates the vital 'breath of life' (Esth 8.12m=16.12; III Macc 6.24). Pneuma in Judith 10.13 and ruach in the Hebrew of Sirach 16.17d by metonymy with this meaning stand for the whole living person. As in the Old Testament this breath comes from and belongs to God (II Macc 7.22; 14.46; 3.24; Wisd Sol 12.1: ὁ γάρ ὁ Θεός τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐστὶν ἐν πᾶσιν; 3 15.11, 16); it departs from a person at death (Bar 2.17; Wisd Sol 16.14; Sir 38.23; cf. IV Macc 12.19 v.1.), and the person deprived of it becomes dust or earth (Tob 3.6; Sir 40.1; 16.30f; Wisd Sol 15.8).

The Hebrew of Sirach 9.9d, דָּבָק הַשָּׁמַיִם (cJ. דָּבָק, הַשָּׁמַיִם being regarded as an erroneous repetition from v. 9e)5 דָּבָק הַשָּׁמַיִם,6 'and in blood you incline (cJ. descend) unto a
pit’, refers to the adulterer’s (9a-c) punishment of death by stoning (Lev 20.10; Dt 22.22), which entailed being pushed into a pit (M Sanh 6.4). This becomes in the Greek translation, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἐστὶν ἀμιθανοῦ, which probably should be translated, ‘in your spirit you slide into destruction’, ἀμιθανοῦ representing not loss of life (as e.g. in Jos Vita 272; Ant 15.62) but the place of the suffering of the wicked dead (as in the LXX of Job 26.6; Prov 15.11, and in Rev 17.8, 11; cf. also the construction, ἐν ἑλετρον ἐστὶν Ἀδωνι, Epigr Gr 587.1), and pneuma the portion or form of the survival of persons in the netherworld (cf. I En 22). In 34.13, πνεῦμα ἁμαχίμενον κύριον ζῆσεται (there is no corresponding Hebrew fragment), however, pneuma is not the means or mode of existence in a happy afterlife, for, according to Jesus the son of Sirach, ‘a son of man is not immortal’ (17.30, save in the remembrance of later generations, 39.9f). Pneuma in 34.13 is therefore that vital breath of life upon which life on earth now depends. RSV mg translates ἐν τῷ πνεύμα Ν in 9.9, ‘by your spirit’; presumably pneuma as the power behind thought and action in general is understood, or perhaps pneuma as the power of the dominant disposition (so JB, ‘in your ardor’).

In II Maccabees 7.23; 14.46 we encounter the new idea that (the bodies of) Jewish martyrs at least are given pneuma by God after death so as to live again. Pneuma is not seen as a principle of continuity between this life and the next. Immortality depends upon God’s power and willingness to give life back to people. In the Wisdom of Solomon 1.16ff the ungodly are attacked for holding doctrines which deny the truth that immortality is a possibility for righteous people (3.1ff). These wrong doctrines include the view that ἰδὶ πνεῦμα (which seems synonymous with ἵδι πνεῦμα in v. 2) at death ἀκολούθησαν ὡς ζώους ἑαυτός (2.3). Pseudo-Solomon himself, however, offers no contrary teaching with particular respect to pneuma in this sense, pneuma as the breath of life. He affirms immortality for righteous persons guided by pneuma which is ὑγιεὶς (3.4; 4.1; 6.18f; 8.17; cf. 3.11), but he
never expressly associates personal immortality with pneuma in the sense of 'breath of life'.

Pneuma has the meaning 'strength' or 'vitality' in this literature only in works originally written in Hebrew (I Macc. 13.7; Judith 7.19; 14.6; Bar. 3.1). Pneuma sometimes refers to the power or seat of dominant dispositions. In Tobit 4.3 (καὶ Τοβίας ἐμβιασθεὶς λύχνος) the pneuma of his mother. The dependency of human dispositions upon divine dispensation is affirmed in Esther 5.15.6 and in the Psalms of Solomon 8.14, where the context suggests that pneuma represents not mere vitality but the man's moral and rational power.

A similar understanding of pneuma underlies its usage in Daniel 3.39 (= the Song of the Three Young Men 16), ἀλλ' ἐν ὑπερήφανῇ πνεύματι καὶ πνεύματι προσδέχεται, where, in accordance with Old Testament usage, human pneuma insofar as it is a power of thought and action with some degree of independence from divine control properly looks to God for help in its profound weakness and need. The Psalms of Solomon 17.37 states that God will make the Messiah Εσώτερον ἐν πνεύματι ἄγαθος; 18.7 states that the Messiah will come ἐν σωφρόνῃ πνεύματι καὶ σωφροσύνῃ καὶ ἀλλήθεια (cf. Isa 11.2), but the commentators read πνεύμα σωφρόνως, a sensible transposition: ἐν σωφρόνῃ πνεύματος κ. τ. λ. does not make sense.
Elsewhere in this literature it is said that God furnishes humble and worthy people with a particular pneuma of understanding (Sir 39.6, πνεῦμα συνειδήσεως, of the student of the law; Su 44/45, πνεῦμα συνειδήσεως and 63, πνεῦμα ἐπιστήμης καὶ συνειδήσεως, both vv. of Daniel). The Wisdom of Solomon represents personified σοφία herself as pneuma (1.6; 9.17) through prayer (7.7; 8.21; cf. 6.12). Imparted σοφία enters the human ψυχή (1.4; 7.27; 10.16); it also penetrates pneumata (7.23). The relationship between human ψυχή and pneuma here is not clear. Scholars usually assume that these are two names for the same things (cf. 15.8, at death γίνεται θεία χρέος, with 15.16, ἄνθρωπος... τῇ πνεύματί δεδομένῳ; cf. also 16.14). However, in 15.11 where God is said to have breathed into a person τοὺς ψυχῆς ἐνεργοῦσαν and τοὺς ψυχῆς ᾿ζωτικοῖν, it may be that ψυχή as volitional power (cf. 3.13; 4.11, 14; 10.7; 17.1, 15) is distinguished from pneuma as purely vital power. Thus in 7.23 where Pseudo-Solomon affirms that in σοφία there is a pneuma διὰ πνευμάτων χωροῦν πνευμάτων νοερῶν ἀποτελόμενον, it is not clear from the rest of the writing what he envisages these pneumata to be. Commentators whom I have consulted who discuss the matter conclude that he means 'spirits in the widest sense, whether angelic or human, and the latter whether incarnate or discarnate.' However, it seems that, given the evident and widely admitted Stoic influence upon his conception of pneuma (cf. especially 1.7, πνεῦμα... τῇ συνεχείᾳ τὰ πνεύματα), pneuma in 7.23 is also possibly the λεπτότερον stuff of which humans partake and angels are composed (cf. Philo who maintains that the mind and the angels are made of the same πνεῦμα θείον which is distinct from the human ψυχή).

Some scholars conclude that, because σοφία in the Wisdom of Solomon was God's instrument in the creation of the world (7.22; 9.2, 9) out of formless material (11.17), σοφία is not itself material pneuma. This is not certain, for
Pseudo-Solomon could well have considered pneuma as necessarily and appropriately a most subtle but still material link between immaterial God and the world of matter (cf. Aristotle’s Πνεῦμα Σύμφωνον which establishes contact between the immaterial Ὑπνή and the material body), so that through σοφία God is able to create and to continue to make efficacious contact with the material world (cf. 10.1ff). Yet even if we assume that pneuma is material in Pseudo-Solomon’s view, we must note that he does not with Stoicism baldly identify God himself as pneuma which pervades all and even the worst things: God is not pneuma; God is not σοφία (7.15, 25f; 8.4; 9.4, 9; cf. Clem Alex Strom 5.14).20

To sum up, pneuma in the additional literature of the Septuagint maintains all the various nuances it has in the translation of the Old Testament, viz. breath, breath of life, vitality, the power of dominant dispositions, the power of human thought and action in general which is misdirected if not humbled before God. Additional, positive understanding which exceeds the realization that one requires divine succor is not attributed to human pneuma but considered the special gift of divine pneuma. In II Maccabees 7.23; 14.46 a breath of life in an afterlife is promised to Jewish martyrs. In Tobit 6.8 an evil pneuma is definitely reckoned as a demonic being for the first time in Jewish literature. In the Greek of Sirach 9.9 pneuma acquires the quite new meaning of ghost.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE WRITINGS OF JOSEPHUS

Josephus uses pneuma of human breath in the Antiquitates 3.291 and 17.169. In 1.34, ἐναγέν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἀνθρώπον Ἐσώ καὶ πνεύμα λοίμων, καὶ πνεύμα ἐνεκεν ἀυτῷ καὶ ὑπνή (cf. Gen 2.7), and 3.260, where blood is said to be ὑπνή ἀυτῷ καὶ πνεύμα (cf. Lev 17.11), pneuma collocated with ὑπνή may represent the vital power of a person’s life distinguished from ὑπνή as psychological power (as with Trypho, Justin Dial 6,
Josephus uses *pneuma* of human vitality in 11.240 and as the seat or power of a dominant disposition in the Bellum 3.92 (πνεῦμα ἀρνικοῦ πνευματός). He never uses *pneuma* of the seat or power of human thought and action in general. He appears deliberately to eschew references to human *pneuma*/*ruach* in his retelling of the history of Judaism, doubtless conscious that much of the usage of the Septuagint and the Old Testament in this regard would be strange and perplexing to his Gentile readership. 1 Josephus speaks of divine *pneuma* infrequently and almost always with regard to past prophetic inspiration (Ant 4.108, 118f; 6.166, 222f; 8.408; 10.239). Solomon's prayer that μὴ ἔχῃ πνεῦμα of God's *pneuma* might inhabit the Temple (Ant 8.114) suggests that Josephus may have conceived of *pneuma* as material. 2 Josephus considers the evil *pneuma* which tormented Saul a δαίμονον (Ant 6.211, 214) and identifies τὰ...καλοῦμενα ἐχθρίων as πνηματικά...ἀνθρώπων πνευμάτα τῶν ἰωσίων εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν καὶ κτησίον τῶν ἱστορίας μὴ τυχαίωντας (Bell 7.185). This last definition is new to us. Otherwise Josephus’ usage of human *pneuma* does not go beyond that of the later parts of the Septuagint.

**HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE WRITINGS OF PHILO**

_Pneuma_ frequently means 'wind' in Philo's writings, and, with one exception, _De cherubim_ 37, where moderate winds are mentioned, violent winds are invariably in view. 1 As a derivation from this usage Philo uses _pneuma_ in figurative expressions with reference to moral or dispositional influences or proclivities (e.g. _Deus imm_ 26, ἀγοραστὸν πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκκέντρος contrasted with ἐπιστήμης καὶ ἀρετῆς ἀφοῦ). _Pneuma_ also means 'breath' in Philo's writings, both human (e.g. _Leg Gai_ 188, 243) and animal (_Aet mund_ 128, snakes' breath; cf. _Vit Mos_ 1.98) breath. Every creature
(πνεῦμα) depends on breath for life (Spec. leg. 1.338).

Philo considers breath to be respirated atmospheric air (Leg. Gai. 125; cf. Gig. 10). Since he does not simply equate breath (pneuma) and air (ἀήρ) but calls them 'congenital' (Deus imm. 84; Praem. poen. 144), it is clear that respirated air undergoes some alteration within the living organism, but Philo does not find occasion to discuss this. In De cherubim. III Philo seems to use pneuma as a simple synonym of ἀήρ; he also identifies the πνεῦμα Θεοῦ of Genesis 1.1 as ἀήρ (Gig. 23; Quaest. Gen. 4.5).

Philo does not interpret Genesis 2.7, 'and he breathed into his face πνεῦμα πνεῦμα λωγίων, as a reference to the vital breath which is in all living creatures; it is rather something which is given to the human being alone. This pneuma is not the substance (ὁσῶς) of the human person's entire psychic center -- even though sometimes Philo's language seems to suggest as much (e.g. Leg. all 3.161). This pneuma given directly by God (Leg. all 1.41) constitutes only that highest part of the ψυχή which is specially human and not also the property of other living creatures, the ψυχή ψυχή, that is, the ἱερεμονικόν, νοῦς, λογιζόμενος, διάνοια. Philo tells us he uses ψυχή in 'two senses, both for the whole soul and also for its dominant part (τὸ ἱερεμονικόν ἄτις μερός), which properly speaking is the soul's soul (ψυχή ψυχή), just as the eye can mean either the whole orb, or the most important part, by which we see...The substance of the soul is two-fold, blood being that of the soul as a whole, and the divine pneuma that of its most dominant (ἡ ἱερεμονικόν πτωτος) part (Rer. div. her. 55; cf. Leg. all 1.37; Spec. leg. 1.171; 4.123; Quaest. Gen. 2.59; Det. pot. ins. 80-84: here blood not breath is the vital power shared by humans and animals alike). Elsewhere, however, Philo not infrequently avows that we cannot comprehend the mind; we cannot know its substance, whether it be pneuma or not. 'The mind that is in each one of us can apprehend other objects (τὰ μὲν ἄλλα δύναται καταλαβεῖν) but it is incapable of knowing itself (ἐκτὸς οὗ καταλαβεῖν)...Can it say what it is and of what kind,
pneuma or blood or fire or air or anything else?\(^5\) (Leg all 1.91; cf. Op mund 69; Cher 65; Mut nom 10; Som 1.30-33; cf. also Cher 114: the ψυχή is unknowable). Nonetheless, many times Philo confidently declares that the human mind is made up of an άνευ Θετο, viz. pneuma or άνευ (cf. in addition to the passages already cited, Op mund 146; Deus imm 46; Plant 18f).

According to Philo, Adam had a νοσ ψυκήν before he was breathed on by God (Leg all 1.32). Here νοσ seems equivalent to ψυχή (so also Leg all 2.23). Philo's terminology appears thus somewhat haphazard. Nevertheless, his usual view is that πνεῦμα θεῦν composes the human mind which other creatures lack (Leg all 1.32f; contrast, however, 90). The presence of πνεῦμα θεῦν in human persons makes possible knowledge of arts and sciences and, most importantly, knowledge of God (Leg all 1.38; Det pot ins 87ff; cf. Plant 24). Yet even this human mind endowed with divine pneuma is not able to comprehend the most important truths, including άγή (Leg all 3.48), without a special and separate, overwhelming and superseding influence of divine προφητικὸν πνεῦμα (Gig 23f; Vit Mos 1.175, 277; 2.264f; Spec leg 4.49). άν νοσ άκολούθειν, πρὸς τιμωθήν προφητεύον φθείρει (Vit Mos 2.6). In prophecy and related experiences inspirational divine pneuma replaces the highest part of the soul, the mind (which is itself divine pneuma).

This is what regularly befalls the fellowship of the prophets. The mind is evicted (ἐξοικείζεται) at the arrival of the divine pneuma, but when that departs the mind returns to its tenancy\(^6\) (Rer div her 265; cf. Spec leg 1.65).

Perhaps Philo held that the power of the constitutional divine pneuma in the human person had been vitiated by close contact with inferior bodily and psychic parts and functions (Leg all 3.41). He explains that inspirational divine pneuma, though it fleetingly visits even bad people (Gig 20), never abides long with men and women -- Moses excepted (Gig 47f); his constitutional
pneuma was \( \kappa \Theta \chi \rho \omega \tau \tau \omicron \nu \) (Vit Mos 2.40) -- because they are flesh (\( \delta \kappa \rho \zeta \)) and thereby drawn to desire lesser things (Gig 28-31, 53; Deus imm 2; Quaest Gen 1.90). When Abraham was temporarily possessed 'everything in him changed to something better, eyes, complexion, stature, carriage, movements, voice. For the divine pneuma which was breathed upon him from on high made its lodging in his soul, and invested his body with singular beauty, his voice with persuasiveness, and his hearers with understanding' (Virt 217). Obviously inspirational divine pneuma is much more powerful than the constitutional divine pneuma in human \( \psi \upsilon \chi \varsigma \). Indeed Philo more than once evinces an extremely low regard for the capacities of the human mind (Cher 116). He believes that a human person cannot begin to come to know God until he or she knows total self-despair (Som 1.60). According to him, it is better to live on a low level \( \omicron \tau \iota \omicron \upsilon \omicron \varsigma \alpha \nu \gamma \xi \omicron 
\) than to try to see God without his special direction (Migr Abr 170f). In strict truth the human mind can effect nothing at all apart from a continuing divine dispensation (Leg all 2.46). God and not the mind effects good human qualities (1.49).

Some scholars consider that Philo's statements about the human mind being replaced by divine pneuma in inspiration do not accord with his own experience of inspiration when he hears and understands a voice revealing truths to him (Cher 27; Som 2.252-254). It is possible, however, to accommodate this experience to Philo's acceptance of Stoic epistemology wherein a pneuma that is not divine effects hearing (Deus imm 83f) and thinking (Som 1.136). In Quis rerum divinarum heres 69f Philo's general description of inspiration indicates that the human mind is not just driven out but in fact drawn nearer to God by the superior inspiring pneuma. Philo also conceives of God as walking in the palace of the perfected human mind (Som 1.148; 2.251; Praem poen 123). One might well be inclined to allow that in these passages Philo uses 'mind' as equivalent to 'soul', that is, he means 'earthly mind', but such a harmonizing supposition is certainly ruled out by Philo's clear
statement that the heir of divine things is the ἱλαθρῶτας νοῦς which forsakes not only the body but τῶν ἑτέρων ψυχῶν (Rer div her 64). Philo apparently countenances two kinds of inspiration, viz. the perfection and the replacement of the human mind. It is probably best to see these as two aspects of inspiration, in accordance with Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin 3.9:

For ecstasy, as its very name shows, is nothing else than the departing and going out of the understanding...For when the mind is divinely possessed and becomes filled with God, it is no longer within itself, for it receives the divine spirit to dwell within it.

The mind which the inspirational divine spirit displaces is the mind which it fills. This mind is so greatly transformed that it can be said to be replaced. The old mind goes and the new mind comes. It is at once not the same mind and yet the same mind.

Philo attributes to pneuma certain physiological functions and properties which reflect the influence of Stoic and medical theorizing upon his employment of the term. He speaks of pneuma as ἤμνητός ἂν (Op mund 30). A πνευματικὴν κοσμικὴν distributed εἰς τὴν τὸς ψυχῆς διανοικεῖ εἴπτερον τὴν τὴν θεοτητικὴν καὶ τὴν κεφαλητικὴν (Op mund 67; cf. perhaps Leg Cat 63).

Pneuma effects plant life (Spec Leg 4.217). Philo speaks in Stoic fashion of τὸ ἔγχυσθαι πνεῦμα νοηματων (Som 1.136). He accepts the Stoic conception of a πνεῦμα τῆς ἔκφυσις (Deus imm 35, ἡς ἔκφυσις πνεῦμα κατεργασμεν' ἐκτο τῷ ἐκτείνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκτείνεται τῶν ἑτέρων πνευμάτων. Cf. Op mund 131, pneuma as ἔκφυσις of the earth; Aet mund 125, of stones; 86, of fire; Rer div her 242 and Omn prob lib 26, 11 of the human body; Praem poen 48, of moral and spiritual life, an unusual application of the idea). This usage of pneuma is quite distinct from his application of divine pneuma to human mind 12 and to God's additional inspirational agency, prophetic pneuma.

In De gigantibus 25-28 Philo teaches that inspirational divine pneuma is not a material substance; he contrasts it with
which 

material: it can be torn into tiny 

pieces (κατακεραυνήσθεν). Is the material human pneuma Philo 

mentions here the divine substance that constitutes the mind 
or the nutritional, sensory, vital pneuma which is not speci-
fically human? It is certainly the latter, for, although 

Philo often uses language that might suggest the specially 
human mind is material (e.g. Op mund 166: it is like κηρού), 

he clearly considers it to be divine pneuma (Leg all 3.161; 

Plant 18f; Spec leg 4.123) which is from heaven (Rer div her 

274), incorporeal (Som 1.30; Virt 12), and uncreated (Rer div 

her 56). It is indeed like the heavenly bodies immortal (Som 

1.34). Scripture 

says that the body was made through the Arti-
ficer taking clay and moulding out of it a human 

form, but that the soul (ψυχή) was originated from 

nothing created whatever, but from the Father and 

Ruler of all: for that which he breathed in was 

nothing else than πνεῦμα Θείον that migrated hither 

from that blissful and happy existence for the bene-

fit of our race, to the end that, even if it is mor-
tal in respect of its visible part, it may in respect 
of the part that is invisible be rendered immortal. 

Hence it may with propriety be said that man is 

the borderland between mortal and immortal nature, 

partaking of each so far as is needful, and that 

he was created at once mortal and immortal, mortal 
in respect of the body, but in respect of the mind 
(σωματικὸς) immortal (Op mund 135; contrast, however, 

Rer div her 265). 

This immortal human mind God may in the end set free to ascend 

again into heaven (Som 1.181) to live amidst the angels there, 

beings akin to it (Gig 12-14) who are also wholly composed of 

this divine pneuma (Abr 113; Quaest Gen 1.90, 92; 2.8; cf. 

Plant 14). Adam in paradise consorted with λοχικὴ θ' 

Θεία λογικὴ blissfully before God ἄτε δὴ πολλῷ πνεῦμα τῷ 

αὐτῷ τοῦ Θείου πνεύματος (Op mund 144). Is it with such an 

eternal destiny in view that God concerns himself about the 

condition of the πνεῦμα λοχικὸν of his servants on earth, that 
it be kept κακωσκότων in righteous living (Spec leg 1.277)?
Philo never unambiguously expresses a belief in personal immortality for the virtuous. He says of Moses that 'the time came when he had to make his pilgrimage from earth to heaven, and leave this mortal life for immortality, summoned thither by the Father who resolved his twofold nature of soul and body into a single unity, transforming his whole being into \( \Psi \Omega \Sigma \) (\textit{Vit Mos} 2,288). But Moses may be here as elsewhere (e.g. \textit{Gig} 47f) sui generis.

In \textit{Quod deterius potiori insidari solet} Philo speaks of a \( \nu \nu \nu \eta \nu \varepsilon \lambda \mu \kappa \pi \tau \varepsilon \pi \zeta \kappa \varepsilon \) as a dominant disposition in a manner reminiscent of Old Testament usage which, as we have seen, was continued in the additional literature of the Septuagint and also by Josephus.

In conclusion it is clear that like Aristotle and some Stoics Philo considers the human mind to be that aspect of our persons which distinguishes us from the rest of creation and links us with divinity (cf. \textit{Op mund} 66; \textit{Deus pot ins} 29). He seems to have held that the human mind was made up of \textit{pneuma} different not just in quality but in kind from the \textit{pneuma/pneumata} performing various functions in other parts of the material creation. Even though he identified the \textit{pneuma} which constituted the human mind as divine \textit{pneuma} he still held something corresponding to the Old Testament appreciation or rather depreciation of human \textit{ruach}, namely that apart from the external influence of divine Spirit human spirit is rightly directed only when it realizes its utter need of divine Spirit. Philo never refers to \textit{pneuma} as the essence or property of God himself. Inspirational divine \textit{pneuma} is rather an intermediate agency God uses in his dealings with human persons. 18

HUMAN SPIRIT IN JEWISH APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Along with \( \nu \varepsilon \)\( \text{shamah} \) (e.g. 11Q \( \text{Ps}^a \) Plea 3f), \textit{ruach} and \( \textit{pneuma} \) still designate 'breath' in this literature (1QH i 28f; I En 14.2) -- human as well as animal breath (1QH vi 12, horses' \textit{ruach}). In dependence on Isaiah 11.4 \textit{spiritus} in the Latin
manuscripts of IV Ezra 13.10, 27 and *ruach* in 1QSb v 24f are used of the Messiah's powerful death-dealing breath. In some writings breath is still considered as the vital 'breath of life' (IV Ezra 3.5; cf. II Bar 85.7) which forsakes a person at death (Test G 5.9; II Bar 14.10f; Test Abr resension A 17f), ascending to God (II Bar 3.2; 14.10), to whom it really belongs (Jub 5.8; II Bar 23.5). In the Testament of Abraham resension A we read that after the patriarch's servants had been decimated by the terrible manifestation in their vicinity of Death's full figure and power, Abraham and Death himself prayed to God for their resuscitation, and the idea which we encountered in II Maccabees 7.23; 14.46, that God provides righteous people with a breath of life in an afterlife, is probably implied in II Baruch 23.5.

In CD vii 3f we read that no member of the 'Damascus' community who keeps the commandments of God is well off. From CD v 11f we learn that possession of a *ruach* is not confined to members of the community; their opponents within Judaism have *ruach* by impugning the commandments of God. The only other occurrence of the term *ruach* in this document relates to God's *ruach* as inspiring the Old Testament prophets (CD ii 12; cf. IQS viii 16). Elsewhere in the Qumran literature *ruach* represents a particular endowment from God upon members of the community to cleanse them from sins (1QH xvi 12; IQS iii 6-8) and to support them in their righteous lives (1QH vii 6f; xvi 7), imparting knowledge (1QH xii 12; xiv 13) and also joy (1QH ix 32; cf. 1QSB ii 24). This special *ruach* from God for the sectarians is not always expressly designated *ruach* in the Qumran literature (e.g. IQS ix 3; 1QSB v 25; IQR xii 12). Friedrich Nötscher has suggested that the possession of *ruach* by opponents of the sect affirmed in CD v 11f 'hat wohl seinem Grund in der Erwählung Israels im Zusammenhang mit dem alten Sinaibund, der eben das ganze Volk mit allen Gliedern umfasste' (cf. Isa 63.11). In 'The Words of the Heavenly
Lights' from Cave 4 (which was not available to Nötscher) we read that God has poured out his רוח upon his people in bringing their exile in Babylon to an end. R. H. Charles in his note on CD v 11f ('Fragments of a Zadokite Work' 7.12) refers to the Hebrew Testament of Napthali 10.9, apparently of a much later date: 'Blessed is the man who does not defile the holy spirit of God ו'רוחה י'נתע啸) which hath been put and breathed into him (ʾבניא הכסתיכונט) and blessed is he who returns it to its Creator as pure ('יריהנפ) as it was on the day when he entrusted it (to him). Two of the three medieval manuscripts of the work known to Charles do not go on to identify the רוח with the constitutional breath of life. The preceeding verses suggest such an identification. It does not seem impossible that the הרוח of life could have been called 'holy' in intertestamental Judaism. After all, it is God's הרוח (Jub 5.8; Gen 6.3), and as such designated קדש הרוח in the Wisdom of Solomon 12.1. Pseudo-Philo considers the spirit of life which has been awakened by God as a functioning prophetic spirit to be holy. Reference may also be made to the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on Genesis 6.3, where it is said that God's Holy Spirit has been put in every human person for the performance of good works. In conclusion, although it does not appear that we can determine with certainty what רוח הננ signifies in CD v 11f; vii 3f, yet in the light of later Jewish usage it seems likely that the vital human spirit is intended.

There are a number of instances in this literature where human spirit in accordance with Old Testament and Septuagintal usage (also Philo De pot ins 17; Jos Bel 3.92) represents the seat or power of the dominant disposition. For example, in Jubilees 19.3f, 8 divine testing finds Abraham patient and not disturbed in spirit; in 34.3 Isaac's spirit is sorrowful; in IV Ezra 3.3; 6.37 the seer's spirit is troubled as he considers the plight of the Jewish people in the world (cf. I En 92.2), and in 1QGenAp ii 17 Lamech's spirit is depressed on account of his wife's seemingly shameful pregnancy. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs closely associate this psychological understanding
of *pneuma* with a widespread supernatural use of the term 'spirit' to denote an angel (cf. e.g. Jub 2.2; 1 En 15.4, 6-8, 10) or, more commonly, a demon (cf. e.g. Jub 1.20; IQM xiii 2, 4; Test Abr resuscitation B 13). Thus in the Testament of Joseph 7.2 the wanton Egyptian woman's *στένωμι* to *πνεύματος* (v. 2) indicates that τὸ *πνεῦμα* τοῦ *βελίκον* αὐτῆς ἐνοχλεῖ (v. 4). It may be noted, however, that many times *pneuma* designates the power of the dominant disposition in the Testaments without any such explicit supernatural reference as we find in the Testament of Joseph 7.4 (so Test R 5.3; Test S 3.1, 5; 4.7; 9; 5.1; 6.6; Test L 2.2 v. 1; 5.6; 9.9; Test Jud 13.3; 14.2; 8; 16.1; Test I 4.4; 7.7; Test Z 9.7f; Test D 1.6; 8; 2.1; 4; 4.5; Test G 1.9; 3.1; 6.2; Test A 1.9). In many other verses, however, the supernatural reference is explicit (Test S 2.7, Simeon decided to destroy *γράφων* τῆς *πλάνης*, ἀποστείλας τὸ *πνεῦμα* τοῦ *ζηλοῦ*, ἐτύφλωσε μου τὸν νεόν; Test D 3.6, anger is a *pneuma* which *κλέα* μετὰ τοῦ *ψεύδους* ἐκ *δεξιῶν* τοῦ *σκότους* πορεύεται; also Test L 3.3; 18.12; Test Jud 25.3; Test D 1.7; 6.1; Test N 3.3; Test A 6.2; 5; Test B 3.4; 5.2). Thus the Testaments evince both a psychological and a supernatural understanding of *pneuma* as the power of the dominant disposition. The latter understanding does not control the former. Cosmic determinism is not affirmed here. The human person always retains the power to overcome evil influences and do what is right (e.g. Test R 4.1, 9), being responsible in the end for his or her actions (e.g. Test L 4.1). The Book of Jubilees, whose demonology is not closely connected with psychology, puts more stress on the human person's lack of power over evil spirits (10.2-6; 11.4f; 12.20).

Most of the references to supernatural *pneumata* in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs concern evil spirits under Satan's sway. Opposed to these there stands ὁ *λόγος* τῆς *εἰρήνης* who guides the good person (Test B 6.1); τὸ *πνεῦμα* τῆς *εὐφροσύνης* who furthers the salvation of persons (Test G 4.7); τὸ *πνεῦμα* τῆς *ἀγάπης* who attends to (συγκαταλέγει) them (Test Jud 20.1); *πνεῦμα* *συνέκκες* (Test L 2.3); *πνεῦμα* *ἀγέλον* (Test B 4.5), that is, *πνεῦμα* *ὄεω* (Test S 4.4; Test B 8.2; cf. also Test L 2.2 v. 1).
The Testaments do not countenance a plurality of good spirits active in human life. If, as seems likely, a plurality of good spirits is envisioned in the Testament of Levi 3.2, the translation is possible but would not exclude a reference to angels (cf. Ps 104.4 LXX, ο Πολων τους δαιμονια του ανεμωμον) -- they are still not seen as active in human life during the course of this world; they go to work at the consummation. Similarly, in the Testament of Asher 6.4 the angels of the Lord are encountered in the next life. In fact, every reference to good δαιμονια in the Testaments concerns beings active in heaven (Test L 3.5, 7) or at the eschaton (Test L 19.3; Test N 8.4, 6; Test Jos 19.9), the only exception being a reference to the angels who visited Lot in Genesis 19 (Test A 7.1). Also in I Enoch 15 good spirits are confined to heaven, whereas a plurality of bad spirits roams the earth. According to the Testaments, beneficent angelic activity in the present world is always propagated by (ο) δαιμονια as special revelation (Test R 3.15; 5.3; Test L 2.6; 5.7; Test Jud 21.5; Test I 2.1; Test Jos 6.6) or deliverance (Test S 2.8; Test Jud 3.10; Test D 5.4; 6.1-7). The Testaments also tell us that God himself is present in (the soul of) a righteous person (Test D 4.7; Test Jos 10.3; Test B 6.4). We may conclude that the Testaments retain the Old Testament understanding of God's δαιμονια as an extension of the personality of God and not a separate personality (even the relationship of evil spirits to Satan seems sometimes to be understood in this way, Test Jud 25.3; Test D 5.1; Test N 8.4). It seems that inter-testamental Judaism usually conceived of a plurality of evil spirits or demons active in the world before the last days in opposition to a unitary good spirit or angel or God himself, a plurality of good spirits getting involved only during the last days (I En 56.5; 1QM i 10f; vii 6). In Q 58 iii 24 evil δαιμονια of the δαιμονια of Satan at work in the present world are opposed to δαιμονια δαιμονια δαιμονια δαιμονια (compare Jub 15.31; contrast, however, Q 58 xvii 17: δαιμονια δαιμονια δαιμονια δαιμονια).
The instruction in 1QS iii 13-iv 26 concerns two spirits which are supernatural influences in the present human world, viz. the קֹהַּ הַיִּסְרֵא הַיָּוִיתֶה (iii 18f); the יָדֶה יָדֶה יָדֶה (iii 25), and the relationships of human persons to these contrary powerful influences, which relationships manifest themselves in their own human ruchoth which are of various kinds (רְ'כָּשׁ, iii 14) -- these are specified in iv 2-6, 9-11 -- according to their 'genealogies' (זִיסוֹנָה, 20 iii 14). 'In these two spirits are the genealogies of all the sons of men, and in the divisions of these two spirits (תַּנִּיתוֹנָה) all the host of the sons of men (פַּרְכַּבְרֵא) have a share (זִיסוֹנָה) according to the generations of the sons of men (יִסְרֵא יִסְרֵא, iv 15). That ruach in iii 14 refers to various human and not angelic and demonic spirits is shown by the fact that the third-person plural suffix points back to רְ'כָּשׁ and by the repetition of which is most naturally taken to imply that every single individual has his or her own ruach as is the case in the Old Testament and other Jewish writings where ruach is used of the emotional or intellectual and volitional power of the human person. 

That ruach in iv 3f, 10 also refers to the constitutional human ruach is shown by the fact that it is synonymous with יַסָּסְרַו (iv 2, 9, 11) and by the fact that the ethical stances inculcated in lines 2-6, 9-11 are 'counsels' (פַּרְכַּבְרֵא; cf. CD iv 21; x 6) of the good or evil metaphysical spirits. Conversely, that the ruchoth in iii 18f, 25; iv 20-22 are not merely psychological inclinations but in fact supernatural agents is established by their identification as respectively יֶלֶת הֶזֶי (iii 20) or יַבָּמַת הַלְּאִיל (iii 24) and יַבָּמַת הַלְּאִיל (iii 20f). It may be significant that iii 18 states that God has 'established' these supernatural ruchoth 'for' (יַסָּסְרַו), not put them in (יַסָּסְרַו) each person. At any rate, the context does not allow us to conclude that, when in iv 23f the two spirits are said to walk or battle in the human heart, this implies their permanent constitutional residence therein. What we find in the teaching of 1QS iii 13-iv 26 concerning spirits may be compared to the dominant understanding of pneumat in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs; that is, we have here as
there a combination or collocation of a supernatural and psychological understanding of spirit as the power of the dominating disposition.

The cosmological dualism of IQS iii 13-iv 26 is not absolute, for God is the creator of both supernatural spirits (iii 25); he is the active ally of the good spirit (iii 24), and he will certainly and predeterminately triumph (iv 18ff). Human responsibility is almost obliterated (iii 21-24; iv 24f) but not entirely, for the supernatural ruchoth give 电网 (iv 6; cf. iii 6), and individuals will be judged (iv 6-8, 11-14) as to how they respond (iv 2-6, 9-11, 16) to their promptings.

Whether the closely associated psychological and supernatural understanding of ruach in IQS iii 13-iv 26 as the power of the good or evil dominating disposition and being can be read into all the other Qumran community writings is to some extent an open question. We certainly encounter it in 1QM xiii-xv (see especially xiii 9ff), and, it would seem, also in 11Q Ps a Plea 14f, as well as in the cryptic fragment 4Q 186, which states that a certain person 'has six (parts) spirit in the House of Light, and three in the Pit of Darkness'; while another 'has (eight) parts spirit' in the latter and one in the former, but there is no certain reference to an evil supernatural ruach in 1QH, and the several references to Belial (IQH ii.16, 22; iii 28f, 32; iv 10, 13; v 26; vi 21; vii 3) can be taken abstractly to mean 'worthlessness' as in the Old Testament (e.g. Nahum 1.11).

In the Qumran community writings ruach meaning the power of human thinking and willing in general is an important anthropological concept of frequent occurrence. In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs pneuma with this meaning occurs only twice (Test Jud 20.2; Test N 2.2). The Testaments usually use other terms for the thinking and willing power of a person, chiefly ψυχή (e.g. Test R 1.9; 4.9; Test Jud 18.3, 6), κρατήρια (e.g. Test R 4.1; 5.3; Test S 2.1), φωνή (e.g. Test R 3.8; 4.6; Test S 2.7), and δύναμις (e.g. Test R 4.6; 5.3, 6; 6.1). The Qumran community writings also usually use other terms,
mainly \(11\frac{2}{15}\) (e.g. CD i 10; 1QpHab viii 10; 1QH i 37) and \(\omega\) (e.g. 1QS iii 1, 8; CD i 20), but the use of ruach in this sense is frequent and significant. God has formed the human ruach to have dominion over the things of this world (1QH i 15; cf. xv 22). As in the Old Testament this human ruach, when considered in isolation from or opposition toward God's ruach is condemned as weak (a mere \(\gamma\) \(\gamma\); 1QH xiii 13; cf. xvii 25; Ps 78.39: \(\gamma\) \(\gamma\) in 1QH can designate humanity in its utter impotence, e.g. iv 29; vii 17; x 23; xv 12), worthless (CD iii 2, 7), and misdirected (1QH i 22) unless it is \(\eta\) \(\eta\) (1QS viii 3; xi 1, contrasted with those who are \(\eta\) \(\eta\); cf. 1QH xviii 15), in which case it receives the favor and succor of (the divine ruach from) God (1QN xi 10; cf. xiv 7). In 1QH iv 27ff the teaching psalmist realizes that, though he himself is nothing, he has been enabled to do great things \(\gamma\) \(\gamma\) \(\gamma\) \(\gamma\) \(\gamma\) \(\gamma\) (line 31). Ruach here must refer to the person's created constitutional ruach (thus \(\gamma\) \(\gamma\); cf. i 8f, 15; xi 22) not in and by itself, but in the foreordained providence of God (iv 32f; cf. i 15; ix 12; xv 22) wherein it has been strengthened by his grace and mercy (iv 36f; cf. i 32), which is equivalent to saying, strengthened by his divine ruach (cf. vii 6f; xiv 25; xvii 26). The \(\gamma\) \(\gamma\) \(\gamma\) is in God's hand (xv 13). Likewise, in 1QH xvi God has foreordained the condition of the teaching psalmist's and every human person's ruach (lines 9f) with respect to the beneficent and necessary influences of divine ruach obtained or not obtained in the course of their lives (6-9, 11f). Thus in the Qumran literature the particular condition of every person's constitutional human ruach with respect to (the good ruach of) God (and at least in some of the writings also with respect to the evil ruach which is ultimately from but actively opposed to God's good ruach) determines a person's status as in varying degrees either righteous or unrighteous, either saved or damned. The members of the Qumran community are ranked \(\nu\) \(\nu\) (1QS ii 20). From \(\nu\) \(\nu\) each member receives guidance and instruction \(\nu\) (1QS ix 18). The spirits of members are examined and judged by him (\(\nu\), 1QS ix 14; \(\nu\) \(\nu\), ix 15) or
by \(\tau\varphi\chi\alpha\chi\) (\(\omega\varphi\pi\), 1QS v 21; vi 17; \(\tau\varphi\chi\alpha\chi\) v 24) or \(\gamma\nu\chi\theta\) (\(\nu\varphi\omega\), CD xx 24). God himself also already judges (1QH xiv 11) and in the end will finally judge (1QS iv 26) them and all humankind \(\gamma\nu\chi\theta\) (cf. I En 41.8f). Abandonment of the community or straying from its teaching comes from a person's ruach (1QS vii 18, 23; viii 12; xi 1).

Often in the Qumran writings, and for the first time in extant Jewish literature, ruach meaning the constitutional power of human thinking and acting and feeling characteristically represents the whole human person insofar as he or she exists before God\(^{32}\) (1QH i 15, 22; ii 15; iii 21; et. al.; contrast IV Ezra 12.3 where spiritus is as ruach generally in the OT seen as an unintegrated powerful part of human personhood).

The signification of ruach as the power of human thought and action in general is an uncommon usage in the Old Testament, where it is favored by a few late writers.\(^{33}\) There are almost no examples of this use of the word in the additional literature of the Septuagint,\(^{34}\) and none at all in Josephus (we find it in Sib Or fr. 3.40). Why has it attained such prominence and importance in the Qumran writings? I will suggest some possible reasons for this development.

The Qumran sectarians believed themselves in their present life together to be associated with God's angels in worship and service of him (1QS xi 5-9; 1QSa ii 8f; 1QH vi 13; 1QM x 10f). These angels will accompany the community members in the battles which presage the age to come (1QM vii 6). Since these angels are ruchoth (1QH iii 22f; 1QM xii 9; cf. 1QH xiii 8; cf. also 1QH i 10f; viii 12; 1QM xii 10 and perhaps x 12), the fact that the Qumran community members are associated with them in their relationship to God might go some way towards explaining why they consider themselves as essentially ruchoth in God's design and oversight. The fact that unrighteous people are at least in some Qumran writings closely associated with ruchoth who are demons (CD xii 2; 1QM xiii 11f; xiv 10) might also help to explain why the sectarians considered not only themselves but all humankind to be essentially ruchoth in God's sight (e.g. 1QS iv 26; 1QH i 15; xvi 9f).
Another possible source of or reason for the sectarians' view that all human persons are essentially ruchoth before God might lie in the fact that they believed that the ruchoth of all the dead would one day come from or be visited in Sheol (1QH viii 28f) to stand before God at the Last Judgement (1QS iv 16ff; 1QpHab vii 7ff). In I Enoch 22, Aramaic fragments of which have been discovered in Qumran Cave 4, we find an explicit instance of just such an understanding of deceased persons existing as spirits in the underworld until the consummation. Such a belief amongst the sectarians would help to explain further why they considered all living persons as essentially ruchoth before God; they did so because it will be as ruchoth that the vast majority of them -- and perhaps even all of them outside the community (see 1QH vi 30: is every wicked person dispatched to Sheol in the holy war which precedes the Last Judgement?) -- stand before their Creator at the consummation. 1QH vii 11f may refer to the eventual silence then of every ruach who spoke against the sect in this life.

Perhaps we may go further than this to explain the re-emergence in the Qumran literature of ruach as signifying the power of human thinking and acting and thus as a term for the essential human self in God's sight. The sectarians seem to have believed that after the Last Judgement they would live forever as ruchoth in heaven or a heaven on earth with the angels and God. That the sectarians expected to enjoy eternal life seems a reasonable conclusion at least from 1QS iv 6-8, where we read that the of those who walk in the good ruach shall be not only 'healing, great peace in a long life, and fruitfulness' but in addition 'every everlasting blessing and eternal joy in life without end, a crown of glory and a garment of majesty in unending life.' It also seems probable that the phrase in iv 23 and CD iii 20 should be taken to refer to the 'glory of Adam' awaiting the sectarians in eternal life. 1QH iv 20-22 also seems to affirm eternal life for them. That this eternal existence
would be as ruchoth 'like angels in heaven' (Mt 22.30) seems a possible inference from 1QH iii 20-23, where we read that God has allotted to the cleansed ruach of the psalmist to praise and proclaim God's greatness, as well as from xi 10-14, where we read that the cleansed ruach of the psalmist stands before God with to be made new (םוזה). It would appear that in order for a person to attain to righteousness and thus salvation the human ruach has to be cleansed (רעה) by (the holy ruach of) God; only as such a cleansed ruach may the community member take his or her place amongst the good angels now and forever (1QH iii 20-23; xi 10-14). Thus in 1QM vii 5, which is probably directly dependent on Deuteronomy 23.9 (compare 1QM vii 6 with Dt 23.10), those who fight with the good angels (line 6) and are prepared for (cf. ix 23; x 19) are as well as physically able and pure (ויה). It seems, then, that the expectation of the sectarian's goes beyond the doctrine of Jubilees 1.19ff, according to which the chosen people will simply have in them a holy spirit in the age to come and the angels and demons will know this. One must admit that the community's predominant interest in their association with angels relates to their present position in the world as it is, yet it does not appear that this was the extent of their association with them.

1QS ii 11-15 states that every hypocrite who has feigned membership in the community will be condemned at the consummation, when the person's spirit, parched (for lack of truth) and watered (with lies), shall be destroyed without pardon; that is, when the person as spirit shall be consigned, along with the unfeignedly wicked (v 13). Complete annihilation is not necessarily implied here. In 1QS iv 14 it is only said that no wicked persons will remain outside this punishment or escape from it. This accords with the statement in 1QH iii 18 that all the ruchim of nothingness or wickedness shall be shut up in hell forever. It is a plausible interpretation, then, that in
the sectarian view of the age to come, the righteous survive forever in heaven and the wicked elsewhere, both and all of them as spirits.

The very fact that IQS iii 13-iv 26 elucidates 'two ways' in which to travel not only through this present life but also most probably into a future life tends to affirm continuity between present and future. The points raised in the last three paragraphs suggest that in the Qumran literature ruach designating the essential thinking and acting human person who lives from and before and if righteous also for God may have been seen as the principle of continuity between earthy life now and heavenly or hellish life later. One must allow, however, that it is quite possible that even though sectarian expressions concerning ruach are patient of such an interpretation and even suggest it to the modern scholar, the sectarians themselves never conceived of ruach in precisely these terms. In this connection it is instructive to note how in the Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum of Pseudo-Philo 64.5ff Samuel summoned from the dead appears not as a man but apparently as an angel yet it is still his bones that are being disturbed.

The caveat raised regarding the intriguing but uncertain conceptualization of human spirit as the principle of continuity between this life and the next probably applies as well to I Enoch, where sin is also a matter of the human spirit (20.6), and where we read that spirits will be judged on the day of great judgement; some will be cast into fire (98.3, 10; 108.6), but the spirits of the righteous because they are pure (108.9) will live in garments of glory ((62.15f) joyfully in God's presence (103.4) with the angels (39.1ff) who are spirits (15.10). Prior to the great judgement the spirits of deceased persons exist in different places in accordance with their worthiness (22.8ff). One might surmise that 39.8 states that the seer's spirit longs to abide in the dwelling-place of the righteous near to God in heaven because it is his spirit which will end up there, or, the same thing said differently, he will end up there as spirit.
In Jewish apocalyptic literature the human person is in contradistinction to the Old Testament no longer after death necessarily identified with the body of dust which returns to the earth while the spirit ascends to God. In the Latin manuscripts of IV Ezra 7.78-80 we read:

Now concerning death, the teaching is: When the decisive decree has gone forth from the Most High that a man shall die, as the inspirationes leaves the body to return again to him who gave it, first of all it adores the glory of the Most High. And if it is one of those who have shown scorn and have not kept the way of the Most High, and who have despised his Law, and who have hated those who fear God -- such inspirationes shall not enter into habitations, but shall immediately wander around in torment, ever grieving and sad (RSV).

Jubilees 23.31 states that at the consummation the bones of the righteous will rest in the earth, but their spirits shall have much joy. In the Apocalypse of Moses 32.4 Eve hears that Adam has left his body to return as pneuma to his Creator. Enoch's proleptic translation to heaven as a recipient of revelations is accordingly represented as a translation of his spirit (71.1, 5f; contrast Ezek 3.12, 14; 8.3 etc.; II Bar 6.3), although verse 11 represents him as still in his body (in the OT spiritual sight was a matter for the human heart, 15, II Kings 5.26).

The Old Testament and Septuagintal (also Jos Ant 11.240) usage of ruach and pneuma in the sense of human vitality or strength continues into our literature (e.g. Jub 31.6; I En 60.4; IV Ezra 12.5; II Bar 85.7; Pseud-Philo Antiq Bib 39.8; Test Abr rescension A 1947). In 1QH i 32; iv 36; ix 12 the ruach of the righteous person is strengthened in the face of opposition and persecution (321). In 1QH v 36 we read that the sect's enemies have caused the ruach of the psalmist to stumble (322). It may be noted that human spirit as vitality has again been found only in works probably written originally in Hebrew or Aramaic. Ruach as strength in 1QH possesses not simply a vital but a decidedly ethical nuance.
The tongue of the teaching psalmist is able to know (viii 36), because continued vitality in these hymns consists in obediently cleaving to the covenant (vii 8). Thus human ruach as vitality in the Qumran literature cannot be disassociated from its dominant meaning in this literature as designating the essential thinking and acting person in God's sight.

The discussion so far has not revealed any influence from Greek philosophy or medicine upon the meanings of human spirit in Jewish apocalyptic writings, and, indeed, only a few stray traces of such influence may be observed in these writings. The Testament of Reuben 2.3ff, which tells of seven pneumata given to every human person at his or her creation, viz. the pneumata of ψωμός, μεθ’ τῆς εὐσεβείας καὶ πίστεως, ἀκοῆς; ὁρώσεως; λαλίας; γεύσεως, and στοράς καὶ συνώσεως, obviously reflects the Stoic conception of pneuma as the principle of cohesion and energizing agent for sensation, speech, procreation and thought in the human organism. It is also possible that the view that evil spirits cause illness and disease (Jub 10.12f; 1QGenAp *x* 16ff) arose in part out of Greek medical theorizing.

The prophetic spirit seems to be identified in the Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum as the vital spirit of life awakened, stirred up in some human persons. Pseudo-Philo in 9.8 (cf. 18.3) relates Genesis 6.3 to the prophetic spirit and calls this spirit a lamp (cf. Prov 20.27). In 18.11 Balaam says, 'I am restrained in the speech of my voice and I cannot express that which I see with mine eyes, for but little is left to me of the holy spirit which abideth in me, since I know that in that I was persuaded of Balac I have lost the days of my life.' From 3.2 it is clear that this spirit is not just in prophets but in all persons. Our author's understanding seems to be that this spirit is only awakened and made effectively prophetic by God in certain persons (20.3; 28.6; 32.14). Theodotion's rendering of Susannah 45, ἔξελθε τὸ θεὸς το ἐξωμα το ζηνον πνευματος νεωτέρου, ὃς οὐκ ἔδωκε Δαυιδ, seems to accord with this usage.
A few final comments may be made. (1) When flesh is directly opposed to spirit in this literature, the impotence of humanity is being contrasted with the strength of superior beings (Satan, Test Job 27.2; the fallen angels, I En 106.17). (2) In 11QtgJob ii 6, 'I have lowered my spirit before my wife', a paraphrase of Job 19.17, ruach as breath of life is being used by metonymy for the whole person (cf. xiv 5). In 1QH ix 16 ruach represents the whole person with the connotation of vitality, בפָּテレビֶר לְהוֹד יִלֶדֶד; we have already seen that in the Qumran literature ruach in this sense cannot be disassociated from ruach meaning the power of human thinking and acting in general. (3) Although ruach and pneuma designate with some frequency once again in this literature the human capacity for understanding and willing, we still encounter here the idea that real ultimate understanding is a special gift from God (e.g. IV Ezra 5.22; 14.40; 1QSb v 25; I Enoch 49.3). In the Sibylline Oracles fragment 1.5f we find the Stoia-influenced idea that God's πνεῦμα (σοφίας) is ἐν ἑαυτῷ as a Χρηστήμα βροτῶν πάντων (cf. 3.701: God's prophetic pneuma is κατὰ Κόσμου). In the Apocalypse of Moses 11.16 the Spirit which is Wisdom is identified as Moses: 'the sacred spirit who was worthy of the Lord, manifold and incomprehensible, the lord of the world, who was faithful in all things, God's chief prophet throughout the earth, the most perfect teacher in the world.'

In conclusion, the conceptions of human spirit in some Jewish apocalyptic writings (e.g. IV Ezra; II Bar) do not go beyond those of the Old Testament and the Septuagint. Elsewhere the psychological understanding of the human spirit as the power of the dominant disposition has been coordinated with a supernatural use of the term to denote angels and particularly demons. In some of these writings spirit meaning the power of human thinking and acting in general has come to designate the essential human self in God's sight and seems to be understood as the principle of continuity between this life and an eternal life of joy or of pain. Stoic influence in these writings is minimal.
In rabbinic literature ruach is still 'the usual word for wind'; it designates breezes (b Suk 27a) as well as storm-winds (b Ber 59a). Greek medical theorizing may perhaps have influenced the rabbinic view that winds (ruchoth) cause (b BM 107b) or aggravate (b Yeb 120b) illnesses.

Ruach and ne shamah are both used in b Ber 10a to represent the vital God-given breath of life in living creatures. Animals as well as humans live by means of their (M Erub 1.7; Git 2.3; BQ 1.1; 7.1; Men 9.9; Ohol 6.1; 15.9). I have not found any passages which expressly represent ne shamah as a property of animals. The human ne shamah leaves the body at death (b Yom 21a). It should return to God (b Shab 152b). According to b Shab 152b, the ne shamah of deceased righteous and wicked people exist in two different places and circumstances until the last judgement. The rabbis do not always strictly associate a dead person's personality with his or her buried body, as does the Old Testament. The following parable from b Sanh 91a-b precludes an identification of the deceased personality with either the descended or the ascended ne shamah.

Antonius said to Rabbi: 'The body and the ne shamah can both free themselves from judgement. Thus the body can plead: The ne shamah has sinned, (the proof being) that from the day it left me I lie like a dumb stone in the grave (powerless to do aught). Whilst the ne shamah can say: The body has sinned, (the proof being) that from the day I departed from it I fly about like a bird (and commit no sin).' He replied, 'I will tell thee a parable. To what may this be compared? To a human king who owned a beautiful orchard which contained splendid figs. Now he appointed two watchmen therein, one lame and the other blind. (One day) the lame man said to the blind, 'I see beautiful figs in the orchard. Come and take: me upon thy shoulder, that we may procure and eat them.' So the lame bestrode the blind, procured and ate them. Some time after, the owner of the orchard came and inquired of them, 'Where are those beautiful figs?' The lame
man replied, "Have I then feet to walk with?"
The blind man replied, "Have I then eyes to see with?" What did he do? He placed the lame upon the blind and judged them together, as it is written... \(^2\)

Psalm 50:4 is cited: 'he calls to the heavens above and to the earth, that he may judge his people' (RSV); 'heaven' refers to the \(\text{n}^e\text{shamah}\) and 'earth' to the body. On the other hand, b Hag 16a states that a person's \(\text{n}^e\text{shamah}\) will testify against him at the last judgement, implying an identification of the deceased's personality with the body. Some rabbis specify that the life of the resurrected and saved person is from his or her original human spirit returning -- which of course is nevertheless also God's since he gave it -- but others say only that it is from God's Spirit. We read in the Midrash Rabbah on Genesis 6:3:

R. Ishmael interpreted this: I will not put My ruach in them when I give the righteous their reward... R. Huna interpreted in R. Aha's name: When I restore the ruach to its sheath, I will not restore their ruach to their sheath. R. Hiyya b. Abba interpreted: I will not fill them with My ruach when I fill other men with My ruach (Gen rabba 26.6). \(^3\)

In b Ber 60b the pious Jew declares upon awakening in the morning:

My God, the \(\text{n}^e\text{shamah}\) which Thou hast placed in me is pure. Thou hast fashioned it in me, Thou didst breathe it in me, and Thou preservest it within me, and Thou wilt one day take it from me and restore it to me in the time to come; \(^4\)

here the body is the locus of personal identity after death. Nowhere in rabbinic literature is personal identity after death expressly connected solely with the ascended \(\text{n}^e\text{shamah}. \(^5\)

The fact that the Jew receives an additional \(\text{n}^e\text{shamah}\) on the Sabbath (b Ber 16a; Tan 27b) seems to mean that rest revives his or her strength; ruach but never \(\text{n}^e\text{shamah}\) had this meaning of vitality in previous Jewish literature. As in the
Old Testament *ruach* in the Mishnah sometimes designates the seat or power of the dominant disposition (pleasure and displeasure, Ab 3.11; bliss, 4.17). Also in accordance with Old Testament usage *ruach* and *ne'shamah* represent the seat or power of human emotion and thought and action in general (b Sanh 91a-b; b Hag 16a: it is located in the [םו] מ; Num rabba 18.11). The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on Genesis 6.3 states that God has put his holy spirit in human persons that they may do good works. As in the Old Testament and other subsequent Jewish literature it is good to be מְלֹא (M Ab 4.4, 10) and bad to be מְלֹא (4.7); the disciple of Abraham has מְלֹא, whereas the disciple of Balaam has מְלֹא (5.19). The usage in M Shebi 10.9 and BB 8.5, where the יָלְלָה finds or does not find rest (לְלָה) depending on the righteous or unrighteous behavior of certain Jews, incorporates the sense of *ruach* as the seat or power of vitality, emotion, disposition and thought. It is clear that, as in the Old Testament, the signification of human *ruach* and *ne'shamah* run over into one another, so that we are presented not with a plurality of *ruchoth/ne'shamoth* but with the many aspects and functions of one constitutional human spirit.

In b Ber 18b *ruach* designates the ghost of a deceased person, and reference is made a number of times in this literature to a demonic יָלְלָה (E.g. M Shab 2.5; b Er 41b). These two usages are brought together (cf. Jos Bel 7.185) in b Sanh 89a, where the evil *ruach* of I Kings 22.20ff is identified as that of the just-murdered (21.13f) Naboth the Jezreelite. In the Midrash rabba on Leviticus 24.3 a spirit which is not evil resides by a fountain; this spirit may be a human ghost.

The rabbis magnify the influence of God's 'in the first instance...prophetic' Holy Spirit on the lives of Biblical persons but restrict it in the present almost entirely to statements of Holy Scripture. The rabbis held that with the death of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi the Holy Spirit had ceased in Israel (b Suk 48a; Sanh 11a; Sot 48b; Yoma 9b; cf. 21b; among the things which the second Temple unlike the first lacked was
the Holy Spirit). 'The underlying cause of the diminution and final disappearance of the Ruah Hakodesh was the unworthiness of Israel, the sinfulness of Israel.' We read in b Sanh 65b that R Akiba lamented:

If one who starves himself that a may rest upon him has his wish granted, he who fasts that the may rest upon him -- how much more should his desire be fulfilled! But alas! our sins have driven it away from us, as it is written, 'But your iniquities have separated between you and your God' (Isa 59.2).

There are only a small number of exception cases in which the Holy Spirit is affirmed as active in the experience of certain rabbis who have miraculous knowledge, spiritual sight. The rabbis do not identify the Holy Spirit as God; concerning their understanding of the relationship of the Spirit to God all that can be said with certainty is that the Spirit is a reality sent by God.

In conclusion, the constitutional human ruach in rabbinic literature retains the nuances and functions which it has in the Old Testament. The use of n'shamah as a synonym for ruach not simply in the sense of breath of life but also more generally to cover other meanings of ruach, a usage of n'shamah nascent in the Old Testament (cf. Job 26.4; 32.8; Prov 20.27), is here taken much further. As ruach but not n'shamah appears as a property of animals in rabbinic literature, this development may have been influenced by a desire to distinguish human beings from animals. The first few chapters of Genesis may have provided a Biblical basis for this distinction. Whereas in Genesis 6.17 and 7.15 ruach is a property of all living creatures, the n'shamah in Genesis 2.7 is imparted only to man. The peculiar reading of 7.22f could be taken to confirm this distinction: In the Targums (Onkelos, Pseudo-Johnathan and Neofiti) on Genesis 2.7 the reception of establishes the man's discursive ability. It would appear that, for the rabbis, what distinguished humans from animals was: on the basis of experience, language; on the
basis of exegesis, $n^\varepsilon$shamah. This elucidates the predominant use of $n^\varepsilon$shamah when the spirit of a deceased human person is in view, a future resurrection for individual animals being scarcely conceivable or unimportant. It is interesting to note in this connection, particularly with respect to the association of righteous human persons with angels which we encountered in some Jewish apocalyptic literature, where both can be considered as essentially spirits, that, to my knowledge, angels in rabbinic literature are not said to be (composed of) $n^\varepsilon$shamah but fire or, according to one rabbi, God's ruach (b Hag 14a). $N^\varepsilon$shamah and ruach in rabbinic usage do not represent the principle of continuity between earthly and eternal life, but at most a principle of continuity along with the body. Stoic influence on rabbinic usage is not evident.

HUMAN SPIRIT IN GnostIC USAGE

Because gnostic pneumatologies differ significantly one from another, we shall consider the writings relevant to our inquiry one by one. We begin this section with an elucidation of the pneumatology of one particular gnostic document, the Apocryphon of John (AJ). It is widely reckoned one of the oldest extant gnostic documents and one whose original largely Jewish teaching has been only secondarily influenced by Christianity. The fact that we have uniquely four different recensions of it suggests that it comprises what was in antiquity an important and influential gnostic tradition. Since the shorter recension of Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 (BG) is often held to represent the most original extant form of the myth and is the best-preserved text, our discussion will center on it.

For our purposes it is convenient to begin with the creation of earthly historical man (BG 47.14ff). Certain unspiritual beings, created and ruled by an imperfect spiritual being, Ialdabaoth, in a lower world, see a reflection in water from the higher world wherein perfect spiritual beings exist.
including the perfect Man whose image is reflected. This spurs these unspiritual beings to try to create out of themselves an image of this reflected perfection. They all contribute to the creation of a lifeless motionless mass. Not until Ialdabaoth is persuaded to breathe into it something of the spirit that is in him does the man raise himself up and move (BG 51.15ff). This inbreathed spirit is obviously the breath of life of Genesis 2.7. In this myth it is introduced into the materiality of the man only so that it can be put into a position from which it can be recalled out of the material world of Ialdabaoth to its appropriate place near God in the spiritual world above (BG 51.1ff; CG ii 67.15ff). Emissaries of the higher world disguised as angels of the lower world dupe Ialdabaoth into giving up his divine element, the spirit, by transferring it to the man, the spirit apparently unable to be recalled so long as it remained within the monstrous figure of Ialdabaoth (BG 37.12ff).

Once the heavenly element, the spirit, leaves Ialdabaoth and enters into the man, a struggle begins between Ialdabaoth and the lower beings on the one hand and God and the higher beings on the other hand, for possession of the heavenly element. A good spirit is sent down from the higher world to show the man the way upward (BG 53.4ff). The rulers of the lower world manufacture out of matter an antagonistic counterfeit spirit to deceive man so that he turns away from perfection (BG 54.11ff): this spirit is the lasciviousness and obliviousness that inhere in the human body (BG 55.8ff; CG ii 69.9ff). All the descendents of Adam and Eve (for her creation see BG 59.12ff) have the heavenly element which was relinquished by Ialdabaoth. The *terminus technicus* for this heavenly element in the concluding catechetical section of the tractate is 'the power' (BG 66.15ff). By itself this power is not able to withstand the force of the counterfeit spirit. It must be strengthened by the good spirit which comes down to it. All people have spirit but the good spirit only comes to some (BG 65.3f). All those to whom it comes are saved by uniting themselves with it either in this life (BG 65.4-6) or, if the
counterfeit spirit gains temporary mastery over them, afterwards (BG 66.13-69.13), but if they ever disunite themselves, they are doomed to eternal torment (BG 70.8ff). Thus some appropriate attitude or practice seems to be necessary for salvation. The Apocryphon of John does not countenance any psychological struggle between the good and the antagonist spirits within the human person. The human person is never torn between the twain but always under the control of either one. Every human person has the counterfeit spirit by nature. It is either dominant or dormant depending upon whether or not a person has the opportunity to and does accept the good spirit. The awareness shown here of the impotence of the constitutional human spirit/power of life has affinities with Old Testament usage, but here this impotence is not so absolute. Immortality is countenanced, and even though according to the Apocryphon (some) human persons receive eternal life as a gift of the good spirit from God if only they accept it as they certainly will sooner or later and do not throw it all away, eternal life is a possibility for them, it is offered to them, only because they already possess a properly eternal element, the human spirit/power. It is not entirely clear why God does not reclaim in its entirety the heavenly element and thereby save all human persons who have it. It may be that some human persons are like Ialdabaoth just too monstrous for God and the good spirit to have close dealings with.

In the main body of this work the entire essential human person is not described as 'spirit' but 'soul' (BG 64.15; 66.14; 68.1, 4, 15; 69.15). We have seen that apocalyptic Jewish writings do consider the whole human person essentially spirit. This is not done in the Apocryphon of John perhaps because here God is spirit (e.g. BG 22.30; 23.3; 26.19f). The three closely-related unrequested emanations from God, Barbelo, Pronoia and the Virgin Spirit, are apparently also spirit (BG 27.20; 31.1; 37.5; 38.10; 53.5 et. al.; subsequent beings created by request to inhabit the upper world are not said to be spirit; Christ is given spirit, BG 30.14ff; 35.10f). The
human person is thus deliberately distinguished from God and his first emanations as not being spirit but soul. No content can be given to this term 'soul' other than 'I'. Some persons are souls (i.e. persons) who have the good spirit. In BG 67.12, however, the soul is identified as 'the power'. The power is the heavenly element relinquished by Ialdabaoth (BG 51.19). This heavenly element is called 'spirit' only once in the Apocryphon and then because Genesis 2.7 is referred to (BG 51.15ff); elsewhere it is the 'power' (BG 38.15-17; 51.2, 19) or the 'substance' (BG 43.5) from above. One can only affirm, therefore, that in the final analysis the essential human person who may be brought out of this life below into the next life above is spirit in the Apocryphon of John. This person as human spirit attains to salvation only if he or she receives and seizes the chance to unite with additional divine spirit, the good spirit. The fact that the essential human person is spirit appears to be played down in the Apocryphon in the interests of maintaining a clear distinction between God and humankind.

The Hypostasis of the Archons (HA) like the Apocryphon of John gives the appearance of being only secondarily a Christian document. If this writing does not flatly identify God as the Holy Spirit (contrast AJ BG 22.21) it at least associates God and the Holy Spirit so closely that we cannot tell how they could have been conceived of as distinct entities (see especially 141.4-6). What is striking about this gnostic teaching is that Adam loses his original endowment with spirit (137.10f; 138.17; in 136.11-15 the Spirit had come down upon Adam as someone quite independent of him). Elect persons are therewith not pneumatics by nature. They become such only when God sends the Spirit of truth to them (144.23f, 35ff; cf. 137.31f). Meantime they are souls (136.15). The Spirit apparently created in Adam a living soul (136.11-15). When Adam lost the Spirit, the soul remained. But the soul belongs to the world above (144.21). Human persons here below with souls but not Spirit are
prevailed upon by evil powers (141.22-24); they are ignorant (145.1f) and not saveable in themselves (144.22-24). They are saved by the gracious gift of the Spirit. Thus in this gnostic document where God is inextricably connected with the Holy Spirit, the essential human person is accordingly not spirit but soul. There is not only no soteriological role for human spirit, there is really no such thing as human spirit here.

Valentinus\textsuperscript{12} does not speak of God as spirit, and for him the Holy Spirit is not an unmediated and direct emanation from God as is Barbelo in the Apocryphon of John (Iren Adv haer 1.11.1).\textsuperscript{13} According to Valentinus the Holy Spirit works to ensure the perfection of the spiritual world around God and mediates between God and some -- those of the \(\varepsilon\kappa\chi\lambda\nu\alpha\gamma\nu\) (1.5.6) -- of humankind for the redemption of the latter.\textsuperscript{14}

These special human specimens attended by the Spirit will in time entirely sever themselves from matter and enter into the heavenly world above (Clem Alex Paed. 32.1).\textsuperscript{15} They will not then and there be absorbed into God but take up a position near him, where they can see him (Clem Alex Exc 64.1). Valentinus holds that spirit domiciles with animal soul in the earthly historical lives of elect persons.\textsuperscript{16} It has been placed therein to be educated so as to be able to return to the upper world (Adv haer 1.5.6) whence it fell in the primeval transgression of Sophia (1.2.2). Such elect persons are essentially spirits; they are \(\ddot{\alpha}\iota\ \pi\nu\varepsilon\upsilon\mu\lambda\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\iota\nu\iota\iota\). At the final consummation, having befores times discarded their bodies, laying aside their souls (\(\alpha\pi\omicron\theta\omicron\mu\omicron\epsilon\omicron\iota\nu\iota\ \tau\iota\ \pi\nu\varepsilon\upsilon\mu\lambda\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\iota\nu\iota\iota\ \tau\iota\ \psi\omicron\chi\omicron\upsilon\iota\)), they will attain to the vision of the Father (Exc 64.1; cf. the Marcosians, Adv haer 1.21.5: the gnostic goes \(\epsilon\iota\iota\ \tau\iota\ \iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\), \(\pi\rho\iota\kappa\upsilon\alpha\iota\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \delta\epsilon\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\ \alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\), \(\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\iota\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \psi\omicron\chi\omicron\upsilon\iota\)). The human spirit is here clearly, in contradistinction to the soul, the principle of continuity between earthly and eternal life.\textsuperscript{17} In and of itself, however, it is not finally able to attain to eternity, for it is only by uniting themselves with their respective angels that the elect spirits can pass within the \(\sigma\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\) to behold the Father (Exc 64.1). Valentinus' teaching thus
retains as does the Apocryphon of John something of the Old Testa-
ment emphasis on the impotence of the human spirit. In Valentinus' system also salvation is by grace in that it depends upon the impartation of self-knowledge and knowledge of God, and this comes through Christ. Here we find something akin to the Old Testament insight that the human spirit only enters into a truly salvific situation when it understands itself as entirely dependent upon God's gracious activity. At the same time, however, a significant difference presents itself in that Valentinus' cosmological speculations carry the implication that all pneumatics will inevitably be saved simply because they are such (cf. Exc 56.31, to... πνευματικον ψυχει σωζόμενον; Strom 4.89.4, ψυχελ...σωζόμενον χεις; 5.3.3; according to Adv Haer 1.6.2 this was explicitly taught by Ptolemaeus).

In Basilides' system the Holy Spirit is an intermediate agency between the upper world (the Supramundane) and the lower world (the Cosmos), an agency which by its very nature is incapable of entering into the upper world (Hipp Ref 7.22.12-23.3; 27.7). Saved human persons do on the contrary enter into the upper world, passing beyond the Spirit (7.25.1; 27.1). It follows that Basilides characteristically does not refer to them as pneumatics (7.27.6 should be taken as a redactional comment of Hippolytus'). Basilides calls the saved God's children (25.4) or sons (25.1) who together comprise the Third Sonship (in 7.25.2 he has 'einen geprägten traditionellen Begriff aufgenommen, um seinem Sohnschaftsbegriff zu erläutern'). Saved persons rise upward and enter into the upper world as extremely light (κρήτω... μαρτίνη), purified souls (26.10; other souls stay below, 27.2). Thus the essential human person who is saved -- as with Valentinus by grace (e.g. 27.6) but also by nature (e.g. 27.2) -- is ψυχή. Basilides' pneumatology is essentially Greek. For him pneuma links with effect immateriality with materiality (as in Aristotle, Greek medicine and Stoicism).

The preceding consideration of the Apocryphon of John, the Hypostasis of the Archons, Valentinus and Basilides suggests that whether or not a particular gnostic tradition identifies
the essential human person who is saved as spirit or not depends upon the established function, place and identification of the Holy Spirit in the cosmological-soteriological system. Since Valentinus neither identifies (with AJ) nor so closely relates (as does HA) nor so fully separates (as does Basilides) God and the Holy Spirit, he alone seems to have been free to conceive of the saved human person as essentially spirit, in accordance with what we have seen was a linguistic usage in previous Jewish apocalyptic literature. Gnostic anthropological terminology is in this way dependent on gnostic theological and cosmological terminology.

Heracleon shows us that this dependence is not absolute. Commenting on the Gospel of John this Valentinian gnostic finds himself forced by 4.24 to identify God as in some way pneuma. For Heracleon pneumatics have the same sort of souls as psychics (Orig Comm in Joh 13.31, 44, 60) but possess in addition a heavenly element (2.21) by dint of which they alone are destined to dwell within the θεός, whereas the psychics are called only to habitations outside it (10.33; 13.51). We may identify this heavenly element as pneuma in the light of Heracleon's significant declaration in his comment on John 4.24 that pneumatics have the same nature as the Father (αυτων των θυτης άνθρωπος άνθρωπος τον πατρι πνευματι εϊσιν, 13.25). In spite of this enterprising identification Heracleon still wants to stay with Valentinus' view that pneumatics are destined not for absorption into but worship before God (13.16, 20). For him also the human pneuma is not fit for the upper world in and of itself but requires first to be perfected by union with further pneuma (13.11, 52). The difference between Valentinus and Heracleon is that the latter not only no longer preserves a distinction between God and saved humankind by a difference in terminology but actually affirms an identity of ψυχή. In Heracleon we come closer to an absolute and final divinization of the saved person who is spirit. The Gospel of Philip, which is commonly considered a witness to late Valentinian gnosisim, takes us further in this direction. Its anthropological understanding
is that the soul of saved persons is reunited in this life with spirit (80) by being given the Holy Spirit (74) in sacraments (23, 59, 61, 71, 78f, 100, 109). Soul and spirit are not essentially different (66). They are two separate parts of one original unity. Their reunion already establishes in this life the real eternal perfect human personality. This saved person has become spirit (44, 113) and, furthermore, has seen and will become God (44). In the Tractate Tripartitus the \( \text{\textit{\textgamma\textkappa\textlambda\nu\sigma\omicron\kappa}} \) of spirits actually displaces the Holy Spirit in the Trinity (57.33-35; 58.29ff).

In the Apocryphon of John the heavenly spirit/power in the earthly human person, the soul, is (1) the vital spirit of life and (2) the authentic self. Emotion, volition, thought are not attributed to this spirit. These human capabilities are expressly said to be part of the material creation of Ialdabaath and his minions (BG 52.2ff; CG ii 67.34ff; cf. also 65.32-34; 66.14ff). This inbreathed spirit thus has no positive function at all in the lower world except to enliven the man so as to be able to get out of it and enter again the upper world of absolute rest and silence (BG 26.7f; 31.10). Emotion, volition and thought are not a part of this spirit because this spirit is not a part of this world. This is a conception of human spirit very different from anything we have yet encountered. In Judaism the constitutional human spirit empowers emotional, mental and volitional activity. In Greek thought, to be sure, such activities are not brought about by the vital spirit of life -- they are the work of the \( \psi\omicron\nu\chi\nu \) and its special \textit{pneuma} -- but here the vital spirit is so far from being in a position to serve as the essential saved human self that it is a property not only of animals as in the Old Testament but even plants. Since gnostic anthropology where it conceives of human spirit stresses to the extreme its otherworldliness, most of the traditional Jewish connotations of human spirit and the entire materialistic Greek conception have no place here.

In the gnosticism of the book Baruch, however, the human \textit{pneuma} is really a part of the earthly world in that it can be
pained and tormented, it can suffer (Hipp Ref 5.26.20, 37). Here we have a rare but clear reflection in gnosticism of the Jewish conception of human spirit as the seat or power of feeling. Also in Baruch the human spirit seems to be understood in Jewish fashion as the seat or power of thought and action (5.26.26, ἄνθρωπος τοῦ πνεύμα τοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κατοικοῦν καὶ φύσεως).

When gnostics speak of evil spirits (e.g. Valentinus in Clem Alex Strom 2.114.3ff; Gosp Phil 61, and elsewhere) they employ a traditional terminology which has no relation at all to their anthropological conception of spirit; these creations of the god of the lower world despite their appellation cannot have spirit (cf. how the antagonist spirit in AJ is appropriately a counterfeit spirit).

Aristotle, as we have seen, identifies the Nous as the divine part of the human person, and in this he is followed by certain late Stoics, chiefly Marcus Aurelius. These thinkers do not consider the Nous to be the real human self. Marcus Aurelius in his Meditations 12.26 depicts it as something entirely foreign to the self (as indeed everything is). The use of the term "Nous" to designate the higher constituent part in the nature of the believer is very rare in gnostic language. According to Adversus haereses 1.30.6 the Ophites taught that man by receiving the spiritus vitae from the deceived Ialdabaoth became a possessor of nous and ἐνεργήμονα. Here it appears that philosophical Greek and Jewish conceptions are combined, as they are in Philo, who holds that the inbreathed -- by God himself -- πνεῦμα θεοῦ constitutes the nous. The Tractatus Tripartitus identifies the 'living soul' (ψυχή) as the "breath of life" and "the thought (γεινωνία) of the exalted aeon" (λόγος). Popular Greek thought contemporaneous with gnosticism conceives of the ψυχή as a somewhat foreign element in the body and the real human self with a future and a past. 'Soul' is in gnosticism a quite common term for the authentic self (cf., in addition to AJ and HA, the Exegesis on the Soul; the Gospel of Mary). Hellenistic Judaism seems to have paved the way for the application of the term 'spirit' to this
Philo holds that the \( \psi u \chi \) which is the \( \upsilon \upsilon \upsilon \) is composed of a \( \nu e \upsilon u \upsilon \upsilon \Theta e i v \) that migrated hither from that blissful and happy existence for the benefit of our race, to the end that, even if it is mortal in respect of its visible part, it may in respect of the part that is invisible be rendered immortal\(^{29}\) (Op mund 135). Gnostic anthropological usage thus suggests that the provenance of the movement lies in the confluence of pagan Greek and Jewish conceptions.\(^{30}\)

It is conceivable that gnostics originating within Hellenistic Jewish circles initially identified the real human self alien to this earth more with pneuma than with \( \psi u \chi \), but then special factors like recourse to the materialistic Stoic conception (Basilides) or the identification of God's nature as pneuma (AJ, HA) led to a considerable dispensing with or playing down of pneuma as the favored term for the heavenly element, the real self. The pneuma-\( \psi u \chi \) dichotomy in the book Baruch is not materially different in itself from the \( \nu e \upsilon u \upsilon \upsilon \Theta e i v - \psi u \chi \) dichotomy in Philo. As Philo holds that the heaven-tending mind leaves the earthbound soul behind (\emph{her div her} 63ff) so does Baruch declare that the spirit must flee from the earthly soul (Ref 5.26.26). Baruch is certainly not inalienably Christian in its anthropology.\(^{31}\) In it as in Philo the identification of the human self with the spirit is not very far advanced; the spirit is repeatedly seen as Elohim's spirit (5.26.17, 20f, 24) and never quite presented as the real 'I'. Yet the spirit seems to represent as it does not in Philo the seat or power of human thought and action (5.26.26), and, as we have seen,\(^{32}\) it is 'spirit' in this sense that designates the essential self with a future in the Qumran literature. It is a reasonable supposition that we have in the anthropological pneumatology of Baruch a half-way house in which two separate Jewish conceptions are converging in the direction of the distinctively gnostic conception of human spirit as an ego dislocated on earth with a future in heaven.

In our study of human spirit in Jewish apocalyptic literature we found evidence which suggested that some of these writings
imply that the saved human person enters into eternal life as spirit to live before God with angels who are also spirit. Certain gnostics conceive of the spiritual human person as being saved either by uniting with or by becoming an angelic spiritual being. Some hold that the union between human and angelic beings takes place either in this life (Adv haer 1.21.3) or in the next life, and there either inside (1.7.1) or outside (Exc 64.1) the perfect world. Sometimes gnostics conceive of this as a reunion of male angelic and female human principles in one androgenous being (e.g. Gosp Phil 71; Exc 22.3). Sometimes they envisage simply a change of the fallen female human principle into a perfect male angelic principle (e.g. Exc 21, 79). The Gospel of Thomas logion 22 does not concern androgeny but sexual innocence as a preparation in this life for the future restoration of asexual perfection (cf. Philo Op mund 134: Adam was neither male nor female; he was not androgenous but asexual). Logion 114 of this Gospel declares that females to be saved must become male spirits. This is because the end is a return to the beginning (18): there were no females at the very beginning; here sin and the fall appear to be inherently connected with the existence of the female as such.

In conclusion, gnostic anthropology holds that all or some human persons possess a heavenly part which constitutes the real ultimate human self or at least the part thereof which is trapped in an earthly form of existence. The term 'spirit' may or may not be used of this real self or part-self, and this depends largely on the function and position of the Holy Spirit in the cosmological system that accompanies gnostic anthropology. The real human self or part-self cannot save itself. It is worthy of salvation and even sometimes certain to be saved simply because of its heavenly nature. It can attain to eternal life in its proper place with God above only by the addition in this life or after it of a further heavenly element or at least the gift of knowledge. Early gnostic usage preserves a distinction between God and saved humankind; this is abandoned by some later gnostics. The gnostic conception of human spirit has clear connections with previous Jewish usage. We
have suggested that gnostic anthropological pneumatology is a novum in that it conceives of the human spirit not only as alien to earthly life (we find something quite like this in Philo of the ψυχή/νους composed of θείαν θέου) but as also constituting the essential human person with a future nearer God (as in certain Jewish apocalyptic writings); it unites hitherto separate Jewish conceptions of human spirit.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE CORPUS HERMETICUM

The concept of human pneuma in the Hermetic literature is derived from Greek philosophy and medicine. The νους is the truly divine and immortal aspect of the human person.

The νους cannot, naked and alone, take up its abode in an earthly body; a body of earth could not endure the presence of that mighty and immortal being (τὴν θυλακούσιον ἄθροιστικήν), nor could so great a virtue (τὴν τοσχωτὴν ἀρετὴν) submit to contact with a body defiled by passion. And so the mind takes to itself the soul for a wrap (ὡς ἴσος ἐπιβολήν τὴν ψυχήν); the soul -- for the soul also is in some measure divine (καὶ ἄμμος θεῖας τῆς οὐσίας) -- uses as its wrap the vital spirit (καὶ ἱσοπερ ἐπιθετήν τῷ πνεύματι χρησμῷ; and the vital spirit controls the body (10.17; cf. 11.4; 12.14).

The human person should recognize that he or she being essentially ἄνωθεν is ἀθρογένες (1.18). Human pneuma, a derivation ἔκ ἀθροέους (1.17), is the vital breath of life which effects bodily activity (10.13).

In 12.19 pneuma is seen as an agency of inspiration.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE GOSPELS

Pneuma in Luke 24.37, 39 denotes the 'ghost' of a deceased human person. In the Synoptic Gospels pneuma often designates an evil demonic agent (we do not find this usage in John's Gospel, but cf. I Jo 4.1, 3, 6). It is never said that these demons
are ghosts of evil persons (as in Jos Bel 7.185).

In Matthew 5.3a Jesus declares the poor πνευμάτι blessed. The πνευμάτι should be understood as a dative of respect. As 'the clean in heart', οἱ καθαροὶ τῷ κεφαλῶν (v. 8), are those whose heart is clean, so are the poor in pneuma those whose pneuma is poor. In IQM xiv 7 we have an exact parallel to οἱ πνευμάτι τῷ πνευμάτι: ἀνήλθε. There is a lacuna immediately after this construct so the meaning of 'poor in ruach' here is not patent. Nonetheless, it is clear that ὁ πνευμάτι parallels ἐγερθείς; thus the 'poor in ruach' are also 'the perfect in way'. The Qumran sectarians are 'the perfect in way' because they know and obey God's commandments in inspired Scripture. Now in Isaiah 66.2 we read that God has a special regard for ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτοῦ ὁ πνευμάτι. In M Aboth 4.10 Rabbi Meir says that the Jew should occupy himself with the Law and be ἀνήλθεν before all men. In IQS iv 3 we read that those who attend to the commandments of God have οὐκ ἔχει ὧν. The 'poor in pneuma' in Matthew 5.3a are therefore those who live in accordance with God's will. These persons are called 'poor in spirit' because they do not live by the power of their own human spirits but in obedient utter dependence upon God's Spirit: πνευμάτι (Ps 51.19(17)). Jesus' declaration in Matthew 5.3 is thus quite in accord with Psalm 34.18 (LXX), which states that God delivers τοὺς ἀνεπείγους τῷ πνευμάτι (HT, τῷ πνευμάτι), and Isaiah 57.15, which states that God dwells with one who is ἀνεπείγος κατ' ἐαυτόν and revives ἀνεπείγος. ἁλίθιος is often translated by πνευμάτι in the Septuagint where the person so designated is depicted as a pious person completely dependent upon God (e.g. Ps 25(24).16; 69(68).30; 70(69).6; 74(73).21; 86(85).1).

In Luke 1.47 (cf. Isaiah 26.9) 'my pneuma' is used in poetic parallelism as a synonym for 'my ψυχή', representing the whole human person. Pneuma in the Gospels means the vital breath of life in Luke 8.55 (at Jesus' words a little girl's pneuma returns and she awakens) and in Matthew 27.50; Luke 23.46 and John 19.30 (Jesus gives up his pneuma, dying on the
cross; cf. Mark 15.37); in Luke 1.80 we read that the child
John ἐκρατατησθήνη πνεῦμα. Pneuma is the seat or power of the
dominant disposition in Mark 8.12 (Jesus ἀναστενάξεις τῷ
πνεύματι αὐτοῦ) and in John 11.33 (Jesus ἐνεβριμάθη τῷ
πνεύματι) and 13.21 (Jesus ἐντραχθη Θεὸς τῷ πνεύματι). In Mark 2.8
(Jesus ἐπήγαγος τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ) pneuma is the seat or power
of human thinking and acting. Pneuma in Mark 14.38b // Matthew
26.41b, τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα προθύμον, η δὲ εἰρήνεια, should also
be understood as a reference to the disciples' power of thought
and volition; the disciples are eager to follow Jesus. Προθυμία
corresponds to the Hebrew root לְלַשׁ (cf. II Chron 29.31: MT,
לְלַשׁ יַקְרָבָה; LXX, πίσς προθύμος τῷ κυρίῳ). 'The saying is
a bridge from the disciples' declaration of solidarity with
Jesus (Mt 26.35 and par.) to their failure on the way with Him,
and it shows why failure was inevitable. Pneuma in the phrase
ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ (Jo 4.23f) has often been taken as a
reference to the human spirit; it is, however, better to inter-
pret these verses in the light of the dialogue with Nicodemus
in the preceding chapter, so that 'the true adorers...are those
who are "born of the Spirit"'.

In the Gospels the meanings of anthropological pneuma do
not go beyond those of ruach in the Old Testament and pneuma
in the Septuagint.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN ACTS

In 7.59 the dying martyr Stephen prays, κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δέξαι
τὸ πνεῦμά μου. Stephen prays that at his death his spirit
separating from his body may ascend into heaven with Jesus (v.
56). It is not said here that Stephen will thenceforth per-
sonally exist as pneuma with Jesus in heaven. We may surmise
rather that his spirit will remain in Jesus' keeping until the
resurrection, when it will descend from heaven again to enliven
his body.

17.16 relates that while Paul was waiting in Athens for
Silas and Timothy, ἀποστόλοι τοῦ Πνεύματος Αὐτοῦ ἐν Αὐτῷ. Although Isaiah 63.10 (LXX) states that the Israelites πειρασμὸν God's πνεύμα Στρογγυλοῖον, most commentators and translators (RV; RSV; JB: 'his whole soul was revolted'; Moffatt; NEB) consider that in Acts 17.16 it is Paul's human spirit which is indignant. The use of the noun πνεομονής with regard to the all too human argument between Paul and Barnabas about Mark (15.39) suggests that 17.16 refers to Paul's own particularly Jewish abhorrence of idolatry. The fact that μαρτυρία is here modified by a third person possessive pronoun (cf. 7.59) and further defined as 'his spirit' which is ἐν ἀυτῷ (cf. Zech 12.1) suggests that the author of Acts wants to distinguish this μαρτυρία from the Holy Spirit that otherwise guides the apostle (13.2, 4, 9; 16.6f etc.). The fact that Paul's evangelization in Athens was not very successful (17.32-34) might suggest that it was not conducted at the instigation of the inspiring Spirit of Jesus. Paul was provoked in his own human spirit to attempt a mission in Athens. 'Spirit' in 17.16 means the seat or power of the dominant human disposition.

18.24f describes Apollos as ἀλήθειας Ἀλέξανδρε τῷ Ἐφέσῳ, ἀνδρὸς λόγου... ἑυφόρου ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ... καταχθενήσις τῷ ὄντι τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ἀκριβοῦ τῷ πνεύματι. This well-equipped evangelist ἐλάλησε καὶ ἐπέδωκεν ἀκριβῶς τῷ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. At the end of this enumeration of Apollos' excellent endowments one is rather surprised to read that he knew ἀκριβῶς ὅπως ἦν, and that, having heard him preach in the Corinthian synagogue, Paul's colleagues Priscilla and Aquila took him aside for more accurate (ἀκριβεστέρως) Christian instruction. The evident imperfections in Apollos' Christian standing and public preaching intimated in verses 25c-26 have influenced many scholars and translators (RV; RSV; NEB; JB; Moffatt) to understand ἰδίων τῷ πνεύματι as a reference to Apollos' enthusiastic human spirit and not the Holy Spirit. In support of this interpretation it may be noted that ἰδίων sometimes describes inward emotional arousal in human persons (cf. e.g. IV Macc 18.20; Philo Rer div her 64). This interpretation is, however, wrong for several
reasons. First of all, 10.47f, where Peter baptizes in the name of Jesus Christ people who have already received the Holy Spirit, shows indubitably that Apollos could have received the Holy Spirit though he knew only the baptism of John (Luke 1.15 affirms the activity of the Holy Spirit prior to Christianity in relation to John the Baptist). Moreover, the fact that the phrase ζέων τῷ πνεύματι occurs directly before the clause that unambiguously represents Apollos as a Christian, ἐλάλει καὶ ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τῷ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, strongly suggests that the Holy Spirit is meant. The use of ἀκεφαλὴ in verse 25 also indicates that the Holy Spirit is in view. ἀκεφαλὴ in Acts is only used of the inspired speech of Christians (cf. e.g. 19.6). ἀκεφαλὴ and ἐπιτεῖν are used of the speech of non-Christians (and also Christians) but never ἀκεφαλὴ. Apollos, therefore, was ζέων in the Holy Spirit.

The fact that pneuma is not modified in 18.25 (contrast 7.59 and 17.16) would also seem to constitute an argument against the view that it means the human spirit. Given this apparent consistency of usage in Acts and Luke (1.47; 23.46), we should probably conclude that pneuma in 19.21, ἔθετο ὁ Παῦλος ἐν τῷ πνεύματι διελθὼν τῶν Μακεδονίων καὶ Ἀχαίων πορεύεσθαι εἰς ἤτεροςλογίαν, and 20.22, where Paul declares, ὥστε Ἰδοῦ δεξιεμένος ἐξ ἧς τῷ πνεύματι πορεύομαι εἰς ἤτεροςλογίαν, being unmodified, means the Holy Spirit. Scholars and translators are divided concerning the translation of pneuma in both verses. RSV, Moffatt and NRB mg affirm that the Holy Spirit is intended in 19.21, whereas RV, JB and NRB understand pneuma as human spirit. In favor of the latter reading reference is sometime made to 5.4, ἔστω ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ (cf. also Luke 1.66; 21.14). In 20.22 RSV, NEB, JB mg see a reference to the human spirit. In favor of understanding pneuma in both places as the Holy Spirit Ernst Haenchen suggests that Luke, who has struck out the real reason for Paul's journey, the collection, must put another in its place. A human resolution does not come into question. The fact that pneuma is not modified in 19.21 and 20.22 is a more significant indication that the Holy Spirit is intended.

In 23.8 we read that the Sadducees λέγουσιν μὴ εἶναι ἄνάστασιν μὴτε ἄξιος μὴτε πνεύματος, whereas the Pharisees ὁμολόγουσιν τῷ
hence the Pharisees are prepared to allow that an pneuma has spoken to Paul (verse 9; cf. 22.7f, 10, 18, 21). Pneuma here cannot be the Holy Spirit because the Pharisees would hardly have affirmed that this person Paul, who was either unknown to them or known to them as a renegade from their party was exceptionally blessed by this Spirit. Their support of Paul in the Sanhedrin seems motivated mainly by their dislike of the Sadducees, whom they expect to incite with their invidious dismissal of the whole affair with the comment, ei de pneuma eliklasen ou iti ni pneuma... Pneuma is sometimes taken as equivalent to pneuma here (cf. Heb 1.7, 13f). This interpretation allows pneuma its usual meaning of 'both', i.e. belief both in resurrection and angels, though pneuma in Koine Greek often means 'all', and it in fact has this meaning already in Acts 19.16. Pneuma in 23.8f has also been understood as 'demon' in accordance with 5.16; 8.7; 16.16, 18; 19.12f, 15f. In the light of Luke 24.37, 39 it is possible that pneuma here means the 'ghost' of a deceased human person. With regard to this suggestion we should note that Josephus relates in two places that the Sadducees deny that the persist after death (Bel 2.165; Ant 18.16: Σαβαουθιοι δε τως ψυχης ο λογος των σωμάτων). H. A. W. Meyer considers that pneuma here incorporates demons and ghosts. In rabbinic usage ruach means a human ghost and a demon, but ruach does not, to my knowledge, denote an angel. If we assume that rabbinic sources reflect first-century Pharisaic usage, and if we assume as well that Acts 23.9 constitutes an accurate report of an actual Pharisaic statement, we should understand pneuma here as a spiritual reality other than an angel, i.e. a human ghost or a demon (according to Jos Bel 7.185 some human ghosts are demons). In this case, too, pneuma might mean 'both', viz. both the doctrine of resurrection and that of spiritual existences, angels and demons and/or ghosts.
In 4.12 we read, 'the λόγος of God is living and active and sharper than every two-edged sword and penetrating ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τέ καὶ μυέλων. Because the 'joints' (ἁρμοι, cf. IV Macc 10.5; Test Z 2.5) and 'marrow' (μυέλοι, cf. Jos Bel 604) of the human body are not attached and so cannot be separated, we might conclude that the ψυχή and the pneuma in 4.12 are accordingly not separated from one another, but divided within themselves. On this reading of the verse -- this verse should not be simply dismissed as mere inpenetrable overblown rhetoric unless it proves impossible to comprehend it exactly -- ψυχή could be the seat of sensations and emotions and pneuma the intellectual faculty (cf. Rer div her 55). This interpretation does not seem adequate, however, because elsewhere in our epistle (3.8,10 et. al.) and even in this very verse the ψυχή is represented as the emotional, rational and volitional power of the human person. Furthermore, ψυχή can only have the meaning it is given in 4.12 on this interpretation again in 12.3, whereas elsewhere (6.19; 10.38f; 13.17), and indeed probably in 12.3 as well, it means the whole living person on earth. Our letter thus evinces a traditional Jewish rather than a Philonic anthropology. We should assume, then, that the ψυχή and the pneuma in 4.16 are not two aspects of the human person which can be picked apart in themselves by the double-edged λόγος Θεοῦ.

Our verse should therefore be seen to contemplate three divisions: between ψυχή and pneuma, of ἁρμῶν and of μυέλων (ἄχρι μερισμοῦ... ἁρμῶν τέ καὶ μυέλων). Severian of Gabala avers that 4.12 concerns the separation of the imparted Holy Spirit from the human soul: μερισμὸν ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος λέγει, ὅταν ἡ μὲν ψυχή προστάσει τῷ σώματι τοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος ἡ ψύχη ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τῷ οὐρανῷ (cf. 2.4; 6.4). An interpretation that is more in accord with the context, however, is that which understands pneuma as the vital breath of life by which the human person as ψυχή lives.
in 4.11 takes in all that has been said since 3.6, and the
in 4.12 indicates that verses 12f further elucidate verse 11.
Christians must be careful lest they 'fall' (πτετείων, 4.11)
as the Hebrews of old 'fell' (πτετείων, 3.18); just as these
died by provoking God in the desert, so also may the Christian
readers of this letter be slain by the sword which is the λόγος
of God before whom they lie naked and prostrate (4.12) and
therefore totally dependent upon the living God for life. The
λόγος of God can kill an apostate Christian completely, that
is, forever, with no resurrection to eternal life, that is,
κατατάσσεσθαι. The mention of a μερισμένο... ἁμών ἐς κεὶ ἰουλίων
underscores the finality and totality of the death God inflicts
upon those who do not continually (σημερον, 3.7, 13, 15; 4.7)
hear his voice but harden their hearts. The λόγος of God is
similarly represented as bearing a sharp sword of awful utter
death in the Wisdom of Solomon 18.15f, ὁ πνευμόνως σου
λόγος... ξίφος ἐξ... φέρων κεὶ ἄτας ἐπλήρωσεν τὰ πάντα Θεόντων
(cf. also v. 20).

In 12.5-11 the author of our letter represents the suffer-
ing his readers are experiencing (v. 4) as God's way of disci-
pling them as sons. In verses 9f he argues that since his
readers used to submit to discipline given by their earthly
parents (πτετείναι, cf. 11.25), they ought to submit all the more
(οὐ πολύ μείλλων) to this present discipline by ὁ πτετήρ τῶν
πνευμάτων, which is for their benefit (ἐνί το ἡμιμερον), that
they may live forever (cf. Luke 10.25, 28) and share God's holi-
ess (ἐστὶν ἡ μεταλαβεῖν τὺς ἁγίαστος ἀυτῶν). Πνευματα here has
been variously understood. Chrysostom allows that it might mean
'spiritual gifts' or 'prayers' or 'incorporeal powers', ἡτοί
tῶν χαρακτῆτων λέγει, ἡτοί τῶν εὐχῶν, ἡτοί τῶν ἰσωμάτων
ἔσωμεν. Oecumenius substitutes ψυχαί for εὐχαί, and Theo-
phylact prefers this alternative. According to Hans Windisch,
'pneumata werden hier die Menschengeister sein, die Gott
geschaffen hat.' This is a good interpretation since it fits
the context. The author holds that God provides the pneuma
t of life that enliven the fleshly bodies produced by human pro-
creation, and for this reason also deserves more obedience than
human parents. **Pneuma** here is the vital breath of life just as in 4.12.

Many scholars understand **pneuma** in 12.9 as embracing all spiritual life, including that of angels (cf. 1.7, 14). They argue that the fact that **pneuma** unlike **δύναμις** is not modified by **γῆ** indicates that the upper as well as the earthly world is in view in 12.9b. A reference to God as father of angels has no relevance here unless we assume that by our human spirit we have the potential of communion with God 'and with a higher order', so that we owe to God 'a more absolute subjection than to those from whom we derive the transitory limitations of our nature.' B. F. Westcott supports this line of interpretation with a reference to verse 23.

12.22-24 enumerate in an unsystematic and inexhaustive way what the readers of this letter have entered upon as Christians. Among other things they are now a part of the Christian church, the **κοινωνία πρωτοτόκων** (Christians are not elsewhere so designated, but cf. Ro 8.29) **ἀποκεχωρισμένοι εν συριστάς** (cf. Luke 10.20; Phil 3.20; Rev 3.5 etc.). The **πνεύματα δικαίων** (cf. το πνεύμα τῶν δικαίων in I En 22.9; cf. also 41.8; 103.3; Wisd Sol 3.1; b Hag 12b; b Shab 132b; III En 43.1-3) **τετελειωμένων** include the faithful of pre-Christian days mentioned in chapter 11 (cf. particularly 11.4, 7) as well as deceased Christians (cf. 11.40; 13.7). They are now in heaven along with the heavenly Jerusalem (v. 22), the angels (v. 22), the names of Christian believers (v. 23), God (v. 23) and Jesus (v. 24, who 'having been perfected', **τετελειωμένοι**, ascended into heaven; 7.28; cf. 5.9). These righteous dead have not, however, already entered into eternal life as **pneumata**. They are not called **δικαιώσ τετελειωμένων**, because they are as yet disembodied and awaiting the resurrection, but **πνεύμα δικαίων τετελειωμένων** (cf. 6.2; 11.19 and especially 11.35). They exist temporarily in a heavenly realm of the dead. 10.14 states that all Christians have been perfected by Jesus' sacrifice on the cross (**μόνον Προσφορά τετελειωμένη εἰς τοὺς δικαιώτας τοὺς δικαιώσ **); the **πνεύματα δικαίων** **πενελειωμένα**
are therefore not necessarily closer to salvation than Christians on earth. The resurrection to eternal life is still to come for both.

Human pneuma in Hebrews is the God-given vital spirit of life in 4.12 and the mode of heavenly existence of righteous persons after death and before the eschaton (cf. 10.25, 37) in 12.23; pneuma in 12.9 probably has the former meaning.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE LETTER OF JAMES

In 2.26, ὑπέρ τοῦ σώματος ψυγμός, pneuma is the 'breath of life'. Just as the pneuma gives life to the body, so works give life to faith; 'by works faith is kept alive'.

I translate the difficult verses 4.5f as follows:

Or do you suppose that Scripture says in vain 'Jealously he yearns over the pneuma which he made to dwell in us?' And he gives more grace, therefore it says, 'God opposes the proud, but gives grace to the humble' (cf. RSV).

The Scripture cited in verse 5 establishes that one's decision to become a friend of the world (4ab) does in fact matter to God (4c); that cited in verse 6 elucidates God's active attitude towards those who are worldly and those who are not. Pneuma is in the accusative case; God who is the subject of ἐψάρμισεν and ἀπεδώκας and who is mentioned in verses 5c and 7a is the subject of ἐπιφόβειν. Elsewhere in primitive Christian literature the pneuma that indwells Christians is the Holy Spirit (Ro 8.11; I Cor 3.16; Hm 3.1; 5.1.2, 2.5; Hs 5.6.5). This is doubtful for our verse, however as it is unlikely that God would 'jealously yearn over' this Spirit. God's particular concern with the human spirit is affirmed in Jewish literature contemporary with James: 1QH 14.11; ἀλήθείας τῆς ἁγίας ἀληθείας ἡς ἡ αὐτοῦ ἡ θεοῦ; Philo (Spec Leg 1.277), πάντες ἑαυτά μη το πλήθος τῶν καταθυμημένων εἶναι τίμιον, ἀλλὰ το καθαρώττον τῶν θεοῦς πνεύμα λέγει. It seems probable that pneuma here is the human spirit. Joachim Jeremias
compares the idea of verse 5b with Job 14.15b, εν χειμωνοι, where Theodotion translates χειμων as ἐνθινοθείν.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN I PETER

The fact that a reference to God precedes and a reference to Jesus Christ follows the phrase ἐν ἁγίωσιν άνθρωπος in 1.2 indicates that the Holy Spirit of God is intended. Some scholars argue that the same Spirit is meant in 3.4, ἀλλ' ὁ θεός τῆς καρδίας ἁγιώσις ἐν τῷ άγίῳ άνθρωπῷ τοῦ πρεσβῆς καὶ ἀγάλματι άνθρωπος, ὃ ἐστιν ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ πολυτικῷ, on the grounds that (1) pneuma in the singular elsewhere in this epistle always refers to the Holy Spirit and (2) only it and not a human spirit could be designated 'unvergänglich'. Neither of these arguments is particularly strong. The first carries little weight given the wide range in meaning of pneuma in usage previous to and contemporary with I Peter; in addition, 3.19 implies that our writer could conceive of a particular pneuma which was not the Holy Spirit. With regard to the second objection it may be noted that Jewish thought regarded the human spirit as an endowment of God's own Spirit and therefore it could be designated 'immortal' in the Wisdom of Solomon 12.1, ὁ χρόνος ἀγάλματι τοῦ θεοῦ άνθρωπος ἐστιν ἐν πασιν.

J. N. D. Kelly has adduced two reasons for seeing a reference in 3.4 to an anthropological spirit. (1) Since this pneuma 'is commended as pleasing to God, it can hardly be the Holy Spirit. This of course assumes that ὁ refers back specifically to pneuma and not to the whole verse 4a (or vv. 3f), but Kelly points out that pneuma is 'so close' to the neuter relative pronoun that this connection seems 'most natural'. Kelly further refers to the fact that (2) 'in the next verse the OT heroines, who had not received the Spirit in baptism, are held up as models of this very characteristic of a gentle and quiet spirit. This observation is not decisive, for 1.11 suggests that our writer could have held that the Holy Spirit
was active in the lives of these Old Testament personages (cf. Gal 4.29). Nevertheless, the argument for seeing a reference to a human spirit in our verse seem marginally stronger than those which maintain that the Holy Spirit is meant. The Septuagint provides an instance of gentleness being a desirable characteristic of a human spirit in Esther 5.1e=15.8, where we read that God changed the human pneuma of Artaxerxes εἰς ΠΡΑΫΤΗΝ. It seems best to understand pneuma in 3.4 as human spirit in the sense of 'disposition', or more particularly as 'der von Gottes Geist geprägte Geist des Menschen'.

Pneuma used in contrast to σῶμα in 3.18 and 4.6 signifies not the human spirit but the Holy Spirit. Elsewhere in the New Testament the verb ἐνωποιεῖν (3.18) is only used, explicitly or implicitly, of the Holy Spirit as the power of eternal life (Jo 5.21; 6.63; Ro 4.17; 8.11; I Cor 15.22, 36, 45; II Cor 3.6; Gal 3.21). In our letter σῶμα in 1.24 represents mortal humanity as such in contradistinction to the immortal power of God in his Πνεῦμα which has been preached (Τὸ ἐνωποιεῖς Θεόν) to these Christian readers (1.25); in 1.12 preaching is said to be ὑπὸ τὸν πνεῦματι ἔνα. It follows that our writer in 3.18 and 4.6 distinguishes pneuma as divine power from σῶμα as human powerlessness in accordance with Old Testament usage (cf. e.g. Isa 31.3).

That this is so is particularly clear in 4.6, where the contrast is καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον σῶμα on the one hand and καὶ τὸν Θεὸν πνεῦματι on the other hand. Σῶμα and pneumatik in both verses are best taken as dative of reference.

If ἐν τῷ εἰς vers6 19 refers back to pneumatik in verse 18 then the author's meaning would be that Jesus went and proclaimed to the spirits in prison with the power of the Holy Spirit (cf. 1.11f) rather than as a disembodied human spirit. In the light of the use of ἐν τῷ εἰς in 1.6, 2.12, 3.16, and 4.4 we may have here a vague temporal or causal conjunction picking up not just pneumatik but the preceding phrase, Θαυμάτω Θεός κ. τ. λ., and meaning 'on which occasion' or 'in which state'. Conjectural emendations which introduce a reference to Εὐαγγελία in place of or after ἐν τῷ καί cannot be accepted because a sudden transference
of attention from Christ to Enoch at this point would be 'highly unnatural and illogical'.

Although many scholars in the past have related verse 19 to an activity of the pre-existent Christ on earth before his incarnation, we may safely set aside such an interpretation as being 'out of touch with the sequence of thought in 3.18-22 which moves from Christ's death to his heavenly session'. There remain three possible interpretations of 'the spirits' in this verse: they may be (1) the angels mentioned in Gen 6.2, 4; (2) human persons who perished in the deluge; (3) both of these.

Increasingly modern scholars opt for the first alternative. They argue that pneuma in our literature is commonly used of angels and demons but only rarely of deceased human persons (it is used of such persons in the realm of the dead in I En 22; Heb 12.23 and the Greek of Sir 9.9). It is further pointed out that pneuma is never used absolutely of deceased persons but always carries a qualifying genitive; therefore we would expect here the expression πνεῦμα τῶν ἀνθρώπων rather than πνεῦμα τῶν ἄνθρωπων if deceased persons were intended. These observations are valid, but it must be pointed out in turn that 'the spirits' is also an unusual designation for the fallen angels of Genesis 6.2, 4. In Jewish and Christian literature these beings are usually called ἐναρχοντες or ἔχθροι and never pneumata except in I Enoch, and here only three times in two special contexts. In 15.4, 6 it is said that these fallen angels used to be (ἦν, ἔμφραχθε) πνεῦμα ζωντα κινούμενον, and in verse 8 they are called spirits inasmuch as they are progenitors of ὁ θεὸς ἀπεθανοντος ἤπειρον πνεύματων καὶ σφραγίζοντος who thereby merit the designation πνεῦμα ἕσχαρον ἐπὶ τὸν θάνατον. Thus we may fairly say that whether 'the spirits' in I Peter 3.19 refer to these fallen angels or the persons who perished in the flood the usage of pneuma in our verse is somewhat unusual. On the basis of linguistic usage alone it is only doubtfully more probable that 'the spirits' in I Peter 3.19 are the fallen angels of Genesis 6.2, 4 rather than the human sinners.
God blotted out in the flood.

There are, however, in addition to this several suggestive similarities between what is related concerning the Watchers in Jewish apocalyptic literature and 'the spirits' in I Peter 3.19f. The former are said to be bound in a prison (δεμοωτήριον, I En 18.14-19.1) as οἱ παραβάτες τῶν ἐπιτάγματος τοῦ κυρίου (21.6; cf. II P 2.4; Jude 6). In I Enoch 12.4-13.2; 15.2-16.4 we read that God told Enoch to go (πορεύομαι θείον) and speak (εἴπετε) to these imprisoned angels, making plain to them their utter wretchedness. Jubilees 5.5f directly contrasts the approval of Noah with the imprisonment of these angels.

These parallels between I Peter 3.19f and apocalyptic depictions of the fate of the apostate angels of Genesis 6 are certainly close and suggestive. Doubts about this interpretation of our verse arise when we attempt to relate a statement about these angels in 3.19f to the context and the concerns of our epistle.

3.19f understood along these lines have been linked with 3.22b, ὄντας ἐν κλίμακι ἄνω ἂν ἐξέλθων καὶ ἐξοφθησάντω καὶ δοκύμενων. This observation holds only if we understand Κηρύσσειν in 3.19 in the sense of 'condemn', 'proclaim judgement'. Such an understanding of Κηρύσσειν, however, cannot be justified. The verb is commonly used in the New Testament of the proclamation of the gospel and never of the proclamation of judgement. If it were being used here in its entirely neutral sense of 'cry aloud' (as in Luke 12.3; Rev 5.2; Jonah 1.2; 3.2, 4) the content or purport of the cry would be indicated. R. T. France argues with respect to our verse that 'the purpose of the letter, to boost the morale of persecuted Christians, would be better served by a mention of Christ's triumphing over evil powers than by an offer of salvation to them'. Such an explanation does not accord with the Christianity of our epistle whose persecuted readers proclaim by word (2.9) and deed (2.12) the good news of God in Christ, presumably to their pagan persecutors for their possible salvation. Furthermore, if we take ἐν τῷ as 'in the Spirit', it is significant that evangelization is in 1.12 said to be ἐν πνεύματι τῷ Θεῷ. Thus it seems evident that
if 'the spirits' in 3.19 are the fallen angels of Genesis 6, we must 'conclude that 3.19 and 3.22 are divergent conceptions which have come together in this passage but are not intended to refer to the same event.'

Given that 3.19 does not refer to 3.22 and Christ's triumph over evil powers, why does our author maintain that Christ preached to the Watchers? We cannot easily dismiss this as a digression, as it is evident from the rest of the letter that digression is not a characteristic of our author's style. Neither can it be maintained that 3.19 is traditional credal material; unlike verse 18 our verse does not convey traditional material; this is indicated (a) by the relative ἡ τινὶ τῶν ἐκ τῶν πατρὸς ἀποκλήσεων, which suggests that the writer is supplementing his liturgical source with further ideas which have occurred to him as relevant; (b) by the abrupt switch from solemn liturgical language and balanced antitheses to a diffuse, prosy and even cumbersome style; and (c) by the topics treated, which are not of the kind that, as far as we know, normally figured in primitive kerygmatic material.

Bo Reicke has suggested that the special significance of verses 19f consists in their making the point that just as Christ preached to those most evil beings, the apostate angels, so should Christian readers proclaim the good news to evil persons. This suggestion is unacceptable because Christ is not presented in our verses as an example to be imitated by Christian readers but as a Redeemer unlike them, who alone was righteous and died to bring them to God (v. 18), who has ascended into heaven to sit at God's right hand (v. 22). Nor does the context of 3.19f have to do with a free proclamation of the gospel by these Christian readers in their social situation. Rather are they being asked (v. 15) in a quite unsympathetic way (v. 16) for a defense (ἀποκλήσεως; cf. Acts 22.1; 25.6; I Cor 9.3; II Cor 7.11; Phil 1.7, 16; II Tim 4.16) of their hope. Reicke, to be sure, suggests that formal accusations have been brought against them by the State. On the basis of I Enoch 67.12, 'this judgement wherewith the angels are judged
is a testimony for the kings and the mighty who possess the earth, he identifies the apostate angels of 3.19f as the powers behind these state persecutions. It is however difficult to thrust this conception upon the author of our epistle who clearly believes that political authorities have been established by God eis ἐκδότην ἀκοπερνῶν ἔποιην οὐκ ἐκ θανάτων (2.13f). The 'extreme generality' of ἐκι and παντεῖ  speaks against the assumption that verses 15f relate to official persecutions. References to persecution elsewhere in our letter also tend to belie the supposition that they were perpetrated by the State. Reicke's suggestion that 3.19 gives guidance to Christians under attack by the State which is seen as the tool of evil supernatural powers must be set aside. It would appear that 3.19 understood as a reference to the Watchers cannot be meaningfully connected to its context. Thus if this were the meaning of τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ θεοῦ, this verse would serve merely to shift the discussion from Christ's redemptive death and resurrection to the baptismal typology of 20f; the fact that Christ preached to the apostate angels would not be a living part of the argument of our epistle.

We now turn to consider the possibility that 'the spirits' in 3.19 are deceased human persons who perished in the deluge. In this regard 4.6 must be considered. It states that καὶ νεκρῶς εὐαγγελίζετε Θ. In the light of the usage of εὐαγγελίζετε elsewhere in our letter (1.12; 2.25) a neuter rather than a masculine pronoun should be supplied here: 'it was preached even to the dead'. The 'dead' in view are undoubtedly the physically dead as an inclusive whole; to understand them as 'spiritually' dead (cf. e.g. Eph 2.1) or to limit them to the righteous or even Christian dead necessitates a sudden and unlikely change in the meaning of the predicate νεκρῶς which at the very end of the preceding verse evidently refers to the physically dead in general. 6b should be taken as a concessive clause (cf. Ro 8.10b), and the entire verse translated as follows: 'for it was to this end (εἰς τοῦτο ἔσται) that the gospel was preached even to the dead, that although judged as men (are judged) in the flesh, they might live as God (lives) in the Spirit.' 6b refers to the judgement of death upon all
human persons as sinners. We should assume on the basis of 1.17 and 2.23 that the judge in verse 5 is God not Christ. God is also the subject of \( \kappa \rho \iota \varepsilon \nu \nu \) in our verse. There is a change in the reference of the verb from the Last Judgement in verse 5 to human death in 6. Given the continuity of subject (God), this change is not so great as to call into question the veracity of our exegesis. Although \( \kappa \rho \iota \varepsilon \nu \nu \) elsewhere in our letter refers to the Last Judgement (1.17; 2.23; 4.5), it cannot have such a reference in 4.6b because this would destroy the contrast between \( \varphi \rho \zeta \) and pneuma, for to say that human persons are raised in the \( \varphi \rho \zeta \) means they appear at the Last Judgement in a fleshly existence, but to say that they live in the pneuma does not imply a spiritual existence but only life in the sphere of powers of God's Spirit. \( \sum \rho \zeta \) in 4.6b represents the principle of human mortality as in 1.24; 3.18 and 4.2 (it is not necessary to see it as the place of sin). 4.6 therefore states that dead persons in general were once evangelized.

The word 'dead' in 4.6a must refer to the physically dead in an inclusive sense. Fallen angels would not be designated 'dead'. 4.6 therefore countenances a preaching to deceased human persons. This preaching took place on one occasion in the past (\( \epsilon \nu \gamma \eta \chi \varepsilon \lambda \iota \varepsilon \eta \) ). If we equate \( \kappa \nu \iota \nu \kappa \rho \pi \iota \) \( \epsilon \nu \gamma \chi \varepsilon \lambda \iota \varepsilon \eta \) (4.6) with \( \kappa \nu \iota \nu \iota '\) then 'the motive in 4.6 about the preaching of the Gospel to the dead does not appear so suddenly and seem so peculiar and isolated.' I shall argue that such a connection should be made. I shall maintain (1) that primitive Christian writers do not elsewhere concern themselves with the apostate angels in connection with the flood but that they are interested in the human persons who perished at that time; (2) that the language of 3.19f fits a reference to deceased human persons at least as well as it does a reference to apostate angels, and (3) that 3.19f understood as referring to such persons has a meaningful relationship not only to 4.6 in particular but to the whole of 3.13-4.6 and
to major themes of the epistle.

In Jewish literature of our period we find references to the disobedience of the angels and the resultant flood in which references the sinful human generation which perished in these waters remains very much in the background (e.g. II Bar 56.12-15). Sometimes, however, these disobedient human persons merit equal attention, as for instance in CD ii 18ff.

Because they walked in the stubbornness of their heart the Heavenly Watchers (יִבְשָׁמָה בָּני) fell; they were caught because they did not keep the commandments (נָּשָׁתְנַן לַאֲנָשָּׁה נְשָׁתְנַן) of God. And their sons also fell who were as tall as cedar trees and whose bodies were like mountains. All flesh on dry land perished; they were as though they had never been because they did not keep the commandments (נָּשָׁתְנַן לַאֲנָשָּׁה נְשָׁתְנַן) of their Maker so that his wrath was kindled against them.

Sometimes the disobedient angels are not mentioned in references to the sinfulness that brought forth the flood.

In II Peter 2.4f a reference to the angels' sin and condemnation precedes a reference to the flood which is brought into direct connection only with the ἀπολύεται νόμου...ἀπεθάνετο. References to the flood in primitive Christian literature evince no particular interest in the apostate angels but have in view always the sinful human generation that perished in it. (see Heb 11.7; I Clem 7.6; 9.4). It is particularly pertinent to note that the saying of Jesus in Matthew 24.37-39 // Luke 17.26f, which may have been known in some form to our author and his readers, compares the generation of the flood with the present generation and affirms the nearness of the end of time. The context of I Peter 3.19f emphasizes the imminence (4.2, 7) of the Last Judgement (3.12; 4.5), and it would also seem that our verses compare the generation of the flood with the generation of today: just as many ἀνεπάθεται then (3.20), so do many ἀπεθάνεται now (2.8; 3.1; 4.17). With this observation we have already begun to relate 3.19f, understood as a reference to dead persons, meaningfully -- and not simply stylistically (as a transition) -- with the concerns of our letter.
Before we deal with the question as to why our author relates to his readers the fact that the gospel was preached to these deceased sinners of old, we turn our attention again to the language of 3.19f. That evil persons were imprisoned after death is affirmed by Jospehus (Ant 18.14, here they are ψυχαὶ), his contemporary, Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai (b Ber 28b), and II Baruch 23.4, though none of these actually designates the dwelling-place of deceased evil persons a 'prison'; Hermas speaks of evil persons' impending ἑώρακον καὶ λαμακαλωτιμόν ( Hv 1.1.8; cf. δεσμωτηρίων in Hs 9.28.7). It is significant that only evil persons are said to be in prison in 3.19f. Nothing requires us to assume that all the dead (4.6) were preached to by Christ 'in prison'. But it is also not impossible or even improbable that our author did conceive of all the dead as 'in prison'; the Odes of Solomon 42.10ff represent dead persons in general as imprisoned; Leonhard Goppelt has called attention to a similar representation in II Clement 6.8, ἐὰν λυσατὶ Νῦν καὶ ἱμῶβ καὶ Δικαία, οὐ πρόσκολτι τῷ Τέκνου ἀπόλυν ἐν τῇ λαμακαλώσει; Tertullian (Adv Jud 12; Adv Marc 3.20) interprets 'house of prison' in Isaiah 42.7 as 'death'. At any rate, comparative study shows that the 'prison' in I Peter 3.19 can be understood equally well as a location for wicked human persons who perished in the flood as for the apostate angels. The reference to God's μακροθυμία makes a reference to human persons more likely in the light of the way the concept of God's long-suffering is applied elsewhere in primitive Christian literature (e.g. Ro 2.4; 9.22; II P 3.15; Diog 9.2). We may compare also M Ab 5.2: 'there were ten generations from Adam to Noah, to show how great was his long-suffering (τοῦ Ἰάων), for all the generations provoked him continually until he brought upon them the waters of the Flood.'

Given that our author in 3.20 compares the widespread ἄγεως of Noah's day with that of the present, does he desire to make any particular point when he mentions that Christ preached to those ancient sinners (3.19) and to all the dead
An affirmative answer to this question suggests itself once we consider our verses in the light of the letter's main themes. These main themes clearly include the certainty of hope and the nearness of judgement. Our author insists again and again on the importance of his readers' Christian conduct in the light of the coming of God's judgement (e.g. 1.7, 9, 13 etc.). He presents God to them as θεὸς κατ' εὐθυμίαν πάσης κρίσεως (1.17), as one who judges δικαιώσας (2.23). In 3.15 he notes that pagans question his readers' hope, and in 4.4 that they blaspheme, that is, they denigrate God either directly or through their contempt for his people. Verse 4 connects closely with verse 5; these blasphemers will have to account for themselves at the Last Judgement. The blasphemy of 4.4f and the challenge of 3.15f should not be separated. This is suggested by the fact that in both passages an account (λογος) has to be given. Our author brilliantly turns the tables on the pagans who trouble the church: God will demand a λογος from these people who maliciously ask Christians for one. On the basis of these observations we may surmise that the pagans taunts against the Christians center on the fact that for them the idea of ultimate retribution and reward is a folly; they consider Christian hope (3.15) futile. Since the Last Judgement is such a ludicrous conception, they are surprised that Christians do not join them in licentious living (4.3). 3.15f indicates that they put pointed questions to Christians asking them to justify their belief. Our author insists on the fact, upholds the justice and stresses the proximity of God's judgement. When God metes out retribution to οἱ κηρευτωτες (4.17f) he will not be acting unjustly (1.17; 2.23), for they had a chance to believe (2.8, 12; 3.1; 4.17). Indeed, so did their prototypes οἱ κηρευτωτες before the flood (3.19). The gospel was preached to the dead εἰς τοῦτο (4.6), that God might be a just judge of σωτήρ οἰκονομίας, of all human persons.
offered salvation once for all to everyone who ever lived, that God's mercy and justice are all-encompassing, so as to embrace even the dead. 41

I conclude that 'the spirits' in 3.19 are deceased human persons who perished in the flood. 42 Contextual exegesis and comparison with other primitive Christian writings provide us with no basis for assuming that the apostate angels of Genesis 6 are also in view in this verse. 43

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE REVELATION TO JOHN

The phrase (χίνεεγθεί) ἐν πνεύματι in Revelation must refer to the divine pneuma which inspires (1.10) and translates (4.2; 17.3; 21.10) John. We may compare the same phrase in Ezekiel 37.1, καὶ ἐκνεφεῖ ἐπ' ἐμὲ χείρ κυρίου, καὶ ἐξήνησέν με ἐν πνεύματι κυρίου, which is equivalent to 3.12, ἀνέλθεν με πνεύμα (also 8.3; 11.1; cf. 3.14; 11.5). This comparison with Ezekiel is particularly appropriate since the writer of Revelation clearly sees himself as a prophet standing in the Old Testament prophetic tradition. 1 The absence of ἦν as a modifier to pneuma tells against an interpretation of the phrase as a reference to the seer's human spirit (contrast I Enoch 71.1, 5f). The employment of χίνεεγθεί in Acts 22.17, χενέεγθαι με ἐν έκκατάσει, and 12.11, ὁ Πετρος ἐν ἐκυύτῳ γένεύμα, suggests that John was ἐν πνεύματι in a state of ecstasy. 2

In 11.11, in language which is dependent on Ezekiel 37.10, a πνεύμα ἥψε ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ brings to life two persons who have been dead for three and a half days. This verse indicates that John considers the breath of human life, in accordance with what we have seen to be the usual Jewish view, as God's possession to do with what he wills. Verses 7-12 indicate that John does not see the human pneuma as a principle of continuity between earthly and eternal life. 3

Some scholars discern a reference to human spirit in the phrase, ὁ κόρος ὁ Θεος τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν προφητῶν in 22.6.
They hold that the plural refers to the human spirits of the prophets under the influence of the unitary Holy Spirit (in 19.10, ἡ ἁγίω σοφία ἄνδρων ἐστιν το πνεῦμα τῆς προφητείας, a single Spirit of prophecy is affirmed; this statement may be a later gloss). There are several alternative interpretations of the plural πνεύματα in 22.6. It is taken as a pleonasm for the persons of the prophets. It is otherwise interpreted by the fact that each individual prophet has a 'gift' of prophetic utterance, pneuma being here equivalent to χρηστοῦμα or πνευματική. A less refined variation of this last explanation is simply that, as each prophet has the pneuma, numbers of them are said to have pneumata. James Moffatt considers it simply an insignificant 'archaic detail' he compares 'the Lord of spirits' in I Enoch 37.2 et. al. -- which does not reflect any particular conceptual commitment on the part of our author. Mere reference to I Enoch (and cf. also II Mace 3.24; Num 16.22 and 27.16, LXX) with the judgement that the plural pneumata is for our author a dead formula, cannot, however, constitute an adequate exegesis of Revelation 22.6, since in our verse, in contradistinction to all the parallels, the 'spirits' in the formula 'Lord/God of spirits' are specified as the 'spirits of prophets'. Since John himself declares that his prophetic (1.3) revelation was imparted to him from Christ αυτῷ Ἵχου ἐκλογή (1.1; cf. 22.6 where v. 7 establishes that Christ is speaking; 22.8, 16), we should conclude that 'the spirits of the prophets' in 22.6 are the various angels (cf. Heb 1.7, 14 for the identification of ἡ ἐκλογή as πνευματική εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀναστάσεως to Christians) through whom the risen Christ communicates with his servants on earth for the good of the church. We may then after all compare our phrase profitably with the appellation 'Lord of spirits' in I Enoch, which occurs over one hundred times, and is probably equivalent to God's Old Testament title, 'Lord of hosts', i.e. angels. The pneuma who speaks in 2.7, 11, 17, 29; 3.6, 13, 22; 14.13 and 22.17 is, however, the Spirit of Christ, the Holy Spirit (cf.
Acts 8.29; 10.19; 11.12; 13.2; 21.11; I Tim 4.1; I Cor 14.2 v.1.), not the particular angel-spirit sent to John.

It is probable that the 'seven spirits' before God's throne (ἐνύσπασμα τῶν ἄγγελων) in Revelation 1.4; 3.1; 4.5 and 5.6 are to be equated with the 'seven angels' before God (ἐνύσπασμα τῶν ἄγγελων) in 8.2 (cf. for the conception of 'the seven angels of the Presence', Tob 12.15). Scholars usually discount this identification on the ground that it is not easy to understand in a Christian writing how angels should come between God and Christ as bestowers with them of the blessings of Χρίστου and ἔγκρισιν (1.4). We do, however, find a similar collocation of God, Christ and angels in the Shepherd of Hermas. In the Similitudes 5.6.2 we read: ὁ Θεὸς τῶν ἄγγελων ἐφότευσε, τοῦτο ἐκεῖν τῶν λαοῦ ἐκτίσε καὶ παρέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῷ υἱῷ κατεστάσας τῶν ἄγγελων ἐν οὐδετέρῳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀνθρώπων (cf. also 5.5.2f; 9.12.6, 8). Moreover, with the idea that the seven spirits are 'sent out into all the earth' as the 'seven eyes' of Christ (5.6), we may compare Philo's description of angels as God's tears and eyes (Som 1.140f). In further support of the identification of the seven spirits of 1.4 et. al. with the seven angels of 8.2, we should note that the seven spirits are in 3.1 linked with the seven stars which are the angels of the seven churches (cf. 1.20).

Most scholars prefer to understand τὰ ἐνυπάλληλα τοῦ Θεοῦ (1.4 et. al.) as a circumlocution for the one Holy Spirit of God. It has been maintained that the Holy Spirit is seen here under the rubric of its seven modes of operation mentioned in Isaiah 11.2f (LXX). Others refer to the fact that the Spirit will speak to seven churches (2.1ff). Against these interpretations it can be argued that in 5.6 the seven spirits are not confined to the seven churches but sent out εἰς τὰ ἀνθρώπου ἄγγελον, and that there is no linguistic similarity between any of our passages and Isaiah 11.2f. A different attempt to identify the seven Spirits as the Holy Spirit is made by I. T. Beckwith. He argues that John describes the Holy Spirit as seven spirits in 4.5 and 5.6 under the influence of the Old Testament.
imagery of the seven lamps and the seven eyes which he uses in chapters four and five; he simply presupposes this symbolism already in 1.4 and 3.1. 'Now in the opening salutation, 1.4-6, having that vision of chapts. 4-5 distinctly in mind... the characterization of the Father given in 4.8, 11 proclaiming him in his eternity and almighty power, is reproduced in 1.4; that of Christ given in 5.9f, 12, proclaiming him in his character as the messianic King of kings and the Savior who by his death and resurrection has redeemed and extolled his people, is reproduced in 1.5-6, while the symbolical designation of the Spirit given in 4.5, 5.6 is repeated here verbally in the phrase, the seven Spirits; in other words the phrase occurs here in the salutation as an unchanged transference from the vision, where it is due to a literal following of Zechariah in blending reality and symbol.'19 (cf. Zech 3.9; 4.2, 10). This interpretation cannot be accepted for the following reasons. First of all, ὁ ἅγιος ἡ πνευματική ἡ ἡγεσία τῆς ζωῆς is not a symbol for God as the seven spirits would be for the Holy Spirit; ὁ ἅγιος τ. λ. is a title of God's. John uses symbols for God in 4.3, ὁ ἅγιος ἡ πνευματική ἡ ἡγεσία τῆς ζωῆς. He does not presuppose these symbols for God in 1.4. Moreover, Beckwith only manages to connect the titles of Christ in the prayer of 1.5f with chapters 4 and 5. The titles of Christ in the benediction (v. 5a) are not found in these two chapters. The fact that titles and not symbols are employed for Christ here also weighs against Beckwith's interpretation. For these reasons it is not possible to maintain that the symbolism of chapters 4 and 5 had a formative influence on the language of 1.4 and 3.1.

A more plausible interpretation of the seven spirits of God as representing the Holy Spirit of God is that which posits that the one Spirit has been divided into seven in Revelation to express its completeness and perfection, just as the scroll which has seven seals in chapter 5 is completely and perfectly sealed: no one can open it save the Lamb. It must be admitted, however, that this understanding of the phrase is at least slightly less probable than that which
recognizes the seven spirits as seven angels, for it is natural to affirm that these seven spirits have the same sort of immediate reality as do God and Christ with whom they are conjoined in 1.4. 21 It is not problematic that a reference to these seven angels comes between God and Christ in this benediction; Moffatt sensibly suggests that, 'since the writer intends to enlarge upon the person of Jesus, or because the seven spirits stood next to the deity in the traditional mis-en-scene, he makes them precede Christ in order.' 22

Perhaps John conceived of the seven angels as at once seven distinct entities and the Holy Spirit itself. This sort of understanding would be paralleled by Pseudo-Justin, ὡς ηερον ἑνιπτι τὸ ἐν καὶ το ἀντι πνεύμα ἐς ἐντα πνεύματα μεριζεόντι φανέρων (Cohortatio ad Graecos 32), 23 and have affinities with Valentinian gnosticism, ἐν ἐννοητι μεντοι ἐς προεβληθησαν οἱ ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, φανέρων, ἐς οὕτως, ὥς ἐνο έου ἰπεζέων θεοῦ (Clem Alex Exc 36.1f). 24 These parallels are rather too late for us to relate them with confidence to the seven spirits of Revelation.
PART II
HUMAN PNEUMA IN PAULINE USAGE

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE THESSALONIAN CORRESPONDENCE

In the following discussion I assume the unity and authenticity of both letters, and the priority of the first.¹

I THESSALONIANS 5.23

From 4.1 onwards Paul gives many exhortations to the Thessalonians Christians, and these exhortations become particularly abundant in 5.12-22. One purpose of Paul's interposition of a prayer at verse 23 is to acknowledge the truth that it is not the Thessalonian Christians themselves but God who effectively accomplishes their present sanctification (v. 23a) and ultimate salvation (v. 23b). "Paul realizes that the preceding exhortations will be of no avail for those who try to carry them out in their own strength -- not that the Thessalonian believers would be likely to try this... -- but he feels it appropriate to remind them of this aspect with this short prayer."² Paul describes God as the God of peace not because God ordains harmony amongst the Thessalonian Christians (5.12f; I Cor 14.33) but because he gives them their salvation (1.1; Ro 8.6).³ The emphasis in the prayer, then, is on their relationship with God not their relationship with one another.

Verse 23 is usually punctuated as follows: Αὐτὸς δὲ οἶκος τῆς εἰρήνης ἡγεῖται ὑμᾶς ὀλοκλήρως καὶ ὀλόκληρον ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχή καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέτρητως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ τηρηθείτε. Ernst von Dobschütz has displayed the formal chiastic structure of the verse: ἄ γιος (1) ὑμᾶς (2) ὀλοκλήρως (3) - ὀλόκληρον (3) ὑμᾶς τὸ πν. καὶ ἡ ψυχή καὶ τὸ σῶμα (2) ... τηρηθείτε (1).⁴ Both ὀλοκλήρως and ὀλόκληρον are adjectival in form. Robert Jewett argues that "since both words could have been used in their adverbial forms of ὀλοκλήρως or ὀλόκληρως, the theory of the adverbial
use of the adjectives is indefensible despite its popularity among translators.\(^5\) This seemingly sensible argument loses its force as soon as we notice that ἀξιέπιτυς, although adverbial in form, is most naturally taken as adjectival in this sentence.\(^6\) Paul could have written ἀξιέπιτον (cf. 3.13). Therefore it is equally legitimate to translate ὀλοτέλεις and ὀλόκληρος as adjectives or adverbs. A decision in this regard does not affect appreciably the interpretation of the verse, which I translate as follows: 'May the God of peace himself sanctify you completely, and may your spirit and soul and body be kept intact and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.'\(^7\)

Both ὀλοτέλεις and ὀλόκληρος should probably be understood as quantitative modifiers unlike ἀξιέπιτυς which is qualitative. ὀλοτελής clearly has a primarily quantitative connotation in the Shepherd of Hermas, where it is used of undamaged stones (Hv 3.6.4) and complete revelation which leaves nothing out (3.10.9; 13.4b; cf. ὀλοτελῶς in 13.4a and also in Hs 8.5.2, sticks ὀλοτελῶς green and no longer half-green); even where the word is applied to faith it does not put aside its quantitative connotation, for what the author has in mind is a full faith which entertains not one jot of doubt about anything (Hm 9.1ff, 4ff).\(^8\) A decree from AD 67 relating to Nero’s declaration of the freedom of all Greeks at the Isthmian games speaks of ἀυεισφορήν, ἓν ὀδηγεί τῶν πρώτων Ἑβαστῶν ὀλοτελὴ ἔδωκεν (IG 7.2713.45).\(^9\) That ὀλόκληρος is a primarily quantitative term is suggested by its use in James 1.4, where those who are ὀλόκληροι are ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι (cf. Acts 3.16, the lame man healed in Jesus’ name has been given ἅν ὁλόκληρόν τῷ πνεύματι), and by its predominant employment in the Septuagint, e.g. λεχθεὶς ὀλόκληρου (Dt 27.6; Josh 8.31; IV Macc 15.17); ἐπὶ ἐβδομάδας ὀλόκληρα (Dt 16.9 A; Lev 23.15). A magical papyrus contains this statement strikingly similar to our verse: τοῦ δὲ σχῆμα ὁλον ὀψως ὡς ῥυτική ὀτί διαφύλαξέ μου τῷ σώμα τῷ γυνήν ὀλόκληρον.\(^10\) Werner Foerster states that ὀλόκληρος denotes completeness in extent or compass, and is
thus a term of quantity rather than quality.11

Verse 23b does not merely repeat but adds to the thought of 23a. Verse 23a states only that the Thessalonian Christians are sanctified by God; 23b promises their preservation by him at the coming of Jesus Christ. It appears to be significant that Paul speaks of his readers being ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ here as in 2.19 and 3.13. Only in 4.15 does he speak of their surviving εἴς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. Now in 4.13-18 Paul has taken up a particular Thessalonian problem. The fact of Christian death has shocked and disconcerted these nascent converts in their imminent expectation of the end. This has happened at a bad time: the believers are experiencing persecution. Two blows have thus been leveled against the Thessalonians' faith. This has prompted Paul to send our letter. In it Paul deals with the problem of persecution at length (2.13-3.13), that of Christian death more briefly. In an authoritative, brisk, surgical manner Paul in 4.13-18 removes a malignant growth from out of the body of Thessalonian church life. He applies to the infection a powerful antidote, viz. λόγος κυρίω (15), and finishes the cure with the command that they παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις (18). Throughout this epistle Paul has repeatedly underscored the absolute certainty and the joy of his readers' hope of salvation (1.6, 10; 2.12, 19; 3.13). He stresses this particularly in the verses which follow 4.13-18. In this last chapter of our letter Paul seems primarily concerned first with boosting the confidence (vv.1-11) and then with rekindling the enthusiasm (16ff) of his readers. Only very briefly in verse 10 do we note an overt allusion to the Thessalonian concern about Christian death.

Verse 5.23 should be understood in the light of the predominant concerns of the last chapter. Jewett has shown that 5.23 and the other similar short prayers in the Thessalonian letters, 3.11, 12f; II Thessalonians 2.16f; 3.5, 16, as well as Romans 15.5f, 13, summarize or prepare for important aspects of the preceding or succeeding discussion. Beda Rigaux has recognized that the prayer in 5.23 'est confiante. Elle
debouche sur une certitude. It chimes in completely with the tone of the whole chapter. The brief overt allusion in 5.10b to 4.13-18 invites us to assume that Paul diffuses such a bracing atmosphere of confidence in this last chapter of his letter to overcome a Thessalonian lack of confidence which is connected to some extent with the problem of unexpected Christian death.

All that has just been said in the preceding two paragraphs encourages us to consider carefully whether the phrase ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχή καὶ τὸ σῶμα may be more than a mere and inexact rhetorical indulgence on Paul's part. It is more than this in my opinion. I suggest that Paul links these three terms together in verse 23b as equivalent to ζωής in 23a as a kind of crowning to the confidence dispensed in the course of his letter, that with them he sets before his readers most vividly his expectation that they will indeed be ζωής, περιληπομένους unto, ἐσ (4.15) and at, ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (5.23). Paul in our verse expects that his readers will exist just as they are now at the parousia of the Lord. This interpretation of the verse finds support in Paul's rare employment of the verb ἐγερέναι elsewhere, particularly in I Corinthians 7.37, ἐγερέναι τὴν ἐκτος ὁ προθέσθην. The believers will be kept just as they are. The fact that Paul prays for this cannot be taken as an indication he has doubts about it, not at all, for he asseverates, προσφέρεται ὦ καλῶν ἡμῖν, ὅσ καὶ ποιῆθε (v. 24). Verses 23 and 24 constitute, then, a climax to the apostle's main epistolary endeavor since 4.13, to turn the thoughts of the Thessalonians away from the problem of Christian death, away from sadness and uncertainty, to the business of Christian living with joy and complete confidence. I am not saying that Paul carefully calculates that his readers will be alive at the parousia; what we have in verses 23f is more a matter of sincere, unreflective pastoral emphasis to revive and stimulate a congregation.

How does Paul understand these three terms, προσφέρει, ψυχή and σῶμα? We cannot avoid asking this question by
assuming that Paul has in verse 23 simply appropriated traditional liturgical terminology and need not be held accountable for the anthropology therein. It has been established that verse 23 and the other similar prayer-units in Paul's letters are all securely anchored in the argument of their surrounding context. We should therefore assume that these prayers were either created or at least altered for the epistolary occasion by Paul. Thus an investigation into the meaning of these three terms cannot be dispensed with on the grounds that what we have here is mere liturgical commonplace. What we have in verse 23 is rather a specifically Pauline epistolary text in liturgical form.

Ernest Best considers it misguided to inquire into the meaning of these three terms on other grounds: Paul is 'only implying with the use of all three terms the completeness of man's preservation'; Best also suggests that Paul is countering 'the normal Hellenistic tendency to divide man'. Yet by the very fact that Paul enumerates these three aspects of the human person he himself sanctions a subdivision of the human person to the extent that he admits of an anthropological pluralism sub specie unitatis, a pluralism which although less basic than the unity of the human person nevertheless does exist. Paul does not simply pray for the preservation of the whole person but for the preservation of the whole person consisting in three particular aspects or parts. George Milligan notes pertinently that the pneuma in distinction from 'in accordance with its derivation... draws more special attention to the several parts to which the wholeness spoken of extends...'; the attempt to inquire into the meaning of the three anthropological terms in verse 23 cannot be circumvented.

Many scholars have understood pneuma in 5.23 as the given to believers. They have drawn attention to the association of sanctification with the imparted pneuma intimated in 4.7f. Representatives of this interpretation include the first theologian known to discuss our verse, Irenaeus (Adv haer 5.6.1), many ancient exegetes especially:
of the Antiochene school, and a minority of modern commentators. Two considerations weigh decisively against this view: 'how could Paul pray that the divine spirit should be preserved, or set it in parallel with the human soul and body?' According to Jewett, 'the discovery of the Qumran writings weakens the first objection since we find there numerous references to the divine spirit being spotted or kept pure.' This observation is not apposite. In Jewish literature, apocalyptic and rabbinic, the spirit which can be spotted or kept pure is the spirit of life given to every human person. Only in CD v 11f; vii 3f is it possible but (I have argued) still not probable that an additional divine dispensation of Spirit to a select group, viz. Jews, is in view. Only in the second-century Shepherd of Hermas (s 5.7; 9.32.2, 4) is the Holy Spirit as an additional divine dispensation considered corruptible. The first objection therefore stands. Against the second objection it might be urged that Paul could quite conceivably collocate the imparted divine Spirit along with the human soul and body if I Corinthians 14.32, πνεύμα προφητῶν προφήτης ὑποτιθεντι, indicates that he considered this imparted Spirit as to some extent at a person's disposal and under his or her control. W. C. van Unnik has interpreted I Thessalonians 5.19, πνεῦμα ὑμῶν ἐβέλυμεν, in the light of I Corinthians 14.32 and a very interesting statement concerning inspiration in Plutarch De defecto oraculorum 40, ἐν Θεον ἐρουμένῳ...καταβέβλωθι τὸν ἐυγένετον. In my opinion, I Cor 14.32 has been misunderstood here. Spirits are subjected to prophets in this verse not because of the nature of human persons but, as the next verse tells us, because of the nature of God, οὐ τις ἐστιν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεὸς ἀλλὰ ἐφίμνης. Spirits which foment confusion do so not because Christians have failed to exercise proper control over them but because they are evil spirits and not the Holy Spirit from God (12.1-3, 10; 14.29). We may safely conclude, then, that pneuma in I Thessalonians 5.23 does not refer to the gift of the Holy Spirit to Christians.
Charles Hasson understands pneuma in our verse as the whole human person who consists of ψυχή and σώμα. His interpretation does not commend itself for two reasons: (1) ψυχή elsewhere in Paul always represents the whole living person, never a part thereof (e.g. I Th 2.8); (2) it is grammatically difficult since it takes "your whole" with "spirit" alone though the Greek strongly implies that the three terms are parallel. Pneuma in our verse, then, should be understood as a part or aspect of the human person.

Our verse contains a trichotomous anthropological statement of some sort. Scholars who have recognized this have usually understood pneuma as intelligence, equivalent to νους, the Godward aspect of the human personality; ψυχή as the seat of the will, emotions and sensation, and σώμα as the material organism. Philo certainly entertains such a trichotomy (cf. e.g. Rer div her 64), and statements in Plato, the creator νους ἐν Ῥηξιν, ψυχήν δὲ ἐν σώματι ζυγιστὶς τὸ πνεῦμα ζωεικτικόν (Tim 30b), and Aristotle, τὸν νουν μέαν θύραιαν ἐπεισενεφιτεν ζα ὑπαντὸν μικρόν (Gen an 736b 27f), are clearly early suggestions of such an anthropological analysis. The problem with this line of interpretation of I Thessalonians 5.23 is that nowhere else in Paul do we find any hint of this understanding of and distinction between pneuma and ψυχή. Moreover, Paul distinguishes between human pneuma and νους in I Corinthians 14.14. We may therefore set aside this particular interpretation of the three anthropological terms in our verse.

G. Wohlenberg has suggested a different interpretation. He understands pneuma as 'das principium des Lebens, das was Leben schafft und setzt, Gottes schöpferischen Hauch', and ψυχή as 'das principatium, das Belebte, der Mensch als persönlich lebender'; σώμα ist Werkzeug des Geistes- und Seelensleben. Here ψυχή and σώμα are certainly understood in a way consistent with Pauline usage (for the latter cf. e.g. I Cor 6.13). The only apparent possible objection to this interpretation is that, although Paul mentions in his
letters an anthropological pneuma a number of times, he never once elsewhere has it clearly in view as simply the principle of life. Yet this objection cannot stand, since we have seen that the use of the word pneuma to refer to the principle of life is not only exceedingly frequent in but also the only signification common to both Greek and Jewish usage of the word previous to and contemporary with Paul. The unassailability of Wohlenberg's interpretation of the three anthropological terms in verse 23 fits and even confirms our earlier identification of the prayer's place and function in the argument and the atmosphere of the latter part of the letter. Verses 23f constitute Paul's last injection of confidence and enthusiasm into Thessalonian Christianity. Verse 23b is related to 10b and 4.13-18: it is to be expected that the readers will be alive at the coming of the Lord (cf. 1.10); the spirit of life (pneuma) will still be in them (ψυχή); they will still be living in the body (σώμα). This interpretation explains the order in which the three terms appear in our verse.

An alternative interpretation of pneuma remains to be considered. Milligan suggests that the three terms have been utilized 'to emphasize a sanctification which shall extend to man's whole being, whether on its immortal, its personal, or its bodily side.' In the same vein G. G. Findlay avers that the apostle mentions τὸ πνεῦμα first because 'it is the primary object of Divine salvation', and he adduces 1 Corinthians 5.5 as proof of this. We shall see later that 1 Corinthians 5.5 does not bear this interpretation. Even if it could, we could not assume that Paul's views concerning the πνεῦμα of human salvation did not change in the few years separating the writing of I Thessalonians from I Corinthians. It is possible that later Corinthian misconceptions stimulated Paul to further and fresh prayer and reflection about this. Thus with respect to the meaning of pneuma in I Thessalonians 5.23 we have to ask: is there any evidence before I Corinthians and particularly in our letter that pneuma here is seen as a principle of continuity between earthly and
eternal life? There is not. Indeed, Paul throughout I Thessalonians stresses not the how but the mere that of eternal life, except to indicate (1) that the Christian dead first come back to life before (2) they and the Christian living are transported in clouds into the air to meet the Lord. "It is unlikely that Christ and Christians remain "in the air" because of the demonic association of "air", because apocalyptic imagery looks either to a new heaven or a new earth, and because "will bring with him" (v. 14) suggests further movement. Yet we have no basis whatsoever for assuming that the Christians ascend to heaven as pneumata or return to earth in σώματα or anything else. So we cannot conclude that pneuma in our verse possesses any special eschatological sense. Our verse has in view Christians at not after the parousia.

I conclude that pneuma in 5.23 means the breath of life. It is in an emphatic position with respect to ψυχή and σώμα because without it the human person would not be ψυχή in a σώμα. The fact that Paul prays for its preservation shows that for him this pneuma is (as in the OT) still essentially God's property which can be reclaimed by him at any time; life on earth is ever a gift of God's grace.

II THESALONIANS 2.8

Pneuma in II Thessalonians 2.8, ὁ πνεῦμα, ὃν ὁ κύριος ἑσόει τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ σώματός αὐτοῦ, may be translated 'breath'; this is not, however, mere human breath but supernatural power which the Messiah possesses to use (cf. Isa 11.4; Rev 2.16; Ps Sol 17.27, 36; 1QSb v 24f).

II THESALONIANS 2.13

It is generally agreed that the phrase ἐν καιρῷ πνεύματος καὶ πάντες ἀλλήλων modifies neither σωτηρία nor ἐλπίς alone but the entire idea expressed by the preceding words, i.e. that it elucidates "wie es vom ἐλπίς zum σωτηρία kommt." A small minority of scholars see a reference to a human spirit in the phrase ἐν καιρῷ πνεύματος, The
fullest argument that I have found in favor of this interpretation is given by G. G. Findlay. He contends that the phrase thus understood (1) 'recalls the memorable prayer' of I Thessalonians 5.23, and (2) forms with καὶ πίστει ἁληθείας a 'patent antithesis' to τί μὴ πιστεύετε τὴν ἁληθείαν ἀλλ' εὐδοκήσαντες τῷ ἀνωτάτῳ in the preceding verse; he also points to (3) 'the probability that the writer, if intending the Holy Spirit by πνεῦματος, would for clearness have prefixed the article or attached to the generic noun some distinguishing term,' and (4) 'the fact that the genitive is objective in the parallel πίστει ἁληθείας.' Findlay also counters two arguments which have been adduced against seeing a reference to a human spirit in our verse. Against the argument that a parallelism between ἁληθείας πνεῦματος and πίστει ἁληθείας cannot be pressed since sanctification is a process whereas faith is not, Findlay refers to 1.4, τὰς ὑπομονὰς ὑμῶν καὶ πίστεως ἐν παντὶ τῷ θεωροῦμεν ὑμῶν καὶ τοῖς θλιμμέσιν ἦσαν ἀνέχεσθε, and to the exhortation which our verse is leading up to, 2.15, ἐὰν δὲ, ἀδελφοί, στρικτε, καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραβάσεις ὡς ἐνθαυσάτε, to prove that faith for Paul is also like sanctification something that needs to be sustained. Finally, he avers that the argument that 'sanctification of the (human) spirit' would have to follow not precede 'faith in the truth' might be applied with equal force to 'sanctification by the (Holy) Spirit' in the light of Galatians 3.2. This last point may be accepted to the extent that it may well be that in our verse as in Galatians 3.2 and particularly 5.22 nothing is being said one way or the other about priority in time.

Findlay's vigorous defense of his interpretation of pneuma in 2.13 may be admired yet not accepted. None of his four positive arguments in favor of it stand up to separate examination. Against (1) we need only note that in I Thessalonians 5.23 the whole person is said to be sanctified. With respect to (2) it must be said that even if we understand ἐν ὑπομονῇ πνεῦματος as 'sanctification by the Spirit'
a contrast with *ὑποκάτωτες τῷ ἀδικίᾳ* still remains, and quite apart from the possibility that behind that *ὑποκάτω* Paul perceives a different sort of spiritual influence from outside active in the *ἐνεργείαν πλάνης* (v. 11; cf. Eph 2.2).

Findlay's argument (3) is not apposite as there are many passages in Paul wherein an anarthrous and unmodified *pneuma* means the Holy Spirit active in Christians' lives (e.g. Ro 7.6; 8.4).

It is sufficient to say with respect to Findlay's argument (4) that it is not apparent that we have to understand *δύναμις* *πνεύματος* and *πίστευ* *λειτουργεί* as exactly parallel constructions.

The decisive argument against taking *pneuma* in our verse as a reference to a human spirit is that elsewhere in his letters Paul specifically associates sanctification with the Holy Spirit several times, whereas the human spirit is only called holy once (I Cor 7.34). In I Thessalonians 4.7f Paul closely associates sanctification and the gift of the Holy Spirit. In I Corinthians 6.11 he expressly says that sanctification is by means of the Holy Spirit. In Romans 15.16 Paul speaks of *ν' προσφορὰ πῶν ἐνθώπια εὐφροσύνη ἐν πνεύματι θεῷ*.

This last passage is particularly relevant to us if we read *ἀπορχήσ* rather than *ἀπ' ἀρχή* in II Thessalonians 2.13. B. M. Metzger reports that the UBS editors adopted the reading *ἀπορχήσ* for the following reasons (external evidence being indecisive): (1) *ἀπ' ἀρχή* occurs nowhere else in Paul; (2) except in Philippians 4.15 *ἀρχή* in Paul always means 'power'; (3) *ἀπορχήσ* occurs six other places in Paul (though in five of them it is with a qualifying genitive), and (4) elsewhere copyists altered *ἀπορχήσ* to *ἀπ' ἀρχή* (Rev 14.4 N; Ro 16.5 D*) 'even though the latter expression is inappropriate in these passages.' One of the two usual objections against this reading is that Paul could not have written *ἀπορχήσ* because the Thessalonians were not the first believers in Macedonia. But, since Paul elsewhere always seems to employ this word in a temporal sense, why could he not have conceived of his readers as the *ἀπορχήσ* in Thessalonica
itself? In I Thessalonians at least Paul appears to evince interest in the conversion of further outsiders (3.12; 4.12; 5.15). According to Ernest Best, the interpretation 'first-fruits of Thessalonica...is excluded since the letter is addressed to the whole church.'

I do not see the force of this objection. The readers could be the first fruits in Thessalonica so far. Are we to assume that there was no continuing mission there? In Romans 8.23 Paul speaks of himself and his readers as ΤΗΝ ἈΠΡΩΧΘΝ ΤΟΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΕΧΩΝΤΕΣ; it does not seem possible to maintain a significant distinction between having and being the first fruits of the Spirit; the thought in the Romans passage is that 'the Spirit's present work in us is the first-fruits...of the full glory which is still to come.'

We are invited by Romans 8.23 and 15.16 to conclude that when Paul speaks of Christians as ΤΗΝ ἈΠΡΩΧΘΝ he has in mind the fact that the Holy Spirit is already at work in them (cf. also I Cor 15.20 with Ro 1.1; 8.11). The reading ΤΗΝ ἈΠΡΩΧΘΝ in our verse thus connects with ΤΗΝ ὅν ὑπέκλη ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ, and thereby nullifies the second usual objection against this reading, that it does not fit the context.

I conclude in the light of Pauline usage elsewhere that pneuma in II Thessalonians 2.13 is the sanctifying Holy Spirit.

**HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE CORINTHIAN CORRESPONDENCE**

The authenticity of I and II Corinthians has never been seriously challenged; the unity of both epistles, particularly the second, is not infrequently denied. In the following exegetical studies, the unity of both epistles is presupposed.

W. G. Kummel suggests that the unity of our letters can be convincingly denied only if an affirmative answer is forthcoming to two questions.

(a) Does the text as transmitted compel us to assume that the material has been combined
secondarily? (b) Can a convincing motive be perceived for the material as it has been transmitted?\textsuperscript{1}

It might appear that an affirmative answer is forthcoming to at least the first of these questions in the case of II Corinthians, which is widely divided into two letters: 1-9 and 10-13.\textsuperscript{2} However, only a mistaken reading of chapters 1-9 leads to the supposition, expressed, for instance, by Willi Marxsen, that it would have been psychologically impossible for Paul to append chapters 10-13 to 1-9, since Paul shows in 1-9 that his readers have given him much joy (7.16).\textsuperscript{3} The early chapters of II Corinthians in fact already suggest that all is not well. They show plainly that tension inheres in the apostle’s relationship with his readers (e.g. 1.17, 24), and they contain critical allusions to apostles who are not like Paul (e.g. 3.1; 5.12). There is a direct connection between Paul’s plea to his readers in 6.11-13; 7.2-4 and the incomplete obedience of the Corinthians mentioned in 10.6b. Paul’s harsh words in 11.13-15 about rival apostles are quite in line with 2.17, as his harsh words in 12.20ff about the Corinthians themselves tie in with the fearful entreaty of 6.1. The last four chapters differ from the preceding in that in them what has been only imperfectly submerged in the first part of the letter surfaces forcefully. Perhaps Paul concluded after all by the end of his discussion relating to the collection that it was no use minimizing the tensions that still inhered in his relations with his readers in spite of the success of Titus’ recent mission to them. At any rate, the substantial integrity of II Corinthians will be assumed in the following exegetical studies.

I CORINTHIANS 2.11

Paul wrote I Corinthians partly to answer a number of questions sent to him by the church in Corinth (7.1; cf. v. 25; 8.1; 12.1; 16.1, 16). He does not take up these questions until towards the middle of a long letter. His preliminary discussion in chapters 1-6 centers on disunited and disgraceful behavior in the Corinthian Christian community. These chapters prepare for chapters 7ff in that in these initial
chapters Paul strives to re-establish his special authorita-
tive status as apostolic founder of the entire church at Cor-
inth; only having done this can he expect that his commands,
admonitions and suggestions in the later chapters will be
accepted by his readers.\(^\text{5}\) Paul's predominant purpose in I
Corinthians is to inculcate amongst his readers the \(\nuo\upsilon\sigma\varsigma\) of
the crucified Christ (1.10b; 2.16) as he, Paul, mediates
(4.16; 11.1) and interprets (7.25, 40; cf. 1.10b) it.\(^\text{6}\) His
argument reaches its climactic point in chapter 13 (including
12.31b).\(^\text{7}\)

In 2.6-16 Paul maintains that he is to be classed amongst
those who speak \(\Theta\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\). This \(\delta\omicron\omicron\varphi\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\) is Christ crucified
and all that he effects (vv. 6-9, 16; cf. 1.24, 30). The
\(\delta\omicron\omicron\varphi\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\) Paul speaks in 2.6ff does not differ in content from
that of 1.17ff.\(^\text{8}\) The 'perfect' of 2.6 are the 'saved' of 1.18b,
the 'believers' of 1.21, the 'called' of 1.24 who have begun
to actualize their new status in Christ. Ernst Küsemann
states correctly that 'jedes Glied der Gemeinde ist berufen,
vollkommen zu sein...Vollkommen sind alle Christen, sofern
sie an der Gemeinde geschenkter, göttlicher Gnade partizi-
pieren und darin bleiben und wachsen.'\(^\text{9}\) According to Paul,
the Corinthian Christians are \(\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\mu\upsilon\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\iota\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) but do not live
like \(\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\mu\upsilon\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) (2.10-3.4). This shows that thus far Paul
has not managed to press upon them the necessary consequences
of their new status in Christ; he has not managed to speak to
them as to spiritual persons (\(\sigma\omicron\nu\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\omicron\varphi\omicron\upsilon\iota\omicron\omicron\iota\) \(\varsigma\lambda\iota\omicron\iota\upsilon\iota\omicron\omicron\iota\iota\) \(\upsilon\mu\iota\nu\) \(\omicron\nu\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\mu\upsilon\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\OMICRON\)): 'it was not the intention, but the melancholy
consequence, that he gave them milk instead of meat.'\(^\text{10}\)
Because the Corinthians have received the Spirit, Paul cannot
rightly call them \(\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\iota\OMICRON\) (cf. 2.14). He calls them \(\sigma\kappa\rho\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\iota\OMICRON\)/
\(\sigma\kappa\rho\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\iota\OMICRON\OMICRON\OMICRON\) (3.1, 3). They are not \(\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\mu\upsilon\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) insofar as they
continue to walk \(\kappa\appa\iota\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) \(\kappa\alpha\omicron\theta\iota\omicron\theta\iota\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\). Paradoxically \(\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\mu\upsilon\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) yet
not \(\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\mu\upsilon\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\OMICRON\) the Corinthian Christians are \(\nu\nu\upsilon\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\OMICRON\) \(\epsilon\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\omicron\omicron\iota\OMICRON\).\(^\text{11}\)

Paul declares that God's wisdom can only be understood
by those who receive the Spirit, that is, by Christians (vv.
10-16).\(^\text{12}\) His reference to a human \(\text{pneuma}\) in verse 11 helps
him to establish this fact. Paul states in verse 10 that the mystery of the cross has been revealed to Christians through the Spirit which alone knows all things including this mystery. In verse 11 he explains how it is that the Spirit alone has this knowledge. Verse 12 then continues the thought of verse 10.

The Spirit alone fathoms the marvelous purpose of God in the mystery of the cross, because the Spirit is God's self-consciousness. Just as the spirit of a human person is his or her self-consciousness, so it is with God's Spirit (Paul does not imply that God's Spirit and the human spirit are similar in other respects). Paul considers it self-evident that τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ alone knows τὰ τοῦ ἄνθρωπος. C. K. Barrett comments that this is 'common human experience'. We should also reckon with the influence of Jewish Scripture on Paul's thinking here. The phrase πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου ἐν αὐτῷ occurs in Zechariah 12.1. Verses 10 and 11 of our chapter seem to reflect Paul's conscious or unconscious recollection of Judith 8.14, ὥσπερ θεὸς κυρίως ἀνθρώπου ὑπὲρσεῖτε καὶ λόγους τὰς δικαιοσύνας αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ δικαίωμασθαι καὶ ποιῶν τὸν Θεὸν, ὥσπερ ἐποίησεν πατὴρ τῶν ἐρευνῆσαι καὶ τὸν νουν αὐτοῦ ἐπικύρωσθαι καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν αὐτοῦ καθιστῆσαι, and particularly Proverbs 20.27, where πνεῦμα (pneuma in the citation in I Clem 21.2) represents ruach meaning human self-understanding. Thus the thought of 2.11a comes out of Paul's general life experience and Jewish background. On the basis of an admitted usage of the word pneuma, Paul proves by providing a human parallel the unique and sufficient capability of the Holy Spirit to make known God's purpose in history.

Although most scholars affirm that in verse 11 Paul compares the Spirit of God with the human spirit with respect to a similarity of function which being pneumata of persons they share, a few scholars surprisingly insist that Paul on the contrary (and in spite of the ὁτίως καὶ) contrasts them. According to W. D. Davies, 'here the Spirit of God and the spirit of man are set over against each other; the true Wisdom
is not attainable through merely human means; the spirit of man...cannot achieve it; it is revealed by the Spirit of God. According to J. B. Lightfoot, the emphatic repetition of ἀναγνώστευον, ἀναγνώστευον, ἀναγνώστευον and of Ἐκτός, Ἐκτός is intended to enforce such a contrast. Surely, however, Paul has repeated these genetival modifiers by necessity so as simply to avoid confusion of pneumata and make the point that just as the human spirit is the principle of human self-understanding, so it is with the Spirit of God. Certainly the Spirit of God which knows ὄντος knows immensely more than the human spirit, but this observation is tangential to the course of Paul’s thought in verses 10 and 11. In verse 14 Paul does not define persons as ψυχικαί because they have a merely human pneuma but because they do not receive the divine pneuma. Negative aspects of the human pneuma do not enter into Paul’s discussion in our verses at all. It is τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ νοσούμα (v. 12) which is contrasted to God’s Spirit and this cannot be equated with the human spirit (v. 11) because the one is received (v. 12) whereas the other is constitutional. Paul makes a clear and limited comparison between the human spirit and the Holy Spirit in verse 11. Potential or implicit contrasts between the two are not relevant to his argument in its context. Paul’s intention in 2.11 is not to denigrate the human spirit but to elucidate the revealing Holy Spirit which he possesses in common with all Christians.

Pneuma in 2.11a is not ‘um des formellen Parallelismus willen im "uneigentlichen" Sinne für "Seele" gebraucht’, since ψυχή in Paul characteristically represents the whole human person; nor is pneuma here equivalent to νοσος, for νοσος in Paul is less a faculty of the human person than ‘die im Bewusstsein stehenden Gedanken’, and νοσος in verse 16 is not equivalent to τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐρευνά in verse 10 but is rather to be related to τῷ ἐρευνά τοῦ Ἐκτος of that verse. Pneuma in 2.11 represents (as does ruach in Prov 20.27) the principle of human self-understanding.
I CORINTHIANS 4.21; GALATIANS 6.1

In 4.14f Paul wraps up his argument in vindication of his apostleship by distinguishing himself as the Corinthian Christians' father ἐν Χριστῷ. He calls upon his readers to follow his example of Christian life and witness (v. 16). He announces that he has sent Timothy to remind them of his ways (v. 17). He assures them that he himself will come again to Corinth soon (v. 19), aware that certain persons there malign him as if he were gone for good (v. 18). Paul contrasts these persons unfavorably with himself: they talk; he has power (δοκίμασι; 2.4f show how severe this criticism is). But Paul here as throughout our letter shows more concern to address the entire congregation than part(s) of it. Having vindicated his apostleship to the Corinthian church, he confronts them all in 4.21 with a choice: he can come back to them as a severe or a gentle father. It is up to them which it will be. The asyndeton of 5.1 emphasizes the dire reality of the former possibility.

A few scholars understand τὸν ἐμὸν πνεύματος in 4.21 as the imparted Holy Spirit which effects πραγμάτευμα (cf. Gal 5.22f, ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια...πραγμάτευμα...). It is claimed that the phrase ἐν πνεύματι πραγμάτευμα in Galatians 6.1 must refer to the Holy Spirit in the light of its correlation with ὁ πνευματικός, which must mean: you who will indeed 'walk in the Spirit' (5.16; cf. vv. 18, 25), but this does not necessarily follow. On the other hand, it has been argued that the Holy Spirit 'kann...kein Parallelglied zu ἀγαθόν bilden' (cf. 16.24), and that if Paul had meant the Holy Spirit we would expect him to have written, ἐν δύναμιν πραγμάτευμα τὸ πνεύματος (cf. Ro 15.30; Gal 5.13 v. 1.). The first of these latter arguments is called into question by I Corinthians 13 and the second by II Corinthians 4.13.

We have a very close parallel to our verse in IQS iii 8; iv 3, ἐν δύναμιν...πνεύματος translates ἐν δύναμιν in the LXX at Ps. 44(45).4, and here ὄντας means 'disposition'. We have already argued that I Peter 3.4, τοῦ πραγμάτευμα...πνεύματος, does
not refer to the Holy Spirit but to the human spirit as 'disposition'. There is no reason why in I Corinthians 4.21 and Galatians 6.1 should not also be understood as 'die "Gesinnung" der Sanftmut, der freilich nach Gal 5,23 selber eine Frucht des Geistes ist', 'a human spirit directed by' the Holy Spirit. If the phrase is taken in this way, the Holy Spirit is seen to have a particular relationship with the human spirit. Elsewhere in Paul the Holy Spirit has a particular relationship to other aspects of the human person as well: the καρδία (Gal 4.6; II Cor 1.22; cf. Ro 5.5), that is, the seat or power of human intentionality and volition (cf. e.g. I Cor 7.37), and the σώμα (Ro 8.10f; I Cor 6.19), that is, the visible vehicle of human life (cf. e.g. I Cor 6.13). The human spirit in our verses is thus not singled out as that aspect of the human person which is most truly and intimately related to the imparted Holy Spirit.

I am inclined to conclude with most commentators and translators (RSV; NEB; JB) that pneuma in I Corinthians 4.21 and Galatians 6.1 means 'disposition', here a Christian disposition.

I CORINTHIANS 5.3f; COLOSSIANS 2.5

In 5.1-5 Paul focuses on a particular case of gross moral abuse within the Corinthian church: a certain man has a scandalous relationship with his stepmother. The apostle's extreme displeasure at this news is unmistakable, and ϊλωσ (v. 1) should probably be taken as expressive of his strong reaction to the report rather than as an indication of the range within which it has spread. Such fornication as is not even found among the Gentiles (5.1b; cf. Ro 1.18ff; I Th 4.4f; Eph 4.17) ought to have driven the church into mourning. Instead the Corinthians, basking in self-satisfaction (v. 2a), have apparently taken no action to counteract the crime. Paul for his part (εξελεύω ) reacts swiftly and sharply. He does not in our verses pass judgement instead of and for the church; he rather anticipates or prophesies what will be done by them.
It is natural to connect the prepositional phrase δικά τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ (v. 4b) with the genitive participle δικά Θεοῦν, and then to attach the prepositional phrase ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ (v. 4a) to the immediately preceding accusative participle τοῦ ...κατέκρυβε λέγειν, 45 which is the object of κατέκρυβα (cf. vv. 12f). 46 Verses 3-5 may then be translated as follows: 'I for my part, being absent in body, but present in pneuma, have already judged as one who is present the person who did such a thing in the name of the Lord Jesus, when you and my pneuma are gathered together with the power of our Lord Jesus, to hand over such a person to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the pneuma may be saved on the day of the Lord.' 47 The main idea in verses 3 and 4 is clearly that Paul associates himself closely with the Corinthians when they come together to judge this great sinner; he will really be present with them then; he stresses this (παρουσιάσας τῷ πνεύματί ...ὑπό παρουσίας, καὶ τῷ Ξικῷ πνεύματος). 48 But will he present with them by means of his human spirit or the Holy Spirit or both?

Carl Holsten considers it patent that pneuma in 5.3f means the Holy Spirit: 'woraus anders hätte der apostel die macht, woraus anders hätte er mit der gemeinde das recht nehmen wollen des παρακολούθησι τῷ σταυρῷ.' 48 Since the δύναμις of the Lord Jesus (v. 4b) enables Paul and the Corinthians to hand over the fornicator to Satan, Holsten's argument cannot decide the meaning of pneuma in verses 3 and 4. Because Paul writes 'my spirit' in verse 4, I assume that pneuma in our verses refers to his human spirit. It is in principle unlikely that Paul would call the imparted divine pneuma 'my pneuma'. Elsewhere in the New Testament and in Jewish literature broadly contemporaneous with Paul 'my spirit' is always the vital spirit from God; it never refers to an additional dispensation of pneuma from God. 'My spirit' in 16.18 and II Corinthians 2.13 certainly represents the apostle's human spirit and not the imparted Spirit, 49 and it cannot be established that 'my spirit' means anything different in I
Corinthians 14.14-16 and Romans 1.9. Therefore I assume that Paul in 5.3f is speaking 'psychologically rather than theologically'.

This conclusion is not contradicted by II Corinthians 12.2 (cf. v. 4), Ἐκτὸς οὖν τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, Ἐκτὸς οὖν τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ Θεὸς οἶδεν; here special circumstances may have influenced Paul to take up an agnostic position as to the manner of a person's unusual presence in another place, or it may be that the experience of being transferred as far as the third heaven was so overwhelming that he simply could not recollect the manner of it. At any rate, Paul in II Corinthians 12.2, 4 clearly reckons with 'the possibility that the self can separate from the σώματος even in this present life'. I Corinthians 5.3f invite us to connect this possibly separated self with the human πνεῦμα. We have a parallel to Paul's usage in I Enoch 71.1, 5f, which represent Enoch's translation to heaven as a translation of his spirit, while verse 11 countenances his bodily presence in heaven. From the fact that Paul represents himself as present in his human spirit apart from his body in different parts of the earth, viz. Corinth and perhaps also Colossae (2.5), but hesitates to say this about his sojourn in heaven, we may infer that he (unlike, perhaps, I Enoch) does not consider the human spirit as the principle of continuity between earthly and eternal life.

In II Kings 5.26 the 'heart' (agree) of Elisha goes a short distance with Gehazi, and sees him take payment from Naaman. When Paul, however, tells the Thessalonians that he was made an orphan by separation from them προσωπῶς οὐ καρδία (I Th 2.17), he does not mean that his 'heart' is invisibly with them but that they are in his heart, i.e. he has a continued and lively affectionate regard for and interest in them (cf. Phil 1.7f, διότι ἵνα ἐσεχθεῖ με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν; cf. further the use of καρδία in II Cor 2.4; 5.12; 6.11; 7.3). Paul's affection for his readers is not to the fore in I Corinthians 5.3f. 'Spirit' here has quite a different meaning than 'heart' in I Thessalonians 2.17. In Pauline usage the human spirit but
not the human heart is the vehicle of a person’s invisible or bodiless presence through earthly space and time.56

Colossians 2.5, εἰ σπερματικόν τὸν ἰσχυρόν ἐμαῖρι λαβεῖν, Χριστῷ ἐλπίζων τῇ γένεσιν καὶ ἀποκτείνων τὸ στερέωμα τοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ πιστεύων ὑμῶν, accords with our exegesis of I Corinthians 5.3f. Since Paul elsewhere associates joy with the Holy Spirit (Ro 14.17; Gal 5.22; I Th 1.6) one might assume that the reference in Colossians 2.5, τὸ σπερματικόν τὸν ἰσχυρόν ἐμαῖρι, is to the Spirit, but Paul can speak of Christian joy without specifying its source in God’s Spirit (cf. II Cor 1.15 et. al.), and the fact that joy is a disposition of the Holy Spirit does not mean that Paul would not also conceive of this joy as a disposition of the constitutional human spirit.57

In the light of 2.1, ἡλικίων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνθρώπων ἐναντίον τέλος, verse 5 might be seen as a rhetorical statement of affection. Many scholars, however, discern a military metaphor in the use of τίγες and στερέωμα in our verse. According to Ernst Lohmeyer, for example, der Apostel ist "bei ihnen", wie der Feldherr, der vor seinen Soldaten stand, die Reihen vor der Schlacht nach einmal mustert.58 The language of our verse does not then stress Paul’s personal affection for his readers but his apostolic supervision of them. The use of ‘spirit’ and not ‘heart’ here is consistent with Paul’s employment of these terms in similar contexts elsewhere. Since metaphor predominates in Colossians 2.5 Paul’s spiritual presence with his readers seems somewhat but is not necessarily less real than in I Corinthians 5.3f.59

My argument for seeing a reference to Paul’s human spirit in I Corinthians 5.3f and Colossians 2.5 rests entirely on Paul’s qualification of pneuma in I Corinthians 5.4 as ‘my spirit’. It is highly likely that pneuma means the same in verse 3 as in verse 4, and there appears to be no exegetical evidence that the usage in Colossians 2.5 differs from that of I Corinthians 5.3f. If pneuma in I Corinthians 5.3 unlike verse 4 did refer to the Holy Spirit then Paul would affirm in
in 5.3f that his human spirit when it separates from his body participates in the Holy Spirit in invisible transcendence through distances of space. It might be noted in favor of this interpretation that in Ezekiel (3.12, 14; 8.3 etc.), II Baruch (6.3) and Revelation (2.10 etc.) God's Spirit transports persons to different parts of the earth and heaven. Even if we interpreted 5.3 in this light, Paul's agnosticism in II Corinthians 12.2, 4 would force us to refrain from assuming that this implied that for him eternal life was a matter for the human spirit in communion with the Holy Spirit apart from the body. It remains, however, more probable that Paul like I Enoch 71.1, 5f conceives of his invisible presence apart from the body as a property of his human spirit.

I CORINTHIANS 5.5

Many scholars maintain that verses 3-5 concern the fornicator's excommunication. Verse 5a expresses the fact that having been exiled from the church this person will be ipso facto under the power of Satan, the God of this world (II Cor 4.4; cf. Col 1.13). This is doubtful; since it is not Paul's view that people within the church are necessarily out of Satan's reach (cf. II Cor 12.7; I Th 2.18), it is not clear that he would equate excommunication with being given over into Satan's power. Furthermore, the phrase 'for the destruction of the flesh', no matter how it is taken, tells against this interpretation. If this phrase refers to illness and/or death, these take place within the church (cf. 11.30); if it refers to the destruction of fleshly lusts, these would, presumably, be strengthened rather than destroyed by sending him back to the world. If Job 2.6, περιδρόμωμεν οὐλ αὐτῷ, has influenced Paul's phrasing here, this would make it even more likely that he envisages a special subjection of this person to Satan. The language of 5.5a thus suggests something other than excommunication.

It has been suggested that Satan will function here in his traditional role of accuser, but Paul does not elsewhere
allude to this function of Satan, and Romans 8.31ff suggest that he may not have been inclined to think of Satan in this way; it is also not clear how accusations of Satan result in the destruction of the flesh. It is equally unlikely that Satan appears in our verse as tempter; the man has already committed fornication; it seems senseless for the church to hand him over to Satan for further temptation to sin. For similar reasons, Satan does not function here as adversary of the gospel.

It follows that Satan is seen as one who brings on physical woe. I Corinthians 11.29f state that those who partake of the Eucharist unworthily, eating and drinking judgement (κρίμα) upon themselves, become ill and even die. This suggests that the judgement passed in our verse against unworthy Christian living would have the same sort of results. Primitive Christian literature associates the devil with the infliction of physical suffering (Acts 10.38), death (Heb 2.14), and physical suffering unto death (Ig Ro 5.3).

We have determined that Satan is seen here as one who inflicts physical woe; it might seem to follow that we should allow 'flesh' a purely physical referent. It has been argued that Satan cannot be an agent for the destruction of the flesh in the ethical sense of the term, because Satan would then be envisioned as working against his own interests. However, the οὐρανός in the flesh given to Paul by an angel of Satan (II Cor 12.7) has the effect not only of causing physical discomfort but also of countering a tendency toward pride; here Satan would seem to be working against his own interests. An ethical referent for 'flesh' in our verse thus cannot be ruled out, although the physical referent seems paramount.

"Ολεθρος τῆς σφυρος can incorporate the notion of the 'utter defeat of the sinful flesh'; Philo speaks of the utter defeat of wisdom, ολεθρω φρουνίεως (Deus sit imm 166; cf. Conf. ling 86; Som 2.179). In our verse ολεθρος must also incorporate the meaning of physical suffering or death or physical suffering unto death. Philo often uses ολεθρος to designate physical death (e.g. Spec leg 1.160; 3.147; 4.127). Every
employment of the term in the Septuagint (where it occurs more than twenty times) specifically designates or -- and this usage is less usual -- clearly incorporates the notion of actual physical death. Ὄξι*ίκαν be used too of physical suffering, but it seems to have this meaning only in contexts which relate the woes of the wicked in the last days and eternity (I Th 5.3; II Th 1.9; IV Macc 10.15, τὸν αἰώνιον τοῦ τυφλοῦ Ὄξι*ίκαν; cf. I Tim 6.9). Our verse views the destruction of the flesh as taking place before this (Paul elsewhere only alludes to activity of Satan previous to the eschaton, 7.5; II Cor 2.11; 4.4; 11.14; 12:7; I Th 2.18; II Th 2.9; cf. Eph 2.2). It may be noted that the notion of eternal Ὄξι*ίκασ as physical suffering, being the opposite of eternal life, is not very different from the notion of death.

Thus it appears probable that I Corinthians 5.5a refers to the death of the malefactor at the instigation of Satan. This may not be sudden death; it may be a slow death which involves physical suffering. Since Ὄξι*ίκασ is used on occasion to suggest unspecified sorts of woe (e.g. Philo Gai 91; Satan's Ὄξι*ίκασ is unspecified in Ig Eph 13.1), it may just be that Paul contemplates only sickness and torment for this sinner, but it is certainly much more likely that I Corinthians 5.5a spells his death.

We now turn to consider the meaning of pneuma in 5b. Scholars have understood it in various ways. It has been seen as the divine power imparted to this particular believer which 'ought no longer to be left in his possession, but must be rescued by his death, in order that it may form part of the perfection and wholeness of the body of Christ at the Last Day.' Although it may be said in favor of this view that it fits the context, viz. Paul's predominant concern for the state of the whole church, and that elsewhere in Paul, with the probable exception of Colossians 2.5, where pneuma is contrasted with 'flesh' the Holy Spirit is meant, it does not seem acceptable for two reasons: it is hard to conceive of the divine Spirit being saved or rescued, and individual
salvation is predicated in 3.15, where Paul also is mainly concerned with the state of the whole church.

Eduard Schweizer maintains that pneuma is the imparted divine pneuma insofar as it creates a new I. 'The pneuma of the sinner which is to be delivered is the I given to him by God, a portion of God's Spirit, though the whole of the new man of the believer is represented therein.' Schweizer's interpretation does not seem to be open to the objection that Paul could hardly contemplate the salvation of the imparted divine Spirit. Yet it is far from obvious that Paul does or would use pneuma to represent the specifically Christian person. Elsewhere in his epistles Paul distinguishes the imparted divine Spirit from the Christian person he indwells.

J. Cambier holds that pneuma here is a qualitative religious term which characterizes the whole human person. It may be urged against this interpretation that pneuma elsewhere in Paul always seems to represent an external influence on or an internal aspect of but never the human person as such.

Some scholars consider that pneuma represents 'the essential, inward self' or 'the higher faculty'. Others consider that it represents the human spirit regenerated by the apportioned divine Spirit. One may object to these interpretations that Paul nowhere else singles out this human spirit for salvation.

Another possibility is that Paul may not have intended pneuma to designate anything definite. Pneuma may be emotively loaded and connotative of, say, 'whatever is true, whatever is honorable' and such like (Phil 4.8) in contrast to what 'flesh' calls to mind. This is unlikely; although Paul appears aggravated in our chapter, verses 3-5 seem to constitute on the contrary a careful and solemn statement of just what must be done to this fornicator. The Corinthians at any rate, like readers until the present day, would not have understood the term pneuma in this loose sense but in a particular precise way.

Thus it would appear that none of the interpretations of
pneuma which have been put forward thus far are satisfactory. Against some, rather weighty objections can be levelled, whereas with regard to others, only indecisive doubts arise. There is another way we can understand pneuma in our verse which seems less doubtful than any other. Pneuma can represent the condemned person insofar as he will exist after his death in the realm of the dead (cf. I En 22; I P 3.19; the Greek of Sir 9.977) wherein or from whence (cf. pneuma in Luke 24.37, 39; ruach in b Ber 18b) he will be called to judgement. Verse 5b does not concern the manner of the duration of his eternal life. It relates rather what will be the mode of being in which he faces judgement and finds approbation on the day of the Lord (cf. 1.8; 3.13; 4.3).

One thing that may be said in favor of this interpretation is that Paul would probably not have employed any term other than pneuma to represent this fornicator as one who is in or from the realm of the dead at the Last Judgement. He could conceivably have used ψυχή for this (cf. e.g. I En 102.11; 103.7), but ψυχή in Paul characteristically refers to the whole living person on earth. Pneuma has no such characteristic meaning in Paul. In our letter Paul has already made reference to the Holy Spirit (2.4 et. al.), the spirit of the world (2.12a), the human spirit as self-understanding (2.11a), and probably (4.21) disposition and (5.3f) the vehicle of a person's invisible presence through space. What characterizes pneuma in Pauline usage, then, is precisely its variegated employment. Paul could perhaps have written ὃ νεκρός or ὃ θεύδων instead of τὸ πνεῦμα, but by so doing he would have dissipated the contrasting chiastic effect of our verse, viz. Satan-destruction-flesh; spirit-salvation-Lord. Paul might also have felt that νεκρός was too final but θεύδων too innocuous a word with which to depict the situation of this savable great sinner. Thus it does not appear that the interpretation of pneuma in verse 5b being suggested here can be called into question on the grounds of Pauline linguistic usage.
It is a semantic axiom that 'the correct meaning of any term is that which contributes least to the total context.'\textsuperscript{78} Another advantage of this interpretation over others is that it does not necessitate any supplementary speculations about a supposed anthropological significance of the Holy Spirit (contrast e.g. Schweizer) or soteriological significance of the human spirit (contrast e.g. Hering). It understands I Corinthians 5.5b as a straightforward statement which would not have required any special reflection on the Corinthians' part in order for it to be properly understood. On this interpretation, the verse says simply: the dead person will be saved on the day of the Lord.

In conclusion, I have argued that, no matter how we understand verse 5b, 5a probably contemplates the death of the fornicator. 5b lays it down that he will also be saved at the Last Judgement.\textsuperscript{79} I have suggested that pneuma represents this person insofar as he at that time exists in or comes out of the realm of the dead. I have further suggested that because this interpretation is so simple and straightforward, and accords with Pauline linguistic usage, it seems more plausible than the other interpretations that have been offered.

I CORINTHIANS 6.17

6.17 can only be comprehended in the context of Paul's considered argument against Christian πορνεύω. The cohesiveness of 6.12-20 is unmistakable. It is generally agreed that with ποντικόν (μοι) ἐξεστιν (cf. 10.23) Paul cites a slogan current in Corinth.\textsuperscript{80} I Corinthians 6.12ff is a criticism of this Corinthian watchword on the grounds of its inapplicability to πορνεύω. In our verse Paul explains the impermissibility of the practice of πορνεύω by Christians. It is excluded because it is not beneficial (v. 12b) but deleterious (12d). The idea that what is morally good is beneficial (τὸ σωματικὸν) is Stoic.\textsuperscript{81} The absence of μοι in verse 12b inhibits us from restricting the criterion that what is morally good is beneficial only to the effects of moral decisions on the individual
Christian who makes them. On the contrary, 6.12 introduces a discussion which continues up to 11.1, and in chapters 7-10 Paul evaluates ἀμφιβολοῦμεν with regard to effects upon others (cf. 7.14; 8.1, 7ff; 10.23ff). Nevertheless, it is clear that 6.13ff focus on the situation of the individual Christian. Union with a πόρνη excludes a believer from fellowship with the Lord and, as Paul adumbrates with the paronomasia of verse 12cd, changes freedom with regard to things external (12c) into domination by something external (12d).

The connection between 6.12ff and the preceding discussion of lawsuits is not manifest. To be sure, the emphasis given to πόρνη in 6.9 (cf. 5.9f) suggests that Paul was preparing there for a return to this theme, although we would expect ἀμφιβολοῦμεν to begin a catalogue of vices by Paul in any context, since it was reckoned the most serious of all sins in Jewish tradition and usually comes first in lists of vices in his other letters (Ro 1.24; Gal 5.19; Col 3.5; cf. Eph 5.3). The rather sudden return to the theme of πόρνη in 6.12 after it had seemingly been brought to a decisive conclusion with 5.13b seems to be best explained as follows. Paul easily entered into a reproof of lawsuits between Christians brought before non-Christians because he had been giving in chapter 5 instruction as to the necessity for passing judgement against a πόρνος within the community. Paul returns to the theme of πόρνη in 6.12ff because he realizes he has not discussed it fully enough in chapter 5. He has insisted that the practice of fornication by even one of its members ruins a Christian community, but he has hitherto only discussed effects of πόρνη on the πόρνος insofar as they depend upon judgement being rendered against him by the church. 6.12ff deal with the inherently calamitous effects of πόρνη itself upon its Christian practitioner.

Renatus Kempthorne, who suggests that Paul uses 6.12ff to explain the severity of the punishment of 5.5, and so still discusses only the effect of that particular instance of immorality upon the whole church, the σώμα of Christ (6.18),
unfortunately pays no attention to verse 13, where the concept of Ὄμοιωμα is introduced into the present discussion (already in 5.3 Ὄμοιωμα means Paul's human body; cf. 7.4). In verse 13 Ὄμοιωμα is compared and contrasted with Κολλησις. Obviously the corporeal human body, not the church as the body of Christ, is meant. Paul thinks along these lines. Just as the belly is fitted for digestion, so is the body fitted for sexual activity. Although the belly can be used to digest foods without restriction, the body is not for unrestricted sexuality; it is not for πορνεία, because it unlike the belly is for the Lord. Foods are for the belly, but not πορνεία but the Lord is for the body. Given this straightforward line of reasoning in verse 13, there is no good reason why we should not quite naturally understand πορνεία in verse 18 as a sin against the individual human body which is for the Lord. In the light of 12.27 (cf. Ro 6.13) it is clear that to say that the individual body is for the Lord is to say that the embodied individual is for the Lord. In our verses, in the course of an argument against πορνεία, Paul emphasizes the corporeal body rather than the individual personality as being for the Lord; our verses are concerned with Christians' use of their bodies.

Verse 14, Ὅ ἔν Θεὸς καὶ τῶν κυριῶν Κολλησιας καὶ θυσίας ἔεξεθερεῖ 93 ὥσ τις δυσμενεψ λῦτος, which provides the contrast to 13b, Ὅ ἔν Θεὸς καὶ τῆς τροφῆς (the belly) καὶ τῶν (foods) κατ' ὅργανον, does not satisfy Paul as proof of the reciprocal relationship of Lord and body posited in 13b, because he knows that Corinthians have problems with the doctrine of a future bodily resurrection. 94 Verses 15-20 provide a better argument for these people. In the light of 9.19-23, it is axiomatic that Paul intends to argue for Christian truths as effectively as he can, to choose among possible arguments those most acceptable to his audience or readership. 95 Accordingly, Paul in verse 15a adducts proof for 13b which he considers will unlike 14 convince the Corinthians to abstain from fornication: the body is for the Lord and the Lord is for the body because
our bodies are members of Christ. Just how 15a proves 13b becomes clear in 15b-17.

Paul in verse 15 proves his assertion that the individual body is for the Lord; it is for the Lord because it is μέλος Χριστοῦ. If the idea of the church as the body of Christ (cf. 10.17; 12.12ff) functions at all in our verse it functions only in verse 15 (cf. 12.27, οὐκ εἰς θεόν οὐκ εἰς σώματα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους). The idea may not be present even in this verse which can be understood perfectly well in the light of Romans 6.12f, τινὶς ὁμοιοτροπίας ἐν τῇ θυσίᾳ οὐκ ἑαυτῷ εἰς τὸ ὑποκούειν τοῖς ἑαυτῷ ὑποτασσόμενοι, μηδὲ παρετάσσετε τῇ μέλη οὐμᾶς ἐπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ὑμνίτικι, ἀλλὰ παρετάσσετε τῷ Θεῷ οὐκ εἰς νεκρῶν ζωντινοι καὶ τῇ μέλη οὐμᾶς ἐπλα ἐπικελεούντις πρὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Comparison with Romans 6 seems more appropriate in the interpretation of our verse than dilating on the idea of the church as the body of Christ, because, as I hope to show, I Corinthians 6.15b-17 deal with the same either-or as Romans 6, and prove that fornication is out of the question for Christians because in it one becomes once again a slave to sin (cf. Ro 6.16, 19-21).

The preliminary ὅσον ὑπάρχει shows that the idea that Christians are μέλη Χριστοῦ was familiar to the Corinthians. ὅπως interrogations indicates that an affirmative response is expected. Such a mode of address was a common evincive device of the diatribe style. When Paul uses it, twice in Romans and ten times in our letter, he brings to his readers' attention an indisputable fact (Ro 6.16; 11.2; I Cor 5.6; 6.16; 9.13, 24) or a basic bit of doctrine (I Cor 6.9) which certainly formed part of his initial proclamation of Christ and instruction of Christians everywhere including Corinth. Only in a few places, here and at 3.16; 6.2f and 19, is there any possibility at all that Paul is putting across something new. However, since we have no reason to discount Luke's report of an eighteen-month sojourn by Paul in Corinth (Acts 18.11), we should conclude that Paul had indeed in all
probability previously found occasion to inform the Corinthians about their status as judges at the eschaton (6.2f) and at least about their being individually and collectively indwelt by the Holy Spirit, so that the inferences that they are temples (19a) and together a temple (3.16a) are immediate. Thus Paul's statement in verse 15a would not be strange to the Corinthians.

Why does Paul not prove the impossibility of Christian simply on the basis of the status of the Christian's body as a temple of the Spirit? Verses 19a and 20b show that a Pauline argument against Christian intercourse with prostitutes could rest upon the presence of the imparted Holy Spirit (which is from God in the individual Christian's body and the consequent defilement of that holy place would produce. The reason why Paul cannot argue in this way, why he cannot just point out that the individual Christian's body is a holy place which will therefore admit no profanation, no , lies in the fact that he has to bring his arguments home against the imposing Corinthians slogan and the Christian people behind it who do not simply presume that entails profanation and so loss of Spirit and Christ (for the close connection of Spirit and Christ, cf. 2.10-16; 6.11 with 1.2). Paul must prove this in order to make his call to holiness (vv. 18a, 20b) stick. If he is to convince Corinthians to whom is at least a real possibility if not an actual practice, it will not do for Paul simply to base his argument on an aversion to fornication nourished in Jewish tradition and/or on Christians' status as temples of the Spirit and so bearers of Christ, which status is not at issue. Paul has to prove that is actually a harmful practice for Christians. With verse 15a Paul has proven that Christian's bodies are for the Lord. Now he has to establish the incompatibility of and membership in Christ's body. He has to justify the either-or of verse 13c, }
In verses 16f Paul contrasts one who cleaves (ὁ κολλώμενος) to a prostitute with one who cleaves (ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος) to the Lord; κολλώμενος is used in both senses in the Septuagint (e.g. Sir 19.2; II Kings 18.6). With the citation of Scripture in verse 16b Paul develops an argument against Christian πορνεία adumbrated in 12d, where he declared, 'I will not be overpowered by anything.' In 19c-20a Paul concludes this line of argument with a reminder to the Corinthians that they were once slaves to sin who were bought at a price by Christ for freedom. In accordance with this line of argument verse 16d establishes that the somatic union between a Christian and a harlot is fleshly; χῶρα in verse 16 connotes domination by sin. Elsewhere in Paul sometimes functions as a synonym for σώμα (cf. II Cor. 4.10f), but it never does so when it is contrasted, as it is here, with the divine pneuma. χῶρα has already been given a negative connotation in our letter: in contrast to pneuma in 3.1-3 and, in the context of punishment of a πορνευόμενος, probably also in 5.5. If, as Jean Hering suggests, Paul has in mind here Christian intercourse with prostitutes associated with pagan temples, this in the light of 10.8-10, 20 would provide further support for the interpretation of verse 16b being suggested here. Paul would in this case point to the ascendancy of demonic powers over Christians that follows from carnal contact with their servants, temple prostitutes. Even if demonic powers do not come into Paul's purview, he at any rate proves in 6.16f that πορνεύω must be shunned by Christians because one who cleaves to a prostitute is under the domain of the flesh, but one who cleaves to the Lord is under the domain of the Spirit.

If we allow χῶρα this negative connotation in contrast to pneuma in verse 16b, Paul creates no problems for himself when he proceeds to condone Christian marriage in chapter 7. In this chapter Paul teaches (1) that Christians can enter into marriage to avoid fornication, and (2) that no Christian should initiate the termination of a marriage, because marriage is like slavery an institution of this world (cf. Mk 12.25 par.)
and rather than caring about our own situation in the world, we should serve Christ and others (cf. 7.17-24, 29-31; I Th 4.11). The idea expressed in 7.14, which affords marriage a positive value in that it children and unbelieving spouses are sanctified, should be brought into the scope of the second reason; obviously Paul would have neither desired nor expected this particular accession to the institution to be used as an incentive for Christians to wed pagans. Now Paul does not in chapter 7 conveniently pass over his usual understanding of marriage as based upon the divine ordinance of Genesis 2.24 because he has in chapter 6 just referred that verse to τὸν αὐτὸν. On the contrary, there is no evidence that Paul understood Genesis 2.24 as ordaining marriage. The rabbinic interpretation of Genesis 2.24 as a halakha for marriage was late and perhaps post-Pauline. The rabbis usually explained γαῖας δοξάσας καὶ εἰρήνην (ἡμῖν Ἰουδαίοι) ἵνα as a prohibition of human intercourse with beasts. If Paul also understood the verse in this way, he could have freely applied it to prostitution as an instance of sexual intercourse between human beings. Furthermore, it is very possible that Genesis 2.24 itself would have contained already for Paul the association of σάρκις with sin if the apostle held that the Fall antedated a sexual relationship between Adam and Eve. At any rate, Paul is free to apply Genesis 2.24 to prostitution because the verse for him (unlike us) has no fixed positive significance except perhaps the rather insignificant one of prohibiting intercourse with beasts. Indeed, it is only because he does not accept the institution of marriage on the basis of Genesis 2.24 that Paul is able with that verse to prove in I Corinthians 6.16 that ἡμεῖς is impossible for Christians without at the same time sacrificing the allowability and indissolubility (except if a pagan partner separates) of Christian marriage.

Paul does not intend to emphasize the fleshly or even sexual nature of our close connection with Christ in 6.17. If this was his intention, it is inexplicable why he should
write pneuma and not σώμα or γῆς. In verses 16 and 17 the Christian's relationship with Christ is contrasted with not compared to a fornicator's relationship with a harlot. In verses 12-18 Paul's argument progresses in a series of antithetical statements. He does not write ἐν σώμα or μια γῆς in verse 17 because 17 is antithetical to 16b (the σε in 17 is adversative as in 13c). 112

A number of scholars understand ἐν πνεύμα in verse 17 as 'one personality' 113 (cf. Gal 2.20). This would accord with the Jewish understanding of μια γῆς as a union of personalities. 114 In the opinion of the present writer, γῆς and pneuma in 6.16f are on the contrary impersonal spheres of power. It is not for Paul somatic union with the prostitute as a human person which severs a Christian from union with Christ. It is somatic union with the prostitute insofar as the prostitute is fleshly and under the domination of sin. 115 Like γῆς in 6.16, pneuma is not a personal term in 6.17. It is the power by means of which one is in communion with Christ. A Christian is ἐν πνεύμα with the Lord because he or she participates in the Spirit wherein Jesus can be found or rather comes to one. The flesh-Spirit contrast in Paul is a contrast of powers not persons.

We may compare 7.14, where it appears that just as fornication with a prostitute brings a Christian under the hegemony of sin (6.16), so does marriage to a Christian bring a pagan under the influence of the sanctifying Spirit (cf. 6.11). It seems patent that in this latter case it is not the fact that the pagan is one personality with the faithful spouse that effects his or her sanctification, but the fact that he or she is ἐν the spouse ἐν πνεύμα with the Lord. It is doubtful that Paul would consider a pagan to be one personality with the Lord. The pagan mate in 7.14 is rather sanctified ἐν the Christian because the Christian participates in the sphere of power of the Spirit. We should understand the Christian fornicator similarly as entering under the dominion of sin ἐν the prostitute who participates in the power of sin.
Pneuma in 6.17 means the Holy Spirit. The phrase ἐν πνεύματι in 6.17 refers to the fact that the Christian participates in the Spirit wherein the Lord is. We cannot assume that the Christian cleaves to the Lord's Holy Spirit with his or her human spirit. We should conclude rather in the light of the context (cf. v. 13c, τῷ θεῷ σώμα...τῷ κυρίῳ, 15) that it is the σώμα that cleaves to the Lord. Thus verse 17 expresses that one who cleaves to the Lord with one's σώμα is in the same Spirit of power as the Lord. Verse 16 has shown that one who cleaves to a harlot with one's σώμα has come again (v. 15b) under the sway of the sinful flesh. It is with this powerful argument that speaks to the beliefs of his readers that Paul hopes to prove to them that fornication is in fact out of the question for Christians. II Corinthians 12.21, εἰκόνισεν δὲ τοὺς Χριστούς τῶν προσωπικῶν καὶ τὰς μετανοήσεις εἰς τὴν...πορεύεται, might suggest he failed after all to convince them of this.

I CORINTHIANS 7.34

The text of this verse is in some disorder. The consensus of recent commentators and translators is to put a full-stop after μετανοήσεις and to read with p 15 B P vg, καὶ τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι. The consensus of recent commentators and translators is also to read with Χ B Clem Alex pauc., καὶ τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι. G. Zuntz has argued that this reading 'is bad from every point of view. It is overlong and rhythmically clumsy; the twofold καὶ gives undue weight to the plain phrase "in body and soul", and the evidence for this reading is small and narrowly confined.' He prefers the reading of p 46 A P, τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι, because its attestation is slightly earlier than that of p 15 F G plerique, καὶ σώματι καὶ πνεύματι.

Consequently the form attested by p 46 and its allies is original. Its first alteration was the addition of καὶ as attested by Χ B and Clement. Its clumsiness led to the deletion of the articles which is characteristic of the later text.
This is a reasonable argument, and we may assume that the most probable original text of 7.34bc is, ἡ ἑτέρῳ ἢ ἅρμανος καὶ ἡ ἔφη θέων ἐκείνῃ τῇ τοῦ κυρίου, ἢ ἢ πῶς σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι.

A. T. Robertson considers that the sense of ἢ χρῆ in our sentence is 'sub-final', that is, it gives the 'purport' rather than the purpose of the preceding statement, and the RSV rendering, 'how to be holy in body and spirit' (so also Moffatt), concurs with his view. On this reading of ἢ χρῆ, which makes it equivalent to ἕτερῳ in 7.32, 33 and 34, our sentence simply lays it down that the unmarried woman and virgin who is anxious about the things of the Lord is ipso facto holy both in body and spirit. The NEB, on the other hand, takes ἢ χρῆ here as final: 'her aim is to be dedicated to him in body as in spirit.' The NEB thereby places the weight of the ἢ χρῆ-clause onto σῶμα and not pneuma. For if ἢ χρῆ is final and pneuma here means the imparted Holy Spirit, then the weight of the ἢ χρῆ-clause certainly cannot rest on pneuma, because Paul holds that the gift of the Holy Spirit precedes and brings about a person's devotion to the things of the Lord (cf. 6.11). If pneuma here means the human spirit as the power or seat of thought, volition and disposition, pneuma cannot bear the weight of a final ἢ χρῆ-clause, because the holiness of the human spirit is not caused by the woman's devotion to the things of the Lord so much as it consists in this devotion. The holiness of the woman's body, however, might be said to depend on the woman's devotion to the Lord, in that she would not in this case turn her attention to marriage and sex; thus she would keep her physical body undefiled (for this sense of ἅρμανος in Paul, cf. 3.17). Thus if ἢ χρῆ is final in verse 34, the emphasis in the ἢ χρῆ-clause rests on the holiness of the unmarried woman's or virgin's body, as in the NEB rendering. But can it have been Paul's intention to emphasize this?

It is impossible for several reasons to maintain that Paul would have represented the holiness of the unmarried
woman's or virgin's body as the 'aim' of her devotion to the Lord and, moreover, stressed this. 6.19 (in the light of 3.17) and 7.14 suggest that Paul considers every Christian's body and even married Christians' bodies 'holy'. In addition, the positioning of σῶμα in verse 34 must be unemphatic; Paul nowhere in chapter 7 indicates any regard for bodily holiness as an end; it is for him simply a means by which one's devotion to the Lord is enhanced (and verse 29c, ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ἀναβαθμός, suggests that the unmarried person's devotion to the Lord is not necessarily superior to the married person's). Paul's interest in verses 32-34 is manifestly in the purity of Christians' volition rather than the status of their physical bodies with respect to marriage and sex. The married woman has a handicap as a Christian not because she has a body defiled by sex but because she has a will which tends to attend to the requirements of her husband and thus is not entirely consecrated to the Lord. The unmarried woman has an advantage compared with the married woman not because she is holy in body but because she is exclusively concerned about the things of the Lord.

Pneuma is in a more emphatic position than σῶμα in our verse. This indicates that, although the holiness of the unmarried woman's body is not of importance to Paul, the holiness of her pneuma does matter to him. Since Paul in our verse contrasts the unmarried with the married woman, pneuma cannot mean the Holy Spirit, which the married woman has just as well as the unmarried; pneuma here must mean the human spirit as the power or seat of thought and volition, which in the unmarried woman can be fully consecrated to the Lord. Paul's usual term for this is Κυρίστη (cf. v. 37; Ro 1.21, 24 et. al.). The collocation with σῶμα perhaps influenced him to use pneuma here as equivalent to Κυρίστη. This collocation is almost a contrast (like 5.3), since purity of body in abstinence from marriage in itself matters not a whit to Paul, but purity of spirit is everything (cf. vv. 29c, 35). The idea that the body of unmarried abstainers from sex was
holy seems to have been current and influential in Corinth; Paul sets above it and therefore to some extent over against it the necessity that the human spirit in its thinking and willing be consecrated to the Lord. 122

I CORINTHIANS 12.10; 14.12, 32

The theme of our chapter is Paul's highly but not entirely critical evaluation of the phenomenon of glossolalia, an evaluation he undertakes with constant reference to the superior gift of prophecy. The apostle seems to have entered into this discussion in response to a Corinthian inquiry (cf. 7.1) peri twv pneumatikon (12.1). It is not important for our purposes to decide whether the Corinthians asked him specifically about spiritual people (cf. 14.37) or spiritual things (cf. 14.1), since he goes on to discuss both. Paul's discussion concerns spiritual things in that it elucidates the diversity (12.4ff), the shared basic value (12.4-27; 13.1-3, 8-11) and the usefulness (14.1ff) of manifestations of the Spirit. Paul reckons pneumatikov anything that 'builds up' (12.7; 14.26) the gifted individual (14.4a), or preferably, also other Christians (14.17b), the whole church (14.4b, 12) and even outsiders (14.24f). Paul's discussion also concerns spiritual people, immediately in 12.2f which identify such people, and subsequently in that the apostle stresses the basic (12.7ff) and relative (12.28-30; 14.1ff) value and proper (loving) motivation and relationship (ch. 13)123 of persons in the Christian community. Paul considers all baptized (v. 13), believing (v. 3, perhaps also 9)124 Christians to be pneumatikoi. For him pneumatikoi are not defined with respect to any one charism or certain charismata but with respect to evidenced fruits of the Spirit (12.3; Gal 5.22; 6.1; cf. Ig Eph 8.2).125 It is probable that the Corinthians had a more restricted understanding of pneumatikoi/pneumatikoi than Paul, for 'the length, the complexity, and the singleness of purpose of Paul's argument in I Cor 12-14 indicate that he was attempting to persuade those who held a view contrary to his own.'126 Paul
expressly presents his whole discussion as authoritative for the Corinthians (14.37).

Chapter 14 deals with the use of gifts by the gifted. Prophecy and glossolalia dominate the discussion. Paul's main point is that prophecy is a superior gift to glossolalia. The content of chapter 14 has been anticipated in chapter 12, where verses 1-3 concern only gifts of inspired speaking. Paul's special interest in prophecy and glossolalia (and their attendant gifts) is also already evident when in a list of gifts he bunches them at the end together (12.10), while his assertion of the superiority of prophecy to glossolalia emerges first in 12.28. The centrality of glossolalia and prophecy in our chapters undoubtedly reflects the Corinthian situation. Given Paul's coupling of them in 12.10 and 13.1f, his prolix differentiation of them in chapter 14, and the exclusive concern of 12.1-3, we might surmise that the Corinthians very probably associated prophecy and glossolalia together, and considered such inspired speaking the πνευματικού par excellence of the πνευματικοί. Elsewhere in early Christian literature prophecy and glossolalia are not differentiated (Acts 2.11, 17; 10.46; 19.6; Iren Adv haer 1.13.3; 3.12.1, 15; Orig Cels 7.9). Over against the Corinthians' delimitation of spiritual things and people, Paul affirms a wide variety of spiritual gifts (12.3-10, 28ff) and those thus gifted (12.12-27), and draws particular attention to another gift of inspired speech: teaching (12.8, 28ff; 14.6b, 19, 26; cf. 2.13); he distinguishes prophecy from glossolalia and maintains the superiority of the former (12.28ff; 14.1-25); he emphasizes that both utterances must be controlled by the exercise of another particular gift, prophecy by διάκρισις; glossolalia by ἐκποίησις (12.10; 14.5-17, 27-30).

From 14.6, 24f and 30 we may conclude that prophecy in Paul's view is essentially the disclosure of something not hitherto known. Paul does not expect prophecy to be co-extensive with the community (12.29, οὐ τοὺς προφητείς). 14.5 expresses a mere wish, not at all an expectation (cf.
7.7); 14.23f depicts an ideal scene. In 14.31 the first πάντες applies only to prophets, the second and third to the community; they are differentiated by the change from the second to the third person. It is certain, however, that any and indeed all members of a community can and should strive to prophesy (12.31b; 14.1, 5, 39). They might be granted this gift in answer to prayer (cf. 14.13).

From 14.27a, ἐνετεύχθην τὰς λόγους λέξει, we may assume that some Christian communities might not experience the gift of tongues (it is not mentioned in Ro 12.6-8). What Paul understands by speaking χαλασσάς has been variously estimated. In our context χαλασσή can refer to the physical organ of speech, an extraordinary vocable or a language. In the first case speaking χαλασσή would be speaking only with the tongue, speaking in which the mind plays no part (cf. 14.14-19).

This interpretation is certainly wrong, because 14.5a represents one person as speaking in tongues, whereas he would presumably possess only one tongue, and the contrast between verse 9, διὰ τὰς χαλασσάς and verse 19, ἐν χαλασσή (and perhaps also 39, where ἐν is read by p 46 B D* G) indicates that χαλασσά should be translated 'in tongues'.

The use of χαλασσή to denote an archaic or unusual word may well be related to our passage, but it cannot suffice as an explanation of it for two reasons: (1) χαλασσή in this sense, rather uncommon anyway, is apparently unparalleled in early Christian and the contemporary Jewish literature, whereas it often means language; (2) that language is its meaning here is suggested by the fact that there are χάριτος, 'kinds', 'classes' of tongues (12.10, 28; cf. 14.10).

It has been maintained that foreign human languages are in view here because this is the sense of ἑτεροχαλασσός in Isaiah 28.11 cited in 14.21. However, we cannot assume that Paul uses this Scripture with much regard for its original context (cf. 9.9; 10.4). Contextual exegesis discloses compelling reasons for identifying the phenomenon of speaking in
tongues in our letter as the speaking of heavenly languages.
14.10f form with verses 7-9 part of a series of analogies, viz.
uncomprehended notes, sounds, human languages, leading up to
the exhortation of verse 12. That the phenomenon of 14.10f,
human language, is not the same as the Corinthian phenomenon
under discussion is clear not only from the fact that a comparis-
on is made, but also from the form the comparison takes, in
that Paul employs a different term, φωνή, for human language.
In addition, ἐν νοομοί (v. 10; cf. 1.20, 27 et. al.) may sug-
gest that here merely earthly languages are being compared
with heavenly ones. This is confirmed by the fact that Paul
presents λαλεῖν χλωσίς as λαλεῖν Ἐα (v. 2) in προσώχη (vv.
14f), ἐνολοθύ (16) and ἑορκροτή (17), for the essence of
heavenly speech is precisely worship of God according to con-
temporary Jewish and Christian writings which sometimes dis-
tinguish different kinds of heavenly languages (cf. χρίνη
χλωσίς) according to what level and what side of heaven the
angelic worshippers occupy (cf. Asc Isa 7.3-10.19; Test L
3.6-8; Test Jud 25.3a; Test Job 48-50; I Enoch 40; Apoc Abr
17; Rev 14.2f; b BB 134a = M Sukk 28a; Tert De anima 9).
13.1 142 and II Corinthians 12.4 143 indicate Paul's familiarity
with the conception of heavenly languages. 144

Paul approves of the practice of speaking in tongues
with qualifications. He values it as a means of communion
with God (14.2, 14-17, 28b) and, if followed up by εὐθυγγεῖ, a source of edification for others (14.5b, 27). He prohi-
bits its public appearance without interpretation as unedi-
fying for believers (14.2, 6-11, 13-19, 28) and harmful for
unbelievers (14.21-23).

Pneuma first occurs in our chapters (12-14) in 12.2f. It is important for us to consider these verses carefully as they appear to constitute a foundation of some sort for the ensuing discussion. ΠΕΡῚ ΤῊΝ Τυμματωκών. 145 In verse 2 nei-
ther οἶν nor οἴς ought to be omitted; their original conjunc-
tion best explains the variant readings retaining either one
of them alone. ὙΣ should be translated 'how'. 146 ἩῊῊ should
be understood as iterative, expressing repetition in past time, 'ever', and thus corresponding to the intermittent nature of pagan spiritual inspiration. Paul declares: 'you know that when you were Gentiles you were carried away to the dumb idols, however often you were moved.' They were carried away as captives; captivity is suggested by ἀπολαύεσθαι (cf. Mark 14.14 etc.). Thus Paul asserts in 12.2 that when these erstwhile Gentiles worshipped at pagan altars they were captives under the sway of certain powers; in the light of 10.20: demonic powers (cf. Eph 2.2; Athenag Suppl 26).

The main interest of scholars in verse 3 has centered on the problem as to whether Jesus was really cursed in Corinth and by whom. Amongst scholars who believe he was cursed in Corinth six different conceptions of who cursed him have been put forth.

(1) Oscar Cullmann avers that weak Christians were compelled to curse Christ by Roman persecutors (cf. Pliny Epp 10.96; Martyr Poly 8.2). This suggestion has met with universal disapproval as there is not notice of state persecution elsewhere in our letter, and the context (11.2-14.40) of 12.3 indicates that Jesus was cursed in Christian worship.

(2) 'Jesus is accursed' has been envisioned as the cry of one overpowered by inspiration. E.-B. Allo refers us to the Sibyls (3.1-7, 296; 5.52) and Cassandra (Virg Aen 6.77-102; Aesch Ag 1072-1086). Our letter offers no evidence that Corinthian ἤλθοντες considered themselves burdened with the Spirit -- quite the contrary (4.8). This interpretation does not commend itself.

(3) Many scholars relate our verses to Jewish imprecations of Jesus (cf. Acts 26.11; Just Dial 16f, 108, 117). It is in itself conceivable that Jews could have cursed Jesus within the Christian ἔνδοξοι (cf. 14.24) or that Christians may have heard this cry in the synagogue, since some Corinthian Christians were origiinally Jews, and may have retained relations with the synagogue, but one cannot allow that they would have confused this Jewish curse with the pneumatic Christian speech
with which our verse is obviously concerned. J. Duncan M. Derrett has maintained recently that the curse was voiced by a Jewish Christian prophet being pressed to maintain his membership in the synagogue. Against this interpretation we may ask: would not the other Christians assume he had just lost the inspiring \( \text{πνεύμα κόσμου} \)? why does Paul have to 'insist' that this blasphemy comes not thence? That this renunciation of Jesus is a problem for Corinthian Christians is conceivable in Derrett's terms only if we assume (a) that the curse was uttered in ecstasy and Corinthians associated ecstasy per se with divine inspiration and/or (b) that Corinthians thought that the \( \text{πνευματικός} \) possessed the prophetic pneuma without acknowledging any possibility of its loss. 12.2-3a might favor the former assumption and 10.1ff the latter. Derrett's reconstruction, then, can be made plausible. Acts 18.12-17 certainly reflect historical tension between Jewish and Christian communities in Corinth. Uncertainty inheres in his interpretation, however, since we have absolutely no confirmatory indication that Jews actually persecuted Christians there after Paul left. If persecution did continue it is unlikely Paul would have been silent about it in our letter (cf. I Th 2.14-16).

(4) Walther Schmithals has argued that gnostics who distinguished between the man Jesus and the heavenly Christ cursed the former. He points out that in this case one can understand why Corinthians asked Paul about this, since not only were the gnostic \( \text{πνευματικός} \) gifted ecstatics, but they were avowedly Christian, since they could continue to confess Christ as Lord. He finds a parallel to this in the imprecations of the Ophites against Jesus (Orig Cels 6.28; fr. 47, 'Origen on I Corinthians'). Birger A. Pearson, however, has cast considerable doubt upon the veracity of Origen's report: it is unparalleled in gnostic and patristic literature, and it can be explained as a misunderstanding based on gnostic identifications of Christ with the venerated cursed serpent of Genesis.

(5) 'Jesus is accursed' has been explained as the consequence of sheer unbridled and extolled spiritual enthusiasm.
Robin Scroggs sees the Corinthian cursing as part of a widespread 'excessive and abusive use of the Spirit' within primitive Christianity, opposed by Matthew and the Didache as well as by Paul. He does not explain why enthusiasts cursed Jesus save that this expressed their limitless pride. Adolf Schlatter suggests that 'ihr Enthusiasmus habe ihr waches Bewusstsein so stark gehemmt, dass aus ihrem Unterbewusstsein unwillkürlich der alte jüdische Fluch wider hervorgekommen sei', but this is sheer speculation.

(6) W. C. van Unnik compares Romans 9.3 and Galatians 3.13 (where ἐκτός is used as equivalent to κωτός on account of the OT quotation) and concludes that Corinthians have misappropriated Paul's understanding of 'Jesus is accursed'. The impression is given that this is the 'last word' that can be said about Jesus, which implies 'his annihilation and separation from God' and implicitly denies his resurrection (cf. I Cor 15, particularly v. 12). Paul would have them add the necessary accompaniment, ἐκτός Ἰησοῦς, which confesses belief in the salvific resurrection of Jesus (cf. Ro 10.6-10). Van Unnik's interpretation accords with Paul's earlier emphasis on the crucified one as the power and wisdom of God (1.24), the Lord of glory (2.8).

Van Unnik's interpretation of the curse commends itself in that it ties in with the major concerns of our letter. It is no longer necessary to suppose that 'Jesus is accursed' is just a jarring counterpoise to the Christian confession of faith. Nor need one postulate that it was Paul's dark hint that unintelligible glossolalia could contain curses against Jesus, since Paul nowhere else implies that anything is wrong with uninterpreted glossolalia as such other than its irrelevance in church and damning effect on outsiders -- on the contrary (14.2)! In our verse Paul condemns inspired Corinthian speaking precisely with regard to its content not form. ἀλλων (12.3) applies to prophecy (14.3, 29) as well as to tongues. Verse 3a is not contrasted but compared with 2 (διό, cf. 14.13). οὐδὲς ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἁλλον λέγει.
there is inspired speaking in this case but it is not inspired by Πνεύμα Χριστού. The Corinthian Πνευματίκοι have been moved by a demonic spirit in their unsupplemented utterance: 'Ανόητος.

Paul's purpose in verse 3 is clearly not to give his readers a standard for Κύριος Πνευμάτων, so that the inspiring pneuma could be questioned concerning Jesus and reveal its demonic or divine provenance. The Corinthians presumably already know how to διακρίνειν Πνεύματα (1.7; 12.10; 14.29). Of course we may infer from verse 3 that Paul thinks inspired speech should be evaluated according to how the content of the message relates to Jesus (cf. 8.5f; 12.4f). In verse 3 considered in its original context, however, we find that Paul is simply and trenchantly telling the Corinthians (οὐ αἰτήσασθε) that the cry 'Jesus is accursed' is demonic. Philipp Bachmann also correctly concludes that our verse offers no test for the διακρίνειν Πνευμάτων. He notes the significant difference in phraseology between 3a and b.

Sollte jedoch damit Pl wirklich angegeben haben, woran man falshe und rechte Begeisterung unterscheiden könne? Für diesen Zweck müsste doch Subjekt und Prädikat jeweilig vertauscht sein: Niemand, der Jesus verflucht, ist und jeder, der Jesus einen Herrn nennt, muss für einen Pneumatischer gehalten werden. Verses 3a and b are not strictly parallel. The substitution of ἔπαιζε in 3b for λαλεῖ in verse 3a is telling in this respect. In our letter λαλεῖ -- a word rarely used by Paul save in II Corinthians -- refers exclusively to inspired speech (2.6f, 11; 3.1; 9.8; 12.30; 13.1; 14.2-6, 18f, 27-29, 40; cf. II Cor 2.17; 4.13; 7.14; 12.4, 19; 13.3) or speech being compared with inspired speech (13.11; 14.9, 11f; cf. II Cor 11.17, 24), whereas ἔπαιζε -- uncommon elsewhere in Paul -- is used of speech which is not specially inspired (1.15; 12.15f, 21, and as part of Paul's diatribe style, 10.28; 11.22; 15.35) or not the speech of Christians (11.24; 14.23; 15.27, 35). Λαλεῖν in verse 3a shows that the statement,
is self-evidently inspired, whereas in 3b Paul declares the statement inspired on the basis of the content of what is said (ἵππεις ἐξατάτε ἑιπεῖν ... εἰ μό). In 12.2-3, therefore, Paul not only declares that the speech of a Christian πνευματικός is and can be inspired by a demonic spirit; he also says that the simple confession of every believer, 'Jesus is Lord', establishes that he or she is a bona fide πνευματικός.

The influences of πνεῦμα ἡμών are not the only spiritual influences at work in the Corinthian community, according to Paul. This is clear not only from 12.2f but also from the fact that he acknowledges (12.10) and urges (14.29) the exercise of the spiritual gift of διακρίνειν πνευματικόν. Διακρίνειν bears several divergent meanings, as its cognate διακρίνειν has different senses, and, indeed, even in our letter (4.7; 6.5; 11.29, 31; cf. Ro 4.20 and 14.23; Jas 1.6 and 2.4; Jude 9 and 22). Because Paul has indicated that differentiations exist with regard to the whence of inspiration in 12.2f and 2.12, διακρίνειν in 12.10 should be understood as 'distinguishing, discerning' (cf. 4.7) rather than interpreting, explaining'. 171 14.29, where the others must mean 'the other prophets' (cf. ἄλλον, v. 30) on account of the article, which is 'retrospective... defined by προφητεύειν', shows that only prophets exercise this gift of discernment. Although this discernment is carried out by prophets as subjects, it is not necessarily to be restricted to prophecy as its object (cf. I Th 5.21). 174

Pneumata in 12.10 in the light of 12.2f and 2.12 must mean inspiring pneuma of either a divine or a demonic nature. In 12.4-11, 13 Paul maintains that Corinthian Christians have all received τὸ κύρος πνεῦμα. 12.10 envisages a plurality of pneuma. This verse does not counter the contextual emphasis on the unity of the Holy Spirit if we allow that in 12.10 Paul recognizes a spirit or spirits (cf. II Cor 12.7) of inspiration in opposition to the Holy Spirit. Paul also affirms a plurality of pneuma in 14.12, ἐπεὶ ἐναπετεί ἐστε πνευματικα. Some sense
that Paul here reproduces a catchy Corinthian self-designation, and it may be that in so doing he is being ironic and even critical, so that we cannot certainly attribute to him the conception of a plurality of good spirits to be sought after on the basis of this verse. In 14.32, once more, a plurality of pneumata is affirmed. 14.32 is an improbable Corinthian watchword, but it could be an ironical statement of Paul's. Paul bases his command, καὶ πνεῦματα προφητῶν προκάθισεν ὑποτεθεται, on the fact that God is not a God of ἀντανάκλασις..., ἡλλὰ εἰρήνης (v. 33a). Divine pneuma ensures order and peace in the Christian community. Paul may be implying here that when this order and peace do not exist, as in Corinth, another pneuma is at work; when two prophets speak at once, one of them speaks under inspiration which is not of the Holy Spirit. Thus it is possible to interpret the use of the plural 'spirits' in 12.10; 14.12 and 32 as alike indicating that Paul countenances the inspirational activity in Corinth of a spirit or spirits contrary to the Spirit of God.

Many commentators consider pneumata in 14.12 as simply equivalent to πνεῦματικός, which is in fact a poorly attested variant reading (P syr P cop sa). John Calvin comments: 'Paul uses the word "spirits" by metonymy here for "spiritual gifts". '178 'Spirits' in 14.32 is similarly explained as meaning 'inspirations'.179 In this way the plural in these verses is taken as 'a reference to the multiplicity of workings' of the one Spirit.180 It is sometimes claimed in support of this interpretation that Paul also uses χάρις and χαρίσμα interchangeably,181 but he does not appear ever to apply χαρίς to a particular gift bestowed upon a believer to be used. Paul shows clearly in 12.4 that he recognizes only a single unitary divine pneuma. He could have used πνεῦματικός instead of pneumata in these verses if this is what he meant. This solution of the problem of the plural pneumata in 14.12 and 32 cannot be considered satisfactory.

Otto Everling182 and E. Earle Ellis183 identify the
pneumata of 14.12 and 32 as angelic agents of inspiration in accordance with Jewish and Christian (e.g. Rev 22.6; Heb 1.7, 14; Barn 18.1) parallels. Paul, however, attributes inspiration to the Lord Jesus Christ (I Th 4.15; I Cor 7.10; 9.14; cf. 12.41); he nowhere else acknowledges the prophetic mediation of angels. Although good angels previously mediated between God and mankind (Gal 3.19), Paul only sees fallen angels at work in a world with believers in Jesus Christ (II Cor 11.14; 12.7); the mention of a manifestation of a good angel in Galatia (1.8) is a rhetorical impossibility. For Paul the good angels worship God in the heavens (II Cor 12.4; I Cor 11.10 may represent Christians as worshipping along with heavenly angels; cf. Ps 137.1 LXX). 184 They no longer come down from there to minister here below, for now the Spirit of Christ is acrive among men and women. The identification of the pneumata of 14.12 and 32 as good inspirational angels may therefore be set aside as being foreign to Paul's thought. This may have been a Corinthian conception, but Paul would not have accepted it.

Martin Dibelius holds that in 14.12 and 32 primitive conceptions of particular and separate spirits inspiring individuals reassert themselves due to that fact that 'der göttliche Geist ausserte sich auf so mannigfache Art, dass jede von diesen Wirkungen wider ein besonders pneum zum Urheber zu haben schien. Dass man in Wahrheit anders dachte, beweisen die Worte des Paulus von den vielerei Gaben und dem einem Geiste.' 185 Against this we may note only that the Corinthians were apparently only impressed by a couple of forms of inspiration, but, more importantly, that Paul writing to them is not overpowered by the manifestations of divine inspiration; he writes 'in Wahrheit', and he has just urged its unitary nature (12.4, 13). He would not be likely simply to revert back to a primitive conceptualization of inspiration in 14.12 and 32, even if this was the conceptualization of his readers.

Pneumata in 14.32 is explained in two other ways. It is
assumed that Paul wird von Geistern in der Mehrzahl reden... weil der Geist, indem er sich mit dem Propheten so vereinigt, dass er in ihm spricht, zum Geist des Propheten wird und die Begrenzheit und die Besonderheit seines Trägers bekommt. Others assume that the imparted Holy Spirit merges with the human spirits of the prophets so as to become a particular distinct pneuma in each of them. Both these interpretations conflict with the emphatic statement in 12.4, and neither can be shown to be Pauline.

The best interpretation of the plural pneumata in 14.12 and 32 is therefore that which associates it with the same plural in 12.10 and with 12.2f, a statement foundational to the discussion in chapter 14, and sees in it a reference to the two different external agencies of human inspiration, the Holy Spirit and a demonic spirit (cf. 2.12) or spirits. Paul would have his readers beware lest their inspired speech be not inspired by the Spirit of God.

I CORINTHIANS 14.2, 14-16

In 14.2 Paul starts to explain why the gift of prophecy is superior to that of speaking in tongues. The clause in 14.2 may be taken in more than one way. If is concessive, the sense of 14.2b will be, 'for no one understands, even though he or she speaks divine truths (μυστηρία). In this case the meaning of μυστηρία must accord with its use in 13.2, and pneumat on the basis of the grammatical structure of the clause can refer either to the imparted Holy Spirit or to the person's human spirit under its influence. Alternatively, may be explicative of ωδες γὰρ λέγωμεν, 'for no one understands, since pneumat he or she speaks μυστηρία. In this case μυστηρία might mean 'riddles', 'unintelligible, baffling, enigmatic statements'. No one understands these riddles. Here pneumat might mean either the Holy Spirit or the human spirit. However, if we take as explicative and wish
to understand \(\text{πνευμάτων}\) in accordance with 13.2 (and 4.1) as 'divine truths' rather than 'riddles', we cannot understand \(\text{πνευμάτων}\) as the imparted Holy Spirit, since the statement, 'but by the Holy Spirit he or she speaks divine truths', would not explain why no one understands them, as Christians can understand divine truths spoken by the Holy Spirit, and it cannot be assumed that verses 2f concern only non-Christians. Therefore, if \(\text{ὁς}\) is explanatory and \(\text{πνευμάτων}\) means 'divine truths', \(\text{πνευμάτων}\) must represent the glossolalic's private human spirit. Because uninterpreted glossolalia is a matter of the glossolalic's self-understanding (cf. \(\text{πνεῦμα}\) in 2.11a), because the public glossolalic in the absence of an interpreter only \(\text{ἐκ τοῦ \ οἴκου Χριστοῦ} (14.4a)\), no one else understands him or her. The various grammatical arrangements of the \(\text{ὅς}\)-clause in 14.2 are then somewhat more patient of the interpretation of \(\text{πνεῦμα}\) as a reference to the glossolalic's human spirit than they are of the alternative interpretation of \(\text{πνεῦμα}\) as a reference to the imparted Holy Spirit.

In support of the view that \(\text{πνεῦμα}\) in 14.2 means the Holy Spirit (so Moffatt, RSV) reference might be made to 12.3, \(\text{ἐν \ πνεῦματι \ ἐκεῖνον \ λαλῶν}\), whereas those who hold that the human spirit is or may be intended here refer to 14.14-16. The latter comparison lies nearer at hand, since the context of 14.14-16 is identical to that of 14.2; in 14.2-19 Paul concerns himself with the problem of the unintelligibility of uninterpreted glossolalia. Furthermore, in 12.3 inspired speaking is said to be \(\text{ἐν \ πνεῦματι}\), whereas in 14.2 and 14.14-16 it is simply \(\text{τῷ} \ \text{πνεῦμα}.\)

A few scholars maintain that \(\text{πνεῦμα}\) in 14.14-16 (and sometimes 14.2 as well) means 'spiritual gift', but the apostle who stated at the start of his discussion \(\text{περὶ τῶν πνευμάτων}: \ \text{ἐνοπλείσεις} \ \text{ἐν \ Χριστῷ \ εἰσίν}, \ \text{τὸ} \ \text{κύριο} \ \text{πνεῦμα} (12.4)\), would be unlikely to use the word \(\text{πνεῦμα}\) as equivalent to 'spiritual gift'. 'My \(\text{πνεῦμα}\) in 14.16 also tells against this interpretation, as it would seem from what
Paul writes in our chapters that glossolalia was not a gift possessed with any degree of permanency by a recognizable circle of Christians or by any Christian individual, so that someone could call it 'my spiritual gift'. Pneuma in our verses can therefore only refer to the imparted Holy Spirit or to the Christian's human spirit which is under the influence of the Holy Spirit when he or she speaks in tongues.

According to Johannes Weiss, pneuma in 14.14-16 cannot mean τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἁγίου (2.11) as this pneuma is indistinguishable from the human νοῦς. This argument is fallacious. In 2.10ff pneuma is not equivalent to νοῦς. In 2.10ff it is clear that the Christian who has the νοῦς χριστίου (v. 16) knows τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ (verse 10), that is, as Romans 11.33f show, τὸ κεφάλαιον ἄνωτερ Χριστοῦ · · · ἐν θεῷ ἄνωτε: the Christian who has the mind of Christ knows that God offers human-kind salvation in him (I Cor 2.7-9). The expression 'but we have the mind of Christ' (2.16) may be unpacked in the light of its preceding verses as follows: 'but we Christians have as conscious thoughts the deep things of God that relate to salvation in Christ.' This νοῦς as a constellation of conscious thoughts is the μυστήριον (2.7) Christians speak (2.6f, 13). Νοῦς in Pauline usage means essentially 'conscious thinking' or 'reasoning consciousness' (cf. Ro 1.28; 7.23, 25; 12.2; 14.5; Phil 4.7; Col 2.18; II Th 2.2). It is by no means self-evident that pneuma in I Corinthians 14.14-16 understood as human spirit must or should have the same meaning.

If pneuma in these verses means human self-understanding, as it does in 2.11 and as we have already noted that it might in 14.2, our verses make eminently good sense. Paul in 14.14 states: 'if I pray in a tongue, my self-understanding prays, but my rational consciousness is unfruitful.' This may mean, if we give ἑκάρπος a passive sense, that my self-understanding participates meaningfully in the process of speaking in tongues whereas my rational consciousness does not, but it more probably means, given that the contextual
emphasis rests on the fact that a Christian who speaks in public in uninterpreted tongues does nothing for others, that my self-understanding benefits from the experience (cf. 14.4a, ὅ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ ζωτῶν οὐνόματι) but my rational consciousness does not. I cannot therefore benefit others, because with respect to this spiritual experience I simply have no conscious thoughts to relate to them. All I can say is that the experience enhances my identity as a Christian. This does not in itself directly benefit others.

My self-understanding benefits when I speak in heavenly tongues because I am in closer communion with God (14.2a). This is valuable for me, but not for others, unless I or someone else can miraculously translate heavenly languages into earthly terms. Because it is an essentially private experience, uninterpreted glossolalia has no place in church (14.28). It is not necessary to infer from the fact that Paul commands a person not to speak in tongues in church in the absence of an interpreter that speaking in tongues is something that the gifted person can turn on or off at will. Paul more probably assumes that it inheres in the very nature of the imparted Spirit that a person is not inspired to speak in tongues in church unless someone will interpret (cf. 14.32-33a).

The interpretation of pneuma in 14.14-16 being advanced here receives confirmation from the fact that, in accordance with contemporary Jewish usage, elsewhere in the New Testament 'my spirit' (14.14) is not used of the imparted Holy Spirit.

I conclude that pneuma in 14.2, 14-16 represents the human spirit as the glossolalic's self-understanding which benefits from the private and exceptional communion with God which takes place when one speaks in heavenly languages. The reference cannot be to the human spirit as self-understanding per se, for which glossolalia is not a possibility, but to that human spirit which in Christians is being changed by the ministrations of the Spirit of Christ. Uninterpreted glossolalia transforms a Christian's self-understanding. It is of no intrinsic benefit to those who hear him or her, but it is
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of value to the person who speaks in tongues.

I CORINTHIANS 16.18; II CORINTHIANS 2.13; 7.13

I Corinthians 16.18 and II Corinthians 2.13 and 7.13 may be discussed together as they all concern a pneuma or pneumata that have or have not been 'refreshed' or 'set at rest'. In I Corinthians 16.18 we read that Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achæicus by their arrival in Ephesus refreshed (ἐνέκυησαν) Paul's pneuma and that of the Corinthians (τῷ εὐμόνῃ καὶ τῷ ὑμῶν). In II Corinthians 2.13 Paul relates that his pneuma had no rest (οὐκ ἐκχύσαν ἐνέκυησαν τῷ πνεῦματί μου) because he did not find 208 Titus in Troas. 7.13 states that Titus' pneuma has been refreshed by all the Christians at Corinth (ἐνέκυησαν τῷ πνεύματί μου απὸ πάντων ὑμῶν).

Paul rejoices in I Corinthians 16.17 because Stephanas and his two companions compensated for Paul's separation from the Corinthian Christians; they filled up the void (ἐνέκυησαν; cf. Hs 9.10.1) caused by the lack of them all. 209 Verse 18a should probably be taken as an explanation of 17b: they filled up this void, for (γὰρ) they refreshed my pneuma and yours. Paul in verse 18a shows the Corinthians that his refreshment is theirs. 210 When one member of the body of Christ is refreshed, all the members are set at rest (cf. 12.25f).

It might seem in 16.18a that because the Corinthians all share the same πνεῦμα...τῷ ὑμῶν, the reference must be to the Holy Spirit distributed among them which unites them together as the body of Christ (12.4-13). This is not necessarily so, however, for there are rabbinic examples of 'spirit' being used in the singular as a characteristic of a plurality of persons meaning nothing more than the natural vital human spirit each one of them has (ד' ןטוי וִנָּ, M Shebi 10.9 and BB 8.5; נְרוּץ נִלֶּ, M Ab 3.11). In these examples ruach is used in the singular to represent that a number of persons have been refreshed (M Shebi 10.9; BB 8.5) or pleased (Ab 3.11) by the same thing. We do not therefore need to conclude from the construction τῷ ὑμῶν that Paul has the distributed
Holy Spirit in mind in I Corinthians 16.18a.

Robert Jewett assumes on other grounds that pneuma in 16.18 refers to the imparted Holy Spirit. He argues as follows:

Despite the dependence upon the Rabbinic form of expression, Paul's concept of the spirit is not typically Rabbinic. Whereas the Rabbinic tradition usually thought of the spirit as identical with the soul as the breath of life given to man at birth, Paul thinks of spirit as an eschatological gift. His distinction between εἰς ψυχὴν ἐνόων and ἐν πνεύμα ἐνομοσύνη in I Cor 15.45 shows quite clearly that he did not accept the synonymity of spirit and soul which was essential to the Rabbinic view. Thus one is forced to the conclusion that Paul refers in I Cor 16.18 to the apportioned divine spirit as his own in an anthropological sense.

Jewett himself forces the conclusion that pneuma in our verse means the apportioned Holy Spirit. For Paul ψυχή characteristically represents the whole human person.

In I Corinthians 15.45 Adam as human person is contrasted with Christ as divine person. Adam is ψυχή; Christ is pneuma. Aspects of the human person are not in view; 15.45 has nothing whatever to say one way or the other about an understanding of pneuma in Paul as a constitutional aspect of the human person. Jewett's argument that 15.45 indicates that the imparted divine pneuma is meant in 16.18 is therefore of no value.

II Corinthians 2.13 establishes that the pneuma which is refreshed or set at rest in Pauline usage is the vital human pneuma. In 2.12 Paul tells that he came to Troas to preach Christ and that he found a fertile mission field there, καὶ Ἐφέσσας μιᾶς ἀπεφθαίρεσας (cf. I Cor 16.9; Col 4.3).

In 2.13 Paul admits that because of his anxiety about Titus he could not do the work that needed to be done in Troas; ἐν κυρίῳ in 2.12 may underscore the importance of the promising situation in that city from a Christian standpoint. The
fact that the apostle expressly mentions that he bade goodbye to the Christians in Troas, ἀλλὰ ἀποκατέβησεν αὐτοῖς, indicates how difficult it was for him to leave Troas. In 2.12f Paul frankly admits that he could not settle down to the promising work before him. He has no rest (οὐκ ἔσχημον ἄνευσιν) in his pneuma and so cannot apply himself to propagating the gospel; the perfect tense here vividly realizes the past event. Paul does not forsake a rich mission field in Troas because the imparted Holy Spirit is impatient to propel him on to Macedonia. He forges it because he is anxious about Titus, for whom he has particular affection (τὸν ἄδελφον μου), and who, having not arrived in Troas when expected, may have come to some harm. Paul in 2.12f shows us that he is 'very human'. Pneuma in verse 13 certainly represents the seat or power of the human person's inner life, vitality, disposition, and we should assume that this is its meaning also in 7.13 and I Corinthians 6.18.

A number of scholars assert that pneuma is used rather casually in II Corinthians 2.13 to represent the whole person. They consider that pneuma in our verse, οὐκ ἔσχημα τὸ πνεῦμα μου, has the same meaning as άρπα in 7.5, ἀδελφόν ἔσχημα ἀνεύσιν άρπασμιν. The usage of αρπα in 7.5, however, differs from that of pneuma in 2.13. In 7.5 αρπα represents the whole man afflicted from within and without (ἐν πνεύμα Θεοκόμιν — ἐχωθεν μικρι, ἐσωθεν φόβος). In 2.13 all that is mentioned is the internal affliction of anxiety. We should conclude from this that Paul uses αρπα instead of pneuma in 7.5 because he there in contradistinction to 2.13 has the whole human person in view. The difference between 2.13 and 7.5 indicates that for Paul the human pneuma is definitely an aspect of the whole human person.

The use of pneuma in I Corinthians 16.18, ἀνεφάγασεν χαρὴν τὸ ἐμὸν πνεύμαν καὶ τὸ ύμων, approaches that of σπλάγχνα in Philemon 7, τὰ σπλαγχνὰ τῶν υἱῶν θυμήσκωμεν ἐκ σοῦ, ἄδελφο, and 20, ἵνα τί πιστεύσῃς μου τὰ σπλαγχνα ἐν Χριστῷ. The two terms are not exactly equivalent. Σπλαγχνα in Pauline usage
is a warmer word than pneuma; it connotes predominantly the depths of affection and love in human persons (cf. II Cor 6.12; 7.5; Philm 12; Phil 1.18; 2.1; Col 3.12). It comes closer in meaning to ψευδόμη, which sometimes represents the seat or source of affectionate feelings (e.g. II Cor 2.4; 5.12; 6.11; 7.3; 8.16; I Th 2.17) than to pneuma.

I conclude that pneuma in our verses signifies the vital human spirit as the seat of inner distress or refreshment.

II CORINTHIANS 4.13

A minority of scholars understands τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πνευστείας in II Corinthians 4.13 to refer in some sense to the human spirit of the believer. Rudolf Bultmann identifies pneuma here as 'a special orientation of the will' which may be conceived of as either a 'specialization -- a particle, so to say -- of the divine Spirit' or 'a very pale locution approaching our own expression: "in the spirit of...", i.e. "with the tendency of".'²²³ P. E. Hughes avers that τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πνευστείας is the human 'disposition or 'impulse' to faith.'²²⁴ According to Henry Alford, this pneuma is the human spirit renewed by the Holy Spirit.²²⁵ Contextual exegesis, however, and comparison with other Pauline passages which link pneuma with πνευστεία, do not allow us to understand pneuma in II Corinthians 4.13 as anything other than the imparted Holy Spirit itself which enables one to believe in the gospel of the resurrection (v. 14).

Paul in verse 12 contrasts himself as an apostle with his readers, ὁ Ἀπόστολος ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνεργεῖται, ἐν δὲ σώμα ἐν ὑμῖν. In verse 14, although he and his readers will share in the same resurrection ἐν τῇ ἁγιότητι, he nevertheless continues to speak in terms of 'we' and 'you'. Thus it is not the case that Paul by τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πνευστείας in verse 13 means to say that he has the same pneuma of faith as his readers.²²⁶ He has rather the same pneuma of faith as the Psalmist, who declared, 'I believed, wherefore I spoke' (Ps 115.1 LXX).

Paul declares in our verse that an apostle's belief in the
gospel is so great that he cannot but proclaim it.

It cannot be assumed that Paul would deny the believing Psalmist, David (Ro 4.6; 11.9), the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 1.16, ὁ θεὸς τοῦ χριστοῦ νεοφύτου [Δικαίωμα]). In I Corinthians 12.3 confessional faith betokens the active presence of the Holy Spirit in Christians, and in 12.9 Paul perhaps names such faith a gift of the Holy Spirit. Also in Galatians faith is inextricably linked with the Holy Spirit: ἐξ ἐκκλησίας μεταπτέρυγως (3.2); Christians walk ἐπί μεταπτέρυγα ἐκ μεταπτέρυγως (5.5). These references establish that pneuma in II Corinthians 4.13 means the imparted Holy Spirit, and the genitive, ὁ θεὸς μεταπτέρυγα, is objective, 'the Spirit which effects or maintains faith'.

II CORINTHIANS 6.6

In II Corinthians 6.4-10 Paul enumerates various ways in which he commends himself as an apostle to the Corinthians. In the midst of this list he mentions that he ministers to them ἐν ἐξ ἐκκλησίαι ἐκ πίστεις (v. 6). Most scholars consider that he means 'by the Holy Spirit' (cf. AV, RV, RSV). Some restrict the meaning here to 'by gifts of the Holy Spirit' (WEB) or 'by signs and wonders of the Holy Spirit', but both these restrictions are arbitrary.

C. K. Barrett points out in his commentary that the phrase ἐν ἐξ ἐκκλησίαι ἐκ πίστεις elsewhere in Paul always refers to the Spirit of God (Ro 9.1; 14.17; 15.16; I Cor 12.3; I Th 1.5) as does ἐν ἐξ ἐκκλησίαι (Ro 5.5; 15.13; I Cor 16.19; II Cor 13.13; I Th 1.6; 4.8). Barrett notes as well that Paul does not usually refer to this Spirit as 'Holy Spirit'; Paul prefers other designations, e.g. ὁ θεὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ θεὸς τοῦ χριστοῦ. Barrett notes correctly that I Corinthians 7.34 and II Corinthians 7.1 countenance the holiness of a Christian's human spirit. He considers it quite unlikely that Paul in II Corinthians 6.6 would 'simply throw in a reference to the Third Person of the Trinity in the midst of a series of human ethical qualities ("Knowledge, patience, kindness, the Holy
Spirit, love”), and argues that the evidence adduced from his usage elsewhere seems to give adequate support to the view that in this verse spirit (pneuma) means the human spirit, and that holy is a description of its ethical quality.

It is, however, questionable whether in verse 6 a part of a series of human ethical qualities. It is not difficult to discover a structure to Paul’s enumeration of apostolic commendations in our verses. It is obvious that ‘tribulations’ (Olywcl), ‘distresses’ (avvkal) and ‘difficulties’ (stevoxwpwv) go together, as do ‘blows’ (plavvkal), ‘imprisonments’ (voknkal) and ‘tumults’ (avxwtpwv), as well as ‘labor’ (kopa), ‘watchful nights’ (avypwv) and ‘fasts’ (vostewv). We have in verse 4f, then, three groups of threes: the first relating to general apostolic predicaments; the second to specific apostolic predicaments, and the third to apostolic exertions. Verse 6 next comprises three alliterative pairs of commendations: ἐν ἀγνωστή, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν μακροθυμία, ἐν ἡμέρασφαλί, ἐν πνευμάτι. This alliterative effect is less marked with ἐν λόγῳ, ἐν θείῳ, ἐν ζωγραφεί. So they may be general characteristics which close the construction as ἐν ἀποικαὶ, as introduced it. Given this structure, it is possible that ἐν πνευμάτι, ἐν θείῳ, ἐν θυμοκρίναι, represent a penultimate general characterization of the apostle’s ministry which should not be put on the same level as ἐν ἀγνωστῇ... ἐν ἡμέρασφαλί. Pneuma in verse 6c may refer to the ‘objective divine source’ of the apostle’s virtues in 6ab and θυμοκρίναι may be brought in at the end of the verse because it is the fundamental virtue of the Christian (cf. Ro 13.9; I Cor 13). This interpretation does not rule out Barrett’s but constitutes a viable alternative to it.

I conclude that the phrase ἐν πνευμάτι in II Corinthians 6.6 is ambiguous. It may refer either to the sanctifying Spirit of God or the sanctified spirit of the apostle.
II CORINTHIANS 7.1

The authenticity of II Corinthians 6.14-7.1 has been a matter of scholarly dispute for more than a century. A number of investigators consider it an unPauline interpolation. They argue that it interrupts the close connection between 6.13, πληρωθείτε καὶ ὑμεῖς, and 7.2, λατρεύσετε ἡμῖν; it has at least six Pauline hapax legomena (εὐπροφήτευεν; μεταχειρίσθησις; συμφωνίας; μεταχειρίσθησις; συμφωνίας; μολυσμῷ; καθορίζειν occurs in Eph 5.26 and Tit 2.14, but these epistles may not be authentic), and it is a self-contained unit of thought with no apparent connection with other themes and concerns of II Corinthians.

In recent years the fact that affinities in thought and terminology between our paragraph and the Qumran literature are closer than usual in Paul have strengthened the arguments against its authenticity. The Qumran literature provides parallels to the dualism of verse 14: δύσκολοτητα-κυβούρι (cf. e.g. 1QS iii 20f, ὧν Ἰδω ὠφω-ταί πλημμύρης); θέλειν (ἡμ. ζώλ.) occurs in the Qumran literature, and in 1QM xiii 1-4 he is opposed to God ζητεῖς ἰδων - θελεῖν γαίας (ἡμ. ζώλ.). The mention of Christ in verse 15a as well as the opposition of faith to unfaith in 15b and 14a establish that II Corinthians 6.14-7.1 cannot be directly derived from Qumran or related circles; if the section is pre-Pauline, it must have already undergone Christian redaction. Other significant similarities between our paragraph and Qumran writings are the idea of the community as a temple (cf. e.g. 1QS ix 5f); strong opposition to idolatry (cf. e.g. 1QS ii 16f); the stress on the community's separateness from the rest of humankind (cf. e.g. 1QS ix 8f); the need for purification of the flesh and the spirit (cf. e.g. 1QM vii 5f); the employment of a florilegium of Scriptural passages (cf. 4QFlor); and the use of the lemma, θς ἔστιν (cf. CD vi 13; viii 9). J. A. Fitzmyer concludes that, although not all the points in this comparison are of equal importance or value, the cumulative effect of so many of them within such a short passage is the...
telling factor... When the... Qumran influence is considered along with the other reasons (the interrupted sequence of the surrounding context, the self-contained unit and the strange vocabulary), the evidence seems to total up to the admission of a Christian reworking of an Essene paragraph which has been introduced into the Pauline letter... a non-Pauline interpolation.242

It can and has been established, however, that the words and ideas of our paragraph have parallels in Paul’s own writings, and so could have been brought together originally in this short paragraph by him.243 Paul opposes 'δικαιοσύνη' and 'ανομία' in Romans 6.19, τὰ μελὴ ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῷ 'ἀγνόητῳ καὶ τῷ 'ανομίᾳ-. τὰ μελὴ ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῷ 'δικαιοσύνῃ, where the additional reference to 'uncleanness' ('ἄθροισίν) ties in with II Corinthians 6.17 and 7.1. A contrast between light and darkness similar to that of II Corinthians 6.14 is suggested by I Thessalonians 5.5, πᾶντες ἄφιν ὑμεῖς ὑμῖν φῶς ἔστε καὶ ὑμῖν ἡμέρασι, ὥστε ἐμμεν ἡμετέρος οὐδὲ σκότως, as well as by Colossians 1.12f. Paul has no invariable appellation for the devil; although he usually refers to him as Satan (e.g. II Cor. 2.11), he also doubtless has him in mind as ο θεοφανής (I Th. 3.5), ο πονηρός (II Th. 3.3), and in our letter, ο Θεος τῶν ἄνω (4.4); in Ephesians, which may be by Paul, he is ο διάβολος (4.27; 6.11). Paul elsewhere refers to the Christian community as a temple of God (I Cor. 3.16f). For him Christians have forsaken idols (I Th. 1.9). In I Corinthians 7.34 he countenances the sanctification of σώμα and pneuma,244 and σώμα can be equivalent to σώφρονι in his usage (e.g. II Cor. 4.10f). In Romans he cites catenae of Scriptural passages (e.g. 3.10-12). Finally, it is possible that when Paul uses λέγει in Scriptural lemmata without a subject (as e.g. in II Cor. 6.2), God is implied. In the light of all these comparisons between II Corinthians 6.14-7.1 and the rest of the Pauline corpus the hypothesis that our paragraph is un-Pauline and closely related to Qumran circles appears unnecessary.

Furthermore, the appearance of several hapax legomena here has
no argumentative force. Paul’s repetitious rhetorical questioning in verses 14f of itself necessitated that he search for synonyms in the backwaters of his vocabulary; with regard to the nouns μεταχείμ and μολούμενος, we should note that the corresponding verbs occur elsewhere in his correspondence: μολούμεν (I Cor 8.7); μετεχεῖν (e.g. I Cor 9.10); with regard to συμφωνίας, we find the adjective σύμφωνος in I Corinthians 7.5. It cannot be established that II Corinthians 6.14-7.1 is un-Pauline.

Nevertheless, our verses still present us with two large problems: their seeming lack of connection with the context, and the apparent idea in them that Christians should absolutely separate themselves from the world, which not only does not accord with Paul’s teaching elsewhere but flatly contradicts it (cf. I Cor 5.9ff).

Scholars who affirm the unity of II Corinthians 6 and 7 usually relate 6.14-7.1 to the possibility mentioned in 6.1, that the Corinthians received ἐλεύθερον τιν̇ χρίμα τού θεοῦ. Some posit a corruption in the text, and hold that 6.14-7.1 originally followed 6.1. 6.2ff, however, follow sensibly upon 6.1 in that in them Paul shows that he is indeed working together with God in Christ for his readers (συνεργοῦντες, 6.1); furthermore, διδοῦντες (v. 3) seems dependent on παρακαλοῦντες (v. 1). It is also argued that the plea in 6.11-13 leads Paul in 6.14-7.1 to touch upon the cause of the Corinthians constrained attitude towards him, viz. their attraction to heathen ways. In this regard the suggestion has been made that Paul in verses 11, ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλατύνθη, and 13, πλατυθεὶς καὶ ὤμοις, recalls Deuteronomy 11.16, προσεχε σεωτῷ μὴ πλατυοπή ἡ καρδία σου καὶ παραβίας καὶ λατρεύσας θεῶς ἐτέροις καὶ προσκυνήσατε άλως. Our paragraph is accordingly taken as Paul’s warning against a false πλατυμός towards paganism which seems to him a real danger for his readers. Our paragraph thus has a real connection with what immediately precedes it.
Even given the above understanding of the connection of our paragraph with the preceding context, it still remains a problem that Paul here appears to advise his readers to sever relations with unbelievers, whereas in I Corinthians he considers this an absurd impossibility in general (5.9-11), and clearly quite wrong in the particular case of a believer who is married to an unbeliever (7.12-16). Margaret Thrall suggests a way around this problem.

It may...be significant that the sharpest and most definite commands to separate from pagan society are found in II Cor vi 17, as part of the catena of scriptural quotations and allusions: εἰσελέγχε ἐκ μισθοῦ ἑυμίων καὶ ἀφορίζοντε... καὶ λαφρόρτου μὴ ἀπεθάνει. If this catena as a whole constituted an already-existing collection of Old Testament texts, Paul might have quoted it as a whole, primarily for the sake of its other statements about God's presence with his people and gracious acceptance of them. In that case, the instructions to become separate from the rest of society would have been retained because they already formed part of the composite quotation. They were compatible with Paul's own theme at the beginning of the passage, though they may have gone somewhat further than he would have done himself -- and than he had done in I Corinthians.

This is by no means a compelling explanation, however, since Isaiah 52.11, ἐπερχόμεντος ἐκ μισθοῦ ἑυμίων καὶ ἀφορίζοντε... καὶ λαφρόρτου μὴ ἀπεθάνει, is precisely the part of the catena which Paul enlarges upon in 7.1, ἐκ τῆς ἁγιασμοῦ ἐκτός ἐκτός ἀπὸ πάντος μακάριος ἐκ τῆς ἁγιασμοῦ, ἐπερχόμεντος ἐκ μισθοῦ ἑυμίων καὶ ἀπεθάνει. Isaiah 52.11 occupies an emphatic central position in the catena in its Pauline context. It is not at all the incidental part of it Thrall suggests it is.

The apparent conflict between our paragraph and Paul's teaching in I Corinthians really disappears with the realization that the thematic statement in verse 14a, μὴ γίνεσθε ἐτερνομοῦντες ἀπάτωσι (cf. Dt 22.10), controls our understanding of 6.17 and 7.1, and that this thematic statement cannot be understood as a call to withdraw altogether from
the world of unbelievers, but as a call not to 'get into
double harness' with them;²⁵² Paul 'does not forbid all inter-
course with the heathen whatever...but the making common
cause with heathen efforts or aims.'²⁵³ 6.17 and 7.1 cannot be
interpreted in isolation from nor given more weight than 6.14a.
Once this is seen, there can be no conflict whatsoever between
our paragraph and I Corinthians 5.10; 7.12; 10.27 and 14.24.
Furthermore, it now becomes more apparent that 6.14-7.1 appro-
priately follows 6.11-13, since the thematic statement in verse
14a pursues the thought of 6.11-13. 'nach der negativen Seite';
the connection is as follows: 'tut euch weit für uns und
begebt euch nicht in Arbeitsgemeinschaft mit dem Ungläubigen.'²⁵⁴

For all this, we still have not satisfactorily related
our paragraph to the themes and concerns of II Corinthians.
If Paul in our paragraph aims to stave off a relapse into
paganism, then 6.14-7.1 lack an inherent connection with the
themes and concerns of the rest of the letter. Elsewhere in
II Corinthians Paul's readers are at risk not from their pagan
neighbors²⁵⁵ but from pseudo-apostolic interlopers.²⁵⁶ It has
therefore been suggested that the ἐν ηθῶσι of 6.14-7.1 are not
pagan neighbors after all but active opponents of Paul who
have come to Corinth to seduce the Christians there away from
him.²⁵⁷ It can be objected to this that ἐν ηθῶσι elsewhere in
Paul refers to unbelievers per se, not unbelievers actively
opposed to Christianity nor substandard Christians (I Cor
6.6; 7.12ff; 10.27; 14.22-24), and already in 4.4 of our let-
ter, ἐν ηθῶσι refers to all who do not accept Paul's preaching
of Christ Jesus.²⁵⁸ Nonetheless, the fact remains that apart
from 6.14-7.1 paganism as a threat to the Corinthians does
not loom large in our letter, if it is mentioned at all (cf.
perhaps 12.21), whereas the threat posed by pseudo-apostolic
intruders is writ large throughout.²⁵⁹ Paul claims these peo-
ple adulterate the Word of God (2.17).²⁶⁰ He calls them mind-
less (10.12), deceitful (11.13), tools of Satan (11.15). They
preach ἀλλοι ἱδωταίν... πωλεῖμα ἐπρον... ἐμφάνισθην ἐπρον
(11.4).²⁶¹ Paul may also be criticizing these people in 1.12,
where he states that his apostolate is not Ἑν τῷ ἱλαρ υἱῷ τῷ ἠδριστῷ, and in 3.4ff he may charge them with a death-dealing ministry of the letter not the Spirit. Even if these latter verses do not relate to the anti-Pauline agitators, it certainly appears from 2.17 and 11.4 that they are not πιστοὶ (cf. I Cor 4.2). Moreover, in 11.2-6 Paul fears lest the purity of the Corinthian congregation be violated by these serpentine transgressors upon his apostolic territory. Nowhere else in our letter does Paul single out pagan associations as an impediment to his readers' purity.

It behooves us therefore to understand 6.14-7.1 in the context of II Corinthians and with particular reference to 11.2f as a warning against a debilitating and defiling preference on the part of the Corinthians for 'apostles' other than Paul. Our paragraph therewith fits into the main theme of the letter as a whole, viz. Paul's unique and genuine apostolate with respect to Corinth and Achaia (1.1) as set over against that of false apostles lately resident there. Should the Corinthians reject Paul for these others, they will have received the grace of God in vain (6.1). 6.2-13 and 7.2-4 are apologetic pleas to affirm Paul's apostleship now. 6.14-7.1 is a concomitant warning not to fall in with false apostles. Threats of a Corinthian relapse into paganism are simply not a living part of the argument of II Corinthians. Since we have seen that 6.14-7.1 follow naturally upon 6.11-13, and since 6.14-7.1 is a living part of the argument of II Corinthians only if it is understood as a critical warning against Paul's pseudo-apostolic adversaries in Corinth, contextual considerations should be given more weight in the interpretation of our paragraph than the linguistic considerations relating to ἀνέστησις in Pauline usage. 262 6.14-7.1 should be understood in accordance with 11.2f as a warning to the Corinthians against the perils of joining forces with false apostles in opposition to Paul. This understanding of 6.14-7.1 receives some confirmation in that in this case Paul employs the idea that the Christian community is a temple of God in basically the same way in
our verses as in I Corinthians 3.16f, where the τίς who can violate the temple is certainly not a pagan, but, according to the context, a misguided Christian worker, whose fate, ὁ Ἑρετὴς τῶν τῶν ὁ Θεὸς (v. 17a), accords with that of the false apostles in II Corinthians, ᾧν τὸ τέλος ἐστὶν κατὰ τὰ ἑρεμούμενα (11.15).

Having established that 6.14-7.1 is by Paul and integral to II Corinthians 6 and 7, we turn to consider the meaning of pneuma in 7.1. Most scholars recognize that this is a reference to the Christian person's human spirit, because the divine Spirit from God cannot be defiled. Robert Jewett, however, avers that pneuma here refers to that portion of the divine spirit given to Christians which is to be kept holy until the παροικία. He cites the Hebrew Testament of Napthali 10.9 as a parallel to our verse. Since II Cor 7.1 stands within this tradition, there is no reason to think that "spirit" ought to be interpreted in the idealistic sense as the inner, rational man. It is, however, certainly not the case that pneuma in our verse must mean either the imparted divine Spirit or a human spirit in the sense of nineteenth century idealism. Pneuma can refer here to the vital pneuma of the human person as in fact it does in the Jewish parallel adduced by Jewett. To be sure, the Shepherd of Hermas countenances the possible defilement of the imparted Holy Spirit (Hs 5.6.5f; 7.2.4), but in this it stands alone amongst primitive Christian writings. That this was not Paul's view is shown by I Corinthians 7.34, in the light of which we may surmise that pneuma in II Corinthians 7.1 represents not simply the vital 'breath of life' but the seat or power of human thinking and willing in general.

II CORINTHIANS 12.18

Commentators and translators disagree as to whether pneuma in II Corinthians 12.18, μενε ἐπελεύστησαν ἡμῖν Τίτοις ὡς τῷ ἐπήνεμον περιπατήσαμεν; ὡς τοῖς ὡς τοῖς ἐνεύεσθαι, refers to the Holy Spirit (so RV; NEB) or to the human disposition of honesty shared by the apostle and his co-worker.
(cf. AV; RSV). Some who take the latter point of view argue that the parallel between ὁ τοῦ Ἰουνίου πνεύματι and ὁ τοῦ Ἀὐτοῦ ἁλαίων demands it, but I do not see any force in this argument. It might appear that we have before us in these verses the very simple matter as to whether Titus is a cheat or not, and that there is no need to bring the Holy Spirit into this discussion. Our verses, however, are a part of the larger matter of whether Paul might be not only a cheat (v. 16b) but in fact an inadequate apostle (vv. 11f), and this would relate to whether or not he and his cohorts walk in the Spirit of Christ.

Since the Pauline phraseology ΠΕΡΙΠΑΤΕῖν ΚΑΤὰ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ (Ro 8.4) or ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ (Gal 5.16) is presupposed in 10.2, ΚΑΤὰ ΣΑΡΚΑ ΠΕΡΙΠΑΤΕῖν (cf. 1.17, ΚΑΤὰ ΣΑΡΚΑ ΒΟΥΛΕῖμαι), which is evidently Paul's defense against an accusation, it is likely that the Corinthians were familiar with this characteristic Pauline conception of 'walking in/by the Holy Spirit', and would understand our verse accordingly. We should therefore conclude that Paul in II Corinthians 12.13 has the Holy Spirit in mind. Titus like Paul is a genuine Christian minister who would not deceive the Corinthians, for he like Paul walks in the Spirit. 

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE LETTER TO THE ROMANS

The following discussion assumes the authenticity, unity1 and integrity2 (except perhaps of 16.25-27)3 of Romans.

1.4

Romans 1.3f, ΠΕΡὶ τοῦ Ὡνὸς ᾧνὼν τοῦ ΧΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΥ ἐκ ΣΕΡΓΓΙΑΣ ΔΗΣΙΝ ΚΑΤὰ ΣΑΡΚΑ, τοῦ ὑποθέτον αὐτοῦ ἔως ἐν κυρίῳ κατὰ πνεύμα τῆς ἁλαίων ἐκ οὐκοστάζων νεκρῶν, ἐνοποιοῦ ΧΡΙΣΤῶν τοῦ κυρίου, in all probability constitutes or contains a traditional Christian confession. This is suggested by the following facts: (1) Jesus' Davidic lineage is not mentioned
elsewhere in the Pauline corpus save in II Timothy 2.8; (2) ὁ ὑπάρχειν, a hapax legomenon in the Pauline corpus, appears in statements about Jesus Christ in Acts 10.42, ὁ ὑπάρχειν ὁ ὑπάρχει

This does not mean, however, that we may say with C. H. Dodd that the confessional formula in verses 3f is 'scarcely a statement of Paul's own theology', that it 'falls short of what Paul would regard as an adequate doctrine of the Person of Christ', since it does not affirm the pre-existence of the Son of God (cf. 8.3; Gal 4.4; Phil 2.6-11; Col 1.15). Since Paul freely chooses to use and so approves of Romans 1.3f, traditional material he may or may not have amended, it is not likely that Romans 1.3f do in his view deny the doctrine of the pre-existence of the Son of God. Many scholars, recognizing this, attempt to make our verse more amenable to Pauline theology by interpreting ὁ ὑπάρχει μετὰ τὸν Θεόν as equivalent to ὁ ὑπάρχει μετὰ τὸν Θεόν, so that the resurrection only declares God's Son to be what he truly always was (cf. RV; NEB; JB). However, no clear example of ὁ ὑπάρχει with this sense has ever been adduced in writings either earlier than or contemporary with the New Testament. This being so, we should take μετὰ τὸν Θεόν as a modifier of μετὰ τὸν Θεόν rather than μετὰ ὁ ὑπάρχει. Even though the latter is a grammatical possibility, it is in Pauline theology a Christological impossibility. Paul means here that the pre-existent Son of God (v. 3a) was ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν appointed 'Son of God in power' (4a), that is, 'Jesus Christ our Lord' (4b). Christ's deity is only now efficacious in Christians' lives. This is Paul's understanding of Romans 1.3f. The strange phrase, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, can be comprehended as expressing that the resurrection of Jesus is the assurance of the future resurrection of those for whom he is Lord (cf. 8.11; Col 1.18: Christ is ἡ ὁ τὸ ἀποκεφάλησεν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν). In accordance with this context, which concerns the elevation of the Son of God to a position of active Lordship in the human sphere,
should be seen as the Πνεῦμα Ἑρωτοῦ (8.9) that sanctifies Christians (15.16). Although Paul does not elsewhere refer to the Holy Spirit as Πνεῦμα Ἑρωτοῦ, the Spirit which brings about holiness, objective genitive, we have a near equivalent of this expression in II Thessalonians 2.13, where Ἐγκυλοφόρως means, as we have seen, sanctification effected by the Spirit, subjective genitive. We may further note that this Spirit is appropriately designated Πνεῦμα Ἑρωτοῦ in Romans 1.4 as a part of Paul's salutation to the Ἀχίλλος in Rome (cf. I Cor 1.2: Ἐγκυλοφόρως ἐν Ὑπάτῳ Ἅγιον, κακών Ἀχίλλος). We may compare how in the Testament of Levi 18.7-9 the Πνεῦμα Ἑρωτοῦ rests upon the Messiah in whose priesthood all sin comes to an end.

Bernadin Schneider, O.F.M., has seen that Romans 1.2-4 provides a three-fold outline of salvation history.

1) the stage of its announcement and promise by God beforehand through his prophets in sacred scriptures (v. 2);

2) the initial stage of its fulfillment in his Son born of the seed of David according to the flesh... (v. 3);

3) the final stage of its accomplishment now begun in his Son constituted Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness... (v. 4).

This confirms that Πνεῦμα Ἑρωτοῦ is here the sanctifying Spirit of Christ at work in the human world since his resurrection from the dead.

Others have understood pneuma here as Christ's divine nature, σάρξ being his human nature, or as his 'inward mental element... filled with God, and thereby holy', σάρξ being 'the outward element perceptible by the senses'. Ernst Käsemann maintains that 'der Geist der Heiligung ist die Macht, kraft deren Jesu als Gottesohn eingesetzt wurde.' J. D. G. Dunn argues that the historical Jesus like later Christians lived not only κατὰ σάρκα as a truly human person but κατὰ Πνεῦμα as well, in obedience to the Holy Spirit, 'and thereby proved his right to be installed as Son of God in
power as from the resurrection of the dead'. None of these interpretations receives corroboration from Paul's Christological teaching elsewhere. Others opine that πνεῦμα ἄγωστονς is Christ's 'heavenly mode of existence'. I Corinthians 15.45, which identifies Christ as pneuma, does not support this interpretation but the one adopted by the present writer, as Christ is pneuma here not because he exists in heaven but in that he is at work on earth as one who provides the ἀπερχόμενος (Ro 8.23) or ἀπραβών (II Cor 1.22; 5.5) of eternal life to Christians already in this life (Ro 8.11).

A human spirit is therefore not in view in Romans 1.4, where πνεῦμα ἄγωστονς designates the sanctifying Holy Spirit.

1.9

The context of the occurrence of pneuma in 1.9 is Paul's asseveration that the Roman Christians do indeed figure in his prayers. He gives thanks concerning their witness of faith (1.8), ceaselessly makes mention of them (vv. 9f), and begs to be able to come to them (vv. 10-12). His witness that all this is true is ὁ Θεός, ὃς λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου ἐν τῷ οἰκετεύοντι τῶν μου ἀγίων (v. 9). The relative clause may be reckoned parenthetical, but it is not an unimportant parenthesis. Paul has prepared for it in the placement of ὁ Θεός at the end of the main clause (cf. 3.30). This shows that with it he intends to add or reiterate something significant about the Romans' place in his prayers.

Λατρεύω originally meant 'to work or serve for a reward' and later simply 'to serve'. Its derived, figurative religious application, which is not common but does occur in Hellenic and Hellenistic literature, became its sole significance in the LXX. In the LXX it is pre-eminently cultic in content (cf. Ro 9.4). Some later Jewish and early Christian writings directly denominate the whole of the religious person's life or at least ethical aspects thereof λατρεύω (Sir 4.14; Philo Sacr Ac 84; Ebr 144; Acts 24.14; 27.23; II Tim 1.3; Heb 9.14; 12.28; Ig Sm 9.1; cf. also Plat Apol 23c;
Epict Diss 3.22.56). In Romans 12.2 and Philippians 3.3 Paul represents the whole of every Christian's life as religious λατρεία. In our verse he represents his own life as λατρεία to God. Paul's λατρεία is distinctively apostolic. He has been set apart (v. 1). In 1.1-6, 11-15 Paul is telling his readers about his apostleship and indicating its relevance to them. With the relative clause, ἐὰν λατρ. κ.τ.λ., then, he counts his prayers concerning them as part of his λατρεία and thereby demonstrates that his apostleship is already of relevance to Roman Christianity.

The ἐν in ἐν τῷ εὐθείᾳ πρὸς θεόν is primarily instrumental, because in other verses in which this prepositional phrase occurs it serves as a corrective lest Paul or other Christians get credit for good work done rather than God who in truth enabled them to do what they did (I Cor 9.18; II Cor 8.8; 10.14; Phil 4.3; I Th 3.2); the εὐθεῖα θεόν is εὐθεῖα θεόν (1.16). By contrast, the ἐν in ἐν τῷ πνεύματι possesses a distinct local nuance. With this prepositional phrase the apostle indicates that his πνεύμα includes what is invisible (cf. Phil 3.3), viz. his private prayer-life. Because this aspect of Paul's λατρεία is not manifest to his readers, he calls God as witness to it.

A number of scholars think that pneuma in verse 9 represents the whole person. If this were so, ἐν τῷ πνεύματι would have a significant instrumental meaning in that it would express that Paul puts all that he is and has into his prayers for Roman Christians. Paul thereby underscores the depth of his concern for them. He says that he serves God with his entire being in prayers which concern them. Unfortunately, the parallels Rudolf Bultmann adduces for this meaning of pneuma in Paul all concern pneuma as receptive, refreshed (I Cor 16.18; II Cor 2.13; 7.13; Gal 6.18; Phil 4.23; Phlm 25), so that our verse, in which pneuma would be active, looks like 'odd one out' in this company. Besides, we have already determined that pneuma in II Corinthians 2.13 does not mean the whole person. Finally, 'my pneuma' in I Corinthians
5.3 certainly does not mean 'my whole person' since it excludes the physical body. This interpretation, therefore, does not commend itself.

Other scholars identify pneuma in verse 9 as comprehending the human spirit and the imparted Holy Spirit, in Paul's case imparted as ἡ ἁπατολία or as designating the latter alone. These interpretations accord with the context (cf. especially vv. 5f and 11) as intimating that Paul's prayers concerning the Roman Christians are a part of his λατρεία and therefore prove the relevance of his apostleship to them. They accord the phrase an instrumental meaning in that they bring out the fact that Paul's prayers are not something he works up in himself by means of his own innate capabilities but are the work of the Spirit that empowers and inspires his apostleship (cf. 8.26). Divine empowering, however, is indicated in the prepositional phrase, ἐπί τοῦ ιουντοφελείου. Moreover, 'my spirit' elsewhere in Paul means the human spirit.

Pneuma in Romans 1.9 should be understood in accordance with I Corinthians 14.2, 14-16, as the seat or power of Paul's personal private communion with God in prayer.

2.29; 7.6

In 1.18-3.20 Paul maintains that all people, both Gentiles and Jews, are sinners confronted with the wrath of God. 2.17ff constitute an explicit indictment of the Jews. Although there is much about them that deserves praise, inasmuch as they possess and press upon others 'the very shape of knowledge and of truth in the law' (v. 20), the Jews themselves do not keep the commandments of the law (vv. 21f). How it is that all Jews (cf. 3.9ff) have in fact failed in this respect is not made clear. The citation of Scripture in 2.24 does not explain this fact but confirms it. Ernst Küsemann avers that as in 1.26ff Paul in accordance with 'apokalypatische Betrachtungsweise' takes 'was empirisch Ausnahme sein mag, als für die Gemeinschaft repräsentativ'. This explanation
seems unsatisfactory because the thought of the context (cf. especially 3.10-12) and the style of these verses (direct address in the second personal singular) indicates that Paul singles out for indictment every individual Jew. Other scholars understand 2.17ff in the light of Matthew 5.21f, 27f (cf. I Jo 3.15).33 Even if Paul was not acquainted with these words of Jesus, he could have been acquainted with the idea of a radical interiorization of obedience, which was taught by other rabbis.34 However, nothing in our text demands or supports this interpretation. It is better to understand Paul here in the light of his own characteristic teaching about the law. According to him, no Jew keeps the law because trying to keep it increases one's awareness of one's endemic sinfulness (3.20b). Any commandment of the law is able to awaken or heighten one's awareness of sinfulness. In 7.7 Paul uses the tenth commandment of the decalogue as an example. In 2.21f the specific sins he suggests, viz. hypocritical teaching (v. 21a), theft (21b), and adultery (22a), reflect Psalm 49(50).16-18, which God addresses τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν. Paul adds the charge of 'sacriilege' (τέφρωλεῖς)35 as a counterweight to the fundamental Gentile error of idolatry (1.23), to ensure that his argument places Jews on the same level of sinfulness as Gentiles.

Having established that all Jews are sinners, Paul proceeds to put aside the possible objection that even if this be allowed, Jews are still in a considerably better or completely safe position with respect to God's judgement on account of circumcision.36 Paul, however, grants circumcision positive value only if it is accompanied by keeping the law (v. 25; cf. Gal 5.3), circumcision being here 'a sort of initiation into the righteousness of the law'.37 This puts the Jews back on square one. Having thus decimated their entire defense against the charge of sinful equality with the Gentiles, Paul now actually suggests an instance of Gentile superiority in God's judgement (vv. 26f).38 This is possible because 'he who is outwardly a Jew is not (a real Jew),
neither is outward circumcision in the flesh (real circumcision), but he who is inwardly a Jew, and circumcision of the heart ἐν πνεύματι ὑπὸ ἴδρυμα (vv. 28f).

Pneuma in verse 29 has been understood as (1) human spirit, human inwardness (cf. 1.9); (2) God's Spirit active in pre-Christian Judaism through the law; (3) the Holy Spirit active in Christendom. That pneuma here denotes the human spirit is unlikely, since the inwardness of the circumcision is already adequately expressed by Καρδία. Those who hold that pneuma refers to the activity of God's Spirit in pre-Christian Judaism base their case on 7.14: ὁ Θεός Πνεύματος ἐστίν. But this verse simply cannot be interpreted to mean that the Spirit of God was active and effective in Judaism through the law. That law could not confer the Spirit (8.2). That law in its origin was spiritual, but it was not so in its appropriation (7.7-12; 8.3). Judaism -- and there is no room for any individual exceptions to this in the argument of Paul in Romans -- misappropriated law as unspiritual and antispiritual 'letter' (7.6; II Cor 3.6ff), i.e. as a means of attaining righteousness by works.

Pneuma in verse 29 must be understood as the Holy Spirit active in Christians for three reasons: (1) the context suggests it; (2) Pauline usage confirms it; (3) extra-Pauline parallels support it.

(1) That Paul has Christians in view in verse 28f seems likely in the light of his statements in verses 7-11, 14-16 where (unlike 26) there is no possible indication that he writes hypothetically when he asserts that Gentiles will be saved (10) and can be doers of the law (13f). It is evident from the διὰ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ of verse 16 that Paul is not discussing the human situation apart from Christianity. Since he elsewhere in his letters never affirms that there is salvation for Gentiles apart from Christ, and he certainly has no reason to do so here -- why should Paul foolishly risk sacrificing the main point of 1.18-3.21, that both Jews and Gentiles are equally sinners in God's sight, by sowing seeds
of doubts about the latter's lostness in chapter 2? — we should conclude that the Gentiles of verses 7-11, 14-16 are Christians. 47 The law they keep is that which has been newly established (3.31), the law of love (13.10). Verses 26f advance the argument past the suggested equality of Christian Gentiles and Christian Jews, non-Christian Gentiles and non-Christian Jews, to the superiority of Christian Gentiles to non-Christian Jews. 48 Our verses provide the capstone to the whole chapter's discussion as the explanation of how all this can be so. It is because the Spirit of God has been given to Jewish and Gentile Christians. 49

(2) In Romans 7.6 where pneuma is also contrasted (οὔτως) to χρίσμα, the latter is indubitably understood as a power ἐν τῇ κατεξουσίᾳ, and that this is equally true of the former becomes clear in 8.1ff (cf. especially v. 9). Ἐν κυνόνη πνεύματος should be understood as 'in the sphere of power of the Spirit'. 51 In II Corinthians 3.6 the life-giving Holy Spirit is contrasted with the deadly letter: ὁ πνεῦμα ἀποκτένεις, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ. 52 In Romans 5.5 and Galatians 4.6 Paul connects the gift of the Holy Spirit with the human heart. And in Colossians 2.11-13, although the Spirit is not explicitly mentioned, Paul celebrates a circumcision ἐξερευνώσεως which made us alive together (εἰς ζωοποιήσεως, cf. II Cor 3.6) with Christ. These verses show that Paul in Romans 2.29 contemplates a Christian circumcision of the heart by the Holy Spirit.

(3) Not only do Jewish writings witness to the expectation of a circumcision of the heart by the Spirit of God (Dt 30.6; Jub 1.23; Ode Sol 11.1f; cf. Ezek 36.26f), but Acts 7.51, where resistance to the Spirit active in Christianity constitutes uncircumcision, shows that this idea was taken over into Christianity; if the Jews addressed by Stephen accepted the Spirit, they would be circumcised in their hearts.

I conclude that pneuma in Romans 2.29 is the Holy Spirit active in Christian life.
In Romans chapter 8 Paul discusses at last — he has already broached this theme more than once in the letter (2.29; 5.5; 7.6) — and at length, Christian life empowered by the Spirit. In this chapter Paul considers this life as salvation. Later in chapter 12f he considers it as love. There is a difference of emphasis.

In 8.3f Paul states that Christian life empowered by the Spirit is now a reality for believers only on account of Jesus Christ's victory over sin in the flesh. In verses 5-8 he contrasts this life with life empowered by sin in the flesh.53 In verse 9 he addresses his readers directly: 'Now you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, since the Spirit of God dwells in you.' But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, this one is not his. But if Christ is in you, 'εν σοι τὸ ζῶν τῆς ψυχῆς τῶν υἱῶν θεοῦ, τὸ δὲ ζῶν τῆς ψυχῆς τῶν εἰς τὸν θὰ σώζεται.' The most straightforward way to translate Paul's succinct and parallel phraseology in verse 10bc seems to be: 'although the body is dead on account of sin, the pneuma is life on account of righteousness.' The body is dead on account of sin because sin — Adam's and ours which follows from his — leads to death (cf. 5.12ff; 6.23); the pneuma is life on account of righteousness because righteousness — God's and ours which follows from his — leads to life (cf. 1.17; 5.18, 21; 6.19, 22f).

By 'body' here Paul means the individual Christian's body which will be raised on the last day, the same body as is mentioned in the next verse. It has been objected against this that the 'dead body' of verse 10 cannot be one of the 'mortal bodies' of verse 11 because 'dead' (νεκρός) is never used in Greek as a synonym of 'mortal' (θανάτος).57 If this objection is accepted, the body of verse 10 would then be the Christian's body insofar as it was formerly dominated by sin (cf. 6.6), and the bodies of verse 11 Christians' bodies which are no longer 'sold under sin' (cf. 6.12).58 The objection does not hold, however, for in verse 10 Paul is talking about the
proleptic life of the pneuma and death of the body. Just as
the Christian does not yet have eternal (cf. 8.6) $\zeta u$ -- but
he or she can have it in the future (cf. 13b, $\zeta n\epsilon k\varepsilon a\theta e$), so is
his or her body not yet dead -- but it will be in the future
(cf. Col 2.13; Eph 2.1, 5 for probably similar usages of
$\nu k p o s$'59); even so it will be made alive again at the last
day (v. 11). 60 Furthermore, the interpretation of verse 10b
being defended here, viz. the human body is headed for death
on account of sin, better fits the clear terminological con-
nectedness of verses 10 and 11 ('life', 'in you')$^{61}$ and does
violence neither to the meaning of $\delta x$ nor to the contras-
tive parallelism between 10b and 10c$^{63}$ (which is similar to
that in 5.19).$^{64}$

If 'body' in verse 10b refers to the Christian's own
body, does it not follow that pneuma in 10c refers to his or
her own spirit, and that just as the human body is doomed to
die due to the activity of sin, the human spirit is destined
to live because of the activity of the Spirit of Christ (cf.
RSV; JB)? This has been the conclusion of many commentators
on this verse.$^{65}$ Against this interpretation, however, it has
been pointed out that, if Paul had meant that the human spirit
was alive in contradistinction to the dead body, he could have
said this more clearly by writing the adjective 'living' ($\zeta w v$
(cf. 6.11). Since he writes the substantive 'life' ($\zeta u$), we
must assume that he means the Spirit of God which is and gives
life (cf. 8.2, 6, 13; 6.4 with 7.5; Gal 6.8; I Cor 15.45; II
Cor 3.5). 66 In verse 11 $\zeta w o p o n o i n e l \ k e '67 \ \tau i \ \Theta silent \ \epsilon u m i n a \ \epsilon m o n v
should not be related to $\nu k e m i $ $\zeta u$ in verse 10, so as to sup-
port the interpretation of the latter as human spirit, as if
Paul meant to say with this $k e$: 'just as your spirits have
life so also will your bodies'; rather does $k e$ relate to the
first part of verse 11 itself: the God who raised (the body
of) Christ Jesus from the dead will 'also' raise up the bodies
of the Roman Christians to life eternal. Similar statements in
I Thessalonians 4.14 and II Corinthians 4.14 support this inter-
pretation of $k e$ in verse 11. Verse 10c thus expresses this:
the Spirit of Christ in you is the ἀναρπή (v. 23) of eternal life for you thanks to God's righteousness revealed in Jesus Christ.

Paul's contrasting the Holy Spirit with the human body in 8.10 is of a piece with his contrasting the Holy Spirit with the power of sin in the flesh in the verses immediately preceding (and in 12f, a recapitulation). The 'body' of verse 10b is the body doomed to death (cf. 7.24). Paul in our verse speaks of this doomed body rather than of the power that sealed its doom, viz. sin in the flesh, because he wants to go on and discuss Christian life now on this earth in the light of Christian hope in the life to come -- this is the theme of Romans 8.10-39 -- and he does not countenance a resurrection of the flesh (I Cor 15.51) but a resurrection of the body. 8.10 constitutes a transitional point in Paul's argument. ἀναρπή replaces ψυχή in representing human subjection to sin which continues in Christians in contrast to being ruled by God's pneuma, because ψυχή unlike ψυχή has a future.

There is no evidence in 8.10 that the human spirit is in view. There is ipso facto no evidence for the human spirit being in view in others verses in 8.1-13 (e.g. v. 9) as exegetes have sometimes thought, apparently on the basis of their misinterpretation of pneuma in verse 10.68

8.16

In 8.12 Paul sums up the discussion since 5.12. As in verses 9-11 he continues to bring his thoughts directly to bear on the situation of his Christian readers: 'So then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh to live according to the flesh. For if you live according to the flesh you will (surely and simply)69 die. But if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body (which has been and still can be captive to sin)70 you will live.' Verse 14 expands on 13b: 'For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are God's sons.' In verses 15-17 Paul starts to explain what it means to be sons of God (14b). This becomes the theme of the rest
of chapter 8. 71

In verse 15 Paul declares that his readers did not receive a πνεῦμα σωληνείας but a πνεῦμα ἅχοθενείας. The signification of these two pneumata has been variously estimated by commentators. Most modern exegetes assume that the former simply expresses what the latter, the Holy Spirit, is not. 72 However, since in Galatians 3.19-4.21 Paul equates bondage to the law with bondage to evil powers, it is probably better to admit that by πνεῦμα σωληνείας in Romans 8.15 he means an evil spirit operating with effect via the misappropriated law (cf. 8.2). 73 At any rate, these two terms do not refer to different human dispositions. 74 Nothing in the context links Christians' υἱὸθενεία with any human temper 75 but instead with trusting faith (15c), loving acts (13b-14a), the objective testimony of the Holy Spirit (16, 26b-27), and hope in what is not seen -- and this means as well: not felt; not possessed; not in hand (24f). 76 Ἐπειτα τὸ πνεῦμα ζητείων is, then, the Spirit which effects adoption, under the influence of which, in the sphere of power of which (ἐν ἓν), we cry, 'ἐφιππόν, father'. 77 When we do this (there is no connective conjunction, but verse 26 suggests that the connection between verses 15 and 16 is temporal; the asyndeton gives verse 16 'extra weight and solemnity') 79 the Holy Spirit συμμαρτυρεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ἡμῶν that we are children of God.

Interpretation of verse 16 depends in part on what one conceives to be the setting in Christian life of the cry, ἐφιππόν, father'. A number of scholars maintain that the setting is liturgical; the cry arises in communal worship. They adduce among themselves the following arguments in favor of this interpretation: (1) 'ἐφιππόν, father' indicates that Paul has in mind the community's recitation of the Lord's Prayer (cf. Lk 11.2); 80 (2) the first person plural suggests a cultic setting; 81 (3) the use of Aramaic points in this direction; 82 (4) so does the fact that the cry is ecstatic; 83 (5) κραίνειν is used in public proclamations. 84 Upon examination, however, these arguments in favor of a communal, liturgical setting for verse 15f break down and cannot establish even
its probability. With regard to (1) and (3), nothing suggests that early Christians only addressed God as 'πατερ, father' while praying the Lord's Prayer in public (cf. Col 1.12; 3.17; Eph 2.18). With regard to (2), Paul often switches from the second to the first person plural in the course of a discussion where what he says does not appear at all to confine itself to a cultic context (e.g. v. 12; 7.4). Nothing in the context supports (4): \( \alpha _{\gamma} \) (v. 14) does not possess any necessarily ecstatic connotations or even any special, specific psychological connotations at all in Pauline usage (cf. 2.4); Galatians 5.18 seems a much closer parallel to Romans 8.14 than does I Corinthians 12.2. So in the absence of any supportive indications, the interpretation of \( \alpha _{\gamma} \) as public proclamation has to give way to an equally possible but contextually validated understanding of its connotation here. The context of verses 15f is not corporate Christian worship but corporate and individual Christian life under the cross (17c, \( \xi \gamma \lambda \epsilon \mu \nu \epsilon \lambda \nu \epsilon \mu \nu \epsilon \nu \)). \( \alpha _{\gamma} \) here then retains the meaning it has generally in the Septuagint, where it is used of the urgent, invariably suffering, trusting cry of God's people in prayer (cf. e.g. Jg 3.9, 15; 4.3 et. al.; Ps 3.4; 4.3 et. al.; cf. also Mark 9.24; Acts 7.60). This cry need not be vocalized: in Galatians 4.6 it seems to be heard in Christians' hearts (cf. Ro 8.26f, where the Spirit offers \( \tau \nu \rho \kappa \alpha \nu \mu o \iota \sigma s \) in Christians' hearts).

\( \zeta \mu \mu \lambda \alpha r t o \rho \varepsilon \nu \) in verse 16 (as in 2.15 and 9.1) can mean (1) 'bear testimony with' (Moffatt; RSV; NEB; JB); (2) 'bear testimony in confirmation or support of'. Either translation accords with Deuteronomy 19.15 (which Paul employs in II Cor 13.1; cf. also Mt 18.16), whereby truths are established by the testimony of two or three witnesses. Support for the latter translation, that the Holy Spirit gives confirmation, assurance to our \( \kappa \nu \gamma \) that we are children of God, comes from the significant placement of \( \varepsilon \gamma \mu \nu \) in verse 16b, which, 'vorangestellte und betonte', seems to have the nuance, '"wir sind es tatsächlich"' (cf. I Jo 3.1, \( \kappa \nu \)
Likewise, ὅσοι...οὗτοι (v. 14) should not be taken to mean that only a certain number of people are God's sons, but that as many as are led by his Spirit -- all these really are his very sons. Paul deliberately appends verse 16 to 15 in order to establish more certainly that Christians really are God's children. He considers a more certain establishment of this requisite. For the Christian claim of sonship to God is a very strange claim. There is no empirical proof. Indeed, the evidence (8.23f) tells against it. Moreover, this claim of sonship to God is a very bold claim. In Jeremiah 3.19 calling God 'father' is connected with perfect obedience, ἦν ἐστὶν Πατέρας καὶ λέγετε με καὶ ἐμοὶ σὺν ἐμοί ὡς οἱ ποστραφήσατε. For Paul such obedience is possible only in the sphere of power of the Spirit (2.29; 7.6 et. al.). Thus one can understand why it is necessary for the Holy Spirit always to confirm Christians' audacious claims to the status of sonship with God.

'Our pneuma' in verse 16 has been taken by some scholars to refer to the imparted pneuma received by Paul and his readers when they became Christians, the πνεῦμα θεός of verse 15. This view is not satisfactory since it is hard to see why Paul would solemnly declare that the Holy Spirit outside us must assure the Holy Spirit within us that we are God's children. Others consider 'our spirit' in verse 16 no different than 'us' in verse 26; pneuma is here simply a formal representation of the whole human person. But before one can assume that pneuma has this formal meaning here, one must ask whether the term 'our spirit' might not have been chosen in verse 16 because that verse expresses something which is not specifically expressed by 'us' in verse 26. And we find that this is in fact the case. The Holy Spirit in verse 16 assures us that we are indeed God's children. He speaks in support of our self-consciousness. In I Corinthians 2.11 Paul attributes self-consciousness, self-knowledge to the human spirit. It would appear that again in our verse with the term 'our spirit' he designates this specific and special aspect of personhood: self-consciousness, self-knowledge.
The close connection of thought and language between I Corinthians 2.9-12 and Romans 8.15-17 is striking. Both passages present two contrasted *pneumata* as potential determinants of Christian understanding. The use of *συμμετιχτεύω* in our verse in the sense of 'confirm', 'assure' is consonant with the understanding of human spirit evinced in I Corinthians 2.9-12, which verses show that an understanding of oneself as the object of God's special favor is not a possibility for the human spirit by itself. According to Paul, consciousness of our sonship to God is (I Cor 2.9-12) and is continually (Ro 8.15-17) the gift of the Holy Spirit. Comparison of these two passages, then, indicates strongly that 'human spirit' does have a particular and significant status in Paul's theological anthropology. It appears that in his view a person's identity as a Christian is established through the relationship of God's Spirit to his or her human spirit. The Holy Spirit which relates to our spirit is in Romans 8.15 called *πνεῦμα* *υἱός θεοῦ*. The context of our verses further establishes that the relationship is one of divine revelation and human response in faith (15b) and work (12-14a, 17b). It follows that it must be comprehended in personal and not metaphysical terms. 'There is fellowship and communion, but not absorption.'

Nothing suggests that any certain or exceptional emotions or feelings or psychological experiences necessarily characterize this relationship. It is rather 'an act of trust'. The Holy Spirit reveals to the Christian person's human spirit that he or she is a child of God and that person believes and acts accordingly.

11.8 (Ephesians 1.17; II Timothy 1.7)

Romans 11.8 is not an exact citation of any passage of Scripture, but the clause, έδωκεν κυρίου ο θεός πνεῦμα κατηνυγέως, certainly depends on Isaiah 29.10, πεπότικεν ύμᾶς κύριος πνεῦμα κατηνυγέως. *Πνεῦμα* κατηνυγέως can mean either 'a pneuma that effects stupor', objective genitive (cf. Ps 59(60).5, σίον κατηνυγέως), or 'a pneuma characterized by
stupor', genitive of quality, and this pneuma in the light of the Pauline usage studied so far, might have been understood by Paul as a demonic pneuma (cf. Ro 8.15, πνεῦμα δούλειας) or a human disposition (cf. I Cor 4.21; Gal 6.1, πνεῦμα πριμώτητος).

In the contemporary Jewish literature a pneuma/ruach that is 'given' (δίδοναι, [12]) always seems to represent an additional dispensation of pneuma/ruach from outside of the human person. In the Wisdom of Solomon 7.7, for example, we read, ἀνσώμεν, καὶ ἐφέυρεσε ἐδοθή μοι ἐπεκκλείσθην, καὶ ἢλθέν μοι πνεῦμα σοφίας (cf. 9.17, βουλήν ἐδώ τις ἐγγιότα); ἵνα μὴ ἔσωθεν σοφίαν καὶ ἐπιλύσεις τὸ ἱσών καὶ πνεῦμα ἐπὶ ψυχήν; 1QH xii 12f; xiii 18f). In Ephesians 1.17, where the author continually prays, ἵνα ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἱσώτω, ἵνα σοφίαν...δοθῇ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκεφάλτησις, means the Holy Spirit (so, rightly, Moffatt; Barclay) which bestows wisdom and revelation, as 3.5 shows, ἔν πνεύματι (and cf. I Cor 2.10a, 12; 12.8: δικ τοῦ πνεύματος ἕν ὁλίγας σοφίας). With regard to Ephesians 1.17, Ernst Gaugler warns correctly that 'man darf sich nicht an dem nur scheinbaren Widerspruch stossen, dass die Leser nach V. 13 den Geist schon besitzen und dass ihnen hier "Geist" erst erbeten wird. Das Paradox ist nicht zu vermeiden, dass der Geist nicht autonatisch alle Möglichkeiten einzieht, sondern dass zu besonderen Betätigungen auch neue und bereichende Mitteilung und Wirkung Gottes nötig ist.' In II Timothy 1.7, πνεῦμα δύναμεως καὶ κράτους καὶ σωροποίησιν, given by God (ἐδώκεν) is accordingly also the efficacious Holy Spirit, as the reference to Χρίσμα τοῦ θεοῦ in the preceding verse suggests in any case.

We are thus able to decide with regard to Romans 11.8 that pneuma is a demonic pneuma that produced stupor in those to whom God gave it (for the idea that demonic spiritual influences stem from God, cf. II Cor 12.7).

12.11

Τῷ πνεῦματι ἐμφανίζεται is rendered by RSV, 'be aglow with
the Spirit', whereas RV, NEB and JB consider that the human spirit is meant here. A few commentators take πνεῦμα as a reference to 'the spiritual element in man himself...penetrated and quickened by the Divine Spirit.'\textsuperscript{105} We have already established that the same phrase in Acts 18.25 clearly refers to the imparted Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{106} Its appearance in an identical formulation in Acts and Romans indicates that it may well have been 'a phrase current in the language of Christian edification'.\textsuperscript{107} The parallel in Acts makes it probable that Paul and his readers would have understood pneuma in Romans 12.11 as the empowering Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{108}

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE REST OF THE PAULINE CORPUS

PHILIPPIANS 1.27

Many modern translators understand pneuma in Philippians 1.27, οἱ στρατιώται ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, as the human spirit (RV; RSV; Moffatt; NEB; Barclay). In support of this translation, reference can be made to the following clause, μηδὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τίποτε τὸ ἐν-πνευματά, as well as to Acts 4.32, τούδε πλήθους τῶν πνευμάτων ἂν κατέρχεται καὶ ζωῆς μέν. On the other hand, Philippians 2.1, εἰ τὸ κοινωνικόν πνεῦμα, which is part of the same exhortatory context as 1.27, certainly refers to the shared Holy Spirit (cf. II Cor 13.13), and in I Corinthians 12.13 pneuma in the phrase, ἐν πνεύματι, must mean the Holy Spirit. The present writer considers that pneuma in 1.27 is the divine power that enables the Philippian church to strive together for the faith of the gospel (v. 27d). Just as the human pneuma gives life and power to the human person (ψυχή), so does the Holy Spirit enliven and strengthen the church to strive together as one ψυχή for the faith of the gospel.\textsuperscript{1}

GALATIANS 6.18; PHILIPPIANS 4.23; PHILEMON 25; II TIMOTHY 4.22

We find the same closing benediction, ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου
Many scholars compare our verses with I Corinthians 16.23, ἐν χήροι ἡμῶν ἠμαται μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν, and II Corinthians 13,13, and conclude that in them pneuma replaces the personal pronoun, that 'your spirit' is a synonym for 'you'. There are no precedents for this usage elsewhere in Paul. A few scholars understand pneuma here as the Holy Spirit. According to Robert Jewett, 'since the word "spirit" is in the singular, reference is clearly being made to the single divine spirit rather than to the various human spirits with which the members of the congregation could be thought to have been born.'

This argument is fallacious in the light of I Corinthians 16.18 and its rabbinic parallels, as well as Romans 8.16. We have seen that in Pauline usage 'Holy Spirit' is never modified by a personal possessive pronoun, and that this is true of Jewish usage and the rest of the New Testament.

Our verses imply that the pneuma in view can be the pneuma of the recipients of the letters apart from the presence of the Lord Jesus Christ. Thus the imparted Holy Spirit cannot be meant. Pneuma in these verses is the human spirit, and it is in view either as the seat of a Christian's identity (I Cor 2.11), established and maintained in communion with the Lord (I Cor 14.2, 14-16; Ro 1.9; 8.16), or as the power of thinking and willing (I Cor. 7.34; II Cor 7.1) or both.

I TIMOTHY 3.16

I Timothy 3.16 declares of Jesus Christ that he was ἐξερεύσθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐκκαθώθη ἐν πνεύματι, ὡς θεός ἐχέλως, ἐκφυγόκος ἐν θεσσαλίᾳ, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, ἢμελήσθη ἐν ἔσχι. These six statements constitute or contain primitive Christian hymnic or confessional material. They may be arranged into...
three couplets, each of which evinces to some degree a contrast, viz. ἐν πνεύματι /pneuma; angels/nations (or Gentiles\(^{10}\); world/glory.

The phrase, ἐν πνεύματι ἐν σαρκί, refers to the Incarnation as a whole, the entire earthly life of Christ (cf. ἐν πνεύματι in Jo 1.31; I P 1.20; I Jo 1.2; ἐν σαρκί in Jo 1.14; Ro 8.3; Heb 5.7; I Jo 4.2; II Jo 7), which culminated in his death (cf. ἐν πνεύματι in Heb 9.26; I Jo 3.5; ἐν σαρκί in Eph 2.15; Col 1.22; Heb 10.20; I P 3.18; 4.1).\(^{12}\) The phrase, ἐν πνεύματι, is almost universally understood as a reference to Christ's resurrection.\(^{13}\) This reading of the phrase receives confirmation from the fact that the following phrase, ἐν σαρκὶ ἐκ θανάτου, in the light of the close parallel in the Ascension of Isaiah 11.23, can only refer to Jesus' manifestation to the angels during or at his ascension into heaven. There is a clear chronological order to the first three phrases in our verse.

Pneuma in 3.16 has been interpreted in three ways. (1) It has been taken to designate 'the human spirit of the Redeemer' which survives death.\(^{14}\) (2) It has been taken to designate the heavenly sphere or realm of being, ἐν σαρκί signifying existence in the earthly sphere or realm.\(^{15}\) Proponents of both these interpretations cite I Peter 3.18 and/or Romans 1.4 as parallels. We have already argued that pneuma in these verses denotes the empowering Holy Spirit of God.\(^{16}\) We are therefore inclined to see in I Timothy 3.16 a reference to (3) the Holy Spirit as the agent of Jesus' resurrection. Our verse in this case accords with Romans 8.11, which states either that ἵνα γίνηται τοῦ ἐξελάθησα του ἵνα σώζῃ ἐκ νεκρῶν is the means by which God will raise the Roman Christians' mortal bodies (reading δικ τού ἐνοικοῦσας ἀιώνιον πνεύματος with \( \kappa \) C et. al.), or that their possession of the Spirit in this life makes it certain that they will be raised (reading δικ τού ἐνοικοῦσας ἀιώνιον πνεύματι with B D et. al.).\(^{17}\)

It has been objected against this interpretation that it requires ἐν in the phrase, ἐν πνεύματι, to have an
instrumental meaning, whereas ἐν in the preceding phrase and elsewhere in our verse is local. The phrases in I Timothy 3.16, however, need not be strictly parallel grammatically. It is significant in this regard that one of the phrases, ὑπὸ ὑπὸ λόγος, lacks the preposition ἐν. J. L. Houlden has suggested that, 'apart from signifying two contrasting spheres of existence, these terms (sarx and pneuma) probably carry the sense of two rival powers under which man may live.' It may be, then, that ἐν in both our phrases is at once local and instrumental, meaning 'in the sphere of power of the flesh/Spirit' (cf. RSV, 'vindicated in the Spirit').

We conclude that the phrase, ἐν δικαίωσεν ἐν πνεύματι, expresses that Jesus was vindicated in that he was raised from the dead by means of the Holy Spirit (cf. Moffatt; Barclay, 'vindicated by the Spirit'; JB, 'attested by the Spirit') or by dint of his possession of that Spirit.

EPHESIANS

Pneuma in Ephesians 2.18, 'for through him (Christ) we both (Jews and Gentiles) have access ἐν τῷ πνεύματι to the Father,' has sometimes been understood as a human spirit. E. F. Scott avers that our verse speaks 'not of the means by which we make our approach, but of the new attitude of worship which is now possible for all men.' According to Albert Klüpper, 'das πνεῦμα ist der den zu einem Menschen Umge- schaffenen beseelende Geist des Glaubens, der sich angesichts dessen, was Christus als versöhnende That durch sein Kreuz ausgerichtet hat, entzündet und dem Menschen das Bewusstsein der Kindschaft vermittelt.' Against this interpretation, we note: (1) the context of our verse, 2.11-22, does not deal with Gentile Christians' subjective apprehension of what Christ has wrought but with the objective facts of their new situation in life brought about in and through Christ; (2) it is doubtful that ἐν πνεύματι in our verse can without further modification bear the meaning Scott gives it, 'the same spiritual attitude of worship', and (3), with respect to Klüpper's
contention, we have already argued that the pneuma of faith in I Corinthians 4.13 is the Holy Spirit and not the human spirit.

The great majority of commentators consider that our verse refers to the Holy Spirit. In favor of this view, we note: (1) the same phrase, ἐν ἑώρακα τὸν πατέρα, refers to the Holy Spirit in Philippians 1.27; (2) Romans 8.15 and Galatians 4.6 declare that the Spirit establishes Christians' filial relationship with God, and this idea accords with our verse, ἐν ἑώρακα τὸν πατέρα; (3) I Corinthians 12.13 parallels ἐν ἑώρακα τὸν πατέρα in verse 16. It follows that pneuma in 4.4 refers to the one Spirit of God imparted to all Christians, in accordance with the context (cf. especially v. 5, ἐν κύριος, μιᾷ πιστεῖ, ἐν θεός), which concerns itself with what has been done for and given to Christians.

Pneuma in 4.23, ἐν ἑώρακα τὸν πατέρα, is often taken to refer to the human spirit (cf. e.g. NEB, 'you must be made new in mind and spirit'; Barclay, 'you must have a completely new attitude of mind'). The context, however, and the usage of pneuma elsewhere in this letter, suggest that the Holy Spirit is meant. Since the context (4.17ff) concerns the ethical distinctiveness of Christians, it is likely that τὸν πνεῦμα here means the Holy Spirit that empowers their new way of life (cf. pneuma in Gal 5.16, 18, 25; Ro 8.13f). The instrumentality of the Spirit has already been expressed in our letter in the dative case without the use of ἐν in 1.13.

Oecumenius has correctly maintained that ἐν ἑώρακα τὸν πατέρα means ἐν ἑώρακα τὸν σώματος; τὸν πνεῦμα is an instrumental dative. Oecumenius understands
τοῦ νοοῦ ψυχῆς as a genitive of possession, τοῦ ἐγκεφάλου πνεύματος, τοῦ Βούδα εν τῷ νῷ. This implies that νοῦς is a constitutional part of the human person. We have already noted that νοῦς in Pauline usage is not a human faculty but a person's conscious thoughts. 29 We should therefore understand τοῦ νοοῦ ψυχῆς as an objective genitive. Pneuma in Ephesians 4.23 is the imparted Holy Spirit which rules and rightly determines our thinking. 30

Finally, pneuma in Ephesians 6.18, πνεομαικόμενον... εν πνεύμαν is sometimes taken as a reference to the human spirit. 31 This is unlikely in the light of Jude 20, εν πνεύματι ἐγκεφαλίς πνεομαικόμενον (cf. also Ro 8.26), and the use of pneuma elsewhere in our letter.
CONCLUSIONS

We have determined that Paul in his letters refers to a human spirit which is distinct from the Holy Spirit at least twenty-one times. The instances are: I Thessalonians 5.23; I Corinthians 2.11; 4.21; 5.3-5; 7.34; 14.2, 14-16; 16.18; II Corinthians 2.13; 7.1, 13; Galatians 6.1, 18; Philippians 4.23; Romans 1.9; 8.16; Philemon 25; perhaps II Corinthians 6.6, and also Colossians 2.5 and II Timothy 4.22, if these letters were written by Paul. Human pneuma is always an aspect or property of the human person. It never serves as a synonym for the human 'self'. Paul did not conceive of it as the principle of continuity between earthly and eternal life. The seven discernible meanings or properties Paul gives to human pneuma can all be traced back to the Old Testament or paralleled with Jewish or Christian usage previous to or contemporaneous with him. Specifically Greek conceptions of human pneuma have not influenced Paul at all.

Pauline usage may be classified as follows:

(1) Pneuma is the breath of life in I Thessalonians 5.23 (cf. e.g. Gen 6.17; Job 33.4; Eccle 12.7).

(2) Pneuma is the seat or power of vitality in I Corinthians 4.21 and II Corinthians 2.13 and 7.13 (cf. e.g. Gen 45.27; Ps 77.3; Prov 18.14).

(3) Pneuma is the seat or power of the dominant disposition in I Corinthians 4.21 and Galatians 6.1 (cf. e.g. Jg 8.3; Prov 11.13; Ezek 3.14); in Romans 11.8 a dominant human disposition is brought on by a demonic spirit.

(4) Pneuma is the seat or power of thought and volition in I Corinthians 7.34; II Corinthians 7.1, and perhaps 6.6; Galatians 6.18; Philippians 4.23, and Philemon 25 (and II Tim 4.22) may belong here (cf. e.g. Ps 51.17; Prov 16.2; Ezek 11.5).

(5) Pneuma is the principle of self-understanding and personal identity in I Corinthians 2.11; 14.2, 14-16; Romans 1.9, and 8.16; Galatians 6.18; Philippians 4.23, and Philemon
25 (and II Tim 4.22) may belong here (cf. Prov 20.27).

(6) **Pneuma** is the vehicle of a person's invisible or bodiless presence through space and time in I Corinthians 5.3-4 (and Col 2.5; cf. I Enoch 71.1, 5f).

(7) **Pneuma** is the ghost of a deceased person in the realm of the dead in I Corinthians 5.5 (cf. the Greek of Sir 9.9d; I Enoch 22; Heb 12.23; I P 3.19, and perhaps Acts 23.8; cf. also b Ber 18b; Luke 24.37,39).

Human **pneuma** is for Paul an important and significant conception. Paul is the only ancient Jewish or Christian writer known to us who drew upon and developed the isolated Old Testament notion (Prov 20.27) that human 'breath' or 'spirit' is the principle or seat of human self-understanding and identity. According to Paul, a Christian knows who he or she is as a Christian and grows in self-awareness by means of his or her constitutional human spirit, which is the power or seat of his or her personal communion with God in prayer (I Cor 14.2, 14-16; Ro 1.9; 8.16). According to Paul, it is by means of or within one's human spirit that one is aware that one has been saved by God and is being changed in Christ. The human **pneuma** is for Paul the principle of human self-transcendence in reflection upon oneself. Paul, unlike certain gnostics, does not say that persons are saved because they have human **pneuma**. He holds rather that they know they are saved because they have human **pneuma**. This understanding of human **pneuma** as the principle of self-understanding and, therefore, in a relationship with the Holy Spirit, the principle of Christian identity, appears to have been Paul's own unique contribution to first-century Christian anthropology.
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25 Isaacs, op. cit., 71; she lists these 'instances of pneuma used as a personal pronoun': Ro 1.9; I Cor 5.4; 14.14; 16.18; II Cor 2.13; 7.13; Gal 6.18; I Th 5.23; II Th 2.2; II Tim 4.22.

PART I

HUMAN PNEUMA IN GREEK USAGE

1 G. Verbeke, L'évolution de la doctrine du pneuma, Paris/Louvain: 1945, 1f n. 1; H. Kleinknecht, TDNT vi 334f. Cf. Pseud-Plat Def 411c: Ἰησοῦς Κυνήγης ἀέρος περὶ τὴν γην·
4 H. Diels, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, hrsg.

6 A. Nauck, Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, Hildesheim: 1964, 133.


8 According to Aristotle, earthquakes are similarly caused by pneuma constrained in the bowels of the earth (Meteor 336a; cf. Pseud-Aristot De mundo 395b 33ff).

9 References in Verbeke, op. cit., 208-211.

10 Verbeke, ibid., 15, 180; Kleinknecht, TDNT vi 353.


12 Cited in Verbeke, op. cit., 185.


14 Ibid., vol. ii 217 lines 28f.

15 According to Diog L 9.19, Xenophanes (fifth-fourth centuries BC) first said ἐκ τῶν ζων ψυχῶν. Burton’s evaluation of this statement, op. cit., 19f., is that pneuma here means evanescent 'breath'. Also according to Diog L 3.67, Plato defined the soul as ἴδαν τῶν πάντων εικόνες πνευμάτων, 'the idea of vital breath diffused in all directions', tr. R. D. Hicks, Diogenes Laertius, vol. 1, London/New York: 1925, 337. No such statement is found in the extant corpus of Plato’s writings.

16 De plac Hippocr et Plat 3.1, tr. Burton, ibid., 102.

17 Cited by Burton, ibid., 104f.

18 Cf. Verbeke, op. cit., 33f: 'L’idée centrale de la psychologie stoicienne est celle-ci: il y a dans le coeur de chaque homme un souffle vital, qui envoie des courants pneumatiques vers les différents organes du corps humain; ceux-ci captent les impressions recues à la périphérie de l’organisme, et viennent rapporter leur message à l’hégemonikon, le pneuma central.'

19 Van Arnim, op. cit., vol. i, 38 lines 30ff.

20 Ibid., vol. ii, 205 lines 16-23.

21 Ibid., vol. ii, 144 lines 24-28; cited by Verbeke, op. cit., 68 n. 174.


24 Cf. Verbeke, op. cit., 77.

26 Against the alternative reading "Gos, see J. Burnet, Early Greek Philosophy, London: 1930, 354 n. 1.

27 For these qualities of pneuma in Stoicism, see Verbeke, ibid., 82 n. 206.


29 Cited in Burton, op. cit., 104.


31 For the Stoic rather than the pre-Socratic bearing of this passage, see Kleinknecht, TDNT vi 353.


35 Cf. ibid., 174.

36 Cf. many examples in Kleinknecht, TDNT vi 344f.

37 Ibid., 343f.

38 Ibid., 349-352.

39 Verbeke, op. cit., 323f, 327-330, 337.

40 Kleinknecht, TDNT vi 338.

HUMAN RUACH AND N' SHAMAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT


3 Robinson, op. cit., 354.

4 Johnson, op. cit., 27; cf. BDB s.v. Ruach in Job 4.15 should probably be understood not as an apparition or
ghost (as in BDB s.v.) but as the wind which presages the divine presence, cf. II Sam 5.24; M. H. Pope, Job, Garden City, New York: 1965, 37.

5 There are many more examples of this usage with respect to God's and also the Messiah's ruach; cf. C. A. Briggs, 'The Use of Ruach in the Old Testament', JBL 19 1900 132f. At Isa 33.11 instead of MT [ ] Targ reads [ ] which would refer to God's breath.

6 Cf. above, 11f.


8 Ps 77.3, 6 belongs here too if the emendation of M. Dahood, S.J., is accepted. He would read [ ] as dia-
lectic equivalent of [ ] in v. 6, so that [ ] means 'that my spirit might be healed', Psalms, vol. ii, Garden City, New York: 1968, 228.


10 It is doubtful that we should consider any of these 'spirits' from God as individualized 'demons', although in I Kings 22.21 / I Chron 18.20 such a ruach is personified. Even if we did consider some of these 'spirits' as 'demons', they could not be strictly distinguished from the person of Yahweh himself, cf. Johnson The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, Cardiff: 1942, 19f. P. Volz sees in some of these passages traces of a popular demonology antedating the Israelites' worship of Yahweh, Der Geist Gottes, Tübingen: 1910, 5f; cf. 22f. In Paul's day, of course, Jewish belief in individual demons is unmistakable.


12 That ruach can designate futility (cf. Eccl:1.14 et. al.) as well as strength is but one example of the not uncommon 'semantic polarization which is...a feature of the Semitic languages', Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, 26.

13 Snaith, op. cit., 158; similarly Johnson, op. cit., 37.

14 Volz, op. cit., 54; cf. 50 n. 1.


18 Cf. Johnson, op. cit., 19-25; Pedersen, op. cit., 104: 'Man in his totality is a [WJ but he has a ruach...'}
THE RENDERING OF HUMAN RUACH AND NE SHAMAH IN THE SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT


HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE ADDITIONAL LITERATURE OF THE SEPTUAGINT

1 The possession of breath is a prerequisite for praising God in Bar 2.17, where breath is decidedly the breath of life. Cf. Ps 30.9; 88.10; 115.17; Sir 17.27; C. A. Moore, Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: the Additions, Garden City, New York: 1977, 287f.

2 Possibly: 'anxious with regard to the breath of life'.

3 This statement does not tend towards a deification of humanity even if we take נפש as masculine, only referring to persons, in accordance with the succeeding context (it is just as likely to be neuter in accordance with the preceding). This statement rather grounds the beginning and continuation of the existence of every living person (or thing) in God's gracious and powerful pneuma; cf. J. M. Reese, Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences, Rome: 1970, 67f. For our author the pneuma of life and the pneuma which is נפש (1.4ff et. al.; cf. below, 24f) are not correlated (for a similar juxtaposition of pneumata in Philo, cf. below, 28-30). The integrity of Wisd Sol has been upheld by most recent scholarship; cf. especially Reese, 122-145.


5 G. H. Box and W. O. E. Oesterley, AP 1 347.


7 Clem Alex: נפש; Box and Oesterley, AP 1 346.

8 On נפש in this work, cf. below, 24f.

these works are 'certainly' translations from Hebrew.

10 Ibid., 585, 592, 611 and 602f.

Sometimes the ΤΕΧNOWLEDYGΑΣ concerning which Γαρ instructs Pseudo-Solomon (Wisd Sol 7.20) are understood as evil spirits in accordance with Jos Ant 8.45: God grants Solomon knowledge of evil spirits in accordance with Pseudo-Solomon and in accordance with the Septuagint translation, it seems better, however, to understand pneuma in Wisd Sol 7.20 as 'wind' (so NEB; RSV mg), for pneuma with this sense is often associated with θεός and cognates in Philo (Op mund 58, 80, 113; Cher 37; Migr Abr 217; Som 2.166; Vit Mos 1.41; Spec leg 1.92, 301; 2.191; Aet mund 11, 139) and Josephus (Ant 2.349; 9.210; 14.28; Bel 4.477), and Wisd Sol 4.4 tells of ΘΕΟΣ ΤΕΧNOWLEDYGΑΣ and 5.23 uses pneuma of 'wind'.

12 Codex Alexandrinus lacks ΘΕΟΣ. The translation of R. B. Townshend, 'the spirit of his Reason', AP ii 674, follows this reading. It is also accepted by H. E. Swete, The Old Testament in Greek, vol. iii, Cambridge, England:1896, 741.

13 So A. Dupont-Sormier, Le quatrième livre des Machabées, Paris:1939, 116, who also accepts the reading of A.


15 ΘΕΟΣ: 'ΕΧΝΕΠΕΝ ΘΕΟΣ ΤΕΧNOWLEDYGΑΣ ΤΕΧΝΗΛΕΠΟΥ; here 'holy spirit' refers to the constitutional human pneuma as the power of thought and will, according to P. Volz, Der Geist Gottes, Tübingen:1910, 83 n. 2, who parallels Hag 1.14 and Ezra 1.1, 5, but F. Büchsel maintains that the verse 'könnte sich auch so erklären, dass Daniel Prophet ist, also den heiligen Geist hat,' Der Geist Gottes im neuen Testament, Gütersloh:1926, 69f. A further interpretation will be suggested below, 45.


18 For Philo, however, this pneuma is immaterial; cf. below, 30f.


20 M. E. Isaacs argues that ΤΕΧNOWLEDYGΑΣ is identified with God; she discounts the Stoic influence as one of terms but not the meaning of the terms, The Concept of Spirit,
London: 1976, 20-24. In my opinion, she does not prove the first point; she assumes the second.

**HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE WRITINGS OF JOSEPHUS**

1. E. Best, 'The Use and Non-use of Pneuma by Josephus', *NovT* 3 1959 219-221.


**HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE WRITINGS OF PHILO**

1. The phrase ὑνεμά σι τῆς θεού πνεύματος (Ap. mund 58; Spec. leg. 1.92) should be evaluated with reference to *Rer. div. her. 208* (Ἐρημία ἐκ νεράρων ὑποκρής... ὑνεμά σι πνεύματος) and *Vit. Mos.* 3.41 (πνεύμα το ψυχολογία το εν κοιμί πρὸς τινάν... πνεύματος βίος εἰς ἑρμ. ὑνεμά), so that the genitive is taken to qualify only ὑνεμά.

2. See, however, A. Laurentin's interpretation of *Cher 111*, 'Le Pneuma dans la doctrine de Philon', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis* 27 1951 397: 'l'air, puissance passive, repose sur l'eau...l'eau aime l'air, lorsqu'il anime d'une puissance active, il importe dans ses bourrasques.' pneuma may mean 'air' also in *Wisd Sol.* 5.11, though there it is disturbed and stirred up.

3. Philo usually reads πνεύμα with the LXX but he cites the verse twice with pneuma (Leg. all 3.161; Dei pot ins. 17). For him πνεύμα is equivalent to pneuma here. The distinction he makes between the two in Leg. all 1.42 not only has no influence on the rest of his writings but is ignored already in Leg. all 1.37; cf. H. A. Wolfson, *Philo*, vol. i, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948, 394 n. 46.
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12 As in Rom div her 232 τὸ...λυγον ψυχης is quite distinct from το... λογικον.


14 Verbeke, op. cit., 245.

15 Tr. Colson and Whitaker, Philo, i 107.

16 Philo writes about the angels at some length in Gig 6-14 and Som 1.135-142.


18 Cf. Verbeke, op. cit., 256. This is denied by Isaacs, op. cit., 56f. According to her, 'pneuma is the nearest he gets to defining το ζυ.' It is clear, however, that Philo holds that humankind cannot grasp the nature of God beyond the fact that he is (Det pot ins 89).

HUMAN SPIRIT IN JEWISH APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

1 M. E. Stone, The Testament of Abraham, Missoula: 1972, 44 line 19; 48 lines 4f and 23f.

2 Ibid., 48 lines 28-32.

3 Cf. also for this Sib Or 4.46, 189. In I En 61.7 'spirit of life' seems to be a property of angels.

4 Most scholars refer this verse to the OT prophets rather than to the Messiah; see e.g. A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, tr. G. Vermes, Oxford: 1961, 124 n. 1.
5 Cf. M. Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns*, Leiden: 1961, 76f; J. Pryke, "Spirit" and "Flesh" in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts*, RQ 5 1965 346. A Dietzel, 'Beten im Geist!', ThZ 13 1957 25ff, has argued that successful prayer is also a gift of this ruach, but his argument seems unconvincing. It is based on only two passages in the Scrolls, both of which are patient of a different interpretation than he provides. (1) Dietzel translates 1QH 17.17, 'Von den Geistern (יָרָחִים), die du in mich hineingegben hast, will ich Antwort der*ýunge hervorbringen', but the consensus of other translators is to render the prefixed יָרָח 'wegen', 'because of', 'à cause de', thus not attributing the prayer, to these spirits. (2) In 1QH 16.11 Dietzel takes יָרָח in accordance with OT usage to refer to prayer by the psalmist that God will put away his wrath in favor of mercy, but lines 10 and 17 suggest that the reference in 1QH is to ethics and obedience in life. Dietzel wrongly adduces Jub 25.14ff as a prayer in the Spirit; it is rather a prophetic blessing in response to a prayer (cf. Gen 48.15ff). It may be noted that in 'The Words of the Heavenly Lights' 5.15f (see n. 7) God's ruach is connected with blessings bestowed upon his people and not with the prayers that should have but did not in fact (so the succeeding context suggests) come in response to the blessings. Finally, the spirit in Pseud-Philo *Antiq Bib* 32.14 is to be connected not with praise but prophecy in accordance with the context (all render praise but only Debora who has the spirit prophesies) and 31.9. We do find the idea of prayer in the Spirit in I En 71.11, but here a person has been translated to heaven to pray in such a way.


8 AP ii 811.


11 Cf. below, 45.

12 Herm m and s, which teach that the νεκτόμα οὐγον given to Christians (m 3.1ff; 5.1.2-4, 2.5-8; 10.1-3; s 9.25.2) and righteous persons in the past who are now angels (s 5.6.7; 9.15.6-16.1) and apparently Jesus (s 5.6.5-7 -- the Christology of Herm is a complex problem) can be defiled or
kept whole (s 5.7; 9.32.3,4), may provide some support for Nötscher's interpretation. (Herm m 3.1ff relate to Christians in accordance with all the other passages in Herm which mention pneuma; there is no justification for equating pneuma in 3.1ff with the human 'soul', the \( \psi \) of Gen 2.7, as does O. J. F. Seitz, 'Two Spirits in Man: an Essay in Biblical Exegetis', NTS 6 1959-1960 86).

13 In apocalyptic Jewish literature natural phenomena have their own spirit or angel (cf. I En 60.15ff; 69.22; 75.5; IV Ezra 6.41) whom God addressed at the creation, when he said, 'Let there be...'; see G. H. Box, AP ii 578 n.

14 Stone, op. cit., 82 lines 25f.

15 See on all this P. A. Munch, 'The Spirits in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', Acta Orientalia 13 1935 257-263.

16 Christian influence can be detected in the references to this good pneuma in Test L 18.7, 11; Test Jud 24.2f; Test B 9.4; see M. de Jonge, 'Christian Influences in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', NovT 4 1960 202-205, 225f. According to de Jonge, 187, 'if we assume...that the Testaments in their present form have been used and edited by Christians in one way or another, we must always reckon with the possibility that those passages too which are not evidently Christian do not come from a Jewish hand...In the history of a writing with such a complicated history as the Testaments many conclusions will necessarily remain hypothetical, but it seems right to assume that a particular passage is Christian until clear evidence of the contrary is adduced. In other words: the burden of proof does not fall on him who assumes that a certain passage is Christian, but the scholar who considers a passage Jewish...!' This may be considered a tour de force rather than a just and viable method for the study of the Testaments.

17 As are the angels of Satan. This is the only reference to bad angels in the Testaments. Apparently some of Satan's minions are kept in reserve for a final assault. Their uninvolved in present life has led to their designation as angels in this verse.


19 I assume that these ruchoth are angels. I do not accept W. -D. Hauschild's identification of them as respectively the human person's constitutional and God's soteriological ruchoth now united; he refers to xvi 14; Geist Gottes und der Mensch, München: 1972, 151.


24 It is therefore erroneous simply to equate the Qumran doctrine of the two spirits with the rabbinic distinction between the good and the evil (as does e.g. Wernberg-Möller, *art. cit.*, 422f; he suggests that in iii 18 corresponds to in Gen 2:7, noting that this Biblical verse provided the basis for the purely psychological rabbinic doctrine).

25 Discussed above, 34f.


27 Only the damaged text of xvii 23 represents a likely reference. For xiii 15, cf. i 22. For the of iii 18, cf. below, 42.

28 I follow the reconstruction of these partially damaged texts in E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran*, München: 1971, 112, 166.

29 In QH this usage is found to be consistent: the human constitutional ruach is 'formed' (); the additional dispensation of divine ruach is 'given' ( ); cf. on the one hand, i 8f, 15; iv 31; xv 22; cf. x 22; cf. also ix 12 ( ); on the other hand, xii 12f; xiii 12f; xvi 17; cf. fr. iii 14; cf. also 11Q Psâ Dav Comp 39. This distinction does not yet seem to have been recognized by scholars.


31 Reading with Lohse, *op. cit.*, 162. The reading ( ), which would introduce the doctrine of the two spirits (thus Dupont-Sommer, *op. cit.*, 244), seems to be excluded by the photocopy of the column in E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*, Jerusalem: 1955, Plate 48, which suggests a lacuna of more than a , and in addition seems to reveal an initial '

32 Cf Schweizer, *art. cit.*, 491.


34 Cf. above, 23.

simply assume, however, that all writings from the Qumran caves testify to the beliefs of the Qumran community: see H. D. F. Sparks, 'The Books of the Qumran Community', JTS N.S. 6 1955 226-229.

36 Further support for attributing such an understanding to the sectarian would come from CD xii 2f, if demonic spirits are there identified with the spirits of (presumably unrighteous) dead people (as in Jos Bel 7.185), so e.g. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., 154 n. 5. In I En 15.8ff demonic spirits are identified as the ghosts of the offspring of the angels who mated with human women in Gen 6; cf. Jub 10.5. Another Jewish view is that the evil spirits were created before Adam, e.g. Pseud-Philo Antiq Bib 60.2; cf. further different rabbinic positions in SB iv 505-507.

37 Tr. G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Hammondsworth: 1968-76. One can translate instead 'fulness of glory' (τιμήν τῆς κοινωνίας) and 'a measure of majesty' (τιμήν τῆς ἐννοίας), so Kuhn, 'Die Sektenschrift und iranische Religion', ZTK 49 1952 299: 'das Vollkommene der Herrlichkeit und das Vollmass des Glanzes'.

38 Wernberg-Möller, The Manual of Discipline, 87 n. 80, compares the Hebrew text of Sir 49.16, עולם יף חכמה יתירה. Others translate 'glory of man', e.g. Ps 8.6.

39 So Lohse, op. cit., 155.

40 R. B. Laurin, 'The Question of Immortality in the Qumran Hodayot', JSS 3 1958 344-355, has denied that the sectarian entertained any hope of immortality 'either in the body or in the soul', 355. I am suggesting that they looked forward to immortality 'in the spirit'. The texts Laurin takes as normative for the community's eschatological views lack this very term 'spirit'. Cf. in favor of the view that the sectarian hoped to live forever with angels before God, J. van der Ploeg, 'L'immortalité de l'homme d'après les textes de la Mer Morte (1QS, 1QH)', VetT 2 1952 171-175; M. Delcor, 'L'immortalité de l'âme dans la Sagesse et dans les documents de Qumran', NRevTh 77 1955 621f; M. Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, Edinburgh:1961, 139-141. F. Nützcher affirms that the sectarian 'am Ende gleich oder ähnlich werden kann' to the angelic נTextures, Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte, Bonn:1956, 43.

41 Tr. Vermes, op. cit., 74.

42 The reference here is not to demons but to enemies of the sect, as the preceding context (particularly line 14) indicates.


44 Cf. also below, 44.
45 Although it is argued that I En 37-71 is certainly a post-Christian composition because 'not one fragment of it, Semitic or even Greek, has been located in the very rich assortment of manuscripts from the caves of Qumran', Milik, op. cit., 91, the argument is not sound because (1) any assumption that the Qumran collection of manuscripts was complete is gratuitous, and (2) even a work which is post-Qumran is not ipso facto post-Christian in the sense that it has been influenced by Christianity.

I Enoch 39.8; 98.3, 10; 108.6, 9 are only extant in Ethiopic, so it is rather uncertain as to whether pneuma rather than Ψυχή was the Greek reading here. See P. Grelot, 'L'eschatologie des Esseniens et le livre d'Hênoch', RQ 1 1958-1959 117, on the inconsistency of the Ethiopic rendering of pneuma and Ψυχή. Grelot discerns in I En a belief in l'immortalité de l'âme ou de l'esprit (les deux mots s'entendent au sens que leur donne l'anthropologie sémitique'), 123.

46 In hymns from Qumran the OT conception has been maintained, 1QH x 3f, 12; xii 26f, 31; fr. iv 11; probably fr. i 4 (cf. 1QS xi 21f).

47 Stone, op. cit., 50 line 2.

48 Ψυχή in 1QH refers to afflictions suffered from enem- 
est of the community, S. Holm-Nielson, Hodayot — Psalms from Qumran, Aarhus: 1960, 27 n. 66.

49 Eissfeldt, op. cit., 608, 622, 624, 630; for Pseud- 
Philo, M. R. James, The Biblical Antiquities of Philo, London/ 
New York: 1917, 28, and D. J. Harrington in C. Perrot and P.-M. 
and for Test Abr, Box, The Testament of Abraham, London: 1927, 
28; cf. above, 17f (pneuma does, however, mean 'vitality' in 
Jos Ant 11.240).

50 Charles, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Oxford: 1908, 4 (and cf. 7), pronounces this section 'certainly a late addition to the text' for three reasons: (1) 2.2 connects with 3.3; (2) 2.3-3.2 has no connection with what precedes or follows it (3.7 being also an interpolation from the same or a later hand); (3) the peculiarly Stoic usage of pneuma.

51 Tr. James, op. cit., 126.

52 Cf. 24 n. 15.

53 Ψυχή does not occur in the OT, or, to my know- 
ledge, elsewhere in the Qumran literature.

54 Tr. Charles, AP ii 423f.
HUMAN RUACH AND NESHAMAH IN RABBINIC USAGE

1. E. Sjöberg, TDNT vi 375.

2. Tr. H. Freedman in The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I. Epstein, vol. xxiv, London: 1935, 610f (all subsequent quotations are from this edition and in them only the translator, volume and page number will be given). G. F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, Cambridge, Massachusetts: 1927, 488, cites a parable from the Tanchuma in which 'the guilt of the soul is greater because it is, so to speak, better bred'.


5. Although one rabbi teaches that the buried body ceases to exist after twelve months (b Shab 152b), we cannot simply assume from this that he connected the personality of the deceased with the ascended spirit. Against the view that the reference in rabbinic literature to neshamah yet to enter into earthly existence implies their actual pre-existence, see F. C. Porter, 'The Pre-existence of the Soul in the Book of Wisdom and in the Rabbinical Writings', Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper, Chicago: 1908, 259.

6. Cited above, 47f, as 'spirit of life' (these various meanings are not to be strictly delimited one from another).

7. Freedman comments, 'this is deduced from the use of the def. art. in the Heb. "And the spirit came forth", implying a particular one,' xxiv 592 n. 4. E. Rohde, Psyche, tr. W. B. Hillis, London: 1925, 210f n. 148, mentioned examples from ancient Greek literature (e.g. Xenoph Cyr 8.7.18) of the soul or a ψυχή representing the soul of a murdered person tormenting the murderer (and others).

8. See Sjöberg, TDNT vi 382-384.


10. Tr. Freedman, xxiii 446.

11. All the references are given by W. Foerster, 'Der heilige Geist im Spätjudentum', NTS 8 1961-1962 118 n. 1.

12. Sjöberg, TDNT vi 387f.

13. The Stoic conception of pneuma as the effective agency in human speech is thus not reflected in the Targums on Gen 2.7.
HUMAN SPIRIT IN GNOSTIC USAGE

1 The term 'gnostic' is used here merely in a convenient way to cover the Nag Hammadi documents and patristic references (the Gospel of Mary is also referred to). With regard to the patristic references I have confined myself to those collected by W. Foerster, Gnostics, tr. R. Mcl. Wilson et. al., vol. i, Oxford: 1972, except in the case of Valentinus, where writings of G. Quispel are followed and cited. The discussion centers on gnostics and gnostic works widely considered to belong to the second century (AD).


3 Cf. R. Kasser, 'Le livre secret de Jean', RThPh third series 14 1964 141.

4 Text with German tr. by W. C. Till, Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, Berlin: 1955, 78ff; English tr. in Foerster-Wilson ii 105ff. References to the shorter version from Nag Hammadi (CG ii) are to the edition with text and English tr. by S. Giverson, Apokryphon Johannis, Copenhagen: 1963.


6 Ibid., 228.

7 In the story which forms the framework of the Apocryphon, Christ's special manifestation to John, Christ calls the saved from among humankind 'Gleichgeistern', BG 22.14; 75.18, Till, op. cit., 84f, 190f. This should be taken to refer to their shared participation in the good spirit rather than their endowment by birth with the spirit relinquished by Ialdabaoth. Cf. the different wording in CG ii 79.30 which Giverson renders as 'brethren in the spirit', op. cit., 106f.

8 Cf. above, 40ff.

9 Quispel surmises that these were originally a single figure, 'Der gnostische Anthropos und die judische Tradition', Gnostic Studies, vol. i, Istanbul:1974, 174f.


11 'Eine bedeutsame, f"ur gnostisches Denken erstaunliche Aussage', Hauschild, op. cit., 222.

12 For texts which represent the views of Valentinus himself, see Quispel, 'The Original Doctrine of Valentinus', VigChr 1 1947 43-73.

13 This holds true even if we read with most scholars 'AλωΣεις' for 'Εκκλησίαζεν, and even if we with Quispel, ibid., 56ff n. 15, identify 'ΑλωΣεις with Συνε; in Valentinus' system
the primordial status of \( \text{God} \) and not the Holy Spirit corre-
sponds to that of Barbelo in AJ; in AJ the Holy Spirit is God.

14 See Hauschild, op. cit., 155.

15 See Quispelt, ‘La conception de l’homme dans la Gnose
valentinienne’, Gnostic Studies ii 54f.

16 Later Valentinian gnosticism probably relates some-
thing close to Valentinus’ own teaching when it explains that
the Demiurge breathed into Adam ‘the animal soul’ or ‘pneuma/
\( \text{God} \) of life’ while, simultaneously and secretly, Sophia sowed
in him the divine spirit, \( \text{God} \) (Adv haer 1.5.5f; 
Exc 50.3; 53.2; cf. 2.1). Hauschild, op. cit., 153, on good
grounds refers the teaching in Clem Alex Strom 4.90.3, \( \text{God} \)
\( \text{God} \) \( \text{God} \) \( \text{God} \) \( \text{God} \), to Valentinus.

17 In later Valentinian writers it becomes clear that
persons as souls not allied with spirit can gain a lesser sort
of life eternal (e.g. Adv haer 1.6.1ff; Exc 56.3; 63.1).

18 Though on the other hand it might be claimed that
the angels \( \text{God} \) \( \text{God} \) \( \text{God} \) \( \text{God} \). Exc
35.4.

19 ‘Und bei solchen Zur-Gnosis-Kommen spielen -- was
nicht übersehen werden darf -- Gnade und Offenbarung seitens
Gottes für Valentin die entscheidende Rolle’, Hauschild, op.
cit., 154.

20 We shall see that this is also a New Testament
insight. I do not deny that Valentinus and other gnostics
were influenced by the New Testament and indeed by Paul. It
seems convenient and appropriate to discuss gnosticism
before the NT and Paul, because previous study of it may help
us better to appreciate Biblical anthropological pneumatology.

21 Hauschild, op. cit., 196 n. 17.

22 Ibid., 195.

23 In Jo 4.24 it is not the Christian’s \( \text{God} \) but his
or her \( \text{God} \) which must be (not is) spiritual, and it
now can be spiritual only because God is active in the world
as Spirit. \( \text{God} \) ‘is not an essential definition of
God, but a description of God’s dealings with men’, R. E.
Brown, S.S., The Gospel according to John, vol. i, Garden

24 I Jo 3.2 affirms that Christians will in the end
have to be like \( \text{God} \) God in order to see him; this like-
ness must be understood with reference to Gen 1.27, \( \text{God} \)
\( \text{God} \), as ‘the likeness of the creature reflecting the
glory of the Creator’, B. F. Westcott, The Epistles of John,
Grand Rapids:1966, 98.

Hammadi’, THZ 33 1977 384 identifies this document as Valen-
tinian and probably later than Gosp Phil.
26 W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos, tr. J. E. Steely, Nashville: 1970, 260f; the Nag Hammadi discoveries have not changed this.

27 Tr. R. McL. Wilson in R. Kasser et al., Tractatus Tripartitus (see n. 25) 1144.

28 In Gen 2.7 the LXX reads πνεον, a word with no anthropological significance other than 'breath' (except in the LXX translation of Job 26.4; 32.8; Prov 20.27). The corresponding Hebrew word נָשָמָה, however, not only serves in the Old Testament as an equivalent of רוח in the latter's most fully anthropological sense as the seat or power of human thought and action in general (cf. above, 19), but in rabbinic writings draws to itself all the other Biblical senses of רוח. Perhaps, then, the initial impetus in the application of Gen 2.7 to the idea of a real human self alien to this earth stems from Hebrew-reading Hellenistic-influenced circles. Hauschild, op. cit., 260 n. 21, suggests that when Philo in Leg all 1.23 reads pneuma along with πνεον in Gen 2.7 he witnesses to an exegetical tradition which already interpreted the verse in a pregnant anthropological sense.


31 E. Haenchen, 'Das Buch Baruch', Gott und Mensch, Tübingen: 1965, 327, relates the pneuma-Ρνεόν dichotomy to Ro 7.14ff. The relation to Philo is closer.

32 Above, 40ff.


HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE CORPUS HERMETICUM

1 Tr. W. Scott, Hermetica, vol. i, Oxford: 1924, 199 (slightly altered); the text, however, is that of A. D. Nock, Corpus Hermeticum, Tome 1, Paris: 1945, 121.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE GOSPELS

1 For רוח with this meaning, cf. above, 49; for dead persons as פנומנת, cf. I Enoch 22; cf. also above, 21ff, 41.

2 The authenticity of this statement (cf. Luke 6.20)
does not concern us here.

3 BDF 105.


5 Cf. ibid., 185. Other scholars who have related Mt 5.3a to Qumran terminology have arrived at a different interpretation of οτι πνευματι αυτη θελεμοντι; cf. K. Schubert, 'The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts', The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, London:1957, 122: 'Jesus called those blessed to whom worldly goods were nothing. In so doing he aligns himself with one of the basic tenets of the Essenes'; E. Best, 'Matthew V.3', NTS 7 1960-1961 257: 'the "poor in spirit" are those who lack courage, in our idiom, the faint-hearted.'

6 Cf. above, 20.

7 M. E. Isaacs, The Concept of Spirit, London:1976, 71, compares 5.30, o 'νευματι αυτη θελεμοντι, and concludes that pneuma here simply substitutes for the personal pronoun; a particular aspect of capacity of the human person, however, is in view in 2.8.

8 K. H. Rengstorff, TDNT vi 697. Therefore it is not correct to see here a reference to the Spirit as 'the power of God...bestowed upon man continually', E. Schweizer, The Good News according to Mark, tr. D. H. Madvig, London:1971, 314. Nor is the pneuma of our verses to be identified with the πνευμα της θεοτητος of 1QS iii 26f, as in P. Bonnard, L'Evangile selon Saint Matthieu, Neuchâtel:1963, 394.


**HUMAN PNEUMA IN ACTS**


3 Cf. H. Preisker, 'Apollos und die Johannesjünger in
Act 18.24-19.6, ZNW 30 1931 301; A. Oepke, TDNT ii 876: 'his natural gifts are emphasized in v. 24...the context of v. 25 is purely religious.'


6 'Die Stätte...wo das Gefessensein schon stattthat', according to H. H. Wendt, Die Apostelgeschichte, Göttingen: 19135, 290.


8 Pneuma in 20.22 need not be a pneuma other than the ονευμα in v. 23; cf. 6.3, 5; otherwise, Meyer, op. cit., ii 180.

9 So e.g. K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury, The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. iv, London:1933, 290: 'pneuma and ένυμα are here tautological.'

10 Robertson 745.


13 Cf. above, 49, 51.


HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS


3 Cramer vii 181.

4 So H. Montefiore, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, London:1964, 88; NEB translates ζωή καὶ πνευμάτων as 'life and spirit'.
HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE LETTER OF JAMES


2 This has been seen by J. Moffatt, The General Epistles, London:1928, 60.

3 F. Mussner's argument, 'schwerlich bei Το Τσέελ an den Heiligen Geist denken; denn wie sollte neben ihm noch ein "grösseres" Gnadengeschenk möglich und denkbar sein?', Der Jakobusbrief, Freiburg:1964, 182, is inconclusive as it is not apparent that we should take v. 6a as adversative to 5b (cf. δέ in 3.18).

4 E. Lohse, Die Texte aus Qumran, München:1971, 162.

5 'Jac 4,5: ἡμινογενσ', ZNW 50 1959 137f.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN I PETER


3 The Epistles of Peter and Jude, New York:1969, 130.

4 Most recent commentators take this view.

5 L. Goppelt, Der erste Petrusbrief, hrsg. F. Hahn,


7 Best, op. cit., 141.

8 It is not clear whether 3.19 should be set in the context of Christ's descent (see Mt 12.40; Acts 2.27; Ro 10.9) or ascent. The main argument for assuming the latter is that πορεύεσθαι would then refer to the same journey in our verse and in v. 22, but πορεύεσθαι is too common and general a word to bear much argumentative weight.

Even if εὐς refers to ταξιωματι in v. 18 it cannot be claimed that v. 19 'must' refer to an upward journey of the resurrected Christ (so R. T. France, 'Exegesis in Practice; Two Examples', New Testament Interpretation, ed. I. H. Marshall, Exeter: 1977, 267) because this involves unwarranted assumptions, that (1) vv. 18f retain an actual chronological order (but our author could quite conceivably have added a reference to the descent of Christ which took place before his resurrection only after mentioning his resurrection because he was not inclined to break up the traditional antipodic statement of v. 18c, Θεωρηθησεν μεν ερήμων ζωομενήσεις εἰς ταξιωματα, or (2) Christ could not have descended to the underworld between his resurrection and ascension. According to Reicke, it is 'unnatural to make a dative of reference serve as an antecedent to a relative pronoun', op. cit., 108.

Reicke suggests that later writers endeavored to 'spiritualize' the conception of an 'underworld' by placing its denizens in the heavens, ibid., 117. H. Schlier, Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief, Tübingen: 1930, 115-117, provides examples from later literature of references to both angels and human persons confined in heavenly places. It would seem neither possible nor necessary for our purposes to decide at the outset in which direction Christ went in v. 19.

9 First suggested apparently by F. C. Baur in an 1856 article (not available to me); see J. E. Huther, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles of Peter and Jude, tr. F. J. Gloag, Edinburgh: 1881, 183 n. 1.

10 See e.g. Reicke, op. cit., 55f; W. J. Dalton, S.J., Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits, Rome: 1965, 146-148; Best, op. cit., 142f.

11 Cf. Reicke, ibid., 61; so far as I can see, this holds for documents discovered since Reicke wrote.

12 In 13.6 'their spirits' are not the fallen angels themselves but their evil progeny as 19.1 shows.

13 A different Νασαβοροντες will be their eternal abode
after the Last Judgement (10.13; 21.10).

14 In I Tim 3.16, ὑπὸθηκέλον, the reference may be to good angels (cf. Asc Isa 11.22ff).


16 These verses have been proffered in support of the view that judgement and condemnation are being proclaimed here; see e.g. Dalton, op. cit., 150f, 152f.

18 Best, op. cit., 149.
19 Cf. Reicke, op. cit., 94.
20 Kelly, op. cit., 152f.
22 Tr. R. H. Charles, AP ii 232.
23 Reicke, op. cit., 134.

24 In my opinion, this argument holds even though our author apparently refers to Rome as 'Babylon' in 5.13. Rome is called 'Babylon' also in Revelation. It may have been the usual designation for Rome in some early Christian circles. Our author may have taken it over simply as a customary usage.

E. G. Selwyn suggests that 'in the case of I Peter, reasons of prudence may have dictated the use of the symbolic name', The First Epistle of St Peter, New York: 1947, 243.

25 Kelly, op. cit., 143.
26 See Best, op. cit., 36-39.
27 3.19 is only the first part of the transitional sequence of subordinate clauses by means of which Peter swings attention away from Christ's death to Christian baptism.' J. D. G. Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, London: 1970, 215.

28 Otherwise, Selwyn, op. cit., 214f.
29 Dalton, op. cit., 47, argues that the verb κρινόμενων should, by the normal rules of syntax, be understood of an action following that expressed by ἔκκριται; but only a tortuous interpretation is able to maintain that in Ro 8.10 the σώμα is only dead 'on account of sin' (ἐν κρίσιν) after Christ dwells in the Christian; cf. below, 161f.

30 If the distinction between the passive voice in 4.6b and the active voice in 6c is carried over into the adverbial modifiers κατὰ κολάζοντας and κατὰ Ὀφελόν, the structural correspondence between 6b and 6c becomes exact.

31 Otherwise, Dalton, op. cit., 266.
32 Best, op. cit., 157. If our author has in mind here Gen 6.3 as rendered by the Targums and Symmachus, 'My Spirit shall not judge (κρίνει) with man because he is flesh', this
would explain the change of reference in the use of \( \kappa \rho \iota \nu \varepsilon \iota \nu \); 3.19f suggests that he could have had it in mind.

33 It has been urged against this interpretation that it implies a 'second chance' after death. This is not so. The preaching of 4.6a took place only once in the past (\( \varepsilon \omega \eta \chi \epsilon \lambda \iota \iota \varepsilon \iota \nu \varepsilon \iota \nu \)). Nothing in our text implies that dead persons will ever be evangelized again. If 4.6a connects with 3.19 then this preaching will be that of Jesus to those who lived and died before his advent and who therefore may be said to have never had a first chance.

Dalton argues against the interpretation of 4.6a that we have accepted that, 'since no further clarification is offered, one would be led to think that Christ's preaching has the consequence that the dead, as a whole, come to everlasting life', op. cit., 46. But are we to assume that all the Gentiles 

34 Reicke, op. cit., 56.


37 Reicke considers it likely that any doctrine of Christ's doings in 3.19 would have to have Scriptural support; he refers to I Cor 15.3f, op. cit., 242f. If we understand 3.19 and 4.6 as references to Christ's offer of salvation to the dead, Isa 42.7 suggests itself as a Scriptural basis for this belief. We should note that Isa 42.6 is applied to Christ in Luke 2.32a; if v. 6 refers to Christ it follows that v. 7 does too, since the same person is addressed by God in both verses. God appoints this person \( \varepsilon \zeta \chi \zeta \chi \varepsilon \iota \nu \iota \varepsilon \iota \nu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \iota \varepsilon \iota \nu \varepsilon \iota \nu \varepsilon \iota \nu \) as a reference to the abode of the dead. Justin Martyr in Dial 26 also appears to apply Isa 42.7 to Christ's proclamation to the dead. Trypho has just asked Justin if any Jews will partake of salvation. Justin replies:

Those who have persecuted and do persecute Christ, if they do not repent, shall not inherit anything on the holy mountain. But the Gentiles, who have believed on Him, and have repented of the sins which they have committed, they shall receive the inheritance along with the patriarchs and the prophets, and the just men who are descended from Jacob, even though they neither keep the Sabbath, nor are circumcised, nor observe the feasts. Assuredly they shall receive the holy inheritance of God. For God speaks by Isaiah thus: "I, the Lord God, have called Thee in
righteousness, and will hold Thine hand, and will strengthen Thee; and I have given Thee a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles, to open the eyes of the blind, to bring out them that are bound from the chains, and those who sit in darkness from the prison-house (tr. W. Dods et. al. in The Writings of Justin Martyr and Athenagoras, Edinburgh: 1867, 118f, my emphasis).

The righteous Jews of the past are those who sit in darkness in the prison-house. Justin then proceeds to cite Isa 62.10-63.6. In my opinion, he understands these vv. to refer to the manifestation in glory of the crucified Christ to deceased Jews. In 62.10-12 someone heralds the arrival of Christ in the underworld to redeem them. In 63.1 the Jews inquire who this is, ἐρώθησαν ἵματιν ἀυτοῦ... ὄρατος ἐν στολῇ, ἄναβοντος μετὰ ἵματος? In v. 2 Christ speaks, ἔκει δυνάμειν δικαίωμα καὶ θρόνον σωτηρίου. The Jews ask, Διὸς τῷ θεῷ ἐρώθησαν ἵματιν, καὶ τῇ ἐναρμονίᾳ σου ἄν ἐπὶ πάντοσιν θυρών? (v. 3). Christ then tells of his redemptive death (vv. 4-6). In chapter 72 Justin cites an apocryphal passage which relates that ἐννυνθήσεται ὁ κόσμος ὥσπερ Ἰσραὴλ τῶν ζαυγῶν κυροῦ τῶν κεκομμένων οἷς κύριος, καὶ κατέβας πρὸς κόσμον ἐφεξήγησαν κυρίος τῷ σωτηρίῳ κυρίος· This evidence, though later than I Peter, nevertheless suggests that our author's employment of φύλακς here betokens his participation in a primitive Christian exegetical tradition which understood Isa 42.7(b)c as a reference to Christ's going into the underworld to proclaim the gospel. This particular exegetical speculation is not, however, a necessary part of my argument that 'the spirits' in 3.19 refers to deceased human persons.

38 Scholars who see a reference to apostate angels in v. 19 sometimes compare v. 20 with I En 9.11, where God suffers the misdeeds of demons. Primitive Christian usage, however, never applies the concept of God's μυκρόνωσις directly to demonic activity but to human sin.


40 It is not to be expected that our author would have stopped to reflect about the fate of those who enter the realm of the dead after Christ has left it and without hearing the gospel during their earthly lives.

41 C. E. B. Cranfield contrasts our author's views with M Sanh 10.3, 'the generation of the Flood shall have no share in the world to come, nor shall they stand in the judgement, for it is written, "My spirit shall not judge (ἴτατον) with man for ever"' (tr. Danby, op. cit., 397), 'The Interpretation of I Peter 3,19 and 4,6', ET 69 1957-1958 372; cf. Targ Neofiti on Gen 6.3.

42 To my knowledge only a few recent commentators conclude that 'the spirits' comprehends only human persons: Spicq, op. cit., 126; Goppelt, op. cit., 249f; Cranfield,

43 In my opinion, modern scholars have been too quick to elucidate our verse in the light of I Enoch. France, op. cit., 270, writes of our verse, 'To us the reference is obscure; to a church which knew and prized the Book of Enoch (as the author of Jude so evidently did too) it would need no explanation'. The assumption that the Christians to whom our author wrote 'knew and prized' I Enoch is gratuitous.

**HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE REVELATION TO JOHN**


2 See e.g. W. Bousset, Die Offenbarung Johannes, Göttingen: 1906\(^2\), 192.

3 It may be noted here that the immortality of the \(\psi\chi\nu\gamma\iota\) is not countenanced in 6.9; 20.4. \(\psi\chi\nu\gamma\iota\) in Revelation means 'living entity', 'being', human (18.13) or otherwise (8.9).


5 Cf. e.g. Bousset, op. cit., 429f.


12 Cf. further SB 805f.

13 Cf. e.g. Beasley-Murray, op. cit., 55.

14 Just Apol 1.6 is probably not a parallel to Rev 1.4; cf. M. Dods, The Writings of Justin Martyr and Athenagoras, Edinburgh: 1867, 11 n. 2.
15 Charles, op. cit., 12f.

16 The order, God—spirits—Christ, in 1.4 does not tell against this interpretation; cf. I Peter 1.1.

17 Augustine states that the 'Holy Spirit is in Scripture especially spoken of by the number seven, whether in Isaiah or in the Apocalypse...on account of the seven-fold operation of one and the self-same Spirit', Expositions on the Book of Psalms, vol. vi, Oxford:1857, 450. The HT of Isa 11.2f mentions only six spirits; the LXX adds τετελεσθη θεός.


21 Cf. Bousset, op. cit., 185: 'Vor allem aber zeigt die vorliegende Stelle einem ganz andern Stil, als jene spiritualisierenden Vorstellungen.'


23 Cited by Bousset, op. cit., 185 n. 2.

24 Cited by Schweizer, art. cit., 201.

PART II

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE THESSALONIAN CORRESPONDENCE


I THESSALONIANS 5.23

2 Ibid., 242.

3 So e.g. E. von Dobschütz, Die Thessalonicher-Briefe, Göttingen:1909, 228.
4 Ibid., 229.


6 Jewett takes it as adjectival in his translation of the verse: 'And may the God of peace sanctify you (to be) integral, and may your spirit, soul, and body be kept complete (in all of its parts) (and) unblemished at the parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ,' Ibid.

7 P. A. von Stempvoort, 'Eine stilistische Lösung einer alten Schwierigkeit in I Thess V 23', NTS 7 1960-1961 262-265, argues that our verse comprises two sentences with a full stop after pneuma. His argument depends to some extent on the unprovable assumption that Hebrew words were foremost in Paul's mind when he wrote our verse. Von Stempvoort understands pneuma as designating nothing different from ὅμοιος; ὅμοιος ὀλοκληρωμένος καὶ ὀλοκληρωμένος ὅμοιος. To ὅμοιος is a 'synonymer Parallelismus mit Alliteration' (265). He implies that Paul does not repeat himself here for sheer poetic effect in that he understands ὀλοκληρωμένος as quantitative and ὀλοκληρωμένος as qualitative (my next paragraph will indicate why both these modifiers are best taken as quantitative). Since von Stempvoort understands ὅμοιος as equivalent to pneuma (265) -- he does not say how he understands ὅμοιος -- it is entirely unclear what he means by identifying the anthropology of his verse 23b as 'dichotomischer': according to him ὅμοιος is already the whole person. Best, op. cit., 243, sets aside von Stempvoort's reconstruction as 'unnecessarily complicated'.

8 BAG s.v.

9 MM s.v.


11 TDNT iii 766. There is much disagreement amongst the commentators as to whether these modifiers are respectively quantitative or qualitative. C. J. Ellicott, St Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, London: 1866, 84f, and J. E. Frame, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St Paul to the Thessalonians, Edinburgh: 1912, 210f, argue that they are both quantitative.


14 Νηρόθετιγ' can be explained as 'brachyology' (J. B.
Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St Paul*, London: 1895, 89), a construction which 'unites movement towards the goal with being at the goal' (Foerster, *TDNT* iii 767); the fact remains that it stresses in contradistinction to τηρηθείς εἰς, being at the goal. Paul's previous usage in 2.19 and 3.13 -- in both places the reference is particularly to the Last Judgment as ἐμπροσθεν in both vv. (cf. II Cor 5.10) and στρατόπεδον in 2.19 (cf. I Cor 9.25) make plain -- and in 4.15 speaks decisively against the opinion that in our verse ἐν τῇ παραστάσει = Klassisch ἐν τῆς πτώσει', M. Dibelius, *An die Thessalonicher I II; an die Philipper*, Tübingen: 1937, 32. The alternation between ἐν and εἰς in these verses is deliberate and significant.

15 As does Dibelius, *ibid*.
16 See Jewett, *The Form and Function of the Homiletic Benediction*, 24–27; he notes that 'these formal units... exhibit remarkable flexibility in vocabulary and content,' 22.
17 *Op. cit.*, 244; this seems to be the view of all the most recent commentators.
20 St Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, London: 1908, 78; cf. above, 88f. J. Hoffatt, *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. IV, London: 1910, 43, identifies ὑμῶν as an 'unemphatic genitive...throwing the emphasis on the following word or words'; it is doubtful whether in Hellenistic Greek a possessive pronoun which precedes is any more unemphatic than one which follows an articular noun; see *M iii* 189f.
21 Cf. also Mart Pol 14.2: εἰς ἀνάστασιν ἡμῶν ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ τῇ καὶ σώματος ἐν ἀντικρίσεως πνεύματος ἐγίνον
22 Their interpretation of our verse could have been influenced by a desire to combat the heretical Christology of Apollinaris which depended on a trichotomous anthropology of pneuma, ψυχή and σώμα; cf. G. Wohlenberg, *Der erste und zweite Thessalonicherbrief*, Leipzig: 1909, 121f n. 2.
23 E.g. von Dobschütz, *op. cit.*, 230f; Frame, *op. cit.*, 211f, 214.
25 Paul's Anthropological Terms, 178f.
26 Cf. above, 33f.
27 "Den Geist Lüschet Nicht Aus" (1 Thessalonicher v 19)' NovT 10 1968 264, 267, 269.
28 Cf. below, 130ff.
30 Ἐκ ψυχῆς in Col 3.23 and Eph 6.6 means 'with the whole self', not with only part thereof as in ἀραθμοβατικά.

31 Best, op. cit., 243.


33 The contention of von Dobschütz, op. cit., 229, that nirgends findet sich in der vorpaulinischen Zeit diese Trichotomie, cannot be sustained.

34 Cited by Lightfoot, op. cit., 88.

35 Cf. below, 137.


38 The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians, Cambridge, England: 1904, 133.

39 Best, op. cit., 200.

40 'Paul, as we might say, leaves the saints and the answer "hanging in the air",' ibid.

II THESAOLANIONS 2.8

41 This pneuma is not the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ, which elsewhere in Paul is never presented as an agent of destruction; cf. Best, ibid., 303.

II THESAOLANIONS 2.13

42 E. von Dobschütz, op. cit., 299.


44 Ὅτι μὴ πιστεύσωντος τῇ ἀληθείᾳ in verse 12 suggests that πιστεύειν should be understood as 'faith in the truth'. Πίστεως with an objective genitive is not uncommon in Paul, cf. particularly Gal 2.16, καὶ μὴ ἔχῃ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἄμειν ἐὰν Ἰησοῦ ἐπιστεύσωμεν; also 3.22; Ro 3.22; Phil 3.9; 1.27, τὴν πίστιν τῷ ἐνεργεῖσθαι Col 2.12, διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργεῖσθαι τοῦ Θεοῦ.

45 Cf. recently E. Best, op. cit., 315.

46 The fact that πιστεύσωντος in verse 12 is an aorist participle does not weigh against Findlay's argument because this verse must be understood with respect to the ΤΟΣ in v. 8.

47 This argument is considered quite decisive by G.

2 According to Kümmel, ibid., 289, this division was first suggested by J. S. Semler in 1776.


4 The integrity of 6.14-7.1 is fully discussed below, 145-151.

I CORINTHIANS 2.11

5 On the existence and nature of opposition to Paul in Corinth see N. A. Dahl, 'Paul and the Church at Corinth in 1 Cor 1:10-4:21', Christian History and Interpretation: Studies presented to John Knox, ed. W. R. Farmer et. al., Cambridge, England: 1967, 318ff. I largely agree with Dahl's delineation of the setting and purpose of our letter. I discount, however, the existence of a 'Christ-party'; ἐν γε Ἡρῴδου (1.12) probably represents Paul's counterblast to the slogans current in Corinth (cf. vv. 13, 30; 3.11, 21ff; 4.17 et. al. and J. C. Hurd, Jr., The Origin of 1 Corinthians, London: 1965, 101-106; the postulate that a pious scribe penned it is superfluous). The objection often urged against this view, that Paul would
then have written \( \text{ἐξώ} \) (cf. e.g. C. K. Barrett, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, London: 1968, 45), does not distinguish between our position as readers of this letter and that of the Corinthians, who would know straightaway that \( \text{ἐξώ} \) \( \text{χριστιανοὶ} \), not being current among them, represented the apostle's interjected opinion (asynedeton is not uncommon in Paul, M iii. 340). Dahl contends that \( \text{ἐξώ} \) \( \text{χριστιανοὶ} \) 'could be an anti-Pauline slogan even if it was not the device of a special party,' op. cit., 326 n. 3, but it seems gratuitous to suggest this. II Cor 10.7 must not influence us here; this verse could point to a subsequent misappropriation of Paul's slogan by some in Corinth.

6 Paul is absolutely sincere in his desire that his converts shall not place loyalty to Paul above loyalty to Christ, but he is obviously not ready to tolerate easily their feeling a superior loyalty to any other human leader; J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, Nashville: 1950, 96.


8 So e.g. E. Schweizer, TDNT vi 425; otherwise e.g. H. Conzelmann, I Corinthians, tr. J. W. Leitch, ed. C. W. MacRae, Philadelphia: 1975, 57.

9 E. Küsemann, 'I Korinther 2,6-16', Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, Bd. 1, Göttingen: 1964, 269; cf. \( \text{τέλειος} \) in 14.20; Phil 3.15; Col 1.28; 4.15.


11 \( \text{σαρκικός}/\text{σιφικίκως} \) and \( \text{ψυχικός} \) do not 'mean the same thing', as B. A. Pearson, The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in I Corinthians, Missoula: 1973, 111, among others, asserts; W. G. Kühmel, Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus, Leipzig: 1929, 26, defends their synonymity by referring to I Cor 15,44b, 48b, but the fact that \( \text{χοίκος} \) not \( \text{σαρκικός}/\text{σιφικίκως} \) appears in 15.47f tells against this.

12 The 'our' of verse 7 prevents us from restricting the first person plural in vv. 10f to only certain Christians.


14 Pneuma in v. 11a is 'das Selbtsbewusstsein des einzelnen Menschen', J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, Göttingen: 1910, 69.


16 Clement takes this to refer to the Spirit of Christ, though in v. 9 he refers to God as \( \text{ἐρέμουσις} \ldots \text{ἐνωφάν} \) \( \text{καὶ ἐνθυμηθήσων οὐ ἡ πνεύμα αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν}. \)
17 Cf. above, 19f.

18 Cf. Barrett, op. cit., 74.


21 A. Robertson and A. Plummer state that 'the words ψυχή and ψυχή, repeated, are emphatic, the argument being a minori ad malum. Even a human being has within him secrets of his own, which no human being whatever can penetrate, but only his own spirit. How much more is this true of God!', A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians, Edinburgh: 1914, 44. Paul, however, has not written μὴν οὐκὶ μὴλλον or πολλῷ μὴλλον (contrast II Cor 3.8ff, 11).

22 This is understood as 'das herrschende Gesinnung der Welt' (C. F. G. Heinrici, Das erste Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus an die Korinther, Berlin: 1880, 112) or as a demonic determining influence (so Weiss, op. cit., 63) or both (O. Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, London: 1957, 62f). In any case Paul here considers it to be like the imparted Holy Spirit a power external to the human person which determines what he or she knows about the meaning of life and history. Exegesis of 12.2f (see below, 131-133) shows that the demonic nature of this pneuma should be recognized here.

23 Here I am in complete disagreement with R. Jewett who maintains that 'Paul is not interested in the similarities but in the incommensurability between the divine and the human spirits', and that 'the πνεῦμα τοῦ Πνεύματος is definable... only in a negative sense as utterly incommensurate with God's spirit, as related to the πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου and as a characteristic of the ψυχή τοῦ Χριστού', Paul's Anthropological Terms, Leiden: 1971, 188, 189.


26 A. Schlatter, Paulus der Bote Jesu, Stuttgart: 1934, 124; see the same author's Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus, Gütersloh: 1932, 27; also Jewett, op. cit., 365.

I CORINTHIANS 4.21; GALATIANS 6.1

28 J. Calvin, The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, tr. J. W. Fraser, Edinburgh:1960, 202. It is not the case that 'the Apostle offers the alternative: shall he come as a father or as a πατήρ κρίνων', Lightfoot, op. cit., 201; the apostle cannot be a πατήρ κρίνων to the Corinthians but only a father.


32 Weiss, op. cit., 123.

33 Cf. below, 142f.

34 Cf. above, 37.

35 Cf. above, 72f.

36 F. Mussner, Der Galaterbrief, Freiburg:1974, 398.

37 H. Ridderbos, The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia, London:1961, 212; cf. C. J. Ellicott, St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, London:1867, 124: 'here pneuma seems immediately to refer to the state of the inward spirit as wrought upon by the Holy Spirit, and ultimately to the Holy Spirit as the inworking power' (his emphasis). It cannot be argued that the human spirit is in view in our verses because pneuma lacks the article (so Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., 93); see II Th 2.13, discussed above, 95-98.

I CORINTHIANS 5.3f; COLOSSIANS 2.5

38 Most scholars, referring to vv. 12f, conclude that Paul does not criticize the woman because she is not a Christian. Weiss, however, states, 'dass die Schuld der Frau nicht besonders hervorgehoben wird, braucht nicht darin seinem Grund zu haben, dass sie keine Christin war; es wird dies dieselbe antikorientalische Betrachtungsweise sein, nach der auch in der Bergpredigt Schuld und Verantwortung beim Ehebruch ganz allein auf den Mann fällt (Mt 5.28, 32)' op. cit., 125. Weiss' point has been controverted by Kümmler, who observes in his annotations to Lietzmann, op. cit., 173, 'bei der doppelten Moral der Antike trägt ja gerade der Mann die geringere
Verantwortung, und Mt 5.32 hebt Jesus gerade die Verantwort-
losigkeit des Mannes auf; cf. Jo 8.3ff.

39 ἡ δίκαιος πάντοτε πράσσει. Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., 96; cf. LS ad. loc. A4; MM ad. loc. The
orists (πράσσει; οὐκ ἔχει θείος) do not make a marriage more
likely, as they should be interpreted with respect to the
impending judgement (vv 3-5a), P. Bachmann, Der erste Brief
des Paulus an die Korinther, Leipzig:1910, 205 (for the read-
ing πράσσει rather than ποιονός, cf. B. M. Metzger, A Textual
Hurd, op. cit., 277f, supposes that this was a spiritual mar-
riage, not moral license.

40 Scholars agree that outright incest is not in view
here; Allo notes that this 'eût été une abomination aux yeux
de tous, et aurait inspiré à Paul des paroles encore plus
foudroyantes', op. cit., 117. Paul writes 'father's wife'
rather than stepmother (μητρια) in accordance with Lev 18.8;
20.11; Dt 23.1, and perhaps to emphasize the enormity of the
crime (cf. Bachmann, op. cit., 205). Most scholars assume
that the father has died or divorced the woman, but W. Schmithals
supposes that 'the offender must have had sexual relations with
the wife of his father who was still alive', as otherwise the
language and the punishment would be 'too harsh', Gnosticism
in Corinth, tr. J. E. Steely, Nashville:1971, 237. It seems
best to admit with Allo, 118, that 'le texte ne nous dit pas
si le père était vivant ou mort'. The father cannot be iden-
tified as τοῦ αἰτιούμενος (II Cor 7.12); this would be Paul
(cf. E. von Dobschütz, Christian Life in the Primitive Church,
tr. G. Brenner, London/New York:1904, 392) if II Cor 2.3-11,
7.8-13 referred back to our verse. It appears, however, that
they refer to an occurrence during a visit of Paul to Corinth
(2.11) subsequent to the writing of I Cor.

41 So Photius, ὁδε άλασμα λακώνα ζε, ἰσηματικήν ἔνυπτα κεί ἀσκαλα-λοτες, Cramer v 94; otherwise, Weiss,
op. cit., 124; cf. on this Hurd, op. cit., 63 n. 1.

42 Πορνεία is properly 'fornication', and it seems to
retain this meaning elsewhere in Paul (6.13f, 18; 7.2; II Cor
12.21; I Th 4.3; Gal 5.14; Col 3.5; cf. Eph 5.3), although in
Mark 7.21 and Mt 15.19 it seems to mean 'sexual immortality' in
general.

43 Cf. M. Goguel, The Primitive Church, tr. H. C.
Snape, London:1964, 234; cf. also Kühsemann, 'Sentences of Holy
tr. W. J. Montague, London:1969, 70f, although he supposes
that the community has no power in this matter, and Origen,
ed. C. Jenkins, JTS 9.1908 364f lines 21ff, although he infers
from this that pneuma in vv. 3f refers to the Χρίστος of pro-
phesy.

44 E. Schweizer draws attention to four indications
that authority in this matter is given to the congregation: (1) ὁ ἀρχιτρεπτός preceded τῷ τοῦ ἀρχιτρεπτοῦ ἱκετημάτως in v. 4; (2) the church is called on to take action in vv. 2, 7 and 13; (3) Paul may have altered the LXX text in v. 13 to underscore the fact that judgement was a matter for the community; (4) the church's responsibility for dealing with transgressors is established by Gal 6.1; II Cor 1.23-2.11; 7.12, and II Th 3.14, Church Order in the New Testament, tr. F. Clarke, London: 1961, 192.

45 This seems preferable to loading both prepositional phrases pleonastically on to ΣΩΚΛΕΤΩΝ, or linking ἐν τῷ ὄνομα κ.τ.λ. with the far-away infinitive ΠΟΡΕΥΟΝΤΑΙ. The idea is that the malefactor has not lived worthily of the name with which he was justified (cf. 6.11; II Th 1.12). There is no warrant for attaching ἐν τῷ ὄνομα κ.τ.λ. with the less proximate ΕΚΚΛΣΙΑ since elsewhere in Paul not judgement but Christian living (Col 3.17) is connected with the name of Jesus. Cf. in favor of the construction adopted here, J. P. Murphy-O'Connor, O.P., 'I Corinthians, V, 3-5', RB 94 1977 239f.

46 ΠΟΡΕΥΟΝΤΑΙ is dependent on ΣΩΚΛΕΤΩΝ; cf. 7.25b; Robertson 1128.

47 'The obvious meaning of the passage is, not that Paul though absent agrees with their verdict, but that his spirit is gathered together with them in its formulation,' E. Best, One Body in Christ, London: 1955, 59. Paul is not 'saying that his person, with all his resource of power from Christ, has made such an impact upon the persons and community during his stay at Corinth, that even when he is not there, the imprint of his person is such a reality that they continue to act according to it,' A. Cone, Human Spirit and Holy Spirit, Philadelphia: 1959, 116f; similarly, F. W. Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Grand Rapids: 1953, 122; Barrett, op. cit., 124.


49 Cf. below, 140f.

50 Cf. below, 136f, 156f.

51 Barrett, op. cit., 123. Best, however, suggests 'that in this passage Paul takes the idea of Christ as an inclusive or corporate personality so seriously that he envisages the presence of the whole personality wherever a "part" of it is acting,' op. cit., 59.

52 Cf. W. L. Knox, St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge, England: 1939, 102 n. 8; 'Paul seems aware of controversies on the point, and to dismiss them as unimportant.'

53 Bultmann, TNT i 202.

54 See below, 107.

55 Cf. above, 44.
56 It is very doubtful that ἄνδρον τῇ ὁμοσύμ. κ.τ.λ. was a commonplace feature of Greek epistolary style, as G. Karlsson has suggested, 'Formelhaftes in Paulusbriefen?', Eranos 54 1956 138-141; he has at any rate adduced no close parallels to I Cor 5.3a.

57 Cf. above, 103f.

58 Die Briefe an die Philippier, an die Kolosser und an Philemon, Göttingen:1953, 95. R. G. Tanner called attention to the apostle's fondness for military metaphors in a communication to the Sixth International Congress on Biblical Studies in Oxford during April, 1978, entitled 'St Paul's View of Militia and Contemporary Social Values'.

59 It does not seem necessary to enter here into the question of the authenticity of Colossians, since 2.5, the only relevant verse, neither adds to nor alters our understanding of pneuma in Pauline usage.

I CORINTHIANS 5.5

60 E.g. Calvin, op. cit., 108.


62 Cf. F. F. Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians, London:1971, 55: 'the language implies a severer sentence than excommunication.'


64 'Was 5,5 die Gemeinde, das bewirkt 11,30 der Einzelne selbst', E. Sokolowski, Die Begriffe Geist und Leben bei Paulus, Göttingen:1903 129 n. 1.

65 'The prince or angel of death is here identified with the devil -- that is, Satan. It is not easy to parallel this outright identification, but it is not inconsonant with the general teaching of the New Testament,' Bruce, The Epistle to the Hebrews, Grand Rapids:1964, 49; cf. Jo 8.44; cf. also b BB 16a where the fact that God specially cautions Satan to spare Job's life (Job 2.7b) proves to Resh Lakish that he is the angel of death.

66 Bachmann, op. cit., 211.

67 Occasionally in his allegorical exegesis Philo adds to a Scriptural reference to physical death a reference to an ethical sort of ὀλέθρος; for example, the destruction of Abel represents the destruction of the teaching devoted to God (ὁλέθρος τῷ φιλοσοφεῖν ἔγχυσις 'Αβέλ), Det Pot ins 1030. This suggests that when Philo uses ὀλέθρος of an ethical sort of death, the idea of real physical death is not far from his mind.
68 Tertullian De pud 14.16 holds that 5.2 also refers to his death: 'pro quo lugerent? Vtique pro mortuo.' The LXX phrase cited by Paul in v. 13b (with a change in the verb from the singular to the plural) refers to death specifically in Dt 17.7; 21.21; 22.21, 24; 24.7 (it includes death in 19.19). Cf. also F. Godet, Commentary on St Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, tr. A. Cusin, Edinburgh:1886, vol. I, 242-264.

69 H. von Campenhausen, Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries, tr. J. A. Baker, London:1967, 134 n. 50; he is following G. Bornkamm.

70 TDNT vi 435.

71 'La Chair et l'Esprit en I Cor V, 5', NTS 15 1968-1969 221, 223f, 228.

72 Barrett, op. cit., 126.


75 Origen (ed. C. Jenkins, JTS 9 1908 364) and Chrysostom (PG 1xi 124) opine strangely that Paul speaks of the salvation of the higher part of the person to make it plain that the whole person will be saved; quite the opposite conclusion would be apt to be drawn.

76 Cf. Thiselton, art. cit.

77 Cf. above, 21f.


79 Paul does not say how nor if his being put to death in itself enhances his salvation. It may be that he is simply saved after not because of his death, that is, de may be consecutive rather than final here; cf. Moule 144. We may agree with H.-D. Wendland that Paul does not discuss how this person is saved, Die Briefe an die Korinther, Göttingen:1972, 43. The present writer inclines toward the interpretation of Büchsel, however, who surmises that Paul in our verse is certain that the fornicator will be saved because he grounds salvation 'on Christ alone' rather than 'on the moral renewal which is associated with justification', TDNT iii 938.

I CORINTHIANS 6.17

80 Cf. Hurd, op. cit., 68. Paul accepts the slogan in principle. Perhaps he has used it or even coined it in a different context. Perhaps he simply accepts it as if πίστευε
Perhaps he distinguishes between 'can' and 'may'. We are not in a position to prefer any one of these options; cf. Schmithals, op. cit., 233.

Cf. Diog L 7.98 (Zeno); Cic Off 3.3.11, 8.35; Epict. Diss 1.18.2 et. al.; Philo Det pot ins 6; Weiss, op. cit., 158 n. 1.

Cf. Bachmann, op. cit., 239.

Cf. Heinrici, op. cit., 178; Godet, op. cit., 1 303.

Τίνος is neuter in accordance with παντα.

Cf. Test R 3.3; Test S 5.3; CD iv 17; also Mark 7.21-23 where πορνεύω heads Jesus' specification of 'evil thoughts'. Verse 18 should be interpreted in this light; cf. Prov 6.32; Conzelmann, op. cit., 112.

In II Cor 12.20ff it is not emphasized. In Ro 13.13 (cf. Eph 4.25ff) it is not mentioned.

Bachmann sees the discussion in 6.1ff prepared for by (1) Πλεονέκτησε... ἢ ἀρνητής (5.11); (2) τοὺς ἔξω ... τοὺς ἔξω (5.10ff); (3) χριστέων (5.3-5, 12f), op. cit., 236.

We can be sure neither that 5.1 was the only case of πορνεύω in Corinth, because it is the only case Paul inveighs against (so Hurd, op. cit., 278), nor that there was plenty of πορνεύω and Paul has singled out the worst offense (καὶ τοκωτὴ πορνεύω; so Schmithals, op. cit., 236f; cf. in favor of this assumption 7.2, δὲ... πὶς πορνεύως).


In 7.4 σώμα represents primarily the corporeal body as a medium for sexual relationship. It may refer in addition to the 'self'; cf. R. Bultmann, TNT 1 194.

The Cynic Diogenes held that licentious sexual activity is of the same order as free intake of food (Diog L 6.46, 69); cf. Lietzmann, op. cit., 27. Verse 13a may reproduce a current Corinthian slogan; Weiss has noted that 'der Satz ohne ἐξίστατος war wohl ursprünglich als eine spiritu- alistische Parole gemeint, op. cit., 159. But it is just as likely that Paul has picked the example of foods as a foil to fornication, both being implications of Πάντως μοι ἐξίστατος which were near at hand; Ro 14 suggests that 'the question of permitted and not-permitted food was in the air in general,' Conzelmann, op. cit., 110 n. 15.

The interpretation of σώμα as 'self' in our vv. appears to have been broached by F. C. Baur, 'Beiträge zur Erklärung der Korintherbriefe', Theologische Jahrbücher 11 1852 536-541.

This reading is certain. Metzger, op. cit., 552, writes, 'the context makes the future necessary as the correlative to καταργεῖν in verse 13 (compare also the parallel
in II Cor 4:14). In addition, we may note that it is inherently unlikely in the light of 4:7 that Paul would in our verse represent his readers as already resurrected.

94 According to Weiss, op. cit., 162, and Best, op. cit., 74, Paul writes 'us' instead of 'our bodies' in v. 14 because he is conscious of the distinction he makes in 15.35ff between our present and future bodies. This interpretation also writes off v. 14 as an effective proof of 13b. According to Schmithals, op. cit., 232f, v. 14 is not 'the real Pauline motivation for the rejection of πορευόμενος' (his emphasis); it was suggested by the gnostic reasoning Paul repeats in v. 13ab.

95 Cf. H. Chadwick, 'All Things to All Men', NTS 1 1955 261-275.


98 The application of temple imagery to the corporate church and to individual Christians came easily to Paul because he believed the Spirit was present in the corporate church and in individual Christians (cf. 12.4ff). In Paul's time temple imagery was widely applied to different domains of divine influence and presence. For example, in 1QS viii 1-10 and ix 3-7 (and perhaps v 5f and xi 8) the Qumran community is called a temple, while in x 3 heaven is a temple; cf. B. Gurtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament; Cambridge, England:1965, 22-30, 94; R. J. McKelvey, The New Temple, Oxford:1969, 46-50.

99 Verse 18, the idea that the fornicator unlike other sinners sins against his own body, adds nothing substantial to the argument; it heightens the exhortation; cf. Lietzmann, op. cit., 28. Πορευόμενος is contrasted unfavorably with all other sins; other particular sins are not in view. Paul's phraseology here probably depends upon the Jewish conception, εὐνόμως or εὐνοήσας; cf. SB iii 366f. If we attribute 18b to Corinthian slogæering (so Moule 196f), we attribute to the Corinthian opposition to Paul a high regard for the οὐγκρίνομεν; this is neither an impossible nor a certain Corinthian characteristic. Unlike Kempthorne, art. cit., 572, I believe ἰδιον prohibits a word-play on οὐγκρίνομεν which would let it refer to the church as Christ's body as well as to the individual's human body; the immediate context of I Clem 46.7, where Ἰδιον of the church, is quite different from that of our verse.

100 Paul probably thinks here of the Hellenistic formulas of slave transactions noted by A. Deissman, Light from the Ancient East, tr. L. R. M. Strachan, London:19273, 322f. Paul uses the terminology of this Hellenistic practice to impress the Corinthians with the truth of their situation as Christians; cf. J. Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, London:1938, 70f. He is not entirely dependent on this
reference for his thought; Barrett, op. cit., 152, notes Scriptural influences, and Schlatter, op. cit., 207, refers to Mt 20.28. Most commentators do not consider it apposite to ask or possible to answer the question from whence Christians have been ransomed, but Wendland sees rightly that 'nach dem Grundgedanken unseres Abschnitts wäre wohl zu ergänzen: aus der Herrschaft der Sünde', op. cit., 44. When we recognize that vv. 19b-20a continue the main line of Paul's argument against ἐπανέλθῃ, we need no longer dismiss the reference as 'ein vorübergehender...Gedankenblitz', Weiss, op. cit., 167.

101 Otherwise e.g. Bultmann: 'in I Cor 6.16f Paul supports his statement, "he becomes one body with her" with Gen 2.24, "they shall become one flesh". In so doing, he gives "flesh" the meaning of soma', TNT i 209.

102 In Col 2.5 ὀνόματι is contrasted with the human pneuma, cf. above, 107.

103 Of course ὀνόματι designates powerlessness not sin in 1.26, 29, but it is not there directly contrasted with pneuma.


105 Although Bachmann interprets 12d and even 18 in terms of the dominance attained by world powers over a πνεῦμα through a πάθος, he does not allow ὀνόματι to carry this thought, op. cit., 239-242, 246-248, 251.

106 He himself apparently married; otherwise, J. Jeremiah, 'War Paulus Witwer?', ZNW 25 1926 310-312; 'Nochmal:', War Paulus Witwer?', ZNW 28 1929 321-323, but if Paul were a widower would he have written 7.7a: Θέλω σε ναύπλιον καὶ ἐμπυκτόν?

107 See D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London:1956, 71-76. In The History of the Synoptic Tradition, tr. J. Marsh, Oxford:1963, 49f, Bultmann allows that Mark 10.6-8 could all go back to Jesus because such a collocation of two texts of Scripture was 'unheard of among the Rabbis', but this fact could argue on the contrary for the addition of Gen 2.24 by early church redaction more removed from rabbinic practices than Jesus was.

108 Daube, op. cit., 81f; J. P. Sampley, 'And the Two Shall Become One Flesh', Cambridge, England:1971, 55f; SB 1 802f; cf. I Cor 15.39 for Paul's awareness of different kinds of flesh.

109 Cf. Apoc. Nos xv-xxi; Origen, ed. C. Jenkins, JTS 9 1908 370, xxxix 110 lines 6-8; b Shab 146a; b AZ 22b. Philo held that the Fall was rooted in the sex drive (Op mund 151f); he thereby gives Gen 2.24b a negative application (Gig 65). This is not Paul's view; the Fall for him is a matter of disobedience (Ro 5.12ff). But this fact does not indicate that for Paul sexual knowledge preceded the Fall. The Biblical story itself suggests the reverse (see Gen 3.16; ἔστιν and γυναικεῖα are associated not only with the knowledge of good
and evil which accompanies the Fall but also sexual knowledge, cf. 2.9, 17; 3.6f; 4.1). On the question as to whether Paul considered that Satan sexually seduced Eve, cf. E. E. Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, Edinburgh:1957, 61-63.

110 Cf. Bauer, art. cit., 538-540, who maintains that Paul failed to prove that ἐπέκαμνε was not indifferent or if he did he disallowed marriage.


113 Cf. Godet, op. cit., 1 310; Weiss, op. cit., 163f 168f; Allo, op. cit., 69, 72f; Moffatt, op. cit., 69f; Best, op. cit., 76.


115 Here I am in complete disagreement with Gundry, who maintains that it is the 'superficality of somatic union with a harlot which contradicts union with Christ', op. cit., 53f.

I CORINTHIANS 7.34

116 See in favor of this reading Metzger, op. cit., 555f.


118 It has been accepted by Conzelmann, op. cit., 131 n. 5.

119 Robertson 993.

120 Bachmann, op. cit., 290.

121 Cf. Calvin's apt comments on our verse, op. cit., 163.

122 Barrett, op. cit., 181, identifies 'that she may be holy both in body and in spirit' as a maxim of the Corinthian ascetical party; it cannot be established from ch. 7 that the Corinthians were concerned about the holiness of the human spirit.

I CORINTHIANS 12.10; 14.12, 32

123 Ch. 13 is Pauline and not out of place. The chapter is dominated by the same concerns that characterize the rest of the letter, e.g. tongues, μισθώματα (cf. especially 8.1-3), maturity/childhood, boasting (for the reading μεθύωμαι in v. 3 cf. Metzger, op. cit., 564). It dovetails with the succeeding and preceding chapters in that 'love provides the scales by which other gifts may be tested and measured, and
also is the means by which the unity of the body is maintained' (cf. 13.4-7 with 14.4, 5b and 12.25f), Barrett, ibid., 297. Schweizer notes how love plays an important part in the similar context of Ro 12f, Church Order in the New Testament, 100 n. 386. These considerations have more weight than the manuscript evidence for the chapter's interpolation noted by J. T. Sanders, 'First Corinthians 13', Interp 20 1966 183 n. 50, viz. paragraph enumeration in Codex Vaticanus.

124 Most scholars interpret πίστις in 12.9 as a special supernatural endowment. They refer to 13.2; Mark 9.23; 11.23; Mt 17.20, and argue that Paul could not speak of confessional faith as a gift enjoyed by some but not all Christians; cf. e.g. Bachmann, op. cit., 382; Barrett, op. cit., 285. On the other hand, it can be argued from the immediate context that πίστις is confessional faith as evoked by the 'word' (v. 8) and able -- potentially, at least -- to express itself in wonder-working (vv. 9b, 10a); here Paul does not wish to deny faith to some Christians but to insist in accordance with v. 3 (and cf. v. 11) that believers who display no exceptional gifts but manifest their faith in Jesus Christ as Lord have the Spirit too; so Schmithals, op. cit., 172f. In this latter view, there are differing degrees of faith, but no different kinds of faith; cf. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians, 1 363; Schlatter, Paulus der Bote Jesu, 340f; II Cor 8.7.

125 To be sure, Ellis has recently argued that for Paul and the Corinthians 'the terms πνευματικός/πνευματικός denote, respectively, gifts of inspired utterance or discernment and men who exercise such gifts,' 'Spiritual' Gifts in the Pauline Community', NTS 20 1973f 128ff. Ellis believes that here Paul is at one with the 'special' association of the Spirit with prophecy in the OT (131f) and Qumran writings (135-137), but the evidence he adduces for this from Paul's letters (129f) is not strong. Against his understanding I note: (1) the fact that only gifts of utterance and discernment are in view as πνευματικά in chapter 14 may be explained simply from the nature of the issue at hand, viz. glossolalia in public worship, rather than from a pre-defined delimitation of πνευματικά; (2) we cannot identify πνευματικά in 14.1 with the 'greater charisms' in 12.31 and still claim the former encompasses only all the gifts of utterance and discernment (so Ellis, 129), since tongues at least (12.28) rank below certain gifts that are not basically or necessarily oral or aural, viz. ἄγαθα ἢρμηνείας ('helpful deeds', cf. II Macc 8.19; III Macc 5.50; BAG s.v.) and κυρήφησις ('administrative acts', cf. Conzelmann, op. cit., 215 n. 49); (3) 'spiritual charism' in Ro 1.11 need not be restricted to 'mutual exhortation' in v. 12 (so Ellis, 129f), since (a) v. 12 is a corrective to 11 and thus these vv. are not strictly parallel to I Th 3.2; II Th 2.17; (b) πράγματα ἐκ τῆς is not necessarily mediated viva voce for Paul (cf. Phlm 7; on Ro 1.11f cf. C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,
New York: 1957, 25); (4) grace is viewed as spiritual power in I Cor 15.10 and II Cor 12.9; this indicates that ΧΑΡΙΤΩΜΑΤΙ is not a more extensive term than ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΗ for Paul (Bultmann, TNT 1 156). Cf. Ignatius, who considers as pneumatic oversight (Mg 13.1; cf. I Cor 12.28), martyrdom (Eph 11.2) and fellowship (5.1). In canonical Eph 1.3 ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΗ refers to everything given by the Spirit (cf. H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser, Düsseldorf: 1957, 44).

126 Hurd, op. cit., 193.


129 Greeven, art. cit., 5-8.

130 Cf. Bultmann, TNT 1 160.

131 S. D. Currie maintains that we are not in a position to comprehend it definitely, "Speaking in Tongues", Evidence outside the New Testament Bearing on "Glossolalia Lalein", Interp 19 1965 274-294. He notes four possibilities: (1) foreign languages; (2) heavenly languages; (3) dark sayings; (4) incantations. He does not attempt to circumscribe the phenomenon by an exegesis of our chapters.

132 Cf. Meyer, op. cit., 1 370: 'We are to understand by ζωγράφισις λαλεῖν such an outburst of prayer in petition, praise, and thanksgiving, as was so ecstatic that in connection with it the speaker’s own conscious intellectual activity was suspended, while the tongue did not serve as the instrument for the utterance of self-active reflection, but, independently of it, was involuntarily set in motion by the Holy Spirit, by whom the man in his deepest nature was seized and borne away.'
133 Godet, op. cit., ii 203.

134 V. 9 does not represent an application of vv. 7-8 to the Corinthian phenomenon but a movement from the non-human to the human sphere (Οὐσία καὶ ὤμετα) for another analogy to uninterpreted public glossolalia, viz. deliberate nonsensical talk; cf. Bachmann, op. cit., 410, who notes that Paul differentiates the speaking envisioned in v. 9 from the Corinthian phenomenon under discussion through his use of ἐστιν and the article. In addition, he calls it εἰς κατ' ἀλλούντες, which is not the same as ἐγὼ ἀλλούντας (v. 2).

135 Instances in Weiss, op. cit., 336ff.


137 Cf. BAG s.v. 2, who include Phil 2.11 here; MM s.v.; Lampe, s.v.; R. H. Gundry, "Ecstatic Utterance" (NEB), JTS N.S. 17 1966 299ff.

138 Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, Jesus and the Spirit, London: 1975, 243; Schlatter, op. cit., 343, 374, relates χένη to the various 'Klang und Sinn' of the 'unverständl.ich' speech, whereas Bachmann, op. cit., 383, understands by χένη prayer, song etc.; cf. Heinrici, op. cit., 386ff, 391. Given the pre-dominant nuance of χένος, 'species', 'race', 'nation', it is far better to understand it here with regard to language. Gundry, art. cit., 300, and Dunn, op. cit., 243ff, follow J. G. Davies, 'Pentecost and Glossolalia', JTS N.S. 3 1952 228-230, and argue that languages are in view here because ἐρμηνεύων and its cognates mean 'translation' almost all the time in the LXX and the NT; the exceptions are Sir 47.17; Job 42.18; Luke 24.27; cf. Ig Phil 6.1.

139 Gundry, art. cit., 306. Chrysostom maintains that foreign languages are in view here and that the gift was given to the early church to enhance its mission -- this in a comment on 14.21 Homilies on the First Epistle of St Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, vol. iv, Part 2, Oxford:1839, 488. Clem Alex also understood the Corinthian glossolalia as speech in foreign languages, Strom 1.16. Allo has noted how the mistaken reading of the Vulgate at I Cor 14.18b, 'quod omnium vestrum lingua loquor', helped perpetuate this mistaken interpretation of the Corinthian phenomenon, op. cit., 364, 379. Concerning τὰ ἀγαθά τῶν ἀνθρώπων (13.1), cf. n. 142.


142 The 'tongues of men' in 13.1 might connote such elaborate human rhetoric as Paul has denigrated in 1.17ff
Dunn refers it to other sorts of inspired speech, e.g. prophecy, teaching etc., op. cit., 230. Either identification accords with the tendency of chapter 13 (noted above, n. 123) to pick up the themes of the rest of the letter. We cannot infer from 13.1 that both heavenly and human language played a part in the Corinthian phenomenon; otherwise, Schlatter, op. cit., 343. Iren Adv haer 5.6.1 may have both foreign human and heavenly languages in mind: Πνευματική λαλησθαι; cf. Mark 16.17.

143. It might be argued that I Cor 14 cannot deal with heavenly language since Paul in II Cor 12.4 denies that this is a possibility for him or anyone, φανερωθεὶ τῷ θεῷ ρήματα, ἐὰν ἤκουσαι ἐὰν ἂν ῥήματα, 'and he heard things that cannot be told, which man may not utter' (RSV). However, H. Windisch notes that τό θεόν ρήματα 'sind vor allem in den Mysterien die geheimen Lehren und Formeln und der Inhalt der Schauungen, die nicht in den Kreis der Nichteingeweihten hinausgetragen werden dürfen,' Der zweite Korintherbrief, Göttingen:1924, 377.

144. Scholars who have argued that heavenly languages are in view here include O. Everling, Die paulinische Engelologie und Dämonologie, Göttingen:1888, 38f; Volz, op. cit., 137 n. 2; G. H. Box, The Apocalypse of Abraham, London:1918, 58 n. 2; Wendland, op. cit., 135; Dunn, op. cit., 244, 304.

145. 'Dass die Aussage, mit der die Verhandlung beginnt eine allgemeinere Bedeutung für das Ganze beansprucht, unterliegt keinem Zweifel,' Heinrici, op. cit., 355.

146. Cf. LS s.v. D 1 2; MM s.v. 2.

147. M iii 92f, 124f; BDF 185f.


150. Cf. Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., 261; Moffatt, op. cit., 179; Schlatter, op. cit., 333, 335f.

151. See R. Mcl. Wilson, 'How Gnostic Were the Corinthians?', NTS 19 1972 65. J. M. Ford, 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians or the First Epistle to the Hebrews?', CBQ 28 1966 402-416, contends but does not prove that Corinthian Christians were predominantly Jewish.

152. A. Stein, 'Wo trugen die korinthischen Christen ihre Rechtsbrüder aus?', ZNW 59 1968 86-90, argues that Corinthian Christians brought their property disputes before wise judges appointed by the synagogue (6.1-6a).


154. 'Cursing Jesus (I Cor xi.3): The Jews as Religious "Persecutors", NTS 21 1975 544-554.
155 Ibid., 553.


158 Ed. C. Jenkins, JTS 10 1905 30.

159 'Did the Gnostics Curse Jesus?', JBL 86 1967 301-305.


163 Cf. G. de Broglie, 'Le texte fondamentale de S Paul contre la foi naturelle', Recherches de science religieuse 39 1951 260-265; K. Maly, 'I Kor 12, 1-3, eine Regel zur Unterscheidung der Geister?', BZ N. F. 10 1966 89ff; Hündige Gemeinde, Stuttgart: 1967, 187; Sweet, art. cit., 241, 259, who thinks Paul is being sarcastic; T. Holtz, 'Das Kennzeichen des Geistes (I Kor xii, 1-3)', NTS 18 1972 372; Conzelmann, op. cit., 204; Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians, 118.


165 Otherwise, Weiss, op. cit., 295f; Barrett, op. cit., 281.


167 It is possible that I Cor 14,33b-35 are a gloss. Conzelmann, op. cit., 246, notes that these verses (1) interrupt the flow of thought; (2) contradict, 11.2ff; (3) contain peculiarities of legalistic usage (e.g. τητρεπηκε Θελ, υποτεινο εκς Θελ), and (4) thought (cf. Gal 3,28, but note what is omitted in I Cor 12,131). Against this Ellis, 'Spiritual Gifts in the Pauline Community', 131, draws attention to the catch-word connection by means of στοιχεῖον. ΛΑΛΕΙΒ in these verses might be cited as evidence for their integrity or as a reason for their inclusion here.


169 Cf. Bachmann, op. cit., 379; Moffatt, op. cit., 178: 'to be a Christian at all...the Spirit is essential'; de Broglie, art. cit., 265f; Schweizer, TDNT vi 423 n. 603; Schmithals, op. cit., 172; Sweet, art. cit., 241, 252; Bruce, op. cit., 118.
170 'The plural... is to be regarded as referring to all the particular cases,' Godet, op. cit., ii 199.

171 Otherwise, G. Dautzenberg, 'Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der διακρίσις Πνευματικής (I Kor 12,10)', BZ 15 1971 93-104; Urchristliche Prophetie, Stuttgart:1975, 122-148. Dunn, op. cit., 233f, 236, thinks that Paul's understanding of διακρίσις incorporates both distinguishing and interpreting, but I see no evidence that interpretation is involved; διακρίσις in Ro 14.1 probably does not have a technical charismatic sense and the διακρίσις in view in I Cor 2.13 in spite of v. 12 carries no connotation of testing.

172 Meyer, op. cit., ii 28; so most commentators; Lietzmann, op. cit., 69, 74; Wendland, op. cit., 130; Barrett, op. cit., 328f, and Bruce, op. cit., 134, attribute the gift of διακρίσις also to non-prophets.

173 This discernment is not the same as that of II.28, 31.

174 Cf. Bachmann, op. cit., 328f; Hering, op. cit., 127 n. 11. Δοκιμάζων and διακρίνειν are synonymous in II.28, 31.

175 Weiss, op. cit., 327, who cites ἔρει as evidence; H. Leisegang, Pneuma Hagion, Leipzig; 1922, 114 n. 2; Groselide, op. cit., 323f; Baker, op. cit., 226f, who argues that aside from 12.31a; 14.1, 12, 39, γνῶναι and cognate elsewhere in I Cor carry a negative connotation (3.3; 13.4), Paul nowhere else in his letters commands zeal, and in our context unfailingly and immediately qualifies his command.

176 Godet, op. cit., ii 275.

177 Cf. Heinrici, op. cit., 456 n. 1; Schlatter, op. cit., 385; Wendland, op. cit., 131. Verse 33a alludes to Gen 1.2: the earth was καθαρσικές but the Πνεῦμα Ἐλέου created order and ordained peace. In Isa 54.10 the covenant of the rainbow is called a covenant of peace. Verse 33a should be appreciated with reference to traditional Jewish teaching concerning the implications of divine order and peace for human existence before God, on which see van Unnik, 'Is I Clement Purely Stoic?', Vig Chr 4 1950 181-189.


179 Cf. e.g. Godet, op. cit., ii 307.

180 Conzelmann, op. cit., 237 n. 46.

181 So Dunn, op. cit., 233, 206.


184 Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J., 'A Feature of Qumran
Angelology and the Angels of I Cor xi 10, NTS 4 1957 55-58, who relates this verse to the exclusion of the physically defective from the Qumran community. Heinrici, op. cit., 316f, refers to Gen 1.16 (πνεῦμα κυρίου, πνεῦμα) as indicating the attendance of angels at the creation of humankind.


I CORINTHIANS 14.2, 14-16


189 For this meaning of ψαρονάω, see Bag s. v. 7.

190 Cf. C. J. Ellicott, St Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, London: 1887, 259.

191 Bruce, op. cit., 130.

192 Calvin, op. cit., 286.

193 E.g. Edwards, op. cit., 367.

194 In 14.16 év is read by B D E P pauc. This reading should not be accepted on external grounds: p46 χριστιανός, A G plerique omit év. It should not be argued that an original év was omitted because it was not read in v. 15, as even with the omission of év the use of pneuma in the dative in v. 16 is not brought into line with v. 15 where it has the article.

195 Cf. e.g. Chrysostom, op. cit., ii 493; Calvin, op. cit., 286, 291; Craig, op. cit., 200; Barrett, op. cit., 320.

196 χριστιανός and πνευματικός are synonymous in our context; cf. 12.31 with 14.1.

197 12.28-30 suggest that there are not recognizable 'glossolaliacs' in the same sense as there are recognizable 'apostles', 'prophets' and 'teachers' in the Christian community: 'das Personalsubstantiv deutet... eine größere Festigkeit des Kreises der Träger an als die Sachbezeichnung,' H. Merklein, Das kirchliche Amt nach der Epheserbrief, München: 1973, 307 n. 106; cf. Greeven, art. cit., 4.


199 Cf. above, 102.
200 Cf. above, 102.

201 For this understanding of νο̄στ, see the literature cited above in n. 26.

202 p46 B G omit ἐρ.

203 Cf. above, 133. In 14.21 (cf. 13.11) Paul subtly denigrates uninterpreted public glossolalia as childish nonsense, and in 14.19, where μυρις is the highest number he could write, he in effect rules it out of church all together; cf. Hurd, op. cit., 112f. Paul, however, does not at all inhibit private glossolalia (14.4a, 18, 28).

204 It cannot be argued that 'my spirit' in 14.14 could refer to the imparted Holy Spirit in the same way as does 'spirits of prophets' in verse 32, where in genuine Christian inspiration it might appear that we could speak of 'the Holy Spirit of a prophet' (so H. Bertrams, Das Wesen des Geistes nach der Anschauung des Apostels Paulus, Münster: 1913, 17 n. 4), for (1) 'my spirit' implies a greater and more particular degree of possession than does the indefinite 'spirits of prophets'; (2) verse 32 may well be an ironical formulation critical of Corinthian pneumatology (cf. above, 133), and (3) in its accuracy of expression may have been sacrificed in the interests of a concise and gripping style. Paul elsewhere affirms that a Christian 'has' the Spirit (Rö 8.9; II Cor 4.13), but not that it is therewith for him or her 'my Spirit'. Weiss wonders whether 14.32 may be a pre-Pauline Christian maxim: 'dieser gewaltige Satz...wie ein formuliertes Sprichwort klingt,' op. cit., 341; cf. 'the spirits of prophets' in Rev 22.6.

205 Cf. Allo, op. cit., 355: 'la partie la plus haute de l'intelligence.'

206 Self-edification is good (14.4a). Gifts of the Spirit are προσ το σωματείον (12.7). 6.12ff confirm that το σωματείον includes what benefits the specific individual (cf. above, 113f); contrast F. D. Bruner, A Theology of the Holy Spirit, Grand Rapids: 1970, 290.

I CORINTHIANS 16.18; II CORINTHIANS 2.13; 7.13

207 Ἐνος is not uncommon in I Cor, where it occurs ten times as compared with twice in Ro and thrice in II Cor; it may be emphatic here; cf. 1.15; 5.4; 7.40; 11.24f; 16.21; Μ iii 191.

208 Το μὴ εὐερεν με Τίνων; το with the infinitive is causal here; Μ iii 242.

209 A number of scholars suppose that Paul is being critical of the Corinthians in 17b (e.g. Bachmann, op. cit., 471: "weil euren Rückstand diese voll verglüten haben"), but such criticism would be quite out of place here; so, rightly, Allo, op. cit., 405f.
210 Εἶδεν τὸν αὐτὸν ὀτι ἡ ἀνάπαυσιν αὐτῶν ἔστιν,
Theophylact PG 124 792C.


213 Εἰς τῷ ψυχῷ τοῦ, Χριστοῦ = Εἰς τῷ Εὐαγγελίσθην τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Εἰς here means 'for the sake of' and τῷ Χριστοῦ is an objective genitive; so Meyer, op. cit., ii 178; Windisch, op. cit., 94; Bultmann, Der zweite Brief an die Korinther, hrsg. E. Dinkler, Göttingen:1976, 55.

214 So Bachmann, Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther, Leipzig:1909, 126. According to Windisch, ὄν κυρίων 'will deutlich machen, dass der Ausdruck bildlich gemeint ist', op. cit., 94; he compares I. Clem 48.4.

215 Windisch, ibid., 95.


217 Cf. Schmiedel, op. cit., 186.

218 Meyer, op. cit., ii 179; cf. Robertson 901: 'the experience may have been too vivid to Paul for the past perfect.' Others consider the perfect here as simply equivalent to an aorist, e.g. Moule 14.

219 Barrett, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, London:1973, 94, suggests that Paul fears that Titus, who had been engaged on the collection, may have fallen prey to bandits.


221 Cf. e.g. Bultmann, op. cit., 55: 'vollig gleichlautend'; Barrett, op. cit., 202: 'at 7.5 Paul says "Our flesh found no relief", meaning exactly what he had said at 2.13, "I got no relief for my spirit"'; J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., 27: 'a synonymous use of pneuma and ἐνεργέω'.

222 It is therefore not correct to say 'that Titus' pneuma was set at rest (II Cor 7.13) means only that he himself was set at rest', Bultmann, TNT i 206.

II CORINTHIANS 4.13

223 TNT i 207f; cf. Der zweite Brief an die Korinther, 123: 'Der Gen. ist Gen. subj...das pneuma bezeichnet im Grunde die Ort und Weise des Glaubens, sein Wie!' cf. also F. V. Filson, The Interpreter's Bible x 321: 'in the same spirit of steadfast faith'.

224 Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, Grand Rapids:1962, 147.

226 Otherwise, e.g. Strachan, op. cit., 96.

227 Cf. e.g. C. Hodge, An Exposition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, London:1883, 97; G. Godet, La Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens, ed. P. Comtesse, Fils, Neuchâtel:1914, 146; Schlatter, op. cit., 534; Schweizer, TDNT vi 426; Wendland, op. cit., 190.

II CORINTHIANS 6.6


229 Cf. e.g. Bultmann, Der zweite Brief an die Korinther, 173.

230 Cf. above, 121ff; below, 145ff.

231 Cf. Plummer, op. cit., 196: 'it is scarcely credible that St Paul would place the Holy Spirit in a list of human virtues and in a subordinate place, neither first... nor last.'


233 Cf. Windisch, op. cit., 204.


235 Meyer, op. cit., ii 303.

II CORINTHIANS 7.1

236 It was first denied by K. Schrader in a commentary of 1835, according to Windisch, op. cit., 18.


238 This verb is apparently a hapax legomenon in extant ancient Greek.

239 The three hapax legomena in 16cd-18 naturally do not count for anything in this regard; Paul has not simply chosen to employ these precise words but the Scripture passages of which they are part: Lev 26.12 (Ὣορεῖνητεαίν); Ezek 20.34 (ταξιδεύειν), and II Sam 7.8 (πωτοκράτωρ). 16cd-18 might constitute a pre-Pauline florilegium with 14-16ab and 7.1 being original to II Cor.


242 Art. cit., 279f.


244 L. Cerfaux doubts that 7.1 could have come from Paul's pen since Paul normally 'bases the sanctity of Christians on the presence of the Holy Spirit', The Christian in the Theology of Saint Paul, London: 1967, 287. Not only I Cor 7.34 but also Ro 12.1 and Col 3.5 rule out this argument against the Pauline authorship of our verses. Windisch notes correctly that ἐπίτελευτάς ἀγνωστον 'heisst: Heiligkeit durchführen im Sinne von Gal 5.24', op. cit., 219.

245 Bachmann, op. cit., 289 n. 3.

246 The hypothesis that II Cor 6.14-7.1 is a fragment of Paul's letter to Corinth mentioned in I Cor 5.9ff is arbitrary. The only thing we know about this letter is that in it Paul urged his readers μὴ συνεκμειγνωσθαι πορναί. Πορνια is not mentioned in II Cor 6.14-7.1.

247 So Plummer, op. cit., 205f; Schlatter, op. cit., 575f; Allo, op. cit., 185f; Bruce, op. cit., 214.

248 F. H. Chase, 'Mr Whitelaw on 2 Cor VI ii - VII 1', The Classical Review 4 1890 151; Thrall, op. cit., 146.

249 Ibid., 147.

250 LXX: αὐτῶς.

251 These words are in a different order in the LXX.

252 Barret, op. cit., 192.

253 Meyer, op. cit., ii 312.

254 Bachmann, op. cit., 292; similarly, Allo, op. cit., 186.

255 As Allo, ibid., 189, and Thrall, art. cit., 141, have seen.

256 For our purposes it will not be necessary to identify the theology and provenance of these intruders. Such an identification is probably not possible in any case; see C. J. A. Hickling, 'Is the Second Epistle to the Corinthians a Source for Early Christian History?', ZNW 66 1975 284-287.
257 Collange, op. cit., 304f; he suggestively relates our paragraph to Paul's adversaries but combines this with a division of 2.14-7.4 into two partly overlapping letters, 2.14-6.1, 14-7.4 and 2.14-6.13, which we find unacceptable.

258 Lietzmann, op. cit., 115, identifies the unbelievers of 4.4 as Paul's opponents, but this view has been rightly rejected by Krummell, ibid., 201, who points to the closer parallel between 4.4 and 2.15.

259 I find J. Munck's argument, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, tr. F. Clarke, Richmond: 1959, 171ff, that the pseudo-apostles are for Paul only a minor irritant, unconvincing.

260 See on this passage, Barrett, op. cit., 103; ἀλλότριοι not λοιποί must be read here; the harder reading is hard, 'too offensive an expression', Metzger, op. cit., 577.

261 I accept the unity of II Cor 1-13; see above, 98f.

262 Thrall, art. cit., 143, in criticism of Collange, asks: 'Even if Paul himself thought that his opponents were no different from the heathen, how could he possibly have supposed that the Corinthians would understand (our paragraph) as an appeal to have no more dealings with men who claimed to be apostles of Christ and servants of righteousness (xi. 13, 15)?' The Corinthians would know this from the criticism Paul levels against these false apostles throughout our letter and from the fact that 6.14-7.1 follow 6.11-13 and lead back into 7.2-4: the false apostles are the alternative to Paul this letter concerns itself with.

263 So e.g. Krummell, Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus, 31.


265 Cited above, 34.

266 Ibid., 185.

267 Cf. above, 34.

268 Cf. above, 121ff.

II CORINTHIANS 12.18

269 We might say, Christian disposition, as Paul and Titus are Christians, but can it be supposed that Paul would deny that non-Christians could be honest?


271 Theophylact's explanation of pneuma in our verse, Τούτου τί πού άνω πνευματική Χαρίσματι Χαρισμάτων τιπ
1 Chapter 16 is often identified as (part of) a letter to Ephesus. The main arguments for this are (1) Paul could not have known so many Romans; (2) Prisca and Aquila (vv. 3f) as well as Epaenetus (v. 5) belong in Ephesus (cf. I Cor 16.10); (3) vv. 17-20 fit Ephesus better than Rome; (4) the recommendation of Phoebe is more appropriate in a letter to Ephesus (cf. E. J. Goodspeed, 'Phoebe's Letter of Introduction', HTR 44 1951 55-57); (5) textual evidence for the conclusion of the letter at the end of chapter 15, viz. p. 940c is strange and indefensible. Others argue against this that (1) the mobility and facility of movement within the Empire make vv. 3-5 not at all problematical; (2) the only other Pauline letter with a lot of greetings is to the Colossian community which the apostle also has not evangelized; (3) Aristobulus and Herodian (v. 16) can be identified as inhabitants of Rome (cf. K. Lake, The Earliest Epistles of St. Paul, London 1911, 331f, 373f); (4) it is hard to conceive how the Ephesian fragment or letter came to be attached to Romans 1-15. On this question, and favoring the chapter's integrity within Romans, cf. K. P. Donfried, 'A Short Note on Ro 16', JBL 89 1970 443-449; W. Willner, 'Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans: An Alternative to the Donfried-Karris Debate Over Romans', CBQ 38 1976 341-345; B. N. Kaye, 'To the Romans and Others' Revisited', NovT 18 1976 38-41; C. E. B. Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, vol. i, Edinburgh 1975, 9-11.

2 J. C. O'Neill argues that much of our canonical Romans consists of later glosses, Paul's Letter to the Romans, Harmondsworth 1975.

3 Not only does its position vary in manuscripts but it is entirely lacking in F^r G (which has a blank space after 14.23) 629 it^g goth. On the other hand, it is not an inappropriate termination to the epistle (cf. F. J. A. Hort, 'On the End of the Epistle to the Romans', in J. B. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, London 1893, 323f, 326-328). I am not convinced that we can attribute it to Marcion (see J. Dupont, O.S.B., 'Pour l'histoire de la doxologie finale de 1'Epître aux Romains', RBen 58 1948 3f, 9, 11-18, on this question), or to the editor of an early edition of the Pauline corpus (otherwise, C. H. Dodd, The Epistle to the Romans, London 1932, xvii; W. Schmithals, Paul and the Gnostics, tr. J. E. Steely, Nashville 1972, 258f).
Since vv. 3 and 4 are not strictly parallel and contain some Pauline terminology, the possibility that Paul has altered an existing formula here cannot be excluded. A pre-Pauline formula cannot be extracted from our vv. with any useful degree of certainty; otherwise, Bultmann, TNT i 49; E. Linnemann, 'Tradition und Interpretation in Rüm. 1,3f', EvTheol 31 1971 273-275.


Cf. e.g. E. Schweizer, IR8-n 1,3f und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus', Neotestamentica, Zürich/Stuttgart:1963, 180; J. D. G. Dunn, 'Jesus -- Flesh and Spirit: An Exposition of Romans 1.3-4', JTS N.S. 24 1973 41; H. Schlier, Der Römerbrief, Freiburg:1977, 24.

Chrysostom, PG 60 397.

Cranfield, op. cit., i 61.


One must allow that the Roman readers, who did not have Phil 2.6-11 and Col 1.15 to refer to, might not have understood our vv. in this way; cf. Linnemann, art. cit., 271.


Cf. Cranfield, op. cit., i 64.

Above, 95ff.

'Κεῖται Πνεῦμα Αὐξάνειν (Romans 1,4)', Bib 48 1967 386f.


An die Römer, Tübingen:1974², 9.

Art. cit., 57.


24. Cf. B. Weiss, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Göttingen: 1891, 59. The frequency of the personal pronoun μου in our context suggests that Paul's prayers have been private prayers (cf. Phil 1.3f; also II Tim 1.3).

25. In 9.1; II Cor 1.23; 11.31; Phil 1.8, Paul invokes God as witness to his feelings, which are also not manifest to his readers. It is quite likely Paul expressed his feelings in private prayers. Cf. Michel, op. cit., 46: 'Dort, wo Menschen die Wahrheit seiner Behauptung nicht nachprüfen können, hält Pts eine Anrufung Gottes als Zeugen für notwendig.' Cf. also J. Huby, S.J., *Saint Paul: Épitre aux Romains*, new ed. by S. Lyonnet, S.J., Paris: 1957, 55.


27. Cf. above, 140f.

28. F. Godet, *Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, vol. i, tr. A. Cusin, Edinburgh: 1880, 143: 'one of the elements of his human nature...penetrated with the Divine Spirit.'


30. Cf. above, 105f, 137f, 139ff.

2.29; 7.6


33. E.g. Barrett, op. cit., 56f.

34. SB i 282, 299-301.

35. Cf. Philo *Spec leg* 3.83; *Dec* 133; *MM* s.v.; Barrett, op. cit., 57.

36. Cf. the rabbinic statements in Michel, op. cit., 91 n. 1; SB i 119.

38 That God is the implied subject of λογίσθηται (v. 26) is patent from the context (cf. vv. 11, 13a, 16, 29b), and v. 27 probably refers to no different reckoning; cf. F. J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans, tr. H. Knight, London: 1961, 88.

39 Theodore of Mopsuestia, PG 66 792f: Paul could not mean the Holy Spirit as he is not yet discussing the situation of those under grace.

40 A. Fridrichsen, 'Der wahre Jude und sein Lob (Röm 2.28f)', Symbolae Arctoae 1 1927 44; Althaus, op. cit., 28.

41 Meyer, op. cit., i 135; Schlatter, op. cit., 112.


43 Cranfield, ibid., 175 n. 3. For καρδία as an expression of human inwardness in Paul cf. Bultmann, TNT i 222; W. D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man, London:1956, 146. Some take τι πνευματικό as appositional to καρδιά in 2.29 (so e.g. R. A. Lipsius, Hand-Commentar zum neuen Testament, Bd. i, Abt. 2, Freiburg:1891, 94).

44 Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., 181; Barrett, op. cit., 146.


46 Indeed, the juxtaposition of 1.17 and 18 indicate that the human situation of 1.18-3.20 is only brought about through the gospel of Jesus Christ, cf. G. Bornkamm, 'The Revelation of God's Wrath (Romans 1-3)', Early Christian Experience, tr. P. L. Hammer, London:1969, 62.


48 M. Luther, Lectures on Romans, tr., ed. W. Pauck, London:1963, 58; Godet, op. cit., ii 27; Zahn, op. cit., 144; Bultmann, TNT i 261, and Schlier, op. cit., 90 (cf. 88), relate these verses but none of the preceding to Gentile Christians.
It is not the introduction of Christians into the picture that makes our verses a conclusive climax to chapter 2 (as Kseemann, 'The Spirit and the Letter', 141, 144; An die Römer, 70, Lyonnet, art. cit., 96f, and J. S. Vos, Traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchungen zur paulinischer Pneumatologie, Assen: 1973, 110, conclude), but the introduction of the Spirit as the basis of the Gentile Christian capacity already intimated.

Ev อง should not be otherwise construed than as masculine and referring to the law as letter; cf. I Cor 15.56; Codet, op. cit., ii 12f.

Cf. O. Kuss, Der Römerbrief, Lief. 1, Regensburg: 1957, 438. E. de W. Burton, Spirit, Soul, and Flesh, Chicago: 1918, 198, understands pneuma in this verse as 'human spirit', probably because he does not pay attention to the meaning of ἔναντι.


Σünde represents 'sin in the flesh'; cf. e.g. W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, New York: 1967, 19.

Cf. Cranfield, op. cit., i 388, for this translation of ἐνέσθη.

'Ολ'κεῖν ἐν denotes a settled permanent penetrative influence,' Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., 196; cf. I Cor 3.16; Cranfield, op. cit., i 388.

Μέν is concessive as in Xenoph An 1.10.12: τίς οἱ μεν οὐκέτι, των δὲ ἐπιφέων ὁ λόγος ἐνεπλάσθη; cf. LS s.v. A ii 4.

Jewett, op. cit., 293.


Cf. further M. Barth, Ephesians, Garden City, New York: 1974, 233.

Cf. Zahn, op. cit., 389; R. H. Gundry, Soma in Biblical Theology, Cambridge, England: 1976, 43-46. It would appear that in Paul's view also Christians who survive until the eschaton get new bodies (I Cor 15.35ff), so that the ones they have in this present life will at that time be 'dead'.

Gundry, ibid., 43f.

Kseemann, An die Römer, 214, translates ὅτι 'im Hinblick auf'. I am not aware that ὅτι can carry this meaning. M. Dibelius, 'Vier Worte des Römerbriefes', Symbolae Biblicae Uppsalienses 3 1944 11, whom Kseemann cites in support, does not establish that it can.
63 Kuss, op. cit., Lief. 2, 504, translates δια αμαρτίας 'um der Beseitigung der Sünde willen'.

64 H. Lietzmann, An die Römer, Tübingen:1928 3, 80, states that in 8.10 'der Wortparallelismus ist strenger als der des Gedankens, wie oft bei Paulus', without specifying where else in Paul this holds true.

65 Schlatter, op. cit., 262, puts forward a variation of this view whereby pneuma here represents not human but Christian spirit, 'der Geiste des Christus und Gottes, der in die Seinen eingehend und zu ihrem Geiste wird.'

66 Dibelius, art. cit., 11; Barrett, op. cit., 159.

67 The omission of Κόλ in a few manuscripts (chiefly Κ Α) is explained by the fact that the preceding word terminates in the same letter.

68 E.g. Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., 196; cf. their comment on v. 10: 'clearly...the human pneuma', 198. Pneuma in Gal 5 also does not refer to the human pneuma: cf. v. 5 with 3.5; v. 16 with 3.3.

8.16

69 Cf. Cranfield, op. cit., 1 394.

70 Σωμα here replaces άρπας under the influence of vv. 10f. άρπας is read by some authorities including D G.


72 E.g. Cranfield, op. cit., 1 396.

73 Von der Osten-Sacken, op. cit., 132; Schlier, op. cit., 252.

74 Otherwise, e.g. Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., 202f.

75 'Peace' in v. 6 refers not to a subjective feeling but an objective fact, viz. our reconciliation with God; cf. 5.1. 8.6f contrasts θεοκτονία with ζωή and εἰρήνη with εὖξεμ.

76 βλέπειν has a pregnant sense in vv. 24f; cf. Mt 14.30.

77 Kuss, op. cit., Lief. 2 601.

78 It is best to punctuate with a full stop after πάρει και a comma after οὗ θεοκτονίας (Nestle; UBS; NEB), for if a full stop is placed after οὗ θεοκτονίας (RSV), 'the sentence τοῦ ναοῦ εἰσὶν χρυσοῦν, and also as far as the meaning is concerned, since προεξία οὗ θεοκτονίας is a new, and not an easy, expression, which seems to require some measure of explanation within the same sentence,' Cranfield, op. cit., 1 398.
79 Cranfield, ibid., 1 402.
80 Zahn, op. cit., 395.
81 Kähsemann, op. cit., 217; Schlier, op. cit., 254.
82 Lietzmann, op. cit., 83; Schlier, op. cit., 254.
83 Kähsemann, op. cit., 218f; Dodd, op. cit., 129f, and Kuss, op. cit., Lieb 2 603f, also assume that the cry is ecstatic.
84 Leenhardt, op. cit., 214; Kähsemann, op. cit., 218.
Cf. W. Grundmann, TDNT iii 899, 900, for Hellenistic and Jewish examples of this usage.
85 8.26 hardly refers to the glossolalia of I Cor 12-14. It is not easy to relate άλλαλαίων to the glossolalia of I Cor 12-14, which was expressed and could be understood by interpreters (cf. A. J. M. Wedderburn, 'Romans 8.26 -- Towards a Theology of Glossolalia?', SJT 28 1975 371-374). Nor is it easy to relate στενάχων to it; the glossolalia of I Cor 12-14 was exultant. Moreover, the phenomenon of 8.26 applies to all Christians and this is not true of glossolalia in I Cor 12-14. One cannot answer this objection by citing the representative function of the glossolalia in community worship (as does Kähsemann, ibid., 230), because a setting of community worship in 8.26 is only an inference from 8.15f (Zahn, op. cit., 412; Kähsemann, 'The Cry for Liberty in the Worship of the Church', Perspectives on Paul, 230); this is to beg the point at issue.
87 Ro 9.27 might indicate that Paul connected κράτεω with inspired but not necessarily public speech.
88 Schlatter's understanding of κράτεω in our verses as intended to emphasize the Christian's prayerful certainty and joy over against the fearful murmurings of the Jews, op. cit., 265, is not supported by the context, where there is no suggestion that Paul is contrasting Christians with Jews in particular.
89 Cf. Cranfield, op. cit., i 399. In support of this interpretation of κράτεω I note how de la Potterie, art. cit., 219-228, is able to relate other terms in vv. 14-17, e.g. κράτεω; ιερον/τέκνον; κληρόνομοι, to LXX passages dealing with God's deliverance of Israel(ites) out of distress. I cannot agree with him that Paul is 'd'une manière plus ou moins consciente' referring solely and specifically to the Exodus from Egypt (de la Potterie, 245, 249f).
90 Cf. Clem Alex Strom 7.7: ἐνδοθευ κράτεων; cf. also Jas 5.4; Gen 4.10; Jos Bel 1.197 and several places in Philo (e.g. Ebr 98) for examples of κράτεω used of unvocalized cries.
91 Cf. BAG s.v.
92 Michel, op. cit., 199.
93 Cf. Cranfield, op. cit., i 393.
94 Note here how the Fatherhood of God is connected with obedience in life. This is the context of it not only in our verse but also in Mark 14.34 // Mt 26.39 // Luke 22.42; Mt 26.42 (Jesus' praying in Gethsemane). It seems gratuitous of G. Delling to assert with regard to ἄγγελος that 'there is no clear line from the cry of Jesus in Gethsemane to the use of the word in the Pauline letters,' Worship in the New Testament, tr. P. Scott, London:1962, 71.
95 Weiss, op. cit., 356; Schlatter, op. cit., 266; Küsemann, An die Römer, 218; Jewett, op. cit., 199.
96 Schlier, op. cit., 254 n. 11.
98 Stacey, op. cit., 133; cf. 143: 'a personal relationship'.

11.8 (EPHESIANS 1.17; II TIMOTHY 1.7)
100 So Meyer, op. cit., ii 208.
101 Sus 45 in the rendering of the LXX, ἐν ἑωρκεῖν ὁ ἄγγελος... πνεῦμα ἐνωμένα νεωτέρω ὑπὶ Δωρία, thus contains a different conception than that of ὁ Θεός ἐν ὑπαίθριο ὑπὶ Δωρία τὸ πνεῦμα το ἐνωμένῳ νεωτέρῳ, ὁ ὑπαίθριο Δωρία.
102 See εἰς iii 128f.
103 Der Epheserbrief, Zürich:1966, 62.
104 Πνεῦμα Ξελίκον in this verse is either what the Holy Spirit is not or an alternative determinative dispensation of pneuma, as in Ro 8.15; I Cor 2.12.

12.11
105 Godet, op. cit., ii 296; LaGrange, op. cit., 302; Leenhardt, op. cit., 314.
106 Cf. above, 65f.
108 Meyer, op. cit., ii 264, argues that τὸ πνεῦμα το ξελίκον refers to the human spirit because it is the opposite
of ἡ πνεῦμα... ἡ πνεῦμα; Barrett, op. cit., 240, concludes that it must refer to the Holy Spirit because it is parallel to ὁ Κυρίω σουλευόντες.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE REST OF THE PAULINE CORPUS

PHILIPPIANS 1.27


GALATIANS 6.18; PHILIPPIANS 4.23; PHILEMON 25

II TIMOTHY 4.22

2 E.g. W. Gutbrod, Die paulinische Anthropologie, Stuttgart/Berlin: 1934, 82.

3 Cf. above, 87ff, 139ff.

4 E.g. G. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, London: 1934, 194.


6 Cf. above, 139f.

7 Cf. above, 166.

8 Cf. H. Bertram, Das Wesen des Geistes nach der Anschauung des Apostels Paulus, Münster: 1913, 14: 'ihre menschliche Gestalt bedurf der Gnade.'

I TIMOTHY 3.16

9 Reading ὅς with Α* Α* C* et. al.; ὅ (D* and other Western witnesses) is an assimilation to the neuter ὁ μυστικον; the reading ἔκσει arose from a misreading of ὅσ as ὅσ; cf. C. K. Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles, Oxford: 1963, 65.

10 So Barrett, who maintains that 'there is certainly an allusion to the work of Paul', ibid., 65, and J. H. Bernard, who argues that ὑπό... ἐκ πρέπει... represents a revelation which embraces those nearest to and farthest from God, The Pastoral Epistles, Cambridge, England: 1906, 63; JB renders, 'proclaimed to the pagans'.


13 W. Lock, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, Edinburgh:1924, 44f, relates this phrase also to Jesus' mighty deeds or sinlessness during his earthly ministry; H. Alford, The Greek Testament, vol. iii, Boston/New York:1872, 334, refers it exclusively to his baptism and temptation.

14 Bernard, op. cit., 63 (his emphasis); so also Gun- dry, art. cit., 211f, and, hesitatingly, J. N. D. Kelly, A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, New York:1963, 211f.


16 Cf. above, 73, 152ff.


18 Cf. e.g. E. F. Scott, The Pastoral Epistles, New York: n.d., 41.

19 The Pastoral Epistles, Hammondsworth:1976, 86.

EPHESIANS

20 The lexical question as to whether θεόν την τιμήν 'is used transitively or intransitively has no importance from the standpoint of exegesis and Biblical theology. For materially it makes no difference, nor could it possibly do so, whether the Christian moves towards grace, towards the Father, or whether he is led. For the Christian does not in any case go of himself,' K. L. Schmidt, TDNT i 134.

21 The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians, London:1930, 175.

22 Der Brief an die Epheser, Göttingen:1891, 91.

23 Cf. above, 169.

24 It is sometimes argued in favor of this interpretation 'Spirit' that a Trinitarian reference is intended in v. 18, θεόν την τιμήν... εν έν της θεόν της... προς τον πατέρα (so, e.g., T. K. Abbott, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, Edinburgh:1897, 68). It is not certain that our author would have been as inclined to make this reference as later generations have been to see it.

25 Otherwise, Klöpper, op. cit., 122; Calvin sees a reference here to the human soul, The Epistles of Paul the

26 In all these verses pneuma is unmodified. This tells against the argument of M. Barth, that if the Holy Spirit had been intended here, it would have been modified, Ephesians, vol. 2, Garden City, New York: 1974, 508.

27 'EV is read by p 49 B 33 pauc.


29 Cf. above, 102, 137.

30 Cf. G. Schrenk, 'Geist und Enthusiasmus', Studien zu Paulus, Zurich: 1954, 121: 'Der Geist... der unser Denken besitzt oder beherrscht.'

31 Cf. e.g. Klöpper, op. cit., 196; Westcott, op. cit., 97.

CONCLUSIONS

1 Cf. above, 93, 141, 156f, 166.

2 Cf. above, 94f, 106; contrast certain Jewish apocalyptic and gnostic writings, above, 44, 56, 57f, 61f; cf. also 31f (Philo), 41-43 (Qumran and I Enoch), 47f and 50f (rabbinic writings).

3 Cf. the alternation between and co-existence of the psychological and supernatural understandings of pneuma as the power of the dominant disposition in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, above, 34f; cf. also the usage in the Dead Sea Scrolls, above, 37f.

4 Cf. above, 66f.

5 Cf. also above, 41, where it is suggested that this usage might also be found in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

6 Cf. above, 56.
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