



University
of Glasgow

MacArthur, Steven Douglas (1980) *Human spirit in Pauline usage*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/1767/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

HUMAN SPIRIT IN PAULINE USAGE

STEVEN DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

A THESIS SUBMITTED
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY
THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

FEBRUARY 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	3
SUMMARY	5
INTRODUCTION	8
PART I -- BACKGROUND TO PAUL'S UNDERSTANDING OF HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u>	11
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN GREEK USAGE	11
HUMAN <u>RUACH</u> AND <u>N^E SHAMAH</u> IN THE OLD TESTAMENT	17
THE RENDERING OF HUMAN <u>RUACH</u> AND <u>N^E SHAMAH</u> IN THE SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT	20
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN THE ADDITIONAL LITERATURE OF THE SEPTUAGINT	21
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN THE WRITINGS OF JOSEPHUS	25
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN THE WRITINGS OF PHILO	26
HUMAN SPIRIT IN JEWISH APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS	32
HUMAN <u>RUACH</u> AND <u>N^E SHAMAH</u> IN RABBINIC USAGE	47
HUMAN SPIRIT IN GNOSTIC USAGE	51
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN THE CORPUS HERMETICUM	62
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN THE GOSPELS	62
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN ACTS	64
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS	68
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN THE LETTER OF JAMES	71
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN I PETER	72
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN THE REVELATION TO JOHN	82
PART II -- HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN PAULINE USAGE	87
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN THE THESSALONIAN CORRESPONDENCE	87
I THESSALONIANS 5.23	87
II THESSALONIANS 2.8	95
II THESSALONIANS 2.13	95
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN THE CORINTHIAN CORRESPONDENCE	98
I CORINTHIANS 2.11	99
I CORINTHIANS 4.21; GALATIANS 6.1	103

I CORINTHIANS 5.3f; COLOSSIANS 2.5	104
I CORINTHIANS 5.5	108
I CORINTHIANS 6.17	113
I CORINTHIANS 7.34	121
I CORINTHIANS 12.10; 14.12, 32	124
I CORINTHIANS 14.2, 14-16	135
I CORINTHIANS 16.18; II CORINTHIANS 2.13; 7.13	139
II CORINTHIANS 4.13	142
II CORINTHIANS 6.6	143
II CORINTHIANS 7.1	145
II CORINTHIANS 12.18	151
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN THE LETTER TO THE ROMANS	152
1.4	152
1.9	155
2.29; 7.6	157
8.10	161
8.16	163
11.8 (Ephesians 1.17; II Timothy 1.7)	167
12.11	168
HUMAN <u>PNEUMA</u> IN THE REST OF THE PAULINE CORPUS	169
PHILIPPIANS 1.27	169
GALATIANS 6.18; PHILIPPIANS 4.23; PHILEMON 25; II TIMOTHY 4.22	169
I TIMOTHY 3.16	170
EPHESIANS	172
CONCLUSIONS	175
NOTES	177
BIBLIOGRAPHY	241
ABBREVIATIONS	261

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 n^eshamah 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 n^eshamah 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^eshamah 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.

INTRODUCTION¹

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 erlösungsfähigen' central core of the human person.² 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.'³ Emil Sokolowski equated the human pneuma with 'der dem leiblichen Teil des Menschen gegenüberstehende ἔσω ἄνθρωπος' and distinguished it from the καρδιά, the seat of emotions and impulses, as 'Organ des religiösen bzw. sittlichen Lebens seines Besitzer' (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).⁴ Very few scholars nowadays are prepared to attribute to the anthropological pneuma an essential status in the possibility and the process of salvation. Friedrich Büchsel's statement, that 'Paulus sieht in dem pneuma, das der Mensch hat, nichts, durch das er mit Gott verwandt ist,'⁵ expresses the consensus of modern scholarship on this question, against which only a few demur.⁶ 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.'⁷ M. E. Isaacs contends that anthropological pneuma in Paul represents 'man in his divine aspect'.⁸

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 ψυχὴ, νοῦς.' According to Holsten, 'die wesenselemente des menschen an sich für Paulus' are only σὰρξ, ψυχὴ and νοῦς.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 position as being completely untenable.¹¹ It has recently been revived, however, in a revised form by Robert Jewett, according 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 (I 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 Corinthian 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 ψυχὴ.¹⁴ According to Eduard Schweizer, when 'Paul uses pneuma non-technically almost in the sense of ψυχὴ, this is the current usage of Judaism...which he naturally brings with him and has to employ.'¹⁵ W. G. Kümmel 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 constitutional 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.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.¹⁸ A more common modern scholarly position is that Paul uses pneuma with respect to human persons in so casual¹⁹ and unemphatic²⁰ a fashion, that it is a profoundly unimportant aspect of his thought.²¹ The most influential recent definition of the term is that of Rudolf Bultmann: 'when Paul speaks of the 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).²² In addition, pneuma is sometimes taken to denote the (part of the) human person surviving death (Ro 1.4;²³ I Cor 5.5²⁴).

Scholarly disagreement, therefore, exists with respect to the fact, meaning and status of the human pneuma in Pauline usage. In this thesis we will look at human 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 pneuma. We will show that there is a concept of human spirit in Paul; that 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 pneuma in Paul can in no instance be adequately or correctly described as 'a signification of self-hood',²⁵ 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' (πνεῦμα βίου, 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 110b⁴).⁵ Vital pneuma is sometimes used by synecdoche for a living person, as in this

inscription: ἔγω Νίνος πάλκι ποτ' ἔχενόμην πνεῦμα, νῦν δ' οὐκ ἔτ' οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ γῇ πεποίημι (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 12,⁶ ἄνθρωπος ἔστι πνεῦμα καὶ σκία μόνον, and Inscriptiones Graecae 14.769, δακρυχαρῆς Πλούτων, οὐ πνεύματα πάντα βρότεα σοι νέμεται, 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 ἀναγκαιότατον καὶ κυριώτατον ἀπολείπει τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν, ἐπεὶ δὲ γε παρὰ τὴν τοῦτου εὐροικν ὑγεία γίνεται, παρὰ δὲ τὴν δύσροικν νόσοι, 'the most necessary and the supreme component in us, since health is the result of its free, and disease of its impaired passage' (Anonymi Londinensis Iatrica 6.14-18;⁷ cf. further examples of diseases attributed to constrained pneuma: Plat Tim 84d-85a, 91c; Aristot Meteor 366b 25f; Epict Diss 3.3.22).⁸ In one of the writings which make up the traditional Hippocratic corpus, De natura hominis, respired 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,⁹ 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 respired emanates from the blood.¹⁰ 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 σύνφυτον πνεῦμα, 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.¹¹ Certain Hippocratic writings which may antedate the Stagirite already attribute similar power and functions to pneuma. De natura pueri 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 φρόνησιν καὶ τὴν κίνησιν in an organism. According to Pseudo-Galen,¹² Erasistratus (third century BC) considered pneuma to be συνερχόν in all of the body's natural activities (εἰς τὰς φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας).

Stoicism identifies ψυχή as consisting of pneuma (e.g. Zeno Fr. 127, 136, 140).¹³ In the human ψυχή this pneuma is sufficiently rarified so as to be συνεπὺς ἡμῖν (Diog L 7.156; Sen Ep 50.6; Scholia in Hom Il 2.857¹⁴).¹⁵ 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 (σύνφυτον ἡμῖν), 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 ἡγεμονικόν)¹⁶ (cf. Diog L 7.156-159; Pseud-Plut Epitome 4.21¹⁷).¹⁸

According to Galen, the early Stoics taught that the ψυχή composed of pneuma was nourished by the blood (De plac Hippocr et Plat 2.8).¹⁹

Galen distinguishes πνεῦμα ψυχικόν 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 ἐκτικόν, which, he says, 'holds together the stones' (τὸ συνέχον τοὺς λίθους, Introd s med 9).²⁰ Other writers show plainly that this third pneuma was considered to hold together not stones alone but every particular entity (Pseud-Gal Περὶ πλῆθους 3;²¹ including human bodies, Sen Naturales quaestiones 2.6.6) and the entire world itself (Alexander of Aphrodisias De mixt 216.14;²² Cic De natura deorum 3.28). Plutarch attributes to the Stoics the conception that the foetus inside the womb has no ψυχή but is καθ' ὅπερ φύτον; at birth the pneuma changes into ψυχή due to the cooling effect (ψυχόμενον) 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 ψυχικόν in itself is not a specifically human attribute but something all animals (ζῷα) share which distinguishes them from plants (φυτά).²³ However, it is adapted in different intensities and qualities to and within different animals (Diog L 7.138f).²⁴

Stoicism considers pneuma a most subtle all-pervasive substance (Tert Apol 21: Cleanthes affirms spiritum... permeatorum universitatis; Pseud-Aristot De mundo 394b 10f). Previous to Stoicism, Hippocrates (De flatibus) had asked of pneuma: τί γὰρ ἄνευ τούτου γένοιτ' ἄν; ἢ τίς οὗτος ἄπειστιν; ἢ τίνι οὐ συμπάρεστιν; ἅπαν γὰρ τὸ μεταξὺ γῆς τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ 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).²⁵ Diogenes of Apollonia (fifth Century BC) had made similar observations concerning ἀήρ, and he was led to assert that it was Θεός (Fr. 5).²⁶ In De flatibus pneuma is acclaimed as δυνάστεύον (15.6f). Some Stoics in turn considered self-moving, eternal,²⁷ all-pervasive pneuma to be Θεός (Aetius Plac 1.6, 7;²⁸ Stobaeus Ecl 1.1.29;²⁹ Sext

Emp Pyrrh hyp 3.218: the Stoics assert that τὸν Θεόν is pneuma which permeates 'even through things foul'³⁰). The doctrine that Θεός 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 ὁρθός. 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' (εἰ μὴ τι θεῖον ὄντως ἐνῆν πνεῦμα τῇ ψυχῇ, δι' οὗ τὴν τῶν τηλικῶνδε περίνοιαν καὶ γνῶσιν ἔσχεν).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 μόνον θύραθεν ἐπεισείναι καὶ θεῖον εἶναι μόνον (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 $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ 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 $\epsilon\pi\iota\nu\omicron\iota\kappa$ 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 poetry⁴⁰ (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 $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ which is specially human is more divine than pneuma which is in other and indeed all creatures and things.

HUMAN RUACH AND N^ESHAMAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

I reiterate that in the following paragraphs I do not try to trace the history of the semantic development of the words ruach and n^eshamah. 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.¹ 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.² I am also not concerned in these paragraphs to relate ruach and n^eshamah to other anthropological terms in the Old Testament, although I am aware that in many cases ruach and n^eshamah are synonymous with such terms: Hebrew anthropological usage is 'not systematic, but syncretistic'.³ My interest lies rather in determining the different significations of human ruach and n^eshamah in this literature, their relative frequency, and the overall Old Testament consensus concerning them.

The basic meaning of רוח seems to be 'air in motion, particularly "wind"'.⁴ 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).⁵ As 'breath' ruach is synonymous with n^eshamah (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 רוח־הַקֹּדֶשׁ (Num 16.22; 27.16). No human

person $\square\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ (Eccl 8.8) 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 ($\aleph\aleph\aleph$, Job 34.14f), earth ($\square\aleph\aleph$, Ps 146.4).⁶

Ruach is the vital power of human life (Prov 18.14). It can suffer decrease (Ezek 21.12(7); 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

(Jg 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 n^eshamah (Job 26.4; 32.8¹¹) -- 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;¹¹ 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).¹² 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';¹³ ruach is not simply at a person's disposal; it is rather 'etwas dem Menschen Fremdes, souverän über ihm stehendes'.¹⁴ Only Proverbs 16.32 and 25.28 teach that a person can rule (שָׁמַד) and restrain (שָׁמַד) 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, הוֹרֹן נִשְׁמַת אָדָם חֹפֶז כָּל-חֲדָרָי' בִּטָּן

רוח, evinces an understanding of human n^eshamah which is unique in the Old Testament. For this very reason a number of scholars suggest that רוח be read for רוח, so that verse 27a says, 'the Lord is the keeper of a man's life'.¹⁶ 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 n^eshamah allows a person the capacity for profound self-understanding.¹⁷

Four further comments of relevance to Pauline pneumatology close this survey of human ruach and n^eshamah in the Old Testament. (1) Where ruach opposes 'flesh' (רוח ו flesh) in this literature 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, substitutes for the רוח of verses 8d and 9a; רוח, usually with a pronominal suffix, frequently represents the whole person in the Old Testament.¹⁸ (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 רוח is רוח). (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 n^eshamah refers to (1), (4), only in Job, and (5) the capacity for self-understanding, 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 misdirected if it is not abject and wretched.

THE RENDERING OF HUMAN RUACH AND N^ESHAMAH
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. N^eshamah 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 רָחַץ -- 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 ψυχή (e.g. Gen 41/8) and θυμός (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, πρόνησις; Job 6.4, αἶμα; Dan 2.1, ἐνυπνίον);¹ 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.'² 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 Αχάβ τετραρχμένον (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: εἶπα ὅτι παρακλέσει με ἡ κλίνη μου, ἀνοίσω δὲ πρὸς ἑμυαυτὸν ἰεῖα λόγον τῇ κοίτῃ μου. ἐκφοβεῖς με ἐνυπνίους καὶ ἐν

ὁρμαίνω με καταπλήσσεις. ἀπαλλάξεις ἀπὸ πνεύματος μου τὴν
 ψυχὴν μου, ἀπὸ δὲ Θανάτου τὰ ὅσῃ μου, 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 ἐλύπησεν) 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,¹
 and IV Maccabees 11.11, where a Jewish patriot being tortured
 on a καταπέλτης finds himself τὸ πνεῦμα στενοχωρούμενος,
 'pressed for breath',² 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: τὸ γὰρ ἄφθαρτόν σου 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;⁴ 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, שְׁנִיחַ לְדָמַי (cj. שְׁנִיחַ,
 שְׁנִיחַ being regarded as an erroneous repetition from v. 9c)⁵
 וְיִשְׁכַּחַן, 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 τῷ πνεύματι⁷ σου ὀλίσθης εἰς ἀπώλειον, which probably should be translated, 'and in your spirit you slide into destruction', ἀπώλειον 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, ὤλισθον εἰς Ἄβου, 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 φοβούμενον κύριον ζήσεται (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 πνεύματι 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 τὸ πνεῦμα (which seems synonymous with ἡ πνοή in v. 2) at death διαχθήσεται ὡς χάυνος ἀνὴρ (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 σοφία⁸ (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).⁹ Pneuma sometimes refers to the power or seat of dominant dispositions. In Tobit 4.3 (X) Tobias is advised not to grieve (μὴ λυπήσῃς) the pneuma of his mother. The dependency of human dispositions upon divine dispensation is affirmed in Esther 5.1e=15.8, καὶ μετέβλεπεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς πραΰτητα, and in the Psalms of Solomon 8.14, ἐκέρασεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα πλυνήσεως (cf. Isa 19.4). These three writings all represent Semitic originals, but this is not certain with regard to the Wisdom of Solomon where we read in 5.3 of lawless people's στενοχωρίαν πνεύματος, 'anguish of spirit' (RSV).¹⁰ In Tobit 6.8 a πνεῦμα πονηρὸν is said to be a δειμόνικον, thus -- in contradistinction to the usage of pneuma in the rest of the Septuagint and the Old Testament -- plainly a being intermediate between God and humankind.¹¹

Pneuma seems to mean the power or seat of human thought and action in general in IV Maccabees 7.13f, Eleazar ἀνεβέβηκεν τῷ πνεύματι (διὰ)¹² τοῦ λογισμοῦ, where the context suggests that pneuma represents not mere vitality but the man's moral and rational power.¹³ A similar understanding of pneuma underlies its usage in Daniel 3.39 (= the Song of the Three Young Men 16), ἀλλ' ἐν ψυχῇ συντετριμμένῃ καὶ πνεύματι τεταπεινωμένῳ προσδεχθεῖν, 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 δυνατόν ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ; 18.7 states that the Messiah will come ἐν σοφίᾳ πνεύματος καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἰσχύος (cf. Isa 11.2), but the commentators read πνεῦμα σοφίας,¹⁴ a sensible transposition: ἐν σοφίᾳ 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, πνεύματι συνέσεως, of the student of the law; Su 44/45, πνεύμα συνέσεως¹⁵ and 63, πνεῦμα ἐπιστήμης καὶ συνέσεως, both vv. of Daniel). The Wisdom of Solomon represents personified σοφία herself as pneuma (1.6; 9.17) which righteous people receive from God (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 τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπαιτηθεὶς χρέος, with 15.16, ἄνθρωπος... τὸ πνεῦμα δεδανεισμένος; cf. also 16.14).¹⁶ However, in 15.11 where God is said to have breathed into a person ψυχὴν ἐνερχοῦσαν and πνεῦμα ζωτικόν, 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 πάντων χωρὺν πνευμάτων νοερῶν καθαρῶν λεπτοτάτων, 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.'¹⁷ However, it seems that, given the evident and widely admitted Stoic influence upon his conception of pneuma (cf. especially 1.7, πνεῦμα... τὸ συνεχὸν τὰ πάντα), pneuma in 7.23 is also possibly the λεπτότατον 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 θεῶν which is distinct from the human ψυχή).¹⁸

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.¹⁹ 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 σὺμφοτον which establishes contact between the immaterial ψυχή 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, ἔπλασεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χροὺν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς λαβών, καὶ πνεῦμα ἐνῆκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ψυχή (cf. Gen 2.7), and 3.260, where blood is said to be ψυχὴν αὐτὸ καὶ πνεῦμα (cf. Lev 17.11), pneuma collocated with ψυχή may represent the vital power of a person's life distinguished from ψυχή as psychological power (as with Trypho, Justin Dial 6,

ζωῆς δὲ ψυχὴ μετέχει... ὅταν δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν μηκέτι εἶναι, ἀπέσται
ἀπ' αὐτῆς τὸ ζωτικὸν πνεῦμα...; cf. *Wisd Sol* 15.11).

Josephus uses pneuma of human vitality in 11.240 and as the seat or power of a dominant disposition in the *Bellum* 3.92 (πνὸς ἀρῆίου πνεύματος). 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 μοῖραν τινα 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 δαιμόνιον (*Ant* 6.211, 214) and identifies τὰ... κλούμενα ἐνιμόνια as πονηρῶν... ἀνθρώπων πνεύματα τοῖς ζῶσιν εἰσδύμενα καὶ κτείνοντα τοὺς βοηθείας μὴ τυγχάνοντας (*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, σφοδρὸν πνεῦμα τὸ κακίας contrasted with ἐπιστήμης καὶ σοφίας αὐραῖς).

Pneuma also means 'breath' in Philo's writings, both human (e.g. *Leg Gal* 188, 243) and animal (*Aet mund* 128, snakes' breath; cf. *Vit Mos* 1.98) breath. Every creature

(πᾶν ζῶον) depends on breath for life (Spec leg 1.338).

Philo considers breath to be respired 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 respired air undergoes some alteration within the living organism, but Philo does not find occasion to discuss this. In De cherubim 111 Philo seems to use pneuma as a simple synonym of ἀήρ;² 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 πνοή/πνεῦμα ζωῆς,³ 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 (οὐσία) 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 ψυχῆς, that is, the ἡγεμονικόν, νοῦς, λογισμός, δεινότης. Philo tells us he uses ψυχή in 'two senses, both for the whole soul and also for its dominant part (τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν αὐτῆς μέρος), which properly speaking is the soul's soul (ψυχή ψυχῆς), 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 twofold, blood being that of the soul as a whole, and the divine pneuma that of its most dominant (ἡγεμονικωτάτου) part'⁴ (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 (ἑαυτὸν δὲ οὐ καταλαμβάνει)...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 οὐσία θεῖα, viz. pneuma or αἰθήρ (cf. in addition to the passages already cited, Op mund 146; Deus imm 46; Plant 18f).

According to Philo, Adam had a νοῦς γεώδης before he was breathed on by God (Leg all 1.32). Here νοῦς seems equivalent to ψυχή (so also Leg all 2.23). Philo's terminology appears thus somewhat haphazard. Nevertheless, his usual view is that πνεῦμα θεῖον composes the human mind which other creatures lack (Leg all 1.32f; contrast, however, 90). The presence of πνεῦμα θεῖον 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 ἀρετή (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). Ὡς γὰρ ὁ νοῦς ἀπολείπεται, πρὸς ταυθ' ἡ προφητεία φθάνει (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 (ἐξοικίζεται) at the arrival of the divine pneuma, but when that departs the mind returns to its tenancy⁶ (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 κκθάρωτατον (Vit Mos 2.40) -- because they are flesh (σάρξ) 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'⁷ (Virt 217). Obviously inspirational divine pneuma is much more powerful than the constitutional divine pneuma in human ψυχῇ. 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 ὡς τὸ πλεῖστον ἀνθρώπων γένος 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).⁸ 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 καθάρωτος
 Voūs which forsakes not only the body but τοῦ ἑτέρου ψυχῆς
 (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
Genesis 3.9:

For ecstasy, as its very name shows, is nothing
 else than the departing and going out of the under-
 standing...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 ζωτικώτατον (Op mund 30). A πνευματικὴ οὐσία dis-
 tributed εἰς τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις effects τὴν τε θρεπτικὴν
 καὶ τὴν αἰσθητικὴν (Op mund 67; cf. perhaps Leg Gai 63).
Pneuma effects plant life (Spec leg 4.217). Philo speaks in
 Stoic fashion of τὸ ἐγκάρδιον πνεῦμα νοημάτων (Som 1.136).¹⁰
 He accepts the Stoic conception of a πνεῦμα συνεχὸν (Deus imm
 35, ἕξις is πνεῦμα ἀνὰ στρεφόμεν' ἑαυτο ; cf. Op mund 131, pneuma
 as ἕξις 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 appli-
 cation of the idea). This usage of pneuma is quite distinct
 from his application of divine pneuma to human mind¹² and to
 God's additional inspirational agency, prophetic pneuma.¹³

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

τὸ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ Μωσέως πνεῦμα ἢ τινος ἄλλου γεννητοῦ which pneuma he does consider material: it can be torn into tiny pieces (κατακερματισθέν). Is the material human pneuma Philo mentions here the divine substance that constitutes the mind or the nutritional, sensory, vital pneuma which is not specifically 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 κηρός), he clearly considers it to be divine pneuma (Leg all 3.161; Plant 18f; Spec leg 4.123)¹⁴ 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 Artificer 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 Θεῖον 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. 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 (εὐαννοία) immortal¹⁵ (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).¹⁶ Adam in paradise consorted with λογικὴ καὶ Θεῖαι φύσεις blissfully before God ἄτε δὴ πολλοῦ ῥυέντος εἰς αὐτὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεύματος (Op mund 144). Is it with such an eternal destiny in view that God concerns himself about the condition of the πνεῦμα λογικόν of his servants on earth, that it be kept κεραιώτατον 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 $\nu\epsilon\tilde{\omicron}\varsigma$ '¹⁷ (Vit Mos 2.288). But Moses may be here as elsewhere (e.g. Gig 47f) sui generis.

In Quod deterius potiori insidari solet 17 Philo speaks of a $\tau\upsilon\epsilon\tilde{\omicron}\mu\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\pi\lambda\epsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$ 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. Op mund 66; Deus pot ins 29). He seems to have held that the human mind was made up of pneuma different not just in quality but in kind from the pneuma/pneumata performing various functions in other parts of the material creation. Even though he identified the pneuma which constituted the human mind as divine pneuma he still held something corresponding to the Old Testament appreciation or rather depreciation of human 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 pneuma as the essence or property of God himself. Inspirational divine 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 n^eshamah (e.g. 11Q Ps^a Plea 3f), ruach and pneuma still designate 'breath' in this literature (1QH i 28f; I En 14.2) -- human as well as animal breath (1QM vi 12, horses' ruach). In dependence on Isaiah 11.4 spiritus in the Latin

manuscripts of IV Ezra 13.10, 27 and ruach in IQSb 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 rescension A 17f¹), 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 rescension A 18 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 ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα ζωῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς τελευτήσαντες, καὶ ἀναζωοποιήθησαν.² 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 23.5.³

In CD vii 3f we read that no member of the 'Damascus' community who keeps the commandments of God $\text{ל' } \text{וְ\text{טִיר} } \text{מִן} \dots \text{יְרָו}$. From CD v 11f we learn that possession of a מִן $\text{וְ\text{טִיר} }$ is not confined to members of the community; their opponents within Judaism have $\text{אֲנִי } \text{וְ\text{טִיר} } \text{מִן}$ by impugning the commandments of God. The only other occurrence of the term $\text{וְ\text{טִיר} } \text{מִן}$ in this document relates to God's $\text{וְ\text{טִיר} } \text{מִן}$ as inspiring the Old Testament prophets (CD ii 12; ⁴ cf. IQS viii 16). Elsewhere in the Qumran literature $\text{מִן } \text{וְ\text{טִיר} } / \text{וְ\text{טִיר} } \text{מִן}$ represents a particular endowment from God upon members of the community to cleanse them from sins (IQH xvi 12; IQS iii 6-8) and to support them in their righteous lives (IQH vii 6f; xvi 7), imparting knowledge (IQH xii 12; xiv 13) and also joy (IQH ix 32; cf. IQSb ii 24).⁵ This special ruach from God for the sectarians is not always expressly designated $\text{וְ\text{טִיר} }$ or $\text{מִן } \text{וְ\text{טִיר} }$ in the Qumran literature (e.g. IQS ix 3; IQSb v 25; IQH xii 12). Friedrich Nötscher has suggested that the possession of $\text{וְ\text{טִיר} } \text{מִן}$ 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'⁶ (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 קדש upon his people in bringing their exile in Babylon to an end.⁷ R. H. Charles in his note on CD v 11f ('Fragments of a Zadokite Work' 7.12)⁸ refers to the Hebrew Testament of Naphtali 10.9, apparently of a much later date:⁹ 'Blessed is the man who does not defile the holy spirit of God (רוח קדש) which hath been put and breathed into him (שמה ונפחה בקרבן) and blessed is he who returns it to its Creator as pure (טהור) as it was on the day when he entrusted it (to him).'¹⁰ Two of the three medieval manuscripts of the work known to Charles do not go on to identify the רוח קדש with the constitutional breath of life. The preceding verses suggest such an identification. It does not seem impossible that the ruach of life could have been called 'holy' in intertestamental Judaism. After all, it is God's ruach (Jub 5.8; Gen 6.3), and as such designated ἀφ' ὁποῦ τὸν 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.¹¹ 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 קדש 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.¹²

There are a number of instances in this literature where human spirit in accordance with Old Testament and Septuagintal usage (also Philo Det 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;¹³ I En 15.4, 6-8, 10) or, more commonly, a demon (cf. e.g. Jub 1.20; IQM xiii 2, 4; Test Abr rescension B 13¹⁴). Thus in the Testament of Joseph 7.2 the wanton Egyptian woman's στενυχμοὶ τοῦ πνεύματος (v. 2) indicates that τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ βελίκαρ αὐτὴν 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 Joseph ὅτι ὁ ἄρχων τῆς πλάνης, ἀποστείλας τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ζήλου, ἐτύφλωσέ μου τὸν νοῦν; Test D 3.6, anger is a pneuma which ἀεὶ μετὰ τοῦ ψεύδους ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Σκτανῶ 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).¹⁵ 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 ἄγγελος τῆς εἰρήνης who guides the good person (Test B 6.1); τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀγάπης who furthers the salvation of persons (Test G 4.7); τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας who attends to (σχολεύειν) them (Test Jud 20.1); πνεῦμα συνέσεως (Test L 2.3); πνεῦμα ἀγαθόν (Test B 4.5), that is, πνεῦμα Θεοῦ (Test S 4.4; Test B 8.2; cf. also Test L 2.2 v.1.).¹⁶

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, πάντα τὰ πνεύματα τῶν ἐπικλωγῶν εἰς ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἀνόμων) -- in view of the reference in the verse to πῦρ, χιόνα, κρύσταλλον, the translation 'winds' is possible but would not exclude a reference to angels (cf. Ps 104.4 LXX, ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα) -- 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.¹⁷ In fact, every reference to good ἀγγέλοι 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 (ὁ) ἄγγελος 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 𐤀𐤏𐤋𐤁 as an extension of the personality of God and not a separate personality¹⁸ (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 intertestamental 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 1QS iii 24 evil 𐤀𐤏𐤋𐤁 of the 𐤀𐤏𐤋𐤁 of Satan at work in the present world are opposed to 𐤀𐤏𐤋𐤁 𐤀𐤏𐤋𐤁 𐤀𐤏𐤋𐤁 𐤀𐤏𐤋𐤁 (compare Jub 15.31; contrast, however, 1QH xvii 17: 𐤀𐤏𐤋𐤁 𐤀𐤏𐤋𐤁 𐤀𐤏𐤋𐤁 𐤀𐤏𐤋𐤁¹⁹).

The instruction in IQS iii 13-iv 26 concerns two spirits which are supernatural influences in the present human world, viz. the רִחוֹת אֱלֹהִים (iii 18f); the רִחוֹת אֱדֹמִים (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 (רִחוֹת שְׂרָרִים , iii 14) -- these are specified in iv 2-6, 9-11 -- according to their 'genealogies' (נִסְתָּרִים ,²⁰ iii 14). 'In these two spirits are the genealogies of all the sons of men, and in the divisions of these two spirits (רִחוֹת שְׂרָרִים) all the host of the sons of men (בְּנֵי אָדָם) have a share (חֵלֶק) according to the generations of the sons of men (דּוֹרֵי אָדָם , 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 אֱלֹהִים and by the repetition of לְכָל 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.²¹ That ruach in iv 3f, 10 also refers to the constitutional human ruach is shown by the fact that it is synonymous with לֵב (iv 2, 9, 11) and by the fact that the ethical stances inculcated in lines 2-6, 9-11 are 'counsels' (נִסְתָּרִים ; cf. CD iv 21; x 6)²² 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 רִחוֹת אֱלֹהִים (iii 20) or רִחוֹת אֱדֹמִים (iii 24) and רִחוֹת אֱלֹהִים (iii 20f).²³ It may be significant that iii 18 states that God has 'established' these supernatural ruchoth 'for' (לְכָל), not put them in (בְּ) 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.²⁴ What we find in the teaching of IQS iii 13-iv 26 concerning spirits may be compared to the dominant understanding of pneumata in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs;²⁵ 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 LQS 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 $\square \cdot \tau \dot{\iota} \delta$ (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 LQS 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 LQM 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 (ei)ght (parts) spirit' in the latter and one in the former,²⁶ but there is no certain reference to an evil supernatural ruach in LQH,²⁷ and the several references to Belial (LQH 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 $\psi\chi\eta$ (e.g. Test R 1.9; 4.9; Test Jud 18.3, 6), $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha$ (e.g. Test R 4.1; 5.3; Test S 2.1), $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (e.g. Test R 3.8; 4.6; Test S 2.7), and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$ (e.g. Test R 4.6; 5.3, 6; 6.1). The Qumran community writings also usually use other terms,

mainly לִבִּי/לֵב (e.g. CD i 10; 1QpHab viii 10; 1QH i 37) and רוּחַ (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).²⁸ 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 רוּחַ בְּלִיָּה , 1QH xiii 13; cf. xvii 25; Ps 78.39: רוּחַ 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 רוּחַ בְּלִיָּה (1QS viii 3; xi 1, contrasted with those who are $\text{בְּלִיָּה בְּלִיָּה}$; cf. 1QH xviii 15), in which case it receives the favor and succor of (the divine ruach from) God (1QM 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 $\text{בְּרוּחַ בְּלִיָּה}$ (line 31). Ruach here must refer to the person's created constitutional ruach (thus רוּחַ ; cf. i 8f, 15; xi 22)²⁹ 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 רוּחַ בְּלִיָּה 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.³⁰

The members of the Qumran community are ranked $\text{בְּרוּחַ בְּלִיָּה}$ (1QS ii 20). From $\text{בְּרוּחַ בְּלִיָּה}$ each member receives guidance and instruction $\text{בְּרוּחַ בְּלִיָּה}$ (1QS ix 18). The spirits of members are examined and judged by him (בְּרוּחַ , 1QS ix 14; $\text{בְּרוּחַ בְּלִיָּה}$, ix 15) or

by $\overline{\text{ṭṭ}}\overline{\text{ṭṭ}}$ ($\overline{\text{ṭṭ}}$, 1QS v 21; vi 17; $\overline{\text{ṭṭ}}$, v 24) or $\overline{\text{ṭṭ}}\overline{\text{ṭṭ}}$ ($\overline{\text{ṭṭ}}$, CD xx 24). God himself also already judges (1QH xiv 11)³¹ and in the end will finally judge (1QS iv 26) them and all humankind $\overline{\text{ṭṭ}}\overline{\text{ṭṭ}}$ $\overline{\text{ṭṭ}}$ (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 God³² (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 4,³⁵ 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.³⁶

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 $\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{ח}}\overline{\text{ל}}\overline{\text{ל}}$ 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 ($\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{ח}}\overline{\text{ל}}\overline{\text{ל}}$) life.'³⁷ It also seems probable that the phrase $\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{ח}}\overline{\text{ל}}\overline{\text{ל}}$ in iv 23 and CD iii 20 should be taken to refer to the 'glory of Adam'³⁸ 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 LQH iii 20-23, where we read that God has allotted to the cleansed ruach of the psalmist לְיָדָיו לְהַלְלֵהוּ 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 (לְיָדָיו)³⁹ 'לְהַלְלֵהוּ לְיָדָיו' to be made new (לְיָדָיו). It would appear that in order for a person to attain to righteousness and thus salvation the human ruach has to be cleansed (לְיָדָיו) 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 (LQH iii 20-23; xi 10-14). Thus in LQM vii 5, which is probably directly dependent on Deuteronomy 23.9 (compare LQM vii 6 with Dt 23.10), those who fight with the good angels (line 6) and are prepared for לְיָדָיו לְיָדָיו (cf. ix 23; x 19) are לְיָדָיו as well as physically able and pure (לְיָדָיו). It seems, then, that the expectation of the sectarians 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.⁴⁰

LQS 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';⁴¹ that is, when the person as spirit shall be consigned לְיָדָיו לְיָדָיו, along with the unfeignedly wicked (v 13). Complete annihilation is not necessarily implied here. In LQS iv 14 it is only said that no wicked persons will remain outside this punishment or escape from it (לְיָדָיו לְיָדָיו). This accords with the statement in LQH iii 18 that all the ruchim of nothingness or wickedness shall be shut up in hell forever.⁴² 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.⁴³ 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.⁴⁴

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 indeed end up there, or, the same thing said differently, he will end up there as spirit.⁴⁵

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.⁴⁶ 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 inspiraciones 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 inspiraciones 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, 1⁶, 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 (יְצַדִּיק).⁴⁸ In 1QH v 36 we read that the sect's enemies have caused the ruach of the psalmist to stumble (לִפְּנֵי הַנֶּפֶשׁ). It may be noted that human spirit as vitality has again been found only in works probably written originally in Hebrew or Aramaic.⁴⁹ Ruach as strength in 1QH possesses not simply a vital but a decidedly ethical nuance.

(so also perhaps I En 41.8). The tongue of the teaching psalmist is able $\square\dot{\lambda}\dot{\omega}\dot{\iota}\dot{\varsigma} \square\dot{\gamma}\dot{\iota}\dot{\gamma} \dot{\alpha}\dot{\iota}\dot{\gamma}\dot{\iota}\dot{\varsigma}$ (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 ζωῆς, μεθ' ἧς ἡ σύστασις κτίζεται; ὁράσεως; ἀκοῆς; ὁσφρήσεως; ἀλλίας; γεύσεως, and σπορᾶς καὶ συνουσίας, 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.⁵⁰ 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.'⁵¹ 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, ἐξήγειρεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον παιδαρίου νεωτέρου, ὡς ὄνομα Δανιηλ, seems to accord with this usage.⁵²

HUMAN RUACH AND N^ESHAMAH IN RABBINIC USAGE

In rabbinic literature ruach is still 'the usual word for wind';¹ 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 n^eshamah 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 רוח נשמה (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 n^eshamah as a property of animals. The human n^eshamah leaves the body at death (b Yom 21a). It should return לאלהים to God (b Shab 152b). According to b Shab 152b, the n^eshamah 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 גוף or the ascended n^eshamah.

Antonius said to Rabbi: 'The body (גוף) and the n^eshamah can both free themselves from judgement. Thus the body can plead: The n^eshamah 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 n^eshamah 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 (91b) 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 n^eshamah and 'earth' to the body. On the other hand, b Hag 16a states that a person's n^eshamah 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 n^eshamah which Thou hast placed in me is pure (לִי נֶשְׁמָה טְהוֹרָה). 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 n^eshamah.⁵

The fact that the Jew receives an additional n^eshamah on the Sabbath (b Ber 16a; Tan 27b) seems to mean that rest revives his or her strength; ruach but never n^eshamah 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 n^eshamah represent the seat or power of human emotion and thought and action in general (b Sanh 91a-b;⁶ b Hag 16a: it is located in the רֶחַק; Num rabba 18.11). The Targum of Pseudo-Johnathan 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 רַחֵם (M Ab 4.4, 10) and bad to be רַחֵם רַחֵם (4.7); the disciple of Abraham has a רַחֵם רַחֵם, whereas the disciple of Balaam has a רַחֵם רַחֵם (5.19). The usage in M Shebi 10.9 and BB 8.5, where the רַחֵם רַחֵם finds or does not find rest (רַחֵם רַחֵם) 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 n^eshamah run over into one another, so that we are presented not with a plurality of ruchoth/n^eshamoth 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 רַחֵם רַחֵם (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.⁷ 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.⁸ 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 dimunition and final disappearance of the Ruah Hakodesh was the unworthiness of Israel, the sinfulness of Israel.'⁹ We read in b Sanh 65b that R Akiba lamented:

If one who starves himself that a רוח קדש may rest upon him has his wish granted, he who fasts that the רוח קדש 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'¹⁰ (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.¹¹ 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.¹²

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^eshamah as a synonym for ruach not simply in the sense of breath of life but also more generally to cover others meanings of ruach, a usage of n^eshamah nascent in the Old Testament (cf. Job 26.4; 32.8; Prov 20.27), is here taken much further. As ruach but not n^eshamah 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^eshamah in Genesis 2.7 is imparted only to man. The peculiar reading of 7.22f could be taken to confirm this distinction: רוח קדש ... רוח קדש. In the Targums (Onkelos, Pseudo-Johnathan and Neofiti) on Genesis 2.7 the reception of רוח קדש 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^eshamah.¹³ This elucidates the predominant use of n^eshamah 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^eshamah but fire or, according to one rabbi, God's ruach (b Hag 14a). N^eshamah 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 USAGE¹

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.² 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.³ 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.⁴

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 descendants 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.⁵ 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.⁶ 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 work⁷ 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.⁸ 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-related⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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 spirit¹¹ (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.

Valentinus¹² 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).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 Ἐκκλησία (1.5.6) -- of humankind for the redemption of the latter.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).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.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 οἱ πνευματικοί. At the final consummation, having beforetimes discarded their bodies, laying aside their souls (ἀποθέμενα τὰ πνευματικά τὰς ψυχάς), they will attain to the vision of the Father (Exc 64.1; cf. the Marcosians, Adv haer 1.21.5: the gnostic goes εἰς τὰ ἴδια, ῥίψαντα τὸν δεσμόν αὐτοῦ, τοῦτέστι τὴν ψυχὴν). The human spirit is here clearly, in contradistinction to the soul, the principle of continuity between earthly and eternal life.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 Ὅρος to behold the Father (Exc 64.1). Valentinus' teaching thus

retains as does the Apocryphon of John something of the Old Testament emphasis on the impotence of the human spirit.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ Here we find something akin to the Old Testament insight²⁰ 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, το... πνευματικὸν φύσει σωζόμενον; Strom 4.89.4, φύσει... σωζόμενον γένος; 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').²¹ 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').²² Saved persons rise upward and enter into the upper world as extremely light (λεπτομερεστάτη), 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 πλήρωμα, 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 (αὐτοῦ τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως ὅντες τῷ πατρὶ πνεῦμά εἰσιν, 13.25).²³ 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 φύσις. 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 gnosticism, 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).²⁴ In the Tractate Tripartitius the Ἐκκλησία of spirits actually displaces the Holy Spirit in the Trinity (57.33-35; 58.29ff).²⁵

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 Ialdabaoth 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 ψυχή and its special 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 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, ἀκούσῃ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κατοικοῦν καὶ φύῃ).

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 νοῦς 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 νοῦς 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.'²⁶ 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 νοῦς and ἐνθύμησις. 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 νοῦς. The Tractatus Tripartitius identifies the 'living soul' (ψυχή) as the "breath of life" and "the thought (νοεῖν) of the exalted aeon" (ἀΐων).²⁷ 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

dislocated self.²⁸ Philo holds that the $\psi\chi\eta'$ which is the $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ is composed of a $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ $\Theta\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$ '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 $\psi\chi\eta'$, 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- $\psi\chi\eta'$ dichotomy in the book Baruch is not materially different in itself from the $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ / $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ $\Theta\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$ - $\psi\chi\eta'$ dichotomy in Philo. As Philo holds that the heaven-tending mind leaves the earthbound soul behind (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 perfection³³ (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 $\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta/\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ composed of $\pi\nu\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha$ $\Theta\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$) 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 $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ is the truly divine and immortal aspect of the human person.

The $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ 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 ($\tau\eta\nu$ $\tau\eta\lambda\iota\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\tau\eta\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\theta\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\upsilon$), nor could so great a virtue ($\tau\eta\nu$ $\tau\omicron\sigma\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\tau\eta\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\tau\eta\nu$) submit to contact with a body defiled by passion. And so the mind takes to itself the soul for a wrap ($\acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\beta\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu$); the soul -- for the soul also is in some measure divine ($\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta$ $\Theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$) -- uses as its wrap the vital spirit ($\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\eta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\chi\rho\eta\tau\iota$); and the vital spirit controls the body (10.17; cf. 11.4; 12.14).¹

The human person should recognize that he or she being essentially $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ is $\acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ (1.18). Human pneuma, a derivation $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\acute{\alpha}\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ (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.¹ 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 $\tau\omega$ πνεύματι blessed.² $\tau\omega$ πνεύματι should be understood as a dative of respect.³ As 'the clean in heart', $\text{οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ}$ (v. 8), are those whose heart is clean, so are the poor in pneuma those whose pneuma is poor.⁴ In IQM xiv 7 we have an exact parallel to $\text{οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι}$: □□□'□□□ . There is a lacuna immediately after this construct so the meaning of 'poor in ruach' here is not patent. Nonetheless, it is clear that □□□'□□□□ parallels □□□'□□□□ ; 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 $\text{'□□□' □□□□ □□□□' □□}$. In M Abot 4.10 Rabbi Meir says that the Jew should occupy himself with the Law and be □□□'□□□ before all men. In IQS iv 3 we read that those who attend to the commandments of God have □□□□ □□□□ □□ . 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): □□□□ □□□ □□□' □□ (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 $\text{τοὺς ταπεινοὺς τῷ πνεύματι}$ (MT, □□□' □□□), and Isaiah 57.15, which states that God dwells with one who is □□□'□□□ □□□ and revives □□□' □□□ □□ . '□□ is often translated by πτωχός 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).⁵

In Luke 1.47 (cf. Isaiah 26.9) 'my pneuma' is used in poetic parallelism as a synonym for 'my $\psi\chi\eta$ ' representing the whole human person.⁶ 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 ἐκραταροῦτο πνεύματι. Pneuma is the seat or power of the dominant disposition in Mark 8.12 (Jesus ἀναστεινάζας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ) and in John 11.33 (Jesus ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι) and 13.21 (Jesus ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι). In Mark 2.8 (Jesus ἐπιγνούς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ) pneuma is the seat or power of human thinking and acting.⁷ Pneuma in Mark 14.38b // Matthew 26.41b, τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής, should also be understood as a reference to the disciples' power of thought and volition; the disciples are eager to follow Jesus. Προθυμ corresponds to the Hebrew root 173 (cf. II Chron 29.31: MT, 173 173 173; LXX, πᾶς πρόθυμος τῇ καρδίᾳ). '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.'⁸ Pneuma in the phrase ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ (Jo 4.23f) has often been taken as a reference to the human spirit;⁹ it is, however, better to interpret 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"'.¹⁰

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 πνεῦμα 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 personally 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, παρωξύνετο τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ θεωροῦντες κατείδωλον οὐσαν τὴν πόλιν. Although Isaiah 63.10 (LXX) states that the Israelites παρώξυναν God's πνεῦμα ἅγιον, 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 παροξυσμός 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 pneuma is here modified by a third person possessive pronoun (cf. 7.59) and further defined as 'his spirit' which is ἐν αὐτῷ (cf. Zech 12.1) suggests that the author of Acts wants to distinguish this pneuma 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 Ἰουδαῖος... Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει, ἀνὴρ λόγιος... εὐνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς... κιτηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ζέων τῷ πνεύματι. This well-equipped evangelist ἐλάλει καὶ ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. At the end of this enumeration of Apollos' excellent endowments one is rather surprised to read that he knew μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου, and that, having heard him preach in the Corinthian synagogue, Paul's colleagues Priscilla and Aquila took him aside for more accurate (ἀκριβέστερον) Christian instruction. The evident imperfections in Apollos' Christian standing and public preaching intimated in verses 25c-26 have influenced many scholars¹ and translators (RV; RSV; NEB; JB; Moffatt) to understand ζέων τῷ πνεύματι as a reference to Apollos' enthusiastic human spirit and not the Holy Spirit.² In support of this interpretation it may be noted that ζεῖν 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 ἁκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ,³ strongly suggests that the Holy Spirit is meant. The use of λαλεῖν in verse 25 also indicates that the Holy Spirit is in view. Λαλεῖν in Acts is only used of the inspired speech of Christians (cf. e.g. 19.6). Λεχεῖν and εἰπεῖν are used of the speech of non-Christians (and also Christians) but never λαλεῖν.⁴ 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 τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαΐαν πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, and 20.22, where Paul declares, νῦν ἰδοὺ δεδεμένος ἐγὼ τῷ πνεύματι πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, being unmodified, means the Holy Spirit. Scholars and translators are divided concerning the translation of pneuma in both verses. RSV, Moffatt and NEB mg affirm that the Holy Spirit is intended in 19.21, whereas RV, JB and NEB understand pneuma as human spirit. In favor of the latter reading reference is sometime made to 5.4, ἔθου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ (cf. also Luke 1.66; 21.14).⁵ In 20.22 RSV, NEB, JB mg see a reference to the human spirit.⁶ 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.'⁷ The fact that pneuma is not modified in 19.21 and 20.22 is a more significant indication that the Holy Spirit is intended.⁸

In 23.8 we read that the Sadducees λέγουσιν μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν μήτε ἄγγελος μήτε πνεῦμα, whereas the Pharisees ὁμολογοῦσιν τὰ

ἀμφοτέρω hence the Pharisees are prepared to allow that an ἄγγελον of 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, εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος --. Pneuma is sometimes taken as equivalent to ἄγγελος here (cf. Heb 1.7, 13f).⁹ This interpretation allows τὰ ἀμφοτέρω its usual meaning of 'both', i.e. belief both in resurrection and angels, though τὰ ἀμφοτέρω in Koine Greek often means 'all',¹⁰ and it in fact has this meaning already in Acts 19.16. Pneuma in 23.8f has also been understood as 'demon'¹¹ 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 ψυχὴ persists after death (Bel 2.165; Ant 18.16: Σαδδουκίους δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς ὁ λόγος συναφνίζει τοῖς σώματι). H. A. W. Meyer considers that pneuma here incorporates demons and ghosts.¹² In rabbinic usage ruach means a human ghost and רִיחַ אֱלֹהִים a demon, but ruach does not, to my knowledge, denote an angel.¹³ 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, τὰ ἀμφοτέρω might mean 'both', viz. both the doctrine of resurrection and that of spiritual existences, angels and demons and/or ghosts.¹⁴

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS

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, ἄρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν. Because the 'joints' (ἄρμοι, cf. IV Macc 10.5; Test Z 2.5) and 'marrow' (μυελοί, cf. Jos Bel 604) of the human body are not attached and so cannot be separated, we might conclude that the ψυχὴ and the pneuma in 4.12 are accordingly not separated from one another, but divided within themselves.¹ On this reading of the verse -- this verse should not be simply dismissed as mere impenetrable overblown rhetoric unless it proves impossible to comprehend it exactly -- ψυχὴ could be the seat of sensations and emotions and pneuma the intellectual faculty (cf. Rer div her 55).² This interpretation does not seem adequate, however, because elsewhere in our epistle (3.8, 10 et. al.) and even in this very verse the καρδιά is represented as the emotional, rational and volitional power of the human person. Furthermore, ψυχὴ 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 ψυχὴ 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 ψυχὴ and pneuma, of ἄρμῶν and of μυελῶν (ἄχρι μερισμοῦ... ἄρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν). 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 ψυχὴ προσπάσχει τῷ σώματι, τοῦ δὲ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἡ χεὶρ ἀνθέλκει πρὸς τὰ οὐρανία³ (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 ψυχὴ lives.⁴ The οὖν in

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' (πίπτειν, 4.11) as the Hebrews of old 'fell' (πίπτειν, 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 prostrate⁵ (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, κατάπαυσις. The mention of a μερισμοῦ... ἄρμων τε καὶ μυελῶν underscores the finality and totality of the death God inflicts upon those who do not continually (σήμερον, 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 παντοδύναμός σου λόγος... ξίφος ὀξύ... φέρων καὶ σῆς ἐπλήρωσεν τὰ πάντα θανάτου (cf. also v. 20).

In 12.5-11 the author of our letter represents the suffering his readers are experiencing (v. 4) as God's way of disciplining them as sons. In verses 9f he argues that since his readers used to submit to discipline given by their earthly parents (πατέρες, cf. 11.25), they ought to submit all the more (οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον) to this present discipline by ὁ πατήρ τῶν πνευμάτων, which is for their benefit (ἐπὶ τὸ συμφερόν), that they may live forever (cf. Luke 10.25, 28) and share God's holiness (εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ). Pneumata here has been variously understood. Chrysostom allows that it might mean 'spiritual gifts' or 'prayers' or 'incorporeal powers', ἥτοι τῶν χάρισμάτων λέγει, ἥτοι τῶν εὐχῶν, ἥτοι τῶν ἀσωμάτων ἐννείμεων.⁶ Oecumenius substitutes ψυχῆ for εὐχοί,⁷ and Theophylact prefers this alternative.⁸ According to Hans Windisch, 'pneumata werden hier die Menschengeister sein, die Gott geschaffen hat.'⁹ This is a good interpretation since it fits the context. The author holds that God provides the pneumata of life that enliven the fleshly bodies produced by human procreation, 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 pneumata in 12.9 as embracing all spiritual life, including that of angels (cf. 1.7, 14). They argue that the fact that pneuma unlike ἀρξ is not modified by ἡμῶν indicates that the upper as well as the earthly world is in view in 12.9b.¹⁰ 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 23.¹¹

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 ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων (Christians are not elsewhere so designated, but cf. Ro 8.29) ἀποχερμασμένον ἐν οὐρανοῖς (cf. Luke 10.20; Phil 3.20; Rev 3.5 etc.). The πνεύματα δικαίων (cf. τὰ πνεύματα 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).¹² 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', τετελειωμένον, 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 'δικαίους τετελειωμένους', because they are as yet disembodied and awaiting the resurrection, but πνεύματι δικαίων τετελειωμένους' (cf. 6.2; 11.19 and especially 11.35).¹³ 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 (μὴ γὰρ προσφορὰ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ δυνάμει τοὺς ἀδικησάντας); the πνεύματα δικαίων τετελειωμένα

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, ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρόν ἐστίν, οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις χωρὶς ἔργων νεκρά ἐστίν, 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'.¹

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);² 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 κατώκειν and δίδωσιν and who is mentioned in verses 5c and 7a is the subject of ἐπιποθεῖ. 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.³ God's particular concern with the human spirit is affirmed in Jewish literature contemporary with James: IQH 14.11f, ^{τ τ τ}ϣωγς ^{τ τ τ}לכ ^{τ τ τ}רמ ^{τ τ τ}ם(τ₁)⁴ תינתן ^{τ τ τ}י' ^{τ τ τ}י'; Philo (Spec Leg 1.277), παρὰ θεῷ μὴ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν κατὰθεομένων εἶναι τίμιον, ἀλλὰ τὸ καθαρώτατον τοῦ θείου πνεύματος λογικόν. It seems probable that pneuma here is the human spirit. Joachim Jeremias

compares the idea of verse 5b with Job 14.15b, $\text{הָיָה כִּי יִשָּׁאֵל הָאֱלֹהִים}$, where Theodotion translates הָיָה as ἐπιποθεῖν.⁵

HUMAN PNEUMA IN I PETER

The fact that a reference to God precedes and a reference to Jesus Christ follows the phrase ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος 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 κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ πραέος καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ πολυτελής, on the grounds that (1) pneuma in the singular elsewhere in this epistle always refers to the Holy Spirit¹ and (2) only it and not a human spirit could be designated 'unvergänglich'.² 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, τὸ γὰρ ἀφθαρτὸν σου πνεῦμα ἐστὶν ἐν πάντιν.

J. N. D. Kelly has adduced two reasons for seeing a reference in 3.4 to an anthropological spirit.³ (1) Since this pneuma 'is commended as pleasing to God, it can hardly be' the Holy Spirit. This of course assumes that ὃ 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 πραΰτητα. It seems best to understand pneuma in 3.4 as human spirit in the sense of 'disposition',⁴ or more particularly as 'der von Gottes Geist geprägte Geist des Menschen'.⁵

Pneuma used in contrast to σάρξ in 3.18 and 4.6 signifies not the human spirit but the Holy Spirit. Elsewhere in the New Testament the verb ζωοποιεῖν (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 σάρξ in 1.24 represents mortal humanity as such in contradistinction to the immortal power of God in his ῥῆμα which has been preached (τὸ εὐαγγελισθέν) to these Christian readers (1.25); in 1.12 preaching is said to be ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ. It follows that our writer in 3.18 and 4.6 distinguishes pneuma as divine power from σάρξ 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 κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκί on the one hand and κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι on the other hand. Σαρκί and pneumatī in both verses are best taken as datives of reference.

If ἐν ᾧ in versé 19 refers back to pneumatī 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 ᾧ in 1.6, 2.12, 3.16, and 4.4 we may have here a vague temporal or causal conjunction picking up not just pneumatī but the preceding phrase, Θανάτω Θεὸς κ. τ. λ., and meaning 'on which occasion' or 'in which state'. Conjectural emendations which introduce a reference to ἔνυχ in place of or after ἐν ᾧ καί cannot be accepted because a sudden transference

of attention from Christ to Enoch at this point would be 'highly unnatural and illogical'.⁶

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'.⁷ 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.⁸

Increasingly modern scholars opt for the first alternative.⁹ They argue that pneuma in our literature is commonly used of angels and demons but only rarely of deceased human persons¹⁰ (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 πνεύμασιν τῶν ἀπειθήσαντων rather than πνεύμασιν ἀπειθήσανσιν 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 ἄγγελοι or ἔχρηγόροι and never pneumata except in I Enoch,¹¹ and here only three times in two special contexts. In 15.4, 6 it is said that these fallen angels used to be (ἦτε, ὑπῆρχετε) πνεύματα ζῶντα αἰῶνα, and in verse 8 they are called spirits inasmuch as they are progenitors of οἱ γίγντες οἱ γεννηθέντες ἀπὸ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ σαρκός who thereby merit the designation πνεύματα ἰσχυρὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.¹² 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 (δεσμωτήριον, I En 18.14-19.1)¹³ as οἱ παράβαντες τὴν ἐπιταγὴν 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 (πορεύεσθαι) and speak (εἰπεῖν) to these imprisoned angels, making plain to them their utter wretchedness.¹⁴ Jubilees 5.5f directly contrasts the approbation 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, ὑπὸ τυχόντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων. 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.¹⁵ 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)¹⁶ 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.'¹⁷ 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 ᾧ as 'in the Spirit', it is significant that evangelization is in 1.12 said to be ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ. 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.'¹⁸

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.¹⁹ 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 $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tilde{\omega}$ followed by $\kappa\alpha\iota$, '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.'²⁰

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.²¹ 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 ($\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha$; 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,'²² he identifies the apostate angels of 3.19f as the powers behind these state persecutions.²³ 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 εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν ἑπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν (2.13f).²⁴ The 'extreme generality' of ἀεὶ and παντὶ²⁵ 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.²⁶ 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 πνεύμασιν, this verse would serve merely to shift the discussion from Christ's redemptive death and resurrection to the baptismal typology of 20f;²⁷ 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 νεκροῖς εὐαγγελίσθη. In the light of the usage of εὐαγγελίζεσθαι 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'.²⁸ 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 νεκροῖς 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),²⁹ and the entire verse translated as follows: 'for it was to this end (εἰς τοῦτο γάρ) 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.'³⁰ 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.³¹ God is also the subject of κρίνειν 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 κρίνειν 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 σάρξ and pneuma, for to say that human persons are raised in the σάρξ 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.³² Σάρξ 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.³³ 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 (εὐαγγελίσθη). If we equate καὶ νεκροῖς εὐαγγελίσθη (4.6) with καὶ τοῖς ἐν φουλικῇ πνεύματι... ἐκήρυξεν (3.19), 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.'³⁴ 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 (𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕) fell; they were caught because they did not keep the commandments (𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤓𐤕) 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 (𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤓𐤕) of their Maker so that his wrath was kindled against them.³⁵

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 ἀρχαίου κόσμου...ἀσεβῶν. 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 ἠπείθεσαν then (3.20), so do many ἀπειθεῖν 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 Jospheus (Ant 18.14, here they are ψυχῶν), 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 θάνατον καὶ ἀγχμαλωτισμόν (Hv 1.1.8; cf. δεσμοτήριον 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, εἰν ἀναστῇ Νῶε καὶ 'Ιωβ καὶ Δαυιδ, οὗ ῥύσσονται τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ἀγχμαλωσίᾳ;³⁶ Tertullian (Adv Jud 12; Adv Marc 3.20) interprets 'house of prison' in Isaiah 42.7 as 'death'.³⁷ 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).³⁸ We may compare also M Ab 5.2: 'there were ten generations from Adam to Noah, to show how great was his long-suffering (ⲡⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ), for all the generations provoked him continually until he brought upon them the waters of the Flood.'³⁹

Given that our author in 3.20 compares the widespread ἀπειθεία 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

(4.6)? 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 τὸν ἀπροσώπολήπτως κρίνοντα (1.17), as one who judges δίκαιως (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 (λόγος) has to be given. Our author brilliantly turns the tables on the pagans who trouble the church: God will demand a λόγος 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 ἀπειθούντες (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 ἀπειθήσαντες before the flood (3.19). The gospel was preached to the dead εἰς τοῦτο (4.6), that God might be a just judge of ζώντας καὶ νεκρούς, of all human persons. Our context (3.13-4.6) follows a reference to the fairness of God's judgement (3.12). The focus of our author's thought in this epistle leads him to affirm the fact that God in Christ

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 (γίνεσθαι) 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 ἐγένετο ἐπ' ἐμέ χεὶρ κυρίου, καὶ ἐξήγαγόν με ἐν πνεύματι κύριος, which is equivalent to 3.12, ἀνέλαβέν με πνεῦμα (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 μου 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 γίνεσθαι in Acts 22.17, γενέσθαι με ἐν ἐκστάσει, and 12.11, ὁ Πέτρος ἐν ἐκστῇ γενόμενος, 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 πνεῦμα ζωῆς 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 κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνεύματων 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 Spirit⁴ (in 19.10, ἡ γὰρ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ ἐστὶν τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς προφητείας, a single Spirit of prophecy is affirmed; this statement may be a later gloss).⁵ There are several alternative interpretations of the plural τὰ πνεύματα in 22.6. It is taken as a pleonasm for the persons of the prophets.⁶ It is otherwise interpreted by the fact that each individual prophets has a 'gift' of prophetic utterance, pneumata being here equivalent to χάρισμα or πνευματικά.⁷ A less refined variation of this last explanation is simply that, as each prophets has the pneuma, numbers of them are said to have pneumata.⁸ 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.⁹ Mere reference to I Enoch (and cf. also II Macc 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 διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου (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 angels¹⁰ (cf. Heb 1.7, 14 for the identification of ἀγγέλοι as πνεύματα εἰς δικκονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα 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.¹¹ 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 (ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θρόνου αὐτοῦ) in Revelation 1.4; 3.1; 4.5 and 5.6 are to be equated with the 'seven angels' before God (ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ) in 8.2 (cf. for the conception of 'the seven angels of the Presence', Tob 12.15).¹² 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 χάρις and εἰρήνη (1.4).¹³ 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 τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἐφύτευσε, τούτ' ἐστὶν τὸν λαὸν ἔκτισε καὶ παρέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὁ υἱὸς κατέστησε τοὺς ἀγγέλους ἐπ' αὐτοὺς τοῦ συντηρεῖν αὐτούς (cf. also s 5.5.2f; 9.12.6, 8).¹⁴ 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 'ears 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).¹⁵

Most scholars prefer to understand τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ Θεοῦ (1.4 et. al.) as a circumlocution for the one Holy Spirit of God.¹⁶ 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).¹⁷ Others refer to the fact that the Spirit will speak to seven churches (2.1ff).¹⁸ 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 πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, 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 chapt. 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 ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος is not a symbol for God as the seven spirits would be for the Holy Spirit; ὁ ὢν κ. τ. λ. is a title of God's. John uses symbols for God in 4.3, ἄνεμος καὶ ὕδωρ. 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,²⁰ 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, ὡςπερ οἱ ἱεροὶ προφῆται τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα εἰς ἑπτὰ πνεύματα μερίζεσθαι φασίν (Cohortatio ad Graecos 32),²³ and have affinities with Valentinian gnosticism, ἐν ἐνότητι μέντοι χε προεβλήθησαν οἱ ἀγγέλοι ἡμῶν, φασίν, εἰς ὄντες, ὡς ἀπὸ ἐνὸς προέλθοντες (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 ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἀρχίσαι ὑμᾶς ὀλοτελεῖς καὶ ὀλοκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τηρηθεῖς. Ernst von Dobschütz has displayed the formal chiastic structure of the verse: 'ἀρχίσαι (1) ὑμᾶς (2) ὀλοτελεῖς (3) - ὀλοκληρον (3) ὑμῶν τὸ πν. καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ κ. τὸ σ. (2)... τηρηθεῖς (1).'⁴ Both ὀλοτελεῖς and ὀλοκληρον are adjectival in form. Robert Jewett argues that 'since both words could have been used in their adverbial forms of ὀλοτελεῖς or ὀλοκληρώως, 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 ἀμέμπως, although adverbial in form, is most naturally taken as adjectival in this sentence.⁶ Paul could have written ἄμεμπτον (cf. 3.13). Therefore it is equally legitimate to translate ὀλοτελεῖς and ὀλόκληρον 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 ὀλοτελεῖς and ὀλόκληρον should probably be understood as quantitative modifiers unlike ἀμέμπως 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 9.1f, 4ff).⁸ A decree from AD 67 relating to Nero's declaration of the freedom of all Greeks at the Isthmian games speaks of ἀνεισφορίαν, ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν πρότερον Σεβαστῶν ὀλοτελῇ 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 τὴν ὀλοκληρίαν τέτην), and by its predominant employment in the Septuagint, e.g. λιθοὺς ὀλοκλήρους (Dt 27.6; Josh 8.31; IV Macc 15.17); ἑπτὰ εβδομάδας ὀλοκλήρους (Dt 16.9 A; Lev 23.15). A magical papyrus contains this statement strikingly similar to our verse: τὸ δὲ σχῆμα ὅλον οὕτως ὡς ὑπόκειται ὅτι διαφύλασσε μου τὸ σῶμα τὴν ψυχὴν 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 παρουσίᾳ here as in 2.19 and 3.13. Only in 4.15 does he speak of their surviving εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν. 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 κυρίου (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.¹² Beda Rigaux has recognized that the prayer in 5.23 'est confiante. Elle

debouche sur une certitude.¹³ 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 ψυχὴ 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 ὑμεῖς 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 ζῶντες, περιλειπόμενοι unto, εἰς (4.15) and at, ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (5.23).¹⁴ 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 τῆρειν elsewhere, particularly in I Corinthians 7.37, τῆρειν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον. 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, πιστὸς ὁ κἀλῶν ὑμεῖς, ὅς καὶ ποιήσει (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, πνεῦμα, ψυχὴ 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.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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;'¹⁷ Best also suggests that Paul is countering 'the normal Hellenistic tendency to divide man'.¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ 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 ὁλόκληρος in distinction from ὁλοτελής 'in accordance with its derivation... draws more special attention to the several parts to which the wholeness spoken of extends...';²⁰ 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 πνεῦμα ἅγιον 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),²¹ many ancient exegetes especially:

of the Antiochene school,²² and a minority of modern commentators.²³ 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?'²⁴ 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.'²⁵ 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)²⁶ 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, πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται, 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, τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε, in the light of I Corinthians 14.32 and a very interesting statement concerning inspiration in Plutarch De defecto oraculorum 40, ἡ θνητὴ φρόνησις... κατασβέννυσσι τὸν ἐνθεσιασμόν.²⁷ 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 γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀκαταστάσις ὁ θεὸς ἀλλὰ εἰρήνης. 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).²⁸ 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 Masson understands pneuma in our verse as the whole human person who consists of $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ and $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$.²⁹ His interpretation does not commend itself for two reasons: (1) $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ elsewhere in Paul always represents the whole living person, never a part thereof (e.g. I Th 2.8);³⁰ (2) it 'is grammatically difficult since it takes "your whole" with "spirit" alone though the Greek strongly implies that the three terms are parallel.'³¹ 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 $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, the Godward aspect of the human personality; $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ as the seat of the will, emotions and sensation, and $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$ as the material organism.³² Philo certainly entertains such a trichotomy (cf. e.g. Rer div her 64),³³ and statements in Plato, the creator $\nu\omicron\upsilon\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \epsilon\nu \psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu \delta\epsilon \epsilon\nu \sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\iota \xi\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \tau\omicron \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ (Tim 30b),³⁴ and Aristotle, $\tau\omicron\nu \nu\omicron\upsilon\nu \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu \theta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu \epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{\iota}\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu \epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu$ (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 $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$. Moreover, Paul distinguishes between human pneuma and $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in I Corinthians 14.14.³⁵ 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 $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ as 'das principatium, das Belebte, der Mensch als persönlich lebender'; $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$ 'ist Werkzeug des Geistes- und Seelensleben.'³⁶ Here $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ and $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$ 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 (ψυχῇ); they will still be living in the body (σώμῃ). 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.'³⁷ 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 I Corinthians 5.5 as proof of this.³⁸ We shall see later that I Corinthians 5.5 does not bear this interpretation. Even if it could, we could not assume that Paul's views concerning the πῶς 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.'³⁹ 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.⁴⁰ 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 THESSALONIANS 2.8

Pneuma in II Thessalonians 2.8, ὁ ἄνομος, ὃν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἀνελεῖ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος 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; IQSb v 24f).⁴¹

II THESSALONIANS 2.13

It is generally agreed that the phrase ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας modifies neither σωτηρίαν nor ἔλκτο alone but the entire idea expressed by the preceding words, i.e. that it elucidates 'wie es vom ἔλκτο zum σωτηρία kommt.'⁴² A small minority of scholars see a reference to a human spirit in the phrase ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος. The

fullest argument that I have found in favor of this interpretation is given by G. G. Findlay.⁴³ He contends that the phrase thus understood (1) 'recalls the memorable prayer' of I Thessalonians 5.23, and (2) forms with καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας a 'patent antithesis' to οὐ μὴ πιστεύοντες τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἀλλὰ εὐδοκῆσαντες τῇ ἀδικίᾳ in the preceding verse; he also points to (3) 'the probability that the writer, if intending the Holy Spirit by πνεύματος, 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 ἀληθείας.'⁴⁴ 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 ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος and πίστει ἀληθείας cannot be pressed since sanctification is a process whereas faith is not,⁴⁵ Findlay refers to 1.4, τῆς ὑπομονῆς ὑμῶν καὶ πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς διωγμοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ ταῖς θλίψεσιν αἵς ἀνέχεσθε, and to the exhortation which our verse is leading up to, 2.15, ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, στήκετε, καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε..., to prove that faith for Paul is also like sanctification something that needs to be sustained.⁴⁶ Finally, he avers that the argument that 'sanctification of the (human) spirit' would have to follow not precede 'faith in the truth'⁴⁷ 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 ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος as 'sanctification by the Spirit'

a contrast with εὐδοκῆσκυτες τῇ ἀδικίᾳ still remains, and quite apart from the possibility that behind that εὐδοκία Paul perceives a different sort of spiritual influence from outside active in the ἐνέρχειαν 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 ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος and πίστει ἀληθείας 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).⁴⁸ 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 ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. This last passage is particularly relevant to us if we read ἀπαρχήν rather than ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in II Thessalonians 2.13. B. M. Metzger reports that the UBS editors adopted the reading ἀπαρχήν for the following reasons (external evidence being indecisive): (1) ἀπ' ἀρχῆς occurs nowhere else in Paul; (2) except in Philippians 4.15 ἀρχή in Paul always means 'power'; (3) 'ἀπαρχή occurs six other places in Paul (though in five of them it is with a qualifying genitive), and (4) elsewhere copyists altered ἀπαρχήν to ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (Rev 14.4 X; Ro 16.5 D*) 'even though the latter expression is inappropriate in these passages.'⁴⁹ One of the two usual objections against this reading is that Paul could not have written ἀπαρχήν because the Thessalonians were not the first believers in Macedonia.⁵⁰ 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 ἀπαρχήν 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.'⁵¹ 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 τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες; 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.'⁵² We are invited by Romans 8.23 and 15.16 to conclude that when Paul speaks of Christians as ἀρχήν 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 ἀρχήν in our verse thus connects with ἐν ἁγιαθμῷ πνεύματος,⁵³ and thereby nullifies the second usual objection against this reading, that it does not fit the context.⁵⁴

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. Kümmel 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?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 10-13.² 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).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 authoritative status as apostolic founder of the entire church at Corinth; only having done this can he expect that his commands, admonitions and suggestions in the later chapters will be accepted by his readers.⁵ Paul's predominant purpose in I Corinthians is to inculcate amongst his readers the νοῦς 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.⁶ His argument reaches its climactic point in chapter 13 (including 12.31b).⁷

In 2.6-16 Paul maintains that he is to be classed amongst those who speak Θεοῦ σοφία. This σοφία is Christ crucified and all that he effects (vv. 6-9, 16; cf. 1.24, 30). The σοφία Paul speaks in 2.6ff does not differ in content from that of 1.17ff.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 Käsemann states correctly that 'jedes Glied der Gemeinde ist berufen, vollkommen zu sein...Vollkommen sind alle Christen, sofern sie an der Gemeinde geschenkter, göttlicher Gnade partizipieren und darin bleiben und wachsen.'⁹ According to Paul, the Corinthian Christians are πνευματικοί but do not live like πνευματικοί (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 (οὐκ ἔβουλήθη λαλῆσαι ὑμῖν ὡς πνευματικοῖς): 'it was not the intention, but the melancholy consequence, that he gave them milk instead of meat.'¹⁰ Because the Corinthians have received the Spirit, Paul cannot rightly call them ψυχικοί (cf. 2.14). He calls them σαρκινοί/σρκικοί (3.1, 3). They are not πνευματικοί insofar as they continue to walk κατὰ ἄνθρωπον. Paradoxically πνευματικοί yet not πνευματικοί the Corinthian Christians are νηπίοι ἐν Χριστῷ.¹¹

Paul declares that God's wisdom can only be understood by those who receive the Spirit, that is, by Christians (vv. 10-16).¹² His reference to a human 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.¹³ Just as the spirit of a human person is his or her self-consciousness,¹⁴ 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 ἀνθρώπου. C. K. Barrett comments that this is 'common human experience'.¹⁵ 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, ὅτι βάθος καρδίας ἀνθρώπου οὐχ εὐρήσετε καὶ λόγους τῆς διανοίας αὐτοῦ οὐ διαλήμψεσθε· καὶ πῶς τὸν Θεόν, ὃς ἐποίησεν πάντα ταῦτα ἐρευνήσατε καὶ τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ ἐπιγνώσεσθε καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν αὐτοῦ κατανοήσατε, and particularly Proverbs 20.27, where πνοή (pneuma in the citation in I Clem 21.2)¹⁶ represents ruach meaning human self-understanding.¹⁷ 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,¹⁸ 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 οὕτως 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.¹⁹ According to J. B. Lightfoot, the emphatic repetition of ἀνθρώπου, ἀνθρώπου, ἀνθρώπου and of Θεοῦ, Θεοῦ is intended to enforce such a contrast.²⁰ 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.²¹ Certainly the Spirit of God which knows πάντα 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 ψυχικοί 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 κόσμου (v. 12)²² 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.²³

Pneuma in 2.11a is not 'um des formallen Parallelismus willen im "uneigentlichen" Sinne für "Seele" gebraucht',²⁴ since ψυχή in Paul characteristically represents the whole human person; nor is pneuma here equivalent to νοῦς,²⁵ for νοῦς in Paul is less a faculty of the human person than 'die im Bewusstsein stehenden Gedanken',²⁶ and νοῦς in verse 16 is not equivalent to τὸ πνεῦμα πάντα ἐρευνᾷ in verse 10 but is rather to be related to τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ of that verse.²⁷ 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 (δύναμις; 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.²⁸ 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 πνεύματι πραΰτητος in 4.21 as the imparted Holy Spirit which effects πραΰτης (cf. Gal 5.22f, ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστὶν ἀγάπη...πραΰτης...).²⁹ It is claimed that the phrase ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος in Galatians 6.1 must refer to the Holy Spirit in the light of its correlation with οἱ πνευματικοί, which must mean: you who will indeed 'walk in the Spirit' (5.16; cf. vv. 18, 25),³⁰ but this does not necessarily follow. On the other hand, it has been argued that the Holy Spirit 'kann...kein Parallelglied zu ἀγάπη bilden',³¹ (cf. 16.24), and that if Paul had meant the Holy Spirit we would expect him to have written, ἐν ἀγάπῃ πραΰτητι τε πνεύματος (cf. Ro 15.30; Gal 5.13 v.1.).³² The first of these latter arguments is called into question by I Corinthians 13 and the second by II Corinthians 4.13.³³

We have a very close parallel to our verse in IQS iii 8; iv 3, 111]4...117 (πραΰτης translates 111]4 in the LXX at Ps. 44(45).4), and here ruach means 'disposition'.³⁴ We have already argued that I Peter 3.4, τοῦ πρέως...πνεύματος, does

not refer to the Holy Spirit but to the human spirit as 'disposition'.³⁵ There is no reason why in I Corinthians 4.21 and Galatians 6.1 πνεῦμα πραΰτητος should not also be understood as 'die "Gesinnung" der Sanftmut, der freilich nach Gal 5,23 selber eine Frucht des Geistes ist',³⁶ 'a human spirit directed by' the Holy Spirit.³⁷ 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 καρδιά (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 σῶμα (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 man³⁸ has a scandalous relationship³⁹ with his stepmother.⁴⁰ The apostle's extreme displeasure at this news is unmistakable, and ὅλως (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.⁴¹ Such fornication⁴² 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 (ἐγὼ μὲν) reacts swiftly and sharply. He does not in our verses pass judgement instead of and for the church; he rather anticipates or prophesies⁴³ what will be done by them.⁴⁴

It is natural to connect the prepositional phrase σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ (v. 4b) with the genitive participle συναχθέντων, and then to attach the prepositional phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (v. 4a) to the immediately preceding accusative participle τὸν...κατερχασμένον,⁴⁵ which is the object of κέκρικα (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.' 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 (παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι...ὡς παρὼν...ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος).⁴⁷ But will he be 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 παραδοῦναι τῷ σατανᾷ.'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 1.9.⁵⁰ Therefore I assume that Paul in 5.3f is speaking 'psychologically rather than theologically'.⁵¹

This conclusion is not contradicted by II Corinthians 12.2 (cf. v. 4), *ἢτε ἐν σώματι οὐκ οἶδα, ἢτε ἐκτὸς 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,⁵² 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 *σῶμα* even in this present life'.⁵³ I Corinthians 5.3f invite us to connect this possibly separated self with the human *pneuma*. 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),⁵⁴ but hesitates to say this about his sojourn in heaven, we may infer that he (unlike, perhaps, I Enoch)⁵⁵ does not consider the human spirit as the principle of continuity between earthly and eternal life.

In II Kings 5.26 the 'heart' (*לֵב*) 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 *προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ* (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, *ὅτι τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ υμῶν*; cf. further the use of *καρδίᾳ* 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 γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι, χαίρων καὶ βλέπων ὑμῶν τάξιν καὶ τὸ στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως 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, τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι, χαίρων, is to this 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 καρπός 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, ἡλίκον ἀγῶνα ἔχω ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν... καὶ ὅσοι οὐχ ἑώρακεν τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐν σαρκί, verse 5 might be seen as a rhetorical statement of affection. Many scholars, however, discern a military metaphor in the use of τάξις and στερέωμα in our verse. According to Ernst Lohmeyer, for example, 'der Apostel ist "bei ihnen", wie der Feldherr, der vor seinen Soldaten stehend, 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.⁶⁰ 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.'⁶¹ If Job 2.6, παραδίδωμι σοι αὐτόν, 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.⁶²

It has been suggested that Satan will function here in his traditional role of accuser,⁶³ 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.⁶⁴ Primitive Christian literature associates the devil with the infliction of physical suffering (Acts 10.38), death (Heb 2.14),⁶⁵ 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.⁶⁶ However, the σκόλοψ 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.

Ὁλεθρος τῆς σαρκός can incorporate the notion of the 'utter defeat of the sinful flesh'; Philo speaks of the utter defeat of wisdom, ὀλέθρῳ φρονήσεως (Deus sit imm 166; cf. Conf ling 86; Som 2.179). In our verse ὀλεθρος must also incorporate the meaning of physical suffering or death or physical suffering unto death. Philo often uses ὀλεθρος to designate physical death (e.g. Spec leg 1.160; 3.147; 4.127).⁶⁷ 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. "Ὀλεθρος" can 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 τυράννου Ὀλεθρον; 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 Ὀλεθρος 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 Ὀλεθρος is used on occasion to suggest unspecified sorts of woe (e.g. Philo Gai 91; Satan's Ὀλεθρος 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.⁶⁸

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.'⁶⁹ 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.'⁷⁰ 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.⁷¹ 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'⁷² or 'the higher faculty'.⁷³ Others consider that it represents the human spirit regenerated by the apportioned divine Spirit.⁷⁴ One may object to these interpretations that Paul nowhere else singles out this human spirit for salvation.⁷⁵

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.⁷⁶ 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 ὁ νεκρός or ὁ καθεύδων 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 καθεύδων 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.'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.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 πορνεία. The cohesiveness of 6.12-20 is unmistakable. It is generally agreed that with πάντα (μοι) ἔξεστιν (cf. 10.23) Paul cites a slogan current in Corinth.⁸⁰ I Corinthians 6.12ff is a criticism of this Corinthian watchword on the grounds of its inapplicability to πορνεία. In our verse Paul explains the impermissibility of the practice of πορνεία 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 συμφερόν) is Stoic.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.⁸² On the contrary, 6.12 introduces a discussion which continues up to 11.1,⁸³ and in chapters 7-10 Paul evaluates τὸ συμφερόν 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).⁸⁴

The connection between 6.12ff and the preceding discussion of lawsuits is not manifest. To be sure, the emphasis given to πορνεία in 6.9 (cf. 5.9f) suggests that Paul was preparing there for a return to this theme, although we would expect πορνεία to begin a catalogue of vices by Paul in any context, since it was reckoned the most serious of all sins in Jewish tradition⁸⁵ 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).⁸⁶ The rather sudden return to the theme of πορνεία 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.⁸⁷ Paul returns to the theme of πορνεία 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 πορνεία 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 πορνεία itself upon its Christian practitioner.⁸⁸

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 ὤμω of Christ (6.18),⁸⁹

unfortunately pays no attention to verse 13, where the concept of σῶμα is introduced into the present discussion (already in 5.3 σῶμα means Paul's human body; cf. 7.4⁹⁰). In verse 13 σῶμα is compared and contrasted with κοιλία.⁹¹ 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.⁹² 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, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς καὶ τὸν κύριον ἤγειρεν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ⁹³ διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, which provides the contrast to 13b, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς καὶ τρυφήν (the belly) καὶ τρώγην (foods) καταργήσκει, 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 adduces 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, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα 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,⁹⁶ μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σῶμα εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ αὐτοῦ, μηδὲ περιστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε τῷ Θεῷ ὥσπερ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντες καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ Θεῷ. 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 οὐκ οἶδατε shows that the idea that Christians are μέλη Χριστοῦ was familiar to the Corinthians. Ὁκ in interrogations indicates that an affirmative response is expected. Such a mode of address was a common evincive device of the diatribe style.⁹⁷ 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)⁹⁸ 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 πορνεία 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 (ἁγίου πνεύματος) which is from God in the individual Christian's body and the consequent defilement of that holy place πορνεία 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 πορνεία, lies in the fact that he has to bring his arguments home against the imposing Corinthians slogan πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν and the Christian people behind it who do not simply presume that πορνεία 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 πορνεία 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 πορνεία is actually a harmful practice for Christians. With verse 15a Paul has proven that Christians' bodies are for the Lord. Now he has to establish the incompatibility of πορνεία and membership in Christ's body. He has to justify the either-or of verse 13c, οὐ τῇ πορνείᾳ ἀλλὰ τῷ κυρίῳ.

In verses 16f⁹⁹ Paul contrasts one who cleaves (ὁ κολλώμενος) to a prostitute with one who cleaves (ὁ δε κολλώμενος) to the Lord; κολλάσθαι 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.¹⁰⁰ In accordance with this line of argument verse 16d establishes that the somatic union between a Christian and a harlot is fleshly; σάρξ in verse 16 connotes domination by sin.¹⁰¹ Σάρξ elsewhere in Paul sometimes functions as a synonym for σῶμα (cf. II Cor 4.10f), but it never does so when it is contrasted, as it is here, with the divine pneuma.¹⁰² Σάρξ 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 πόρνος, probably also in 5.5.¹⁰³ If, as Jean Hering suggests,¹⁰⁴ 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.¹⁰⁵ Even if demonic powers do not come into Paul's purview, he at any rate proves in 6.16f that πορνεία 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 σάρξ 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 in 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 πορνεία. On the contrary, there is no evidence that Paul understood Genesis 2.24 as ordaining marriage.¹⁰⁶ The rabbinic interpretation of Genesis 2.24 as a halakha for marriage was late and perhaps post-Pauline.¹⁰⁷ The rabbis usually explained תנא רבנן (והיה) וְהָיוּ as a prohibition of human intercourse with beasts.¹⁰⁸ 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 ἁρπαγ with sin if the apostle held that the Fall antedated a sexual relationship between Adam and Eve.¹⁰⁹ 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 πορνεία is impossible for Christians without at the same time sacrificing the allowability and indissolubility (except if a pagan partner separates) of Christian marriage.¹¹⁰

Paul does not intend to emphasize the fleshly or even sexual nature of our close connection with Christ in 6.17.¹¹¹ If this was his intention, it is inexplicable why he should

write pneuma and not $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ or $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\zeta$. 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 $\epsilon\upsilon\ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ or $\mu\epsilon\lambda\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\zeta$ in verse 17 because 17 is antithetical to 16b (the $\delta\epsilon$ in 17 is adversative as in 13c).¹¹²

A number of scholars understand $\epsilon\upsilon\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ in verse 17 as 'one personality'¹¹³ (cf. Gal 2.20). This would accord with the Jewish understanding of $\mu\epsilon\lambda\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\zeta$ as a union of personalities.¹¹⁴ In the opinion of the present writer, $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\zeta$ 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 dominion of sin.¹¹⁵ Like $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\zeta$ 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 $\epsilon\upsilon\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ 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 $\epsilon\upsilon$ the spouse $\epsilon\upsilon\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ 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 $\epsilon\upsilon$ 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 $\epsilon\upsilon$ the prostitute who participates in the power of sin.

Pneuma in 6.17 means the Holy Spirit. The phrase ἐν πνεύμα 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, τὸ ἐν σῶμα...τῷ κυρίῳ, 15) that it is the σῶμα that cleaves to the Lord. Thus verse 17 expresses that one who cleaves to the Lord with one's σῶμα is in the same Spirit of power as the Lord. Verse 16 has shown that one who cleaves to a harlot with one's σῶμα 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, πολλοὺς τῶν προσημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων ἐπὶ τῇ...πορνείᾳ, 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 μεμέρισται and to read with p¹⁵ B P vg, καὶ ἡ χυρὴ ἡ ἄγκυρος καὶ ἡ παρθένος.¹¹⁶ The consensus of recent commentators and translators is also to read with X 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 p⁴⁶ A P, τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι, because its attestation is slightly earlier than that of p¹⁵ F G plerique, καὶ σώματι καὶ πνεύματι.

Consequently the form attested by p⁴⁶ and its allies is original. Its first alteration was the addition of καὶ as attested by X B and Clement. Its clumsiness led to the deletion of the articles which is characteristic of the later text.¹¹⁷

This is a reasonable argument,¹¹⁸ and we may assume that the most probable original text of 7.34bc is, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἁγία καὶ ἡ παρθένος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ἡ ἁγία τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι.

A. T. Robertson considers that the sense of ἵνα in our sentence is 'sub-final', that is, it gives the 'purport' rather than the purpose of the preceding statement,¹¹⁹ and the RSV rendering, 'how to be holy in body and spirit' (so also Moffatt), concurs with his view. On this reading of ἵνα, which makes it equivalent to πῶς 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 ἵνα here as final: 'her aim is to be dedicated to him in body as in spirit.' The NEB thereby places the weight of the ἵνα-clause onto σώματι and not pneuma. For if ἵνα is final and pneuma here means the imparted Holy Spirit, then the weight of the ἵνα-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 ἵνα-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 ἁγιος in Paul, cf. 3.17). Thus if ἵνα is final in verse 34, the emphasis in the ἵνα-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 $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ 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, ἵνα καὶ οἱ ἔχοντες $\chi\upsilon\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\varsigma$ ὡς μὴ ἔχοντες $\bar{\omega}\tau\iota\nu$, 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 $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ 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.¹²⁰ 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 $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ (cf. v. 37; Ro 1.21, 24 et. al.). The collocation with $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ perhaps influenced him to use pneuma here as equivalent to $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$. 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).¹²¹ 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) *περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν* (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 *πνευματικόν* 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 *πνευματικοί*. For him *πνευματικοί* are not defined with respect to any one *χάρισμα* or certain *χαρακτικά* but with respect to evidenced fruits of the Spirit (12.3; Gal 5.22; 6.1; cf. 1g Eph 8.2).¹²⁵ It is probable that the Corinthians had a more restricted understanding of *πνευματικοί/πνευματικά* 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 πνευματικόν 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).¹²⁷ 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 δόκρυς; glossolalia by ἐρμηνεία (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.¹²⁸ Paul does not expect prophecy to be co-extensive with the community (12.29, μὴ πάντες προφητεύει). 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.¹²⁹ 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).¹³⁰

From 14.27a, εἴτε γλῶσση τις λάλει, 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 γλῶσσαις has been variously estimated.¹³¹ In our context γλῶσση can refer to the physical organ of speech, an extraordinary vocable or a language. In the first case speaking γλῶσση would be speaking only with the tongue, speaking in which the mind plays no part (cf. 14.14-19).¹³² This interpretation is certainly wrong, because 14.5a represents one person as speaking in tongues, whereas he would presumably possess only one tongue,¹³³ and the contrast between verse 9, διὰ τῆς γλῶσσης¹³⁴ and verse 19, ἐν γλῶσση (and perhaps also 39, where ἐν is read by p⁴⁶ B D* G) indicates that γλῶσσαις should be translated 'in tongues'.

The use of γλῶσση to denote an archaic or unusual word¹³⁵ may well be related to our passage,¹³⁶ but it cannot suffice as an explanation of it for two reasons: (1) γλῶσση in this sense, rather uncommon anyway, is apparently unparalleled in early Christian and the contemporary Jewish literature, whereas it often means language;¹³⁷ (2) that language is its meaning here is suggested by the fact that there are γένος, 'kinds', 'classes' of tongues (12.10, 28; cf. 14.10).¹³⁸

It has been maintained that foreign human languages are in view here because this is the sense of ἑτερογλώσσοις in Isaiah 28.11 cited in 14.21.¹³⁹ However, we cannot assume that Paul uses this Scripture with much regard for its original context (cf. 9.9; 10.4).¹⁴⁰ 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 comparison is made, but also from the form the comparison takes, in that Paul employs a different term, φωνή, for human language. In addition, ἐν κόσμῳ (v. 10; cf. 1.20, 27 et. al.) may suggest that here merely earthly languages are being compared with heavenly ones. This is confirmed by the fact that Paul presents λαλεῖν γλώσσαις as λαλεῖν Θεῷ (v. 2) in προσευχή (vv. 14f), εὐλογία (16) and εὐχαριστία (17), for the essence of heavenly speech is precisely worship of God according to contemporary Jewish and Christian writings which sometimes distinguish different kinds of heavenly languages (cf. γένη γλωσσῶν) 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;¹⁴¹ Tert De anima 9). 13.1¹⁴² and II Corinthians 12.4¹⁴³ 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 ἐργασίαι, a source of edification for others (14.5b, 27). He prohibits its public appearance without interpretation as unedifying 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 τῶν πνευματικῶν.¹⁴⁵ In verse 2 neither ὅτι nor ὅτις ought to be omitted; their original conjunction best explains the variant readings retaining either one of them alone. Ὡς should be translated 'how'.¹⁴⁶ Ἄν should

be understood as iterative, expressing repetition in past time, 'ever',¹⁴⁷ 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 ἀπαχθῆναι (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).¹⁴⁸ 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).¹⁴⁹ Our letter offers no evidence that Corinthian πνευματικοί 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).¹⁵⁰ It is in itself conceivable that Jews could have cursed Jesus within the Christian ἐκκλησία (cf. 14.24) or that Christians may have heard this cry in the synagogue, since some Corinthian Christians were originally Jews,¹⁵¹ and may have retained relations with the synagogue,¹⁵² but one cannot allow that they would have confused this Jewish curse with the pneumatic Christian speech

with which our verse is obviously concerned.¹⁵³ 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.¹⁵⁴ Against this interpretation we may ask: would not the other Christians assume he had just lost the inspiring πνεῦμα ἅγιον? why does Paul have to 'insist'¹⁵⁵ 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 πνευματικοί 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.¹⁵⁶ 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.¹⁵⁷ He points out that in this case one can understand why Corinthians asked Paul about this, since not only were the gnostic πνευματικοί gifted ecstasies, 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'¹⁵⁸). 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 3.¹⁵⁹

(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.¹⁶⁰ 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,'¹⁶¹ but this is sheer speculation.

(6) W. C. van Unnik compares Romans 9.3 and Galatians 3.13 (where $\kappa\tau\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ is used as equivalent to $\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$ 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, $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma \text{ 'I}\eta\varsigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, 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).¹⁶²

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.¹⁶³ Nor need one postulate that it was Paul's dark hint that unintelligible glossolalia could contain curses against Jesus,¹⁶⁴ 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. $\Lambda\alpha\lambda\omega\nu$ (12.3) applies to prophecy (14.3, 29) as well as to tongues. Verse 3a is not contrasted but compared with 2 ($\delta\iota\acute{o}$, cf. 14.13). $\text{Οὐδείς ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ λαλῶν λέγει}$.

'Ανάθεμα' Ἰησοῦς: there is inspired speaking in this case but it is not inspired by πνεῦμα ἅγιον. The Corinthian πνευματικοί have been moved by a demonic spirit in their unsupplemented utterance: 'Ανάθεμα' Ἰησοῦς.

Paul's purpose in verse 3 is clearly not to give his readers a standard for δικάρισις πνευμάτων, so that the inspiring pneuma could be questioned concerning Jesus and reveal its demonic or divine provenance.¹⁶⁵ The Corinthians presumably already know how to δικάρῖναι 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 (γνωρίζω ὑμῖν ὅτι) that the cry 'Jesus is accursed' is demonic. Philipp Bachmann also correctly concludes that our verse offers no test for the δικάρισις πνευμάτων. He notes the significant difference in phraseology between 3a and b.

Sollte jedoch damit Pl wirklich angegeben haben, woran man falsche und rechte Begeisterung unterscheiden könne? Für diesen Zweck müsste doch Subjekt und Prädikat jeweilig vertauscht sein: Niemand, der Jesus verflucht, kann und jeder, der Jesus einen Herrn nennt, muss für einen Pneumatiker gehalten werden.¹⁶⁶

Verses 3a and b are not strictly parallel. The substitution of εἰπεῖν in 3b for λαλεῖν in verse 3a is telling in this respect. In our letter λαλεῖν -- 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),¹⁶⁷ whereas εἰπεῖν -- 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). Λαλῶν in verse 3a shows that the statement,

'Ανάθεμα Ἰησοῦς, is self-evidently inspired,¹⁶⁸ whereas in 3b Paul declares the statement inspired on the basis of the content of what is said (οὐδεὶς δύναται εἰπεῖν ... εἰ μὴ). 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.¹⁶⁹

The influences of πνεῦμα ἄγιον 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 διακρίσεις¹⁷⁰ πνευμάτων.

Διακρίσεις 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, διακρίσεις 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. ἄλλω, v. 30) on account of the article, which is 'retrospective...defined by προφητεῖ',¹⁷² shows that only prophets exercise this gift of discernment. Although this discernment¹⁷³ 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 pneumata of either a divine or a demonic nature. In 12.4-11, 13 Paul maintains that Corinthian Christians have all received τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα. 12.10 envisages a plurality of pneumata. 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 pneumata in 14.12, ἐπεὶ ζῆλωται εἶτε πνεύματα. Some sense

that Paul here reproduces a catchy Corinthian self-designation,¹⁷⁵ and it may be that in so doing he is being ironical¹⁷⁶ 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 πνεύματα προφητῶν προφητείας ὑποτάσσεται, on the fact that God is not a God of ἀκαταστασίας... ἀλλὰ εἰρήνης (v. 33a). Divine pneuma ensures order and peace in the Christian community.¹⁷⁷ 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 πνευματικά, 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 χάρισμα interchangeably,¹⁸¹ but he does not appear ever to apply χάρις 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 πνευματικά 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. 12.4!); he nowhere else acknowledges the prophetic mediation of angels. Although good angels previously mediated between God and humankind (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 LXXX).¹⁸⁴ They no longer come down from there to minister here below, for now the Spirit of Christ is active 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 äusserte sich auf so mannigfache Art, dass jede von diesen Wirkungen wider ein besonders pneuma 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 Begrenztheit und die Besonderheit seines Trägers bekommt.'¹⁸⁶ 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.¹⁸⁷ 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. Ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσση οὐκ ἄνθρωπος λαλεῖ ἀλλὰ Θεῶ· οὐδὲς γὰρ ἀκούει, πνεύματι δὲ λαλεῖ μυστηρία. The δέ-clause in 14.2 may be taken in more than one way. If δέ is concessive,¹⁸⁸ the sense of 14.2b will be, 'for no one understands,¹⁸⁹ 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 pneumati 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, δέ may be explicative of οὐδὲς γὰρ ἀκούει, 'for no one understands, since pneumati he or she speaks μυστηρία.'¹⁹⁰ In this case μυστηρία might mean 'riddles',¹⁹¹ 'unintelligible, baffling, enigmatic statements'.¹⁹² No one understands these riddles. Here pneumati might mean either the Holy Spirit or the human spirit. However; if we take δέ as explicative and wish

to understand μυστήρια in accordance with 13.2 (and 4.1) as 'divine truths' rather than 'riddles', we cannot understand pneumatī 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 δέ is explanatory and μυστήρια means 'divine truths', pneumatī must represent the glossolaliac's private human spirit. Because uninterpreted glossolalia is a matter of the glossolaliac's self-understanding (cf. pneuma in 2.11a), because the public glossolaliac in the absence of an interpreter only ἑαυτὸν οἰκοδομεῖ (14.4a), no one else understands him or her. The various grammatical arrangements of the δέ-clause in 14.2 are then somewhat more patient of the interpretation of pneuma as a reference to the glossolaliac's human spirit than they are of the alternative interpretation of pneuma as a reference to the imparted Holy Spirit.

In support of the view that pneuma in 14.2 means the Holy Spirit (so Moffatt, RSV) reference might be made to 12.3, ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ λαλῶν, whereas those who hold that the human spirit is or may be intended here refer to 14.14-16.¹⁹³ 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 ἐν πνεύματι, whereas in 14.2 and 14.14-16 it is simply (τῷ) πνεύματι.¹⁹⁴

A few scholars¹⁹⁵ maintain that pneuma in 14.14-16 (and sometimes 14.2 as well) means 'spiritual gift', but the apostle who stated at the start of his discussion περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν: ἐκκρεβείζεις δὲ χαρισμάτων ἐσίν, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα (12.4), would be unlikely to use the word pneuma as equivalent to 'spiritual gift'.¹⁹⁶ 'My pneuma' 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'.¹⁹⁷ 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 ἑνθρώπου (2.11) as this pneuma is indistinguishable from the human νοῦς.¹⁹⁸ This argument is fallacious. In 2.10ff pneuma is not equivalent to νοῦς.¹⁹⁹ In 2.10ff it is clear that the Christian who has the νοῦν χριστοῦ (v. 16) knows τὰ βύθια τοῦ Θεοῦ (verse 10), that is, as Romans 11.33f show, τὰ κρύμματα αὐτοῦ καὶ ... αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ: 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 thoughts²⁰⁰ the deep things of God that relate to salvation in Christ.' This νοῦς as a constellation of conscious thoughts is the γνωστῆριον (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).²⁰¹ 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: '(for)²⁰² if I pray in a tongue, my self-understanding prays, but my rational consciousness is unfruitful.' This may mean, if we give ἄκρην 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, ὁ λαλῶν γλῶσση ἑαυτὸν οἰνοδομεῖ) 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).²⁰³

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.²⁰⁴

I conclude that pneuma in 14.2, 14-16 represents the human spirit as the glossolaliac's self-understanding²⁰⁵ 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

of value to the person who speaks in tongues.²⁰⁶

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 Achaicus by their arrival in Ephesus refreshed (ἀνέπαυσαν) Paul's pneuma and that of the Corinthians (τὸ ἐμὸν²⁰⁷ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν). In II Corinthians 2.13 Paul relates that his pneuma had no rest (οὐκ ἔσχקה ἀνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου) because he did not find²⁰⁸ Titus in Troas. 7.13 states that Titus' pneuma has been refreshed by all the Christians at Corinth (ἀναπέπκυσται τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ 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 (ἀνεπλήρωσαν; 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 (γάρ) 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...τὸ 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 (□'חַוָּן □'חַ, M Shebi 10.9 and BB 8.5; □'חַ □'חַ □'חַ, 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 τὸ 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 ζῶσαν and εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν in I Cor 15.45 shows quite clearly that he did not accept the synonymy 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.²¹¹

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.²¹² 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 Christ²¹³ and that he found a fertile mission field there, καὶ Θύρας μοι ἀνεῳγμένης (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.²¹⁴ The

fact that the apostle expressly mentions that he bade goodbye to the Christians in Troas, ἀλλὰ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς, indicates how difficult it was for him to leave Troas.²¹⁵ In 2.12f Paul frankly admits 'that he could not settle down to the promising work before him.'²¹⁶ He has no rest (οὐκ ἔσχημα ἄνεσιν) in his pneuma and so cannot apply himself to propagating the gospel;²¹⁷ the perfect tense here 'vividly realizes the past event'.²¹⁸ Paul does not forsake a rich mission field in Troas because the imparted Holy Spirit is impatient to propel him on to Macedonia. He forsakes it because he is anxious about Titus, for whom he has particular affection (τὸν ἀδελφόν μου), and who, having not arrived in Troas when expected, may have come to some harm.²¹⁹ Paul in 2.12f shows us that he is 'very human'.²²⁰ 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 ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματι μου, has the same meaning as σὰρξ in 7.5, οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἢ σὰρξ ἡμῶν.²²¹ The usage of σὰρξ in 7.5, however, differs from that of pneuma in 2.13. In 7.5 σὰρξ represents the whole man afflicted from within and without (ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι — ἐσωθεν μὲν, ἔσωθεν φόβοι). In 2.13 all that is mentioned is the internal affliction of anxiety. We should conclude from this that Paul uses σὰρξ 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.²²²

The use of pneuma in I Corinthians 16.18, ἀνέπαυθεν γὰρ τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν, approaches that of σπλάγχνα in Philemon 7, τὰ σπλάγχνα τῶν ἁγίων ἀναπέπαιται διὰ σοῦ, ἀδελφε, and 20, ἀνάπαυσόν μου τὰ σπλάγχνα ἐν Χριστῷ. The two terms are not exactly equivalent. Σπλάγχνα 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; Phlm 12; Phil 1.18; 2.1; Col 3.12). It comes closer in meaning to καρδιά, 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 πίστεως 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 πίστεως 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 πίστις, 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 θάνατος ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνεργεῖται, ἡ δὲ ζωὴ ἐν ὑμῖν. In verse 14, although he and his readers will share in the same resurrection σὺν Ἰησοῦ, he nevertheless continues to speak in terms of 'we' and 'you'. Thus it is not the case that Paul by τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως 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, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ). 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: τὸ πνεῦμα is received ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως (3.2); Christians walk πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως (5.5). These references establish that pneuma in II Corinthians 4.13 means the imparted Holy Spirit, and the genitive, τῆς πίστεως, is objective, 'the Spirit which effects or maintains faith'.²²⁷

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 πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (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' (NEB)²²⁸ or 'by signs and wonders of the Holy Spirit',²²⁹ but both these restrictions are arbitrary.

C. K. Barrett points out in his commentary that the phrase ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ 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 πνεῦμα ἅγιον (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. πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ. Barrett notes correctly that I Corinthians 7.34 and II Corinthians 7.1 countenance the holiness of a Christian's human spirit.²³⁰ 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"),²³¹ 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.'²³²

It is, however, questionable whether ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ is in fact 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' (Θλίψει), 'distresses' (ἀνάγκαι) and 'difficulties' (στενόχωρίαι) go together, as do 'blows' (πληγαί), 'imprisonments' (φυλακαί) and 'tumults' (ἀκαταστασίαι), as well as 'labors' (κόποι), 'watchful nights' (ἀγρυπνίαι) and 'fasts' (νηστείαι). 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.²³³ Verse 6 next comprises three alliterative pairs of commendations: ἐν ἁγνότητι, ἐν γνώσει; ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν χρηστότητι; ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀνυποκρίτως.²³⁴ This alliterative effect is less marked with ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας, ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ, so they may be general characteristics which close the construction as ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ introduced it. Given this structure, it is possible that ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀνυποκρίτως, represent a penultimate general characterization of the apostle's ministry which should not be put on the same level as ἐν ἁγνότητι... ἐν χρηστότητι. Pneuma in verse 6c may refer to the 'objective divine source' of the apostle's virtues in 6ab and ἀγάπη 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).²³⁵ This interpretation does not rule out Barrett's but constitutes a viable alternative to it.

I conclude that the phrase ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ 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.²³⁶ A number of investigators consider it an unPauline interpolation.²³⁷ They argue that it interrupts the close connection between 6.13, *πλκύνθητε κὶ ὑμεῖς*, and 7.2, *χωρήσατε ἡμῖς*; it has at least six Pauline hapax legomena (*ετεροζυχειν*;²³⁸ *μετοχή*; *συμφώνησις*; *βελιάρ*; *συγκκτῆθεσις*; *μολυσμός*; *καθαρίζειν* occurs in Eph 5.26 and Tit 2.14, but these epistles may not be authentic),²³⁹ 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.²⁴⁰ The Qumran literature provides parallels to the dualism of verse 14: *δικαιοσύνη-ἀνομία* (cf. e.g. IQS iii 20f, *וְיִחַד גִּלְגַּל-וְיִחַד גִּלְגַּל*). *βελιάρ* (*גִּלְגַּל*) occurs in the Qumran literature, and in IQM xiii 1-4 he is opposed to God *גִּלְגַּל גִּלְגַּל - גִּלְגַּל גִּלְגַּל*.²⁴¹ 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. IQS ix 5f); strong opposition to idolatry (cf. e.g. IQS ii 16f); the stress on the community's separateness from the rest of humankind (cf. e.g. IQS ix 8f); the need for purification of the flesh and the spirit (cf. e.g. IQM vii 5f); the employment of a florilegium of Scriptural passages (cf. 4QFlor), and the use of the lemma, *καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Θεὸς ὅτι* (cf. CD vi 13; viii 9: *גִּלְגַּל גִּלְגַּל*). 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 ἁνομία in Romans 6.19, τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἁνομίᾳ - τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσυνῇ, where the additional reference to 'uncleaness' (ἀκαθαρσία) 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, πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἐσμέν νυκτός οὐδὲ σκοτός, 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 ὁ πειράζων (I Th 3.5), ὁ πονηρός (II Th 3.3), and in our letter, ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ ἁῶνος (4.4); in Ephesians, which may be by Paul, he is ὁ 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 σῶμα and πνεῦμα,²⁴⁴ and σῶμα can be equivalent to σὰρξ 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;²⁴⁵ with regard to the nouns μετοχή and μολυσμός, we should note that the corresponding verbs occur elsewhere in his correspondence: μολύνειν (I Cor 8.7); μετέχειν (e.g. I Cor 9.10); with regard to συμφώνησις, 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).²⁴⁶

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 εἰς κενὸν τὴν χάριν τοῦ 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, δίδοντες (v. 3) seems dependent on παρακαλοῦμεν (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.²⁴⁷ In this regard the suggestion has been made that Paul in verses 11, ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτυνται, and 13, πλατύνθητε καὶ ὑμεῖς, recalls Deuteronomy 10.16, πρόσεχε δεκτύῳ μὴ πλατυνθῇ ἡ καρδία σου καὶ παραβῇτε καὶ λιτρεύσῃτε Θεῷς ἑτέροις καὶ προσκυνήσατε αὐτοῖς.²⁴⁸ Our paragraph is accordingly taken as Paul's warning against a false πλατυσμός 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: *ἐξέλθαιτε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν καὶ ἀφορίσθητε, ... καὶ ἁκρῆς μὴ ἄπτεσθε*. 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.²⁴⁹

This is by no means a compelling explanation, however, since Isaiah 52.11, *ἐξέλθαιτε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν*²⁵⁰ καὶ ἀφορίσθητε ... καὶ ἁκρῆς μὴ ἄπτεσθε,²⁵¹ is precisely the part of the catena which Paul enlarges upon in 7.1, καὶ καθαρίζομεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιασμόν ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ. 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 ἑτεροζυχοῦντες ἀπίστοις* (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 intercourse 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 appropriately 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 begeben 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 ἀπίστοι 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 ἀπίστοι 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 letter, ἀπίστοι 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 people adulterate the Word of God (2.17).²⁶⁰ He calls them mindless (10.12), deceitful (11.13), tools of Satan (11.15). They preach ἄλλον ἰησοῦν... πνεῦμα ἕτερον... εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον (11.4).²⁶¹ Paul may also be criticizing these people in 1.12,

where he states that his apostolate is not ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀρκεκῆ, 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 πρῶτοι (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 ἀνίστος 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 $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ who can violate the temple is certainly not a pagan, but, according to the context, a misguided Christian worker, whose fate, $\phi\theta\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (v. 17a), accords with that of the false apostles in II Corinthians, $\bar{\omega}\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\grave{\alpha}\ \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\bar{\nu}$ (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.²⁶³ 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 $\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$.'²⁶⁴ He cites the Hebrew Testament of Naphtali 10.9 as a parallel to our verse.²⁶⁵ '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.'²⁶⁶ 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.²⁶⁷ 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 7.34,²⁶⁸ 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, $\mu\acute{\eta}\tau\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\varsigma;\ \acute{\omicron}\ \tau\omega\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\ \pi\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu;\ \acute{\omicron}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\iota}\chi\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu;$, refers to the Holy Spirit (so RV; NEB) or to the human disposition of honesty²⁶⁹ shared by the apostle and his co-worker

(cf. AV; RSV). Some who take the latter point of view argue that the parallel between οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι and οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἰχθυῖν demands it,²⁷⁰ 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 πνεῦμα (Ro 8.4) or πνεύματι (Gal 5.16) is presupposed in 10.2, κατὰ σάρκα περιπατεῖν (cf. 1.17, κατὰ σάρκα βουλεύομαι), 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 12.18 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.²⁷¹

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 υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιασμένης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου, in all probability constitutes or contains⁴ 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) ὀρίζειν, a hapax legomenon in the Pauline corpus, appears in statements about Jesus Christ in Acts 10.42, οὕτως ἐστὶν ὁ ὠρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν, and 17.31, (ὁ Θεός) μέλλει κρίνειν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ἐν ἧς ἔστη ὁ ὠρισμένος.⁵ 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).⁶ 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 ὀρισθέντος as equivalent to δειχθέντος, αποκινθέντος,⁷ 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 ὀρίζειν with this sense has ever been adduced in writings either earlier than or contemporary with the New Testament.⁸ This being so, we should take ἐν δυνάμει as a modifier of υἱοῦ Θεοῦ rather than τοῦ ὀρισθέντος. Even though the latter is a grammatical possibility, it is in Pauline theology a Christological impossibility.⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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 πρῶτοτος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν).¹¹ In accordance with this context, which concerns the elevation of the Son of God to a position of active Lordship in the human sphere, κατὰ πνεῦμα

ἁγιασμένης should be seen as the πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ (8.9) that sanctifies Christians (15.16).¹² Although Paul does not elsewhere refer to the Holy Spirit as πνεῦμα ἁγιασμένης, the Spirit which brings about holiness, objective genitive, we have a near equivalent of this expression in II Thessalonians 2.13, where ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος means, as we have seen,¹³ sanctification effected by the Spirit, subjective genitive. We may further note that this Spirit is appropriately designated πνεῦμα ἁγιασμένη in Romans 1.4 as a part of Paul's salutation to the ἁγίοι in Rome (cf. I Cor 1.2: ἡγιασμένοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοὶ ἁγίοις). We may compare how in the Testament of Levi 18.7-9 the πνεῦμα ἁγιασμοῦ 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).¹⁴

This confirms that πνεῦμα ἁγιασμένης 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, σὰρξ being his human nature,¹⁵ or as his 'inward mental element...filled with God, and thereby holy', σὰρξ being 'the outward element perceptible by the senses'.¹⁶ Ernst Käsemann maintains that 'der Geist der Heiligung ist die Macht, kraft deren Jesu als Gottesohn eingesetzt wurde.'¹⁷ 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'.¹⁸ None of these interpretations receives corroboration from Paul's Christological teaching elsewhere. Others opine that πνεῦμα ἁγιασμένης is Christ's 'heavenly mode of existence'.¹⁹ 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 ἀπαρχή (Ro 8.23) or ἄρραβων (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 ἁγιασμένης 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, ᾧ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ (v. 9). The relative clause may be reckoned parenthetical,²⁰ 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).²¹ This shows that with it he intends to add or reiterate something significant about the Romans' place in his prayers.

Λατρεύειν 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 signification 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 λατρεία (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).²² 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, ᾧ λατρ. κ.τ.λ., then, he counts his prayers concerning them as part of his λατρεία²³ and thereby demonstrates that his apostleship is already of relevance to Roman Christianity.

The ἐν in ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ 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 εὐαγγέλιον is δύνamis Θεοῦ (1.16). By contrast, the ἐν in ἐν τῷ πνεύματι possesses a distinct local nuance. With this prepositional phrase the apostle indicates that his λατρεία includes what is invisible (cf. Phil 3.3), viz. his private prayer-life.²⁴ Because this aspect of Paul's λατρεία is not manifest to his readers, he calls God as witness to it.²⁵

A number of scholars think that pneuma in verse 9 represents the whole person.²⁶ If this were so, ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου 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.²⁷ 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,²⁸ in Paul's case imparted as πνεῦμα ἀποστολῆς, or as designating the latter alone.²⁹ 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, ἐν τῷ ἐωχχελίῳ. Moreover, 'my spirit' elsewhere in Paul means the human spirit.³⁰

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.³¹ 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 Käsemann avers that as in 1.26ff Paul in accordance with 'apokalyptische Betrachtungsweise' takes 'was empirisch Ausnahme sein mag, als für die Gemeinschaft repräsentativ'.³² 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 τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ. Paul adds the charge of 'sacrilege' (ἱεροσυλεῖς)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 οὐ γράμμι' (vv. 28f).

Pneuma in verse 29 has been understood as (1) human spirit,³⁹ human inwardness⁴⁰ (cf. 1.9); (2) God's Spirit active in pre-Christian Judaism through the law;⁴¹ (3) the Holy Spirit active in Christendom.⁴² 'That pneuma here denotes the human spirit is unlikely, since the inwardness of the circumcision is already adequately expressed by καρδιά.⁴³ Those who hold that pneuma refers to the activity of God's Spirit in pre-Christian Judaism base their case on 7.14: ὁ νόμος πνευματικός 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,⁴⁴ 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.⁴⁵

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.⁴⁶ 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 (οὐ) to γράμμα, the latter is indubitably understood as a power ἐν ᾧ⁵⁰ κτερίζομεθα, and that this is equally true of the former becomes clear in 8.1ff (cf. especially v. 9). Ἐν κινόντι 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: τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, 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 ἀχειροποιήτῳ which made us alive together (συνεζωοποίησεν, 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.

8.10

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, since⁵⁴ the Spirit of God dwells in you.⁵⁵ But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, this one is not his. But if Christ is in you, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζῶν διὰ δικαιοσύνην.' The most straightforward way to translate Paul's succinct and parallel phraseology in verse 10bc seems to be: 'although⁵⁶ 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' (θνητός).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) ζωή -- but he or she can have it in the future (cf. 13b, ζήσεσθε), 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 νεκρός⁵⁹); 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 connectedness of verses 10 and 11 ('life', 'in you')⁶¹ and does violence neither to the meaning of δὲ⁶² nor to the contrastive parallelism between 10b and 10c⁶³ (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' (ζών, cf. 6.11). Since he writes the substantive 'life' (ζωή), 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 3.6).⁶⁶ In verse 11 ζωοποιήσει καὶ⁶⁷ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν should not be related to πνεῦμα ζωή in verse 10, so as to support the interpretation of the latter as human spirit, as if Paul meant to say with this καὶ: 'just as your spirits have life so also will your bodies'; rather does καὶ 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 interpretation of καὶ in verse 11. Verse 10c thus expresses this:

the Spirit of Christ in you is the ἀναρχή (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. Σῶμα replaces σὰρξ in representing human subjection to sin which continues in Christians in contrast to being ruled by God's pneuma, because σῶμα unlike σὰρξ 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 δουλείας but a πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας. 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 δουλείας 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' υἱοθεσία with any human temper⁷⁵ 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 Πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας is, then, the Spirit which effects adoption,⁷⁷ under the influence of which, in the sphere of power of which (ἐν ᾧ), we cry, 'ἄββᾶ, father'.⁷⁸ 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 τῷ πνεύματι 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, 'ἄββᾶ, 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) 'ἄββᾶ, 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) κρᾶζειν 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 'ἄββᾶ, 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):⁸⁵ ἄχειν (v. 14) does not possess any necessarily ecstatic connotations or even any special, specific psychological connotations at all in Pauline usage (cf. 2.4);⁸⁶ 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,⁸⁷ the interpretation of κρίζειν as public proclamation has to give way to an equally possible but contextually validated understanding of its connotation here.⁸⁸ The context of verses 15f is not corporate Christian worship but corporate and individual Christian life under the cross (17c, συμπαρόχομεν). Κρίζειν 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).⁸⁹ This cry need not be vocalized: in Galatians 4.6 it seems to be heard in Christians' hearts⁹⁰ (cf. Ro 8.26f, where the Spirit offers στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις in Christians' hearts).

Συμμεκτυρεῖν 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'.⁹¹ 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 pneuma that we are children of God, comes from the significant placement of ἐσμέν in verse 16b, which, 'vorangestellte und betonte', seems to have the nuance, '"wir sind es tatsächlich"' (cf. I Jo 3.1, καὶ

ἔδμεν).⁹² 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.⁹³ 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, καὶ εἶπα Πατέρα καλέσετε με καὶ ἂν ἐμοῦ οὐκ ἀποστραφήσθε.⁹⁴ 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 υἱοθεσίας of verse 15.⁹⁵ 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.⁹⁶ 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.⁹⁷ 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 συμμετρεῖν 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 υἱοθεσίας. 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.'⁹⁸ Nothing suggests that any certain or exceptional emotions or feelings or psychological experiences necessarily characterize this relationship. It is rather 'an act of trust'.⁹⁹ 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, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα κενύσεως, certainly depends on Isaiah 29.10, πεπότικεν ὑμεῖς κύριος πνεύματι κενύσεως. Πνεῦμα κενύσεως can mean either 'a pneuma that effects stupor', objective genitive (cf. Ps 59(60).5, οἶνον κενύσεως), 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 pneuma¹⁰⁰ (cf. Ro 8.15, πνεῦμα δουλείας) or a human disposition (cf. I Cor 4.21; Gal 6.1, πνεῦμα πραΰτητος).

In the contemporary Jewish literature a pneuma/ruach that is 'given' (δίδοναι, [נָתַן]) 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, εὐξέμεν, καὶ φρόνησις ἐδόθη μοι ἐπεκλεσμένη, καὶ ἦλθεν μοι πνεῦμα σοφίας (cf. 9.17, βουλήν δέ σου τίς ἔχων, εἰ μὴ σὺ ἔδωκας σοφίαν καὶ ἐπέμψας τὸ ἔχιόν σου πνεῦμα ἀπὸ ὑψίστων; IQH xii 12f; xiii 18f).¹⁰¹ Pneuma in Ephesians 1.17, where the author continually prays, ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ...δῶῃ¹⁰² ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκλύψεως, means the Holy Spirit (so, rightly, Moffatt; Barclay) which bestows wisdom and revelation, as 3.5 shows, ὡς νῦν ἀπεκλύφθη... ἐν πνεύματι (and cf. I Cor 2.10a, 12; 12.8: διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος... λόγος 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 automatisch alle Möglichkeiten eingiesst, sondern dass zu besonderen Betätigung auch neue und bereichende Mitteilung und Wirkung Gottes nötig ist.'¹⁰³ In II Timothy 1.7, πνεῦμα δυνάμεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ σωφρονισμοῦ, given by God (ἔδωκεν) is accordingly also the efficacious Holy Spirit, as the reference to τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ in the preceding verse suggests in any case.¹⁰⁴

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 πνεύματι ζέοντες 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 τῷ πνεύματι as a reference to 'the spiritual element in man himself...penetrated and quickened by the Divine Spirit.'¹⁰⁵ We have already established that the same phrase in Acts 18.25 clearly refers to the imparted Holy Spirit.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'.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.¹⁰⁸

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE REST OF THE PAULINE CORPUS

PHILIPPIANS 1.27

Many modern translators understand pneuma in Philippians 1.27, ὅτι στήκετε 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, μὲν ψυχῇ συναθροῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, as well as to Acts 4.32, τοῦ δὲ πλήθους τῶν πιστευσάντων ἧν καρδιά καὶ ψυχὴ μία. On the other hand, Philippians 2.1, εἴ τις κοινωνία πνεύματος, 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 πνεύμα, 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 (ψυχὴ), so does the Holy Spirit enliven and strengthen the church to strive together as one ψυχὴ for the faith of the gospel.¹

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

We find the same closing benediction, ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου

ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, in Galatians 6.18; Philippians 4.23 and Philemon 25; II Timothy 4.22a is similar: Ὁ κύριος μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος σου. This usage of pneuma has no context, therefore, except that it concludes a letter. It must be understood in the light of Paul's usage of pneuma elsewhere.

Many scholars compare our verses with I Corinthians 16.23, ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ 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'.² There are no precedents for this usage elsewhere in Paul.³ A few scholars understand pneuma here as the Holy Spirit.⁴ 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.'⁵ This argument is fallacious in the light of I Corinthians 16.18 and its rabbinic parallels,⁶ as well as Romans 8.16.⁷ 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.⁸ 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 Christ⁹ that he was ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ. 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. σάρξ / pneuma; angels/nations (or Gentiles¹⁰); world/glory.¹¹

The phrase, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, refers to the Incarnation as a whole, the entire earthly life of Christ (cf. φανερώσει in Jo 1.31; I P 1.20; I Jo 1.2; σάρξ in Jo 1.14; Ro 8.3; Heb 5.7; I Jo 4.2; II Jo 7), which culminated in his death (cf. φανερώσει in Heb 9.26; I Jo 3.5; σάρξ in Eph 2.15; Col 1.22; Heb 10.20; I P 3.18; 4.1).¹² The phrase, ἐδικαιώθη 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, ὥφθη ἰσχυροῦς, 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, σάρξ 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 τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐχέοντος τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν is the means by which God will raise the Roman Christians' mortal bodies (reading διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικούντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος with X C et. al.), or that their possession of the Spirit in this life makes it certain that they will be raised (reading διὰ τὸ ἐνοικεῖν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα with B D et. al.).¹⁷

It has been objected against this interpretation that it requires ἐν in the phrase, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, to have an

instrumental meaning, whereas ἐν in the preceding phrase and elsewhere in our verse is local.¹⁸ 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, ὡφθῆ ἀγγέλους, 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.'¹⁹ 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, ἔδικαιώθη 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'²⁰ ἐν ἐνὶ 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.'²¹ According to Albert Klöpper, 'das ἐν πνεύματι ist der den zu einem Menschen Umgeschaffenen 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.'²² 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 Klöpper'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 ἐνὶ πνεύματι, refers to the Holy Spirit in Philippians 1.27;²³ (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, οἱ ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (cf. καὶ οικεῖται τοῦ Θεοῦ, v. 19), and (3) I Corinthians 12.13 parallels ἐν σῶμα with ἐν πνεύμα meaning the Holy Spirit, πάντες εἰς ἐν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν... καὶ πάντες ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν, just as οἱ ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι in our verse parallels τοὺς ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐν ἐνὶ σῶματι in verse 16.²⁴ It follows that pneuma in 4.4, σπουδάζοντες τηρεῖν τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης· ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεύμα..., also refers to the one Spirit of God imparted to all Christians,²⁵ in accordance with the context (cf. especially v. 5, εἷς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἐν βάπτισμα, εἰς Θεός), which concerns itself with what has been done for and given to Christians.

Pneuma in 4.23, ἀνανεώσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν, 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 τῷ πνεύματι here means the Holy Spirit that empowers their new way of life (cf. pneuma in Gal 5.16, 18, 25; Ro 8.13f).²⁶ The instrumentality of the Spirit has already been expressed in our letter in the dative case without the use of ἐν in 1.13.²⁷

Oecumenius has correctly maintained that ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι means ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος;²⁸ τῷ πνεύματι is an instrumental dative. Oecumenius understands

τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν as a genitive of possession, τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, τοῦ ὄντος ἐν 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 νοῦς ὑμῶν 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, προσευχόμενοι... ἐν πνεύματι is sometimes taken as a reference to the human spirit.³¹ This is unlikely in the light of Jude 20, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι (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'.¹ Paul did not conceive of it as the principle of continuity between earthly and eternal life.² 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 2.11 and 16.18 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.³

(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;⁴ cf. also b Ber 18b; Luke 24.37,39).⁵

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,⁶ 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.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1 Cf. R. Jewett's history of research on the concept of human pneuma in Pauline usage, Paul's Anthropological Terms, Leiden:1971, 166-175.

2 Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus, Kiel:1872, 49. Lüdemann maintained that this idea was neither Greek nor Jewish but uniquely Christian.

3 A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians, Edinburgh:1914², 98.

4 Die Begriffe Geist und Leben bei Paulus, Göttingen: 1903, 145, 142f (his emphasis).

5 Der Geist Gottes im neuen Testament, Gütersloh:1926, 417; with respect to his or her possession of pneuma, the human person is, adds Büchsel, only 'Gott vergleichbar' (cf. I Cor 2.11).

6 E.g. R. W. F. Wootton, '"Spirit" and "Soul" in the New Testament', Bible Translator 26 1975 241: 'the spirit is that aspect of human life which comes nearest to God'; similarly B. Reicke, 'Body and Soul in the New Testament', StudTheol 19 1965 210f.

7 Human Spirit and Holy Spirit, Philadelphia:1959, 86f, 79.

8 The Concept of Spirit, London:1976, 76, 79: 'pneuma stresses man's affinity with God, just as $\pi\rho\upsilon\varsigma$ emphasizes his dissimilarity.'

9 Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus, Rostock: 1868, 391 n., 392.

10 Die Thessalonicher-Briefe, Göttingen:1909, 229. B. Weiss was influenced by Holsten's analysis to the extent that he referred only I Cor 2.11; 5.3 and Col 2.5 to an anthropological pneuma, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, tr. D. Eaton, Edinburgh:1882, 346f n. 9.

11 Cf. e.g. Büchsel, op. cit., 416; E. Schweizer, TDNT vi 434f. Holsten himself later modified it; in Das Evangelium des Paulus, Teil 1, Berlin:1880, he allows that, although 'die paulinische anthropologie sollte...den geist des menschen mit pneuma nie bezeichnen', pneuma cannot be dispensed with as a term for 'das geistige wesen des menschen...weil zwei wesensmomente des geistes nur durch pneuma ganz zum ausdruck gebracht werden können, die unsichtbare innerlichkeit und die den menschen innerlich bewegende kraft des geistes,' 464 (his emphasis),

12 Jewett holds that Letter B consists of I Cor 1.1-6.11; 7.1-9.23; 10.23-11.1; 12.1-14.40; 16.1-12.

13 Op. cit., 451.

14 An die Römer, Tübingen:1928, 81.

- 15 TDNT vi 436.
- 16 Man in the New Testament, tr. J. J. Vincent, London:1963, 44.
- 17 Church Dogmatics, vol. iii, part 2, tr. H. Knight et. al., ed. G. W. Bromley and T. F. Torrance, Edinburgh:1960, 359.
- 18 W. D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man, London:1956, 129, 134; D. E. H. Whiteley, The Theology of St Paul, Oxford:1964, 42f.
- 19 E.g. Kümmel, Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus, Leipzig:1929, 26; Stacey, ibid., 136.
- 20 E.g. W. Gutbrod, Die paulinische Anthropologie, Stuttgart/Berlin:1934, 80-85.
- 21 Cf. H. Bertrams, Das Wesen des Geistes nach der Anschauung des Apostels Paulus, Münster:1913, 22: 'der vielfältige Gebrauch, den Paulus von dem Worte pneuma macht hatte für seine Leser und Zeitgenossen nichts Absonderliches an sich.'
- 22 TNT i 206f; cf. H. Conzelmann, An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, tr. J. Bowden, New York:1969, 180; D. Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, Cambridge, England:1967, 283f.
- 23 BAG s.v. 2.
- 24 Wootton, art. cit., 240f.
- 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: πνεῦμα κίνησις αἶρος περὶ τὴν γῆν.
- 2 E. de W. Burton, Spirit, Soul, and Flesh, Chicago:1918, 15.
- 3 Tr. H. W. Smyth; Aeschylus, vol. 1, London/New York:1922, 295.
- 4 H. Diels, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, hrsg.

W. Kranz, Berlin:1951⁶, 200 line 10; cf. Fr. 22, 202 lines 4f.

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

7 Tr. W. H. S. Jones, The Medical Writings of Anonymous Londinensis, Cambridge, England:1947, 37.

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.

11 This is fully discussed by A. L. Peck, Aristotle: Generation of Animals, London/Cambridge, Massachusetts:1943, 576ff.

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

13 J. van Arnim, Stoicorum veterum fragmenta, Leipzig: 1905, vol. i, 35 lines 33f; 38 lines 6-9, 30ff.

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

15 According to Diog L 9.19, Xenophanes (fifth-fourth centuries BC) first said ἐστὶ... ἡ ψυχὴ πνεῦμα. 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 ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ πάντῃ διεσπῶτος πνεύματος, '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 stoïcienne est celle-ci: il y a dans la 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'hegemonikon, le pneuma central.'

19 Von 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.

22 Von Arnim, op. cit., vol. ii, 154 lines 6-9; cited by Verbeke, op. cit., 67 n. 172.

23 Galen in Von Arnim, op. cit., vol. ii, 204 lines 11f; 205 lines 10-15; Tert De anima 25.

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

25 Tr. W. H. S. Jones, Hippocrates, vol. ii, London/New York:1923, 231. Jones dates the writing at the end of the fifth century BC.

26 Against the alternative reading $\epsilon\theta\omicron\varsigma$, see J. Burnet, Early Greek Philosophy, London:1930⁴, 354 n. 1.

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

28 Von Arnim, op. cit., vol. ii, 298 lines 11-13; cited in Verbeke, op. cit., 82 n. 206.

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

30 Tr. R. G. Bury, Sextus Empiricus, vol. i, London/New York:1953, 473.

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

32 Tr. Burton, op. cit., 115; cf. Philo Det pot ins 87-90.

33 Tr. R. M. Gummere, Seneca: Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales, Cambridge, Massachusetts/London:1934, 335.

34 Cf. Verbeke, op. cit., 48-50.

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^E SHAMAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1 E. de W. Burton, Spirit, Soul, and Flesh, Chicago:1918, 53.

2 So W. R. Schoemaker, 'The Use of Ruach in the Old Testament, and of Pneuma in the New Testament', JBL 23 1904 4; H. W. Robinson, 'Hebrew Psychology', The People and the Book, ed. A. S. Peake, Oxford:1925, 358-361. Burton, op. cit., 54f, considers this conclusion likely; A. R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, Cardiff:1949, 28 n. 8, and D. Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, Cambridge, England:1967, 203f, do not accept it.

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 רוח Targ reads 'רוח רוח', which would refer to God's breath.

6 Cf. above, 11f.

7 J. Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture, vol. i/ii, London/Copenhagen:1926, 151.

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

9 N. H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, London:1944, 146.

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.

11 For the interpretation of n^e shamah and ruach in this verse, see S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job, Edinburgh:1921, 280.

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.

15 For this understanding of Job 20.3, see H. H. Rowley, Job, London:1970, 176.

16 R. B. Y. Scott, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Garden City, New York:1965, 122.

17 W. McKane, Proverbs, London:1970, 547.

18 Cf. Johnson, op. cit., 19-25; Pedersen, op. cit., 104: 'Man in his totality is a רוח but he has a ruach...'

THE RENDERING OF HUMAN RUACH AND N^E SHAMAH IN THE SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

1 Cf. W. R. Schoemaker, 'The Use of Ruach in the Old Testament, and of Pneuma in the New Testament', JBL 23 1904 38.

2 M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, tr. J. Bowden, vol. 1, London:1974, 162.

3 So H. P. Smith, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel, Edinburgh:1899, 330, 331.

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 $\pi\alpha\upsilon\varsigma$ 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 $\sigma\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha$ (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.

4 Hebrew manuscripts which probably represent the Hebrew original rather than a later re-translation read וְנִשְׁנָה , I. Levi, The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, Leiden:1969, 45.

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

6 Levi, op. cit., 13.

7 Clem Alex: $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota$; Box and Oesterley, AP i 346.

8 On $\sigma\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha$ in this work, cf. below, 24f.

9 O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: an Introduction, tr. P. R. Ackroyd, Oxford:1965, 578, 587, 593, states that all

these works are 'certainly' translations from Hebrew.

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

11 Sometimes the πνευμάτων βίαις concerning which σοφία instructs Pseudo-Solomon (Wisd Sol 7.20) are understood as evil spirits in accordance with Jos Ant 8.45: God grants Solomon knowledge of τὴν κατὰ τῶν ἐκζημονίων τέχνην εἰς ὠφέλειαν καὶ θεράπειαν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. 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 βίαις 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 βίαις ἀνέμων and 5.23 uses pneuma of 'wind'.

12 Codex Alexandrinus lacks βίαις. The translation of R. B. Townshend, 'the spirit of his Reason', AP ii 674, follows this reading. It is also accepted by H. B. Swete, The Old Testament in Greek, vol. iii, Cambridge, England:1894, 741.

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

14 So H. E. Ryle and M. R. Jones, Ψάλλουσι Σολομῶντος, Cambridge, England:1981, 151; G. B. Gray, AP ii 651.

15 Θ: ἐξηγείρεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον πατρὸς νεωτέρου; 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.

16 So S. Holmes, AP i 560; J. Drummond, Philo Judaeus, vol. i, London:1888, 200; 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, ed. R. F. Harper et. al., Chicago:1908, 225; W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter, hrsg. H. Gressmann, Tübingen:1926, 400 n. 1.

17 J. A. F. Gregg, The Wisdom of Solomon, Cambridge, England:1909, 74; likewise E. G. Clarke, The Wisdom of Solomon, Cambridge, England:1973, 55.

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

19 So Drummond, op. cit., i 225; G. Verbeke, L'évolution de la doctrine du pneuma, Paris/Louvain:1945, 233, 235.

20 M. E. Isaacs argues that πνεῦμα σοφίας 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.

2 Cf. W. R. Schoemaker, 'The Use of Ruach in the Old Testament, and of Pneuma in the New Testament', JBL 23 1904 46; Best, art. cit., 223.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE WRITINGS OF PHILO

1 The phrase νηνεμίας καὶ βίης πνευμάτων (Op mund 58; Spec leg 1.92) should be evaluated with reference to Rer div her 208 (Θερμὸν ἐκνέτιον ψυχῶν... νηνεμία πνεύμασι) and Vit Mos 1.41 (πάντα γὰρ μεταβάλλειν τὰ ἐν κόσμῳ πρὸς τὴν ἐντίκ... πνευμάτων βίης εἰς ἕρπ νήνεμον), so that the genitive is taken to qualify only βίης.

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' animé 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 πνοή with the LXX but he cites the verse twice with pneuma (Leg all 3.161; Det pot ins 17). For him πνοή 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:1948², 394 n. 46.

4 Tr. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Philo, vol. iv, Cambridge, Massachusetts/London:1968, 311.

5 Tr. Colson and Whitaker, Philo, vol. i, Cambridge, Massachusetts/London:1971, 207.

6 Tr. Colson and Whitaker, Philo, iv 419.

7 Tr. Colson, Philo, vol. viii, London/Cambridge, Massachusetts:1939, 297.

8 See G. Verbeke, L'évolution de la doctrine du pneuma, Paris/Louvain:1945, 254.

9 Tr. R. Marcus, Philo: Questions and Answers on Genesis, London/Cambridge, Massachusetts:1973, 191.

10 Cf. J. von Arnim, Stoicorum veterum fragmenta, Leipzig:1905, vol. ii, 228 lines 4f.

11 On the meaning of pneuma here, see Colson's note in Philo, vol. ix, Cambridge, Massachusetts/London:1967, 24f.

12 As in Rer div her 232 τό... ἄλογον ψυχῆς is quite distinct from τό... λογικόν.

13 Cf. Verbeke: 'un tout autre sens', op. cit., 249. 'The metaphor used in Praem 48' provides a most tenuous basis for M. E. Isaac's contention to the contrary, The Concept of Spirit, London:1976, 44, and Laurentin's contrary argument rests on a forced and unnatural understanding of Det pot ins 83f, art. cit., 411-413. Laurentin maintains that pneuma in Philonic usage is always the same divine pneuma. Isaacs demurs to the extent that pneuma in the sense of wind and air does not necessarily possess any theological overtones, 60f. It seems clear to the present writer that in addition physiological and cohesive pneuma must be exempted from possessing a theological referent.

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.

17 Tr. Colson, Philo, vol. vi, Cambridge, Massachusetts/London:1935, 593.

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 τό ὄν.' 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 lQH 17.17, 'Von den Geistern (𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕), die du in mich hineingegeben hast, will ich Antwort der Zunge hervorbringen', but the consensus of other translators is to render the prefixed 𐤓𐤕 'wegen', 'because of', 'à cause de', thus not attributing the prayer to these spirits. (2) In lQH 16.11 Dietzel takes 𐤒𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤓 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 lQH 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 Debbora 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.

6 'Geist und Geister in den Texten von Qumran', Mélanges Bibliques en l'honneur de André Robert, Paris:1957, 308; similarly F. Büchsel, Der Geist Gottes im neuen Testament, Gütersloh:1926, 69f.

7 Text in M. Baillet, 'Un Recueil Liturgique de Qumran, Grotte 4: "Les Paroles des Luminaires"', RB 68 1961 208. In Isa 59.21 the Spirit rests permanently upon Israel in the Messianic age.

8 AP ii 811.

9 O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: an Introduction, tr. P. R. Ackroyd, Oxford:1965, 636. Charles himself also dates this work well into the Christian era.

10 Tr. Charles, AP ii 363; text in Charles, The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Oxford: 1908, 244.

11 Cf. below, 45.

12 Herm m and s, which teach that the πνεῦμα ἁγίων 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 נִשְׁמָה of Gen 2.7, as does O. J. F. Seitz, 'Two Spirits in Man: an Essay in Biblical Exegesis', 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 uninvolvedness in present life has led to their designation as angels in this verse.

18 See A. R. Johnson, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, Cardiff:1942, passim.

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.

20 On this term see A. R. C. Leaney, The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning, London:1966, 146.

21 P. Wernberg-Møller, 'A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1Q Serek III, 13 - IV, 26)', RQ 3 1961-1962 419.

22 Wernberg-Møller, The Manual of Discipline, Grand Rapids:1957, 79 n. 21.

23 E. Schweizer, 'Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologische Hoffnung bei Zarathustra, spätjüdischen Gruppen, Gnostikern und den Zeugen des neuens Testaments', The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology...in Honour of Charles Harold Dodd, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube, Cambridge, England:1956, 491.

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 7Y' (as does e.g. Wernberg-Møller, art. cit., 422f; he suggests that 7Y' in iii 18 corresponds to 7Y' in Gen 2.7, noting that this Biblical verse provided the basis for the purely psychological rabbinic doctrine).

25 Discussed above, 34f.

26 Tr. J. M. Allegro, DJDJ v 89f.

27 Only the damaged text of xvii 23 represents a likely reference. For xiii 15, cf. i 22. For the 7Y' 7Y' of iii 18, cf. below, 42.

28 I follow the reconstruction of these partially damaged texts in E. Lohse, Die Texte aus Qumran, München:1971², 112, 166.

29 In 1QH this usage is found to be consistent: the human constitutional ruach is 'formed' (7Y'); the additional dispensation of divine ruach is 'given' (7Y'); cf. on the one hand, i 8f, 15; iv 31; xv 22; cf. x 22; cf. also ix 12 (7Y'); on the other hand, xii 12f; xiii 12f; xvi 11f; xvii 17; cf. fr. iii 14; cf. also 11Q Ps^a Dav Comp 39. This distinction does not yet seem to have been recognized by scholars.

30 K. G. Kuhn, 'New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament', The Scrolls and the New Testament, tr., ed. K. Stendahl, New York:1957, 105, has not recognized the importance of the constitutional human ruach in the sectarian anthropology.

31 Reading 7Y' (7Y') with Lohse, op. cit., 162. The reading 7Y' (7Y'), 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 Y, and in addition seems to reveal an initial '.

32 Cf Schweizer, art. cit., 491.

33 Cf. W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, tr. J. A. Baker, vol. ii, London:1967, 132f.

34 Cf. above, 23.

35 Text in J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4, Oxford:1976, 218, 229. We cannot

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 sectarians 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, Hammonds-worth:1968³, 76. One can translate instead 'fulness of glory' (𐤔𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤔𐤕𐤕) and 'a measure of majesty' (𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤔𐤕𐤕), so Kuhn, 'Die Sektenschrift und iranische Religion', ZTK 49 1952 299: 'das Vollkommene der Herrlichkeit und das Vollmass des Glanzes'.

38 Wernberg-Møller, The Manual of Discipline, 87 n. 80, compares the Hebrew text of Sir 49.16, 𐤔𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤔𐤕𐤕 𐤔𐤕𐤕 𐤔𐤕𐤕 𐤔𐤕𐤕 𐤔𐤕𐤕 𐤔𐤕𐤕 𐤔𐤕𐤕. Others translate 'glory of man'; cf. 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 sectarians 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 sectarians 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. Nötscher affirms that the sectarians 'am Ende gleich oder ähnlich werden kann' to the angelic 𐤔𐤕𐤕 𐤔𐤕𐤕, 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.

43 G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism, Cambridge, Massachusetts:1972, 164, 166.

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 $\psi\chi\eta$ was the Greek reading here. See P. Grelôt, 'L'eschatologie des Esseniens et le livre d'Hénoch', RQ 1 1958-1959 117, on the inconsistency of the Ethiopic rendering of pneuma, and $\psi\chi\eta$. Grelôt 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 $\psi\chi\eta$ in 1QH refers to afflictions suffered from enemies of the community, S. Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot -- Psalms from Qumran, Aarhus:1960, 27 n. 66.

49 Eissfeldt, op. cit., 608, 622, 624, 630; for Pseudo-Philo, M. R. James, The Biblical Antiquities of Philo, London/New York:1917, 28, and D. J. Harrington in C. Perrot and P.-M. Bogaert, Les Antiquités Bibliques, vol. ii, Paris:1976, 76f, 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 $\gamma\delta\zeta\eta$ does not occur in the OT, or, to my knowledge, elsewhere in the Qumran literature.

54 Tr. Charles, AP ii 423f.

HUMAN RUACH AND N^ESHAMAH 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'.
- 3 Tr. H. Freedman, Midrash Rabbah, ed. Freedman and M. Simon, vol. i, London:1939, 214f. The dictum of R. Phineas b. Jair, וְהַיְהוּדִים יִשְׁמְרוּ אֶת רוּחָם (M Sot 9.15) may refer to a miraculous ability given a righteous person in this present life.
- 4 Tr. M. Simon, i 378.
- 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 רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים 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 δαίμων representing the soul of a murdered person tormenting the murderer (and others).
- 8 See Sjöberg, TDNT vi 382-384.
- 9 H. Parzen, 'The Ruah Hakodesh in Tannaitic Literature', JQR 20 1929-1930 56.
- 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, Gnosis, 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).

2 See especially S. Arai, 'Zur Christologie des Apokryphons des Johannes', NTS 15 1968-1969 302-318.

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, Apocryphon Johannis, Copenhagen:1963.

5 W.-D. Hauschild, Gottes Geist und der Mensch, München:1972, 227.

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 ΟΜΟΠΝΑ, ὁμοπνεῦμα, '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 jüdische Tradition', Gnostic Studies, vol. i, Istanbul:1974, 174f.

10 R. A. Bullard, The Hypostasis of the Archons, Berlin:1970, 3, 115.

11 'Eine bedeutsame, für 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 Ἀληθεία for Ἐκκλησία, and even if we with Quispel, ibid., 56f n. 15, identify Ἀληθεία with Σιγή; in Valentinus' system

the primordial status of Ζυγή and not the Holy Spirit corresponds to that of Barbelo in AJ; in AJ the Holy Spirit is God.

14 See Hauschild, op. cit., 155.

15 See Quispel, 'La conception de l'homme dans la Gnose valentinienne', Gnostic Studies ii 54f.

16 Later Valentinian gnosticism probably relates something close to Valentinus' own teaching when it explains that the Demiurge breathed into Adam 'the animal soul' or 'pneuma/πνοή of life' while, simultaneously and secretly, Sophia sowed in him the divine spirit, σπέρμα πνευματικόν (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, τὴν τοῦ διαφέροντος ἐπένθεσθαι πνεύματος, 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 σχεδόν... ἡμῶν χρεῖν ἔχοντες, ἵνα εἰσέλθωσιν, 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 φύσις but his or her προκύνησις which must be (not is) spiritual, and it can now be spiritual only because God is active in the world as Spirit. Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός '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 City, New York:1966, 172.

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

25 Cf. R. Kasser et. al., Tractatus Tripartitus, vol. i, Bern:1973, 39f. U. Luz, 'Der dreiteilige Traktat von Nag Hammadi', ThZ 33 1977 384 identifies this document as Valentinian 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) ii 144.

28 In Gen 2.7 the LXX reads πνοή, 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 נ^eshamah, however, not only serves in the Old Testament as an equivalent of ruach 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 ruach. 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 πνοή in Gen 2.7 he witnesses to an exegetical tradition which already interpreted the verse in a pregnant anthropological sense.

29 Tr. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Philo, vol. i, Cambridge, Massachusetts/London:1929, 107.

30 Cf. R. McL. Wilson, The Gnostic Problem, London: 1958, 211.

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

32 Above, 40ff.

33 Cf. H. C. Kee, '"Becoming a Child" in the Gospel of Thomas', JBL 82 1963 307ff.

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 ruach with this meaning, cf. above, 49; for dead persons as pneumata, cf. I Enoch 22; cf. also above, 21f, 41.

2 The authenticity of this statement (cf. Luke 6.20)

does not concern us here.

3 BDF 105.

4 Cf. T. Zahn, Das Evangelium Matthäus, Leipzig:1910³, 183f.

5 Cf. ibid., 185. Other scholars who have related Mt 5.3a to Qumran terminology have arrived at a different interpretation of οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι; 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, ὁ ἰησοῦς ἐπιχρῶς ἐν ἑαυτῷ, and concludes that pneuma here simply substitutes for the personal pronoun; a particular aspect or 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 ΠΝΧ ΠΠ of IQS iii 26f, as in P. Bonnard, L'évangile selon Saint Matthieu, Neuchâtel:1963, 384.

9 Cf. e.g. J. H. Bernard, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to John, ed. A. H. McNeile, vol. i, Edinburgh:1928, 149.

10 R. Schnackenburg, The Gospel according to John, tr. K. Smith, vol. i, New York:1968, 437; cf. R. Bultmann, The Gospel of John, tr. G. H. Beasley-Murray et. al., Philadelphia:1971, 190.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN ACTS

1 E.g. F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, Grand Rapids:1952², 351; Commentary on the Book of the Acts, Grand Rapids:1954, 382 n. 56.

2 E. Haenchen comments, 'the possession of the Spirit by an evidently still imperfect Christian does not really seem conceivable', The Acts of the Apostles, tr. R. McL. Wilson et. al., Philadelphia:1971, 550 n. 7.

3 Cf. H. Preisker, 'Apollon 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.'

4 Cf. H. Jaschke, '" $\lambda\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ " bei Lukas', BZ N.F. 15 1971 109-114.

5 So e.g. H. A. W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Acts of the Apostles, tr. P. J. Gloag, ed. W. P. Dickson, vol. ii, Edinburgh:1877, 161.

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

7 Op. cit., 591 n. 6.

8 Pneuma in 20.22 need not be a pneuma other than the $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ 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 $\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ are here tautological.'

10 Robertson 745.

11 Cf. e.g. W. Neil, The Acts of the Apostles, London: 1973, 229.

12 Op. cit., ii 233, 234.

13 Cf. above, 49, 51.

14 Cf. H. Alford, The Greek Testament, vol. ii, Cambridge, England:1865⁵, 254.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS

1 Cf. e.g. G. Lünemann, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Hebrews, tr. M. J. Evans, Edinburgh:1882, 180f; B. F. Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews, London:1889, 103; J. Hering, The Epistle to the Hebrews, tr. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock, London:1970, 33.

2 Cf. e.g. J. Calvin, The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews; The First and Second Epistles of St Peter, tr. W. B. Johnston, ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance, Edinburgh:1963, 52; M. Luther, 'Lectures on Hebrews', Luther's Works, tr. W. A. Hansen, ed. J. Pelikan, vol. xxix, Saint Louis:1968, 164; C. Spicq, L'épître aux Hébreux, vol. i, Paris:1952, 52f.

3 Cramer vii 181.

4 So H. Montefiore, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, London:1964, 88; NEB translates $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\varsigma$ καὶ πνεύματος as 'life and spirit'.

- 5 Cf. for this rendering of τραχηλίζεν, Montefiore, ibid., 89; W. S. Wood, "'Prostrate, Prone, Overthrown'", The Expositor, Ninth Series 3 1925 444-455.
- 6 PG lxi 205.
- 7 PG cxix 428.
- 8 PG cxxv 373.
- 9 Der Hebräerbrief, Tübingen:1931², 111.
- 10 Cf. e.g. H. Alford, The Greek Testament, vol. iv, Cambridge, England:1866, 243.
- 11 Op. cit., 402.
- 12 So e.g. B. Weiss, Kritisch exegetisch Handbuch Über den Brief an die Hebräer, Göttingen:1888, 339.
- 13 Alford, op. cit., 255; cf. H. von Soden, Hand-Commentar zum neuen Testament, Bd. iii, Abt. ii, Freiburg/Leipzig:1891, 97.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE LETTER OF JAMES

- 1 J. H. Ropes, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St James, Edinburgh:1916, 225.
- 2 This has been seen by J. Moffatt, The General Epistles, London:1928, 60.
- 3 F. Mussner's argument, 'schwerlich bei τὸ πνεῦμα 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:1971², 162.
- 5 'Jac 4,5: ἐπιποθεῖν', ZNW 50 1959 137f.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN I PETER

- 1 E. Best, I Peter, London:1971, 125.
- 2 K. H. Schelke, Die Petrusbriefe; der Judasbrief, Freiburg:1961, 90.
- 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,

Göttingen:1978, 217.

6 B. Reicke, The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism, Copenhagen:1946, 94. B. M. Metzger justly comments, 'an emendation that introduces fresh difficulties stands self-condemned,' The Text of the New Testament, New York/Oxford: 1968, 185 n. 1.

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 πορεύθεις 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 ἐν ᾧ refers to πνεύματι 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, Θύκτωθεις μὲν ἀρκὶ ζωοποιήθεις δὲ πνεῦμα), 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. P. 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 δεσμητήριον will be their eternal abode

after the Last Judgement (10.13; 21.10).

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

15 C. Spicq, O.P., Les épîtres de Saint Pierre, Paris: 1966, 138; Best, op. cit., 144.

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.

17 Op. cit., 271.

18 Best, op. cit., 149.

19 Cf. Reicke, op. cit., 94.

20 Kelly, op. cit., 152f.

21 Op. cit., 130f.

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:1947², 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 κριθῶν should, by the normal rules of syntax, be understood of an action following that expressed by εὐαγγελίσθη', but only a tortuous interpretation is able to maintain that in Ro 8.10 the σῶμα is only dead 'on account of sin' (ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ) 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 ἀνθρώπους and κατὰ Θεόν, 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 (κρίνῃ) with man because he is flesh', this

would explain the change of reference in the use of κρίνειν; 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 (εὐηγγελίσθη). 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 amongst whom these Christian readers τὴν ἀναστροφὴν... ἔχοντες κλην, ἵνα... δοξάσωσιν τὸν Θεόν in 1.12 do then actually glorify God? Or that all the pagan husbands to whom Christian wives subject themselves ἵνα... κερδηθήσονται in 3.1 are indeed won? Such assumptions on the basis of any of these verses are arbitrary and unsound.

34 Reicke, op. cit., 56.

35 Tr. G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Hammondsworth:1968, 99.

36 Op. cit., 250.

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 ἐξαρχεῖν... ἐξ οἴκου φυλακῆς καὶ θημένων ἐν σκοτει. Our author like Tertullian may have understood οἴκου φυλακῆς 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. M. 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, ἐρύθημα ἱματίων αὐτοῦ... ὥραϊος ἐν στολῇ, ἀναβαίνων βίᾳ μετὰ ἰσχύος? In v. 2 Christ speaks, ἔχω δικέλογον δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίσιν σωτηρίου. The Jews ask, Διὰ τί σου ἐρυθρά τὰ ἱματία, καὶ τί ἐνδύματά σου ὡς ἀπὸ πετρίτου λίθου? (v. 3). Christ then tells of his redemptive death (vv. 4-6). In chapter 72 Justin cites an apocryphal passage which relates that ἐμνήσθη δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἅγιος Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτῶν τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χῶματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ. This evidence, though later than I Peter, nevertheless suggests that our author's employment of φυλακῇ 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 μακροθυμία directly to demonic activity but to human sin.

39 Tr. H. Danby, The Mishnah, Oxford:1933, 455.

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 (יִלְטֵךְ) 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,

I and II Peter and Jude, London:1950, 102, and, hesitatingly, F. W. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, Oxford:1958², 146.

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

1 See I. T. Beckwith, The Apocalypse of John, New York: 1919, 292f.

2 So e.g. W. Bousset, Die Offenbarung Johannis, Göttingen:1906², 192.

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

4 Beckwith, op. cit., 772; R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John, vol. ii, Edinburgh:1920, 218.

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

6 E. Lohmeyer, Die Offenbarung des Johannes, Tübingen: 1970², 177; G. R. Beasley-Murray, The Book of Revelation, London:1974, 335.

7 H. B. Swete, The Apocalypse of St John, London:1906, 299; E.-B. Allo, Saint Jean: L'Apocalypse, Paris:1921, 329.

8 A. Farrer, The Revelation of St John the Divine, Oxford:1964, 61.

9 The Expositor's Greek Testament, London:1905, vol. v, 489; cf. also Bousset, op. cit., 455f n. 3.

10 Cf. E. E. Ellis, '"Spiritual" Gifts in the Pauline Community', NTS 20 1973-1974 134.

11 See D. Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, Cambridge, England:1967, 221.

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 MT of Isa 11.2f mentions only six spirits; the LXX adds πνεῦμα φόβου.

18 Swete, op. cit., 6; The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, London:1910, 274f; E. Schweizer, 'Die sieben Geister in der Apocalypse', Neotestamentica, Zürich/Stuttgart:1963, 199-202.

19 Op. cit., 426f; cf. G. B. Caird, The Revelation of St John the Divine, New York:1966, 15: 'We have here the first example of John's kaleidoscopic variations on Old Testament imagery.'

20 H. Alford, The Greek Testament, vol. iv, Cambridge, England:1866, 549; A. Skrinjar, 'Les sept esprits (Apoc 1.4; 3.1; 4.5; 5.6)', Biblica 16 1935 137.

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

22 Op. cit., 338.

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

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

PART II

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE THESSALONIAN CORRESPONDENCE

1 See on these matters E. Best, A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, London:1972, 22-29, 30-35, 42-58.

I THESSALONIANS 5.23

2 Ibid., 242.

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

- 4 Ibid., 229.
- 5 Paul's Anthropological Terms, Leiden:1971, 176.
- 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 ὁμοῦς; ὁμοῦς ὁλοτελεῖς καὶ ὁλόκληρον ὁμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα is a 'synonymer Parallelismus mit Alliteration' (265). He implies that Paul does not repeat himself here for sheer poetic effect in that he understands ὁλοτελεῖς as quantitative and ὁλόκληρον as qualitative (my next paragraph will indicate why both these modifiers are best taken as quantitative). Since von Stempvoort understands ψυχή as equivalent to pneuma (265) -- he does not say how he understands σῶμα -- it is entirely unclear what he means by identifying the anthropology of his verse 23b as 'dichotomischer': according to him ψυχή 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.
- 10 Greek Papyri in the British Museum, ed. F. G. Kenyon, vol. i, London:1893, 103 lines 1-3, cited in part in 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.
- 12 'The Form and Function of the Homiletic Benediction', AngThR 51 1969 24-27; cf. also G. F. Wiles, Paul's Intercessory Prayers, Cambridge, England:1974, 45-97. Jewett relates 5.23 to the problem of enthusiasts in Thessalonica, Paul's Anthropological Terms, 180-182; also 'Enthusiastic Radicalism and the Thessalonian Correspondence', Society of Biblical Literature: Proceedings, vol. i, 1972, 204f; the arguments of Best, op. cit., 19-22, against this alleged occasion of the letter seem quite decisive.
- 13 Saint Paul: Les épîtres aux Thessaloniens, Paris:1956, 594.
- 14 Τηρηθεῖν ἐν 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 $\tau\eta\rho\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\eta\ \epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, 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 $\epsilon\upsilon\mu\eta\rho\omicron\varsigma\theta\epsilon\upsilon$ in both vv. (cf. II Cor 5.10) and $\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\iota$ in 2.19 (cf. I Cor 9.25) make plain -- and in 4.15 speaks decisively against the opinion that in our verse ' $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\eta\ \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\iota\alpha$ = klassisch $\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\eta\nu\ \pi.$ ', M. Dibelius, An die Thessalonicher I II; an die Philipper, Tübingen:1937², 32. The alternation between $\epsilon\upsilon$ and $\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ 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.

18 Ibid., 20; cf. 22.

19 See S. Laeuchli, 'Monism and Dualism in the Pauline Anthropology', BibR 3 1958 26.

20 St Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, London:1908, 78; cf. above, 88f. J. Moffatt, The Expositor's Greek Testament, vol. iv, London:1910, 43, identifies $\psi\chi\omega\nu$ 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: $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\ \zeta\omega\eta\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\ \psi\upsilon\chi\eta\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\nu\ \alpha\phi\theta\epsilon\rho\sigma\iota\alpha\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\upsilon$

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 σῶμα; cf. G. Wohlenberg, Der erste und zweite Thessalonicherbrief, Leipzig:1909², 121f n. 2.

23 E.g. von Dobschütz, op. cit., 230f; Frame, op. cit., 211f, 214.

24 Best, op. cit., 243.

25 Paul's Anthropological Terms, 178f.

26 Cf. above, 33f.

27 '"Den Geist Löscht Nicht Aus" (1 Thessalonicher v 19)', NovT 10 1968 264, 267, 269.

28 Cf. below, 130ff.

29 Les deux épîtres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniens, Neuchâtel:1957, 78.

30 Ἐκ ψυχῆς in Col 3.23 and Eph 6.6 means 'with the whole self', not with only part thereof as in ὁφθαλμοδουλικῶς.

31 Best, op. cit., 243.

32 See e.g. M. Luther, 'The Magnificat', Luther's Works, ed. J. Pelikan, vol. xxi, St Louis:1956, 303f; Lightfoot, op. cit., 88.

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.

36 Op. cit., 122; he, apparently follows C. K. von Hoffmann whose commentary, 1869², is not available to me; a few other representatives of this position are noted by W. G. Kümmel, Man in the New Testament, tr. J. J. Vincent, London:1963, 45 n. 51.

37 Op. cit., 78.

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 THESSALONIANS 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 THESSALONIANS 2.13

42 E. von Dobschütz, op. cit., 299.

43 Op. cit., 190.

44 Ὁι μὴ πιστεύοντες τῇ ἀληθείᾳ in verse 12 suggests that πίστει ἀληθείας should be understood as 'faith in the truth'. Πίστις with an objective genitive is not uncommon in Paul, cf. particularly Gal 2.16, ἐν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν; also 3.22; Ro 3.22; Phil 3.9; 1.27, τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; Col 2.12, διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ.

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

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

47 This argument is considered quite decisive by G.

Lünemann, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles of St Paul to the Thessalonians, tr. P. J. Gloag, Edinburgh:1880, 239f.

48 Cf. below, 121-124.

49 A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, London:1971, 636f. Frame, op. cit., 281, notes that in Sir 24.9 A changes ἀπ' ἀρχῆς to ἀπαρχῆν, but this change makes some sense in that ἀπ' ἀρχῆς here merely repeats the preceding πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος, and the combination of ἀπαρχῆν with creation is quite natural.

50 So e.g. Lünemann, op. cit., 202.

51 Op. cit., 313.

52 C. E. B. Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, vol. 1, Edinburgh:1975, 418, my emphasis.

53 Cf. also in v. 14 εἰς περιποίησιν δόξης with Eph 1.13f.

54 So e.g. B. Rigaux, op. cit., 682.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE CORINTHIAN CORRESPONDENCE

1 Introduction to the New Testament, tr. H. C. Kee, London:1975², 290.

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

3 Introduction to the New Testament, tr. G. Buswell, Oxford:1968, 77.

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'; ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ (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 ἀλλ' (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 ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ, not being current among them, represented the apostle's interjected opinion (asyndeton is not uncommon in Paul, M iii 340). Dahl contends that ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ '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.

7 Cf. R. Bultmann, 'Karl Barth, The Resurrection of the Dead', Faith and Understanding, tr. L. P. Smith, ed. R. W. Funk, vol. i, London:1969, 80.

8 So e.g. E. Schweizer, TDNT vi 425; otherwise e.g. H. Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, tr. J. W. Leitch, ed. G. W. MacRae, Philadelphia:1975, 57.

9 E. Käsemann, '1 Korinther 2,6-16', Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, Bd. i, Göttingen:1964, 269; cf. τέλειος in 14.20; Phil 3.15; Col 1.28; 4.15.

10 K. Barth, The Resurrection of the Dead, tr. H. J. Stenning, London:1933, 28; cf. R. W. Funk, Language, Hermeneutic and Word of God, New York:1966, 300 n. 107.

11 Σαρκικός/σαρκινός and ψυχικός do not 'mean the same thing', as B. A. Pearson, The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians, Missoula:1973, 111, among others, asserts; W. G. Kümmel, 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 χοϊκός not σαρκικός/σαρκινός 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.

13 F. Büchsel, Der Geist Gottes im neuen Testament, Gütersloh:1926, 398.

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

15 Op. cit., 74.

16 Clement takes this to refer to the Spirit of Christ, though in v. 9 he refers to God as ἐρευνητής... ἐννοῶν καὶ ἐνθυμήσεων οὐ ἢ πνοὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν.

17 Cf. above, 19f.

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

19 Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, New York:1967, 186; cf. W. D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man, London:1956, 132: 'in I Cor 2.11 the Spirit of God is contrasted with the spirit of man in order to show the inadequacy of the latter;' U. Wilckens, Weisheit und Torheit, Tübingen:1959, 81: 'in 2,11 der Geist Gottes vom Geist des Menschen radikal unterschieden wird' (his emphasis).

20 Notes on Epistles of St Paul, London:1895, 178.

21 A. Robertson and A. Plummer state that 'the words $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omega\nu$ and $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon$, repeated, are emphatic, the argument being a minori ad majus. Even a human being has within him secrets of his won, 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:1914², 44. Paul, however, has not written $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\chi\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ or $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ (contrast II Cor 3.8f, 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 $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon$ is definable... only in a negative sense as utterly incommensurate with God's spirit, as related to the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\omicron\varsigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$ and as a characteristic of the $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma\ \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ ', Paul's Anthropological Terms, Leiden:1971, 188, 189.

24 H. Lietzmann, An die Korinther I-II, erg. W. G. Kümmel, Tübingen:1969, 13.

25 E.-B. Allo, O.P., Saint Paul: Première Épître aux Corinthiens, Paris:1956, 46; cf. Conzelmann, op. cit., 66.

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.

27 Cf. Heinrici, op. cit., 116.

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 παιδαγωγός', Lightfoot, op. cit., 201; the apostle cannot be a παιδαγωγός to the Corinthians but only a father.

29 E.g. H. A. W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians, vol. I, tr. D. D. Bannermann, ed. W. P. Dickson, Edinburgh:1877, 136; P. Bonnard, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Galates, Neuchâtel:1953, 118; C. Spicq, 'Une reminiscence de Job XXXVII, 13 dans I Cor IV, 21', RB 60 1953 511, claims that II Cor 10.1, παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς διὰ τῆς προύτης καὶ ἐπιτελείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, establishes that the Holy Spirit is intended here.

30 So e.g. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Galatians, tr. G. H. Venables, Edinburgh:1873, 321.

31 P. W. Schmiedel, Hand-Commentar zum neuen Testament, Bd. ii, Freiburg:1891, 90.

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:1961³, 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 antikororientalische 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 Kümmel, 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 Verantwortlosigkeit des Mannes auf;' cf. Jo 8.3ff.

39 "Ἐχειν can mean either a marriage or an enduring concubinage, 'a permanent union of some kind', Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., 96; cf. LS ad. loc. A4; MM ad. loc. The aorists (πράξας; κατεργασάμενον) 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:1910², 205 (for the reading πράξας rather than ποιήσας, cf. B. M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, London:1971, 550). Hurd, op. cit., 277f, supposes that this was a spiritual marriage, 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' (ματρίκα) 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 text ne nous dit pas si le père était vivant ou mort'. The father cannot be identified as τοῦ ἀδικήθεντος (II Cor 7.12); this would be Paul (cf. E. von Dobschütz, Christian Life in the Primitive Church, tr. G. Bremner, 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 (2.1) subsequent to the writing of I Cor.

41 So Photius, τόδε ὅλως ἀκούεται, ὡς ἐκπεπληγμένου ἐπὶ τῇ φήμῃ καὶ ἀσχάλλοντες, 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 Käsemann, 'Sentences of Holy Law in the New Testament', New Testament Questions of Today, 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 χάρις of prophecy.

44 E. Schweizer draws attention to four indications

that authority in this matter is given to the congregation: (1) ὑμῶν precedes καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ ἰκεύμετος 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 συνεχθέντων, or linking ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. κ.τ.λ. with the far-away infinitive παραδοῦναι. 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 ὀνόμ. κ.τ.λ. with the less proximate κερρικα 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 Παραδοῦναι is dependent on συνεχθέντων; 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. Come, 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.

48 Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus, Rostock: 1868, 385; cf. Kummel, op. cit., 31.

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 ἀνὼν τῷ σώμ. 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 Philipper, 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.

61 G. G. Findlay, The Expositor's Greek Testament, vol. ii, London:1900, 809. The idea that life in the world of the unredeemed would produce in this exile a longing for life in the church of the redeemed is arbitrary and unlikely.

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

63 A. C. Thiselton, 'The Meaning of Sarx in I Corinthians 5.5', SJT 26 1973 213, 224f.

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 ὀλεθρος; for example, the destruction of Abel represents the destruction of the teaching devoted to God (ὀλέθρῳ τοῦ φιλοθεοῦ εὐχμητοῦ Ἀβελ, Det Pot ins 1030. This suggests that when Philo uses ὀλεθρος 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, 242-244.

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.

73 C. T. Craig, The Interpreter's Bible, vol. x, Nashville:1953, 62.

74 E.g. J. Héring, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, tr. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock, London:1962, 36.

75 Origen (ed. C. Jenkins, JTS 9 1908 364) and Chrysostom (PG lxi 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.

78 E. A. Nida, cited by Thistelton, 'Semantics and New Testament Interpretation', New Testament Interpretation, Ed. I.H. Marshall, Exeter:1977, 84.

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, '∪α 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 τὸν ἁγίου

= adiaphora. 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.

81 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.

82 Cf. Bachmann, op. cit., 239.

83 Cf. Heinrici, op. cit., 178; Godet, op. cit., i 303.

84 Τίς is neuter in accordance with πάντα.

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

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

87 Bachmann sees the discussion in 6.1ff prepared for by (1) πλεονέκτης... ἡ ἀρπαξ (5.11); (2) τοὺς ἔξω... τοὺς ἔσω (5.10ff); (3) κρίνειν (5.3-5, 12f), op. cit., 236.

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

89 'Incest and the Body of Christ: A Study of I Cor vi 12-20', NTS 14 1967-1968 568-574.

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

91 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 ἐστὶν war wohl ursprünglich als eine spiritualistische 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 πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν 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.

92 The interpretation of σῶμα 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.

93 This reading is certain. Metzger, op. cit., 552, writes, 'the context makes the future necessary as the correlative to καταρχήν in verse 13 (compare also the parallel

in II Cor 4.14).⁹ 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 πορνεία' (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.

96 Cf. A. J. M. Wedderburn, 'The Body of Christ and Related Concepts in 1 Corinthians', SJT 24 1971 75.

97 Cf. Bultmann, Der Stil der paulinischer Predigt und der kynische-stoische Diatribe, Göttingen:1910, 13, 65.

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 IQS 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. Gärtner, 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. Πορνεία is contrasted unfavorably with all other sins; other particular sins are not in view. Paul's phraseology here probably depends upon the Jewish conception, כוֹפֵּי הַגִּיד or כוֹפֵּי הַגִּיד וְהַיָּדָיִם; cf. SB iii 366f. If we attribute 18b to Corinthian sloganizing (so Moule 196f), we attribute to the Corinthian opposition to Paul a high regard for the σώμα; this is neither an impossible nor a certain Corinthian characteristic. Unlike Kempthorne, art. cit., 572, I believe ἵδρον prohibits a word-play on σώμα 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 τὸ σώμα τὸ ἵδρον is 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:1927⁵, 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 πορνεία, 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 σάρξ is contrasted with the human pneuma, cf. above, 107.

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

104 Op. cit., 45.

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

106 He himself apparently married; otherwise, J. Jeremias, 'War Paulus Witwer?', ZNW 25 1926 310-312; 'Nochmals: War Paulus Witwer?', ZNW 28 1929 321-323, but if Paul were a widower would he have written 7.7a: Θέλω δε πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμεαυτόν?

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 i 802f; cf. I Cor 15.39 for Paul's awareness of different kinds of flesh.

109 Cf. Apoc Mos xv-xxi; Origen, ed. C. Jenkins, JTS 9 1908 370, xxix 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; ὑπὸ and χινώσκεν 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 πορνεία was not indifferent or if he did he disallowed marriage.

111 Otherwise, A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, tr. W. Montgomery, New York:1968, 127; J. A. T. Robinson, The Body, London:1952, 64; Jewett, op. cit., 261.

112 Cf. R. H. Gundry, Soma in Biblical Theology, Cambridge, England:1976, 68.

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

114 Cf. R. Batey, 'The $\mu\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\acute{\nu}\eta\varsigma$ Union of Christ and the Church', NTS 13 1966-1967 272f.

115 Here I am in complete disagreement with Gundry, who maintains that it is the 'superficiality 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.

117 The Text of the Epistles, London:1953, 199f.

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, $\chi\upsilon\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ (cf. especially 8.1-3), maturity/childhood, boasting (for the reading $\kappa\rho\upsilon\chi\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ in v. 3 cf. Metzger, op. cit., 564). It dovetails with the succeeding and preceeding 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, i 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 πνευματικά/πνευματικοί 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 τὰ 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. ἀντιλήψεις ('helpful deeds', cf. II Macc 8.19; III Macc 5.50; BAG s.v.) and κυβερνήσεις ('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) παρακαλεῖν 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 χαρίσματα is not a more extensive term than πνευματικά for Paul (Bultmann, TNT i 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 πνευματικῇ refers to everything given by the Spirit (cf. H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser, Düsseldorf:1957⁷, 44).

126 Hurd, op. cit., 193.

127 Cf. G. Bornkamm, 'Glaube und Vernunft bei Paulus', Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum, München:1963, 133; Schmithals, op. cit., 284; J. P. M. Sweet, 'A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia', NTS 13 1967 242 n. 6, 252; D. W. B. Robinson, 'Charismata versus Pneumatika: Paul's Method of Discussion', Reformed Theological Review 31 1972 50f; D. L. Baker, 'The Interpretation of I Corinthians 12-14', EvQ 46 1974 228f. OT evidence for prophetic glossolalia adduced by H. Gunkel, Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, Göttingen:1888, 21; P. Volz, Der Geist Gottes, Tübingen:1910, 8f, and E. Mossiman, Das Zungenreden geschichtlich und psychologisch untersucht, Tübingen:1911, 38, is uncertain; otherwise, R. A. Harrisville, 'Speaking in Tongues: A Lexicographical Survey', CBQ 38 1976 45.

128 Cf. H. Greeven, 'Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus', ZNW 41 1952-1953 9-11. It should not be assumed on the basis of 14.3 that πράκλῃσιν καὶ πράμυσθιν are specifically or especially prophetic; rather they inhere in all forms of inspired Christian speech and action except uninterpreted glossolalia; otherwise, Ellis, 'The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts', Apostolic History and the Gospel (F. F. Bruce Festschrift), Exeter:1970, 57.

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

130 Cf. Bultmann, TNT i 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 "Glossais 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., i 370: 'We are to understand by γλώσσαις 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 (οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς) 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 διὰ and the article. In addition, he calls it εἰς αἶρα λαλοῦντες, which is not the same as Θεῷ λαλοῦντες (v. 2).

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

136 So Heinrichi, op. cit., 381, 383-385, 389f; Lietzmann, op. cit., 69; Allo, op. cit., 380f.

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 299f.

138 Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, Jesus and the Spirit, London: 1975, 243; Schlatter, op. cit., 343, 374, relates γένη to the various 'Klang und Sinn' of the 'unverständlich' speech, whereas Bachmann, op. cit., 383, understands by γένη prayer, song etc.; cf. Heinrichi, op. cit., 386f, 391. Given the predominant nuance of γένος, 'species', 'race', 'nation', it is far better to understand it here with regard to language. Gundry, art. cit., 300, and Dunn, op. cit., 243f, follow J. G. Davies, 'Pentecost and Glossolalia', JTS N.S. 3 1952 228-230, and argue that languages are in view here because ἐρμηνεύειν 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 Phld 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 14.2! 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 τὰς γλώσσας τῶν ἀνθρώπων (13.1), cf. n. 142.

140 Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J., 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and the New Testament', NTS 7 1960-1961 324f.

141 Cited in SB iii 449. b Shab 12b states that angels do not understand Aramaic and may be taken to imply that they know only Hebrew amongst human languages. Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, 'The Belief in Angels and Demons', Judaism and Christianity, vol. i, London:1937, 200.

142 The 'tongues of men' in 13.1 might connote such elaborate human rhetoric as Paul has denigrated in 1.17ff

(cf. II Cor 10.10). 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: παντοδαπαῖς γλώσσαις; 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, καὶ ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἔξόν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι, 'and he heard things that cannot be told, which man may not utter' (RSV). However, H. Windisch notes that ἄρρητα ῥήματα '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 Angelologie 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.

148 The Christology of the New Testament, tr. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall, London:1963, 219f.

149 Op. cit., 321f; followed by Barrett, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, 280.

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 Rechtshändel aus?', ZNW 59 1968 86-90, argues that Corinthian Christians brought their property disputes before wise judges appointed by the synagogue (6.1-6a).

153 Barrett, op. cit., 280.

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

155 Ibid., 553.

156 Cf. E. Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, tr. R. McL. Wilson, Philadelphia:1971, 541.

157 Op. cit., 127-130; cf. Godet, op. cit., ii 135-137; N. Brox, 'ΑΝΑΘΕΜΑ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ (I Kor 12,3)', BZ N.F. 12 1968 105ff.

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

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

160 'The Exaltation of the Spirit by Some Early Christians', JBL 84 1965 367.

161 Op. cit., 334.

162 'Jesus: Anathema or Kyrios', Christ and Spirit in the New Testament (in Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule), ed. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, Cambridge, England:1973, 113-126; the quotations are from 121, 124.

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; Mündige Gemeinde, Stuttgart:1967, 187; Sweet, art. cit., 241, 259, who thinks Paul is being sarcastic; T. Holtz, 'Das Kennzeichnen des Geistes (I Kor xii, 1-3)', NTS 18 1972 372; Conzelmann, op. cit., 204; Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians, 118.

164 Heinrici, op. cit., 360; Bachmann, op. cit., 379. Allo emphasizes Paul's distrust of speaking in tongues as possibly demonic, op. cit., 322, 355, 362, 383; cf. also Zuntz, op. cit., 141.

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

166 Op. cit., 378f.

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. ἐπιτρέπεσθαι; ὑποτάσσεσθαι), and (4) thought (cf. Gal 3.28, but note what is omitted in I Cor 12.13!). Against this Ellis, 'Spiritual Gifts in the Pauline Community', 131, draws attention to the catch-word connection by means of ὁμοῦν. Ἀλλοῦν in these verses might be cited as evidence for their integrity or as a reason for their inclusion here.

168 On Ἀλλοῦν as a terminus technicus in early Christianity, cf. J. Dupont, O.S.B., Gnosis, Louvain/Paris:1960², 222-226; cf. also above, 66.

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 $\delta\lambda\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma$ πνευμαίων (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 $\delta\lambda\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma$ incorporates both distinguishing and interpreting, but I see no evidence that interpretation is involved; $\delta\lambda\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma$ in Ro 14.1 probably does not have a technical charismatic sense and the $\sigma\upsilon\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$ 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 $\delta\lambda\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma$ also to non-prophets.

173 This discernment is not the same as that of 11.28, 31.

174 Cf. Bachmann, op. cit., 328f; Hering, op. cit., 127 n. 11. $\Delta\omicron\kappa\rho\iota\upsilon\acute{\zeta}\epsilon\iota\nu$ and $\delta\lambda\kappa\rho\iota\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ are synonymous in 11.28, 31.

175 Weiss, op. cit., 327, who cites $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ as evidence; H. Leisegang, Pneuma Hagion, Leipzig:1922, 114 n. 2; Grosheide, op. cit., 323f; Baker, op. cit., 226f, who argues that aside from 12.31a; 14.1, 12, 39, $\zeta\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ 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. Heinrichi, op. cit., 456 n. 1; Schlatter, op. cit., 385; Wendland, op. cit., 131. Verse 33a alludes to Gen 1.2: the earth was $\chi\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ but the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ 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.

178 Op. cit., 290.

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

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

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

182 Op. cit., 40-43.

183 Op. cit., 132-144; also 'Christ and Spirit in I Corinthians', Christ and Spirit in the New Testament, 269-272, 274-277.

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 (Ποιήσωμεν, ἰῶν) as indicating the attendance of angels at the creation of humankind.

185 Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus, Göttingen: 1909, 76; cf. Heinrici, op. cit., 439f; Weiss, op. cit., 326, 341; Lietzmann, op. cit., 71; W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos, tr. J. E. Steely, Nashville:1970, 161; Bultmann, TNT i 155f; Héring, op. cit., 149; Barrett, op. cit., 319, 329; Meyer, op. cit., ii 12f, so understands pneumata in 14.12 but not 32.

186 Schlatter, op. cit., 342; cf. Godet, op. cit., ii 276: 'a strong individualizing of the Holy Spirit.'

187 So Grosheide, op. cit., 339; Meyer, op. cit., ii 29.

I CORINTHIANS 14.2, 14-16

188 Cf. T. C. Edwards, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, London:1887, 259.

189 For this meaning of ἀκούειν, 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 ἐν is read by B D E P pauc. This reading should not be accepted on external grounds: p⁴⁶ Λ*, A G plerique omit ἐν. It should not be argued that an original ἐν was omitted because it was not read in v. 15, as even with the omission of ἐν 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 Χάρισμα and πνευματικόν 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.

198 Op. cit., 327f.

199 Cf. above, 102.

200 Cf. above, 102.

201 For this understanding of $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, see the literature cited above in n. 26.

202 p⁴⁶ B G omit $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho$.

203 Cf. above, 133. In 14.21 (cf. 13.11) Paul subtly denigrates uninterpreted public glossolalia as childish nonsense, and in 14.19, where $\mu\upsilon\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ 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 (Ro 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 $\pi\rho\sigma\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ (12.7). 6.12ff confirm that $\tau\omicron\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ 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 $\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$ 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; M iii 191.

208 $\tau\omega\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \epsilon\upsilon\phi\epsilon\iota\nu\ \mu\epsilon\ \tau\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\nu$; $\tau\omega$ with the infinitive is causal here; M 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 vergüten haben'"), but such criticism would be quite out of place here; so, rightly, Allo, op. cit., 405f.

210 "Εδειξεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι ἡ αὐτοῦ ἀνάπαυσις αὐτῶν ἐστίν,
Theophylact PG 124 792C.

211 Op. cit., 115.

212 Cf. I. Hermann, Kyrios und Pneuma, München:1961, 61.

213 Εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ = εἰς τὸ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὸν Χριστόν; εἰς here means 'for the sake of' and τοῦ 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, ἐν κυρίῳ 'will deutlich machen, dass der Ausdruck bildlich gemeint ist', op. cit., 94; he compares I Clem 48.4.

215 Windisch, ibid., 95.

216 R. H. Strachan, The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, London:1935, 73.

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.

220 A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians, Edinburgh: 1915, 65.

221 Cf. e.g. Bultmann, op. cit., 55: 'völlig 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 ἄρξ'.

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.

225 The Greek Testament, vol. ii, Cambridge, England: 1865⁵, 654.

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

227 Cf. e.g. C. Hodge, An Exposition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, London:1883⁶, 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

228 Cf. Chrysostom, The Homilies of S John Chrysostom ...on the Second Epistle of St Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians. Oxford:1848, 151; H. Grotius, Annotationes in Novum Testamentum, vol. v, Groningen:1828, 496; Allo, Saint Paul: Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens, Paris:1956, 176.

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.'

232 Op. cit., 187.

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

234 Cf. J.-F. Collange, Énigmes de la Deuxième Épître de Paul aux Corinthiens, Cambridge, England:1972, 295.

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.

237 H.-D. Betz considers it an anti-Pauline interpolation, '2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?', JBL 92 1973 88-108; cf. J. J. Gunther, St Paul's Opponents and their Background, Leiden:1973, 313.

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 (ἐμπεριπατεῖν); Ezek 20.34 (εἰσδέξεσθαι), and II Sam 7.8 (παντοκράτωρ). 16cd-18 might constitute a pre-Pauline florilegium with 14-16ab and 7.1 being original to II Cor.

240 This was first noted by K. G. Kuhn, 'Les rouleaux de cuivre de Qumran', RB 61 1954 203 n. 2; cf. at length J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J., 'Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6.14-7.1', CBQ 23 1961 271-280; J. Gnailka, '2 Cor 6:14-7:1 in the Light of the Qumran Texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', Paul and Qumran, ed. J. P. Murphy-O'Connor, O.P., London:1968, 48-68; cf. also H. Braun, Qumran und das Neue Testament, Tübingen:1966, 201-204.

241 Text as restored by E. Lohse, Die Texte aus Qumran, München:1971, 210.

242 Art. cit., 279f.

243 Cf. M. Thrall, 'The Problem of II Cor VI 14 - VII 1 in Some Recent Discussion', NTS 24 1977-1978 137f.

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 ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιασμόν '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 συναναμικνύσθαι πόρνοις. Πορνεία 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: αὐτῆς.

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 Kümmel, 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; πολλοί 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. Kümmel, Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus, 31.

264 Op. cit., 184.

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?

270 So e.g. Schmiedel, op. cit., 254; Plummer, op. cit., 365; Barrett, op. cit., 326; cf. also R. V. G. Tasker, The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, London:1958, 184.

271 Theophylact's explanation of pneuma in our verse, Τοῦτεστιν, οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ πνευματικῷ χάρισματι; χάρισμα γὰρ

καλεῖ τὸ στενόμενον μὴ λαβεῖν, PG 124 940C, is strange and indefensible.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE LETTER TO THE ROMANS

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, 'Pheobe'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. p⁴⁶. 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. Wuellner, '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, Hammondsworth:1975.

3 Not only does its position vary in manuscripts but it is entirely lacking in F⁸¹ G (which has a blank space after 14.23) 629 it⁸ 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 l'Épître 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).

1.4

4 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 Röm. 1,3f', EvTheol 31 1971 273-275.

5 Cf. e.g. E. Schweizer, 'Röm 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 I.3-4', JTS N.S. 24 1973 41; H. Schlier, Der Römerbrief, Freiburg:1977, 24.

6 Op. cit., 4f.

7 Chrysostom, PG 60 397.

8 Cranfield, op. cit., i 61.

9 Cf. K. L. Schmidt, TDNT v 453.

10 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.

11 Cf. A. Schlatter, Gottes Gerechtigkeit, Stuttgart:1975, 26.

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

13 Above, 95ff.

14 'Κτῆρ ΤΙΝΕΥΜΑ 'Αγλωσύνῃς (Romans 1,4)', Bib 48 1967 386f.

15 E.g. C. Hodge, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Edinburgh:1875², 16-18; M.-J. LaGrange, Saint Paul: Epître aux Romains, Paris:1916, 7f.

16 H. A. W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans, tr. W. P. Dickson, Edinburgh:1873, 47; cf. W. Sanday and A. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Edinburgh:1902², 9.

17 An die Römer, Tübingen:1974², 9.

18 Art. cit., 57.

19 F. Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology, tr. H. Knight and G. Ogg, London:1969, 249f; cf. Schweizer, op. cit., 188f.

1.9

20 C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, New York:1957, 23.

21 O. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, Göttingen:1966⁴, 46.

22 H. Strathmann, TDNT iv 59-65.

23 Cf. T. Zahn, Der Brief an die Römer, Leipzig:1910, 57; P. Althaus, Der Brief an die Römer, Göttingen:1970¹¹, 11; Cranfield, op. cit., i 76f. For prayer as ἱκετεύω, cf. SB iii 26; Dan 6.17(16), 21(20); Michel, op. cit., 46.

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 Pls eine Anrufung Gottes als Zeugen für notwendig.' Cf. also J. Huby, S.J., Saint Paul: Épître aux Romains, new ed. by S. Lyonnet, S.J., Paris:1957, 55.

26 Bultmann, TNT i 206; Althaus, op. cit., 11; E. Best, The Letter of Paul to the Romans, Cambridge, England: 1967, 13; Michel, op. cit., 46f; Käsemann, op. cit., 15.

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.'

29 Schlatter, op. cit., 26; Schweizer, TDNT vi 435; R. Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms, Leiden:1971, 198.

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

2.29; 7.6

31 'Wrath is God's personal...reaction against sin,' Barrett, op. cit., 33. Cf. Best, A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, London:1972, 84f, for arguments in favor of this interpretation of the concept.

32 Op. cit., 64.

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.

37 J. Calvin, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians, tr. R. MacKenzie, Edinburgh: 1960, 69.

38 That God is the implied subject of λογισθήσεται (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.

42 Calvin, op. cit., 140f; Godet, op. cit., i 219; J. Denney, The Expositor's Greek Testament, vol. ii, London:1900, 602; Weiss, op. cit., 131; Michel, op. cit., 93; Käsemann, 'The Spirit and the Letter', Perspectives on Paul, tr. M. Kohl, London:1971, 70f; An die Römer, 145; S. Lyonnet, 'La circoncision du coeur, celle qui relève de l'Esprit et non de la lettre', L'Évangile hier et aujourd'hui: Mélanges offerts au F. J. Leenhardt, Geneva:1968, 92, 94ff; J. Murray, The Epistle to the Romans, Grand Rapids:1968, 88f; Cranfield, op. cit., i 175.

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 ἐν πνεύματι as appositional to καρδίας 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.

45 Cf. Käsemann, 'The Spirit and the Letter', 142f, 146f; J.-F. Collange, Enigmes de la deuxième épître de Paul aux Corinthiens, Cambridge, England:1972, 64; Cranfield, op. cit., i 339f.

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.

47 Cf. Augustine, The Spirit and the Letter (xxvi-xxviii), tr., ed. J. Burnaby, London:1955, 226-233; K. Barth, A Shorter Commentary on Romans, tr. D. H. van Daalen, London: 1959, 36, 38f; Cranfield, op. cit., i 151-153, 155, 159, 173.

48 M. Luther, Lectures on Romans, tr., ed. W. Pauck, London:1961, 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.

49 It is not the introduction of Christians into the picture that makes our verses a conclusive climax to chapter 2 (as Käsemann, 'The Spirit and the Letter', 141, 144; An die Römer, 70, Lyonnet, art. cit., 96f, and J. S. Vos, Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur paulinischer Pneumatologie, Assen:1973, 110, conclude), but the introduction of the Spirit as the basis of the Gentile Christian capacity already intimated.

50 Ἐν ᾧ should not be otherwise construed than as masculine and referring to the law as letter; cf. I Cor 15.56; Godet, op. cit., ii 12f.

51 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 ὑπὸ τῷ σάρκα.

52 Against the understanding of pneuma in this verse as Scripture's spiritual sense (so E.-B. Allo, Saint Paul: Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens, Paris:1956, 107) cf. B. Schneider, 'The Meaning of St Paul's Antithesis "The Letter and the Spirit"', CBQ 15 1953 195f.

8.10

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

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

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

56 Μέν is concessive as in Xenoph An 1.10.12: πέζοι μὲν οὐκέτι, τῶν δὲ ἵππεων ὁ λόφος ἐνεπλάσθη; cf. LS s.v. A ii 4.

57 Jewett, op. cit., 293.

58 Ibid., 297; E. Fuchs, Die Freiheit des Glaubens, München:1949, 97, 101.

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

60 Cf. Zahn, op. cit., 389; R. H. Gundry, Sōma 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'.

61 Gundry, ibid., 43f.

62 Käsemann, An die Römer, 214, translates ὁὐκ 'im Hinblick auf'. I am not aware that ὁὐκ can carry this meaning. M. Dibelius, 'Vier Worte des Römerbriefs', Symbolae Biblicae Uppsalienses 3 1944 11, whom Käsemann cites in support, does not establish that it can.

63 Kuss, op. cit., Lief. 2, 504, translates δὲ ἀμαρτίαν 'um der Beseitigung der Sünde willen'.

64 H. Lietzmann, An die Römer, Tübingen:1928³, 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 eingeht und zu ihrem Geiste wird.'

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

67 The omission of καὶ in a few manuscripts (chiefly N A) 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., i 394.

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

71 Cf. P. von der Osten-Sacken, Römer 8 als Beispiel paulinischer Soteriologie, Göttingen:1974, 135-139, on the relation of vv. 15-17 to 18-39. Paul probably employs υἱός (vv. 14, 19) and τέκνον (vv. 16, 21) as synonyms.

72 E.g. Cranfield, op. cit., i 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 θάνατος with ζωή and εἰρήνη with ἔχθρα.

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 πατήρ and a comma after υἱοθεσίας (Nestle; UBS; NEB), for if a full stop is placed after υἱοθεσίας (RSV), 'the sentence οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε, κ. τ. λ. seems incomplete both stylistically, since there is nothing to balance πάλιν ἐν φόβον, and also as far as the meaning is concerned, since πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας is a new, and not an easy, expression, which seems to require some measure of explanation within the same sentence,' Cranfield, op. cit., i 398.

- 79 Cranfield, ibid., i 402.
- 80 Zahn, op. cit., 395.
- 81 K semann, op. cit., 217; Schlier, op. cit., 254.
- 82 Lietzmann, op. cit., 83; Schlier, op. cit., 254.
- 83 K semann, op. cit., 218f; Dodd, op. cit., 129f, and Kuss, op. cit., Lief 2 603f, also assume that the cry is ecstatic.
- 84 Leenhardt, op. cit., 214; K semann, 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 ἀλλήλοις 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 στενγμοῖς 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 glossolalic in community worship (as does K semann, ibid., 230), because a setting of community worship in 8.26 is only an inference from 8.15f (Zahn, op. cit., 412; K semann, 'The Cry for Liberty in the Worship of the Church', Perspectives on Paul, 230); this is to beg the point at issue.
- 86 Cf. I. de la Potterie, 'Le chr tien conduit par l'Esprit dans son cheminement eschatologique', The Law of the Spirit in Rom 7 and 8, ed. L. de Lorenzi, Rome:1976, 215-218, 221-223.
- 87 Ro 9.27 might indicate that Paul connected κράζειν with inspired but not necessarily public speech.
- 88 Schlatter's understanding of κράζειν 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 κράζειν I note how de la Potterie, art. cit., 219-228, is able to relate other terms in vv. 14-17, e.g. ἄγειν; υἱός/τέκνον; κληρόνομος, to LXX passages dealing with God's deliverance of Israel(ites) out of distress. I cannot agree with him that Paul is 'd'une mani re 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: ἔνδοθεν κεκράχμεν; cf. also Jas 5.4; Gen 4.10; Jos Bel 1.197 and several places in Philo (e.g. Ebr 98) for examples of κράζειν 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 ἀββᾶ 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; Käsemann, An die Römer, 218; Jewett, op. cit., 199.

96 Schlier, op. cit., 254 n. 11.

97 E.g. H. Conzelmann, An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, tr. J. Bowden, London:1969, 180.

98 Stacey, op. cit., 133; cf. 143: 'a personal relationship'.

99 E. Brunner, The Letter to the Romans, tr. H. A. Kennedy, London:1959, 73.

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, καὶ ἔδωκεν ὁ ἄγγελος... πνεῦμα συνέσεως νεωτέρῳ ὄντι Δαυιδ, thus contains a different conception than that of θ, ἐξήγειρεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον πατρὸς νεωτέρου, ὃ ὄνυμα Δαυιδ.

102 See M iii 128f.

103 Der Epheserbrief, Zürich:1966, 62.

104 Πνεῦμα θελήεις 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.

107 Käsemann, 'The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus', Essays on New Testament Themes, tr. W. J. Montague, London:1964, 143.

108 Meyer, op. cit., ii 264, argues that τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες refers to the human spirit because it is the opposite

of τῇ σπουδῇ...ὁκνηροί; Barrett, op. cit., 240, concludes that it must refer to the Holy Spirit because it is parallel to τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες.

HUMAN PNEUMA IN THE REST OF THE PAULINE CORPUS

PHILIPPIANS 1.27

1 Cf. H. C. G. Moule, The Epistle to the Philippians, Cambridge, England:1897, 29.

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.

5 Paul's Anthropological Terms, Leiden:1971, 184.

6 Cf. above, 139f.

7 Cf. above, 166.

8 Cf. H. Bertrams, Das Wesen des Geistes nach der Anschauung des Apostels Paulus, Münster:1913, 14: 'ihr menschliches Geist bedurft der Gnade.'

I TIMOTHY 3.16

9 Reading ὅς with A* C* et. al.; ὅ (D* and other Western witnesses) is an assimilation to the neuter τὸ μυστήριον; the reading Θεός arose from a misreading of ΟΣ as ΘΣ; 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 ὡφθῇ...ἐν ἑθνεσιν 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'.

11 Cf. R. H. Gundry, 'The Form, Meaning and Background of the Hymn Quoted in I Tim 3.16', Apostolic History and the Gospel, Grand Rapids:1970, 204f.

12 D. M. Stanley, S.J., understands ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί as 'an allusion to Christ's death in its redemptive character', Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology, Rome:1961, 237.

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 Gundry, art. cit., 211f, and, hesitatingly, J. N. D. Kelly, A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, New York:1963, 211f.

15 E.g. M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, tr. P. Buttolph and A. Yarbro, ed. H. Koester, Philadelphia:1972, 62.

16 Cf. above, 73, 152ff.

17 Cf. J. Jeremias, Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, Göttingen:1963, 24; cf. also, on the one hand, A. Schlatter, Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus, Stuttgart:1936, 114: 'der, durch den er gerechtfertigt wurde, ist der Geist. Denn der Geist hat ihn auferweckt...', and on the other hand, B. Weiss, Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus, Göttingen:1902, 157f: 'auf Grund dessen, dass er Geist hatte, ward ihm das $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ zu teil.'

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 $\pi\rho\sigma\tau\epsilon\chi\omega\gamma\eta$ '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, $\delta\iota' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ldots \epsilon\nu \epsilon\nu\iota \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota \ldots \pi\rho\varsigma \tau\omicron\nu \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$ (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

Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and the Colossians, Edinburgh?London:1965, 172: E. Haupt, Die Gefangenschaftsbriege, Göttingen:1897, 135, and B. F. Westcott, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, London:1906, 58, see a reference to the human spirit under the influence of the Holy Spirit.

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 p⁴⁹ B 33 pauc.

28 PG 118 1228c; cf. recently J. H. Houlden, Paul's Letters from Prison, Hammondsworth:1970, 319.

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.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Only items cited in the footnotes
of the thesis have been included here)

Abbott, T. K., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, ICC, Edinburgh: 1897.

Alford, H., The Greek Testament, 5th ed., 4 vols., Cambridge, England: 1965.

Allo, E.-B., Saint Jean: L'Apocalypse, EB, Paris: 1921.

Allo, E.-B., Saint Paul: Première Épître aux Corinthiens, EB, Paris: 1956.

Allo, E.-B., Saint Paul: Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens, EB, Paris: 1956.

Althaus, P., Der Brief an die Römer, NTD, Göttingen: 1970.

Arai, S., 'Zur Christologie des Apokryphons des Johannes', NTS 15 1968-1969 302-318.

von Arnim, J., Stoicorum veterum fragmenta, Leipzig: 1905.

Augustine, The Spirit and the Letter, tr., ed. J. Burnaby, LCC, vol. viii, London: 1955, 182-250.

Augustine, Expositions on the Book of Psalms, Eng tr., Lib. Fath, vol. vi, Oxford: 1857.

Bachmann, P., Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther, KNT vii, 2nd ed., Leipzig: 1910.

Bachmann, P., Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther, KNT viii, 2nd ed., Leipzig: 1909.

Baillet, M., 'Un Recueil Liturgique de Qumran, Grotte 4: "Les Paroles des Luminaires"', RB 68 1961 195-250.

Baker, D. L., 'The Interpretation of I Corinthians 12-14', EvQ 46 1974 224-234.

Barrett, C. K., A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, HNTC, New York: 1957.

Barrett, C. K., The First Epistle to the Corinthians, BNTC, London: 1968.

Barrett, C. K., The Pastoral Epistles, New Clarendon Bible, Oxford: 1963.

Barrett, C. K., The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, BNTC, London: 1973.

Barth, K., The Resurrection of the Dead, tr. H. J. Stenning, London: 1933.

Barth, K., A Shorter Commentary on Romans, tr. D. H. van Daalen, London:1959.

Barth, K., 'The Spirit as Basis of Soul and Body', Church Dogmatics, vol. iii, part 2, tr. H. Knight et. al., ed. G. W. Bromley and T. F. Torrance, Edinburgh:1960, 344-366.

Barth, M., Ephesians, AnchBib 34 34a, 2 vols., Garden City, New York:1974.

Baur, F. C., 'Beiträge zur Erklärung der Korintherbriefe', Theologische Jahrbücher 11 1852, 1-40.

Batey, R., 'The $\mu\lambda\kappa\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi$ Union of Christ and the Church', NTS 13 1966-1967, 270-281.

Beare, F. W., The First Epistle of Peter, 2nd ed., Oxford: 1958.

Beasley-Murray, G. R., The Book of Revelation, NCB, London: 1974.

Beckwith, I. T., The Apocalypse of John, New York:1919.

Bernard, J. H., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to John, ICC, ed. A. H. McNeile, 2 vols., Edinburgh:1928.

Bernard, J. H., The Pastoral Epistles, CGT, Cambridge, England:1906.

Bertrams, H., Das Wesen des Geistes nach der Anschauung des Apostels Paulus, Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen Bd. iv, Heft 4, Münster:1913.

Best, E., A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, BNTC, London:1972.

Best, E., I Peter, NCB, London:1971.

Best, E., The Letter of Paul to the Romans, Cambridge Bible Commentary, Cambridge, England:1967.

Best, E., 'Matthew V.3', NTS 7 1960-1961, 255-258.

Best, E., One Body in Christ, London:1955.

Best, E., 'The Use and Non-use of Pneuma by Josephus', NovT 3 1959, 218-225.

Betz, H.-D., '2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?', JBL 92 1973, 88-108.

Black, M., The Scrolls and Christian Origins, Edinburgh:1961.

Bonnard, P., L'épître de Saint Paul aux Galates, CNT 9, Neuchâtel:1953.

Bonnard, P., L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu, CNT 1, Neuchâtel:1963.

Bornkamm, G., 'Glaube und Vernunft bei Paulus', Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum, BET 28, München:1963, 119-137.

Bornkamm, G., 'The Revelation of God's Wrath (Romans 1-3)',

Early Christian Experience, tr. P. L. Hammer, London:1969.

Bousset, W., Kyrios Christos, tr. J. E. Steely, Nashville: 1970.

Bousset, W., Die Offenbarung Johannis, KEK 16, 2nd ed., Göttingen:1906.

Bousset, W., Die Religion des Judentums im spät-hellenistischen Zeitalter, HNT 21, hrsg. H. Gressmann, 3rd ed., Tübingen: 1926.

Box, G. H., The Testament of Abraham, Translations of early documents, ser. 1, London:1927.

Braun, H., Qumran und das Neue Testament, 2 vols., Tübingen: 1966.

Briggs, C. A., 'The Use of Ruach in the Old Testament', JBL 19 1900, 132-145.

de Broglie, G., 'Le texte fondamentale de S Paul contre la foi naturelle', RSR 39 1951, 253-266.

Brown, R. E., S.S., The Gospel according to John, AnchBib 29 29a, 2 vols., Garden City, New York:1966.

Brox, N., 'ANAGEMA IHEOUS (1 Kor 12,3)', BZ N.F. 12 1968, 103-111.

Bruce, F. F., The Acts of the Apostles, 2nd ed., Grand Rapids:1952.

Bruce, F. F., Commentary on the Book of the Acts, NIC, Grand Rapids:1954.

Bruce, F. F., The Epistle to the Hebrews, NIC, Grand Rapids: 1964.

Bruce, F. F., 1 and 2 Corinthians, NCB, London:1971.

Bruner, F. D., A Theology of the Holy Spirit, Grand Rapids: 1970.

Brunner, E., The Letter to the Romans, tr. H. A. Kennedy, London:1959.

Büchsel, F., Der Geist Gottes im neuen Testament, Gütersloh: 1926.

Bullard, R. A., The Hypostasis of the Archons, Patristische Texte und Studien 10, Berlin:1970.

Bultmann, R., The Gospel of John, tr. G. R. Beasley-Murray et al., Philadelphia:1971.

Bultmann, R., The History of the Synoptic Tradition, tr. J. Marsh, Oxford:1963.

Bultmann, R., 'Karl Barth, The Resurrection of the Dead', Faith and Understanding, tr. L. P. Smith, ed. R. W. Funk, vol. i, London:1969, 66-94.

Bultmann, R., Der Stil der paulinischer Predigt und der

kynische-stoische Diatribe, FRLANT 13, Göttingen:1910.

Bultmann, R., Der zweite Brief an die Korinther, KEK, hrsg. E. Dinkler, Göttingen:1976.

Burnet, J., Early Greek Philosophy, 4th ed., London:1930.

Burton, E. de W., Spirit, Soul, and Flesh, Historical and linguistic studies, 2nd ser., vol. iii, Chicago:1918.

Caird, G. B., The Revelation of St John the Divine, HNTC, New York:1966.

Calvin, J., The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, tr. T. H. L. Parker, Calvin's Commentaries, Edinburgh/London:1965.

Calvin, J., The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, tr. J. W. Fraser, Calvin's Commentaries, Edinburgh:1960.

Cambier, J., 'La Chair et l'Esprit en I Cor V, 5', NTS 15 1968-1969, 221-232.

von Campenhausen, H., Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries, tr. J. A. Baker, London:1967.

Cerfaux, L., The Christian in the Theology of Saint Paul, tr. L. Soiron, London:1967.

Chadwick, H., 'All Things to All Men', NTS 1 1954-1955, 261-275.

Charles, R. H., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John, ICC, 2 vols., Edinburgh:1920.

Charles, R. H., The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Oxford:1908.

Charles, R. H., The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Oxford:1908.

Chase, F. H., 'Mr Whitelaw on 2 Cor VI 11. - VII 1', The Classical Review 4 1890, 150-152.

Chrysostom, J., Homilies on the First Epistle of St Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, LibFath, vol. iii, Part 2, Oxford:1839.

Clarke, E. G., The Wisdom of Solomon, Cambridge Bible Commentary, Cambridge, England:1973.

Collange, J.-F., Énigmes de la Deuxième Épître de Paul aux Corinthiens, SNTS Monograph Series 18, Cambridge, England:1972.

Collard, C., Euripides: Supplices, vol. ii, Groningen:1975.

Colson, F. H., and Whitaker, G. H., Philo, LCL, vols. i-v, Cambridge, Massachusetts/London:1929-1934.

Colson, F. H., Philo, LCL, vols. vi-x, Cambridge,

Massachusetts/London:1935-1962.

Come, A., Human Spirit and Holy Spirit, Philadelphia:1959.

Conzelmann, H., 1 Corinthians, Hermeneia, tr. J. W. Leitch, ed. G. W. MacRae, Philadelphia:1975.

Conzelmann, H., An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, tr. J. Bowden, New York:1969.

Cranfield, C. E. B., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, ICC, vol. i, Edinburgh:1975.

Cranfield, C. E. B., I and II Peter and Jude, Torch Bible Commentaries, London:1950.

Cranfield, C. E. B., 'The Interpretation of I Peter 3,19 and 4,6', ET 69 1957-1958, 369-372.

Cullmann, O., The Christology of the New Testament, tr. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall, London:1963.

Cullmann, O., The State in the New Testament, London:1957.

Currie, S. D., '"Speaking in Tongues", Evidence outside the New Testament Bearing on "Glossais Lalein"', Interp 19 1965, 274-294.

Dahl, N. A., '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, 313-335.

Dahood, M., S.J., Psalms, AnchBib 16 17 17a, 3 vols., Garden City, New York:1966-1970.

Dalton, W. J., S.J., Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits, AnalectBib 23, Rome:1965.

Daube, D., The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London:1956.

Dautzenberg, G., Urchristliche Prophetie, BWANT 104, Stuttgart:1975.

Dautzenberg, G., 'Zum religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der ἐν κρείσσιν πνεύματων (I Kor 12,10)', BZ 15 1971, 93-104.

Davies, J. G., 'Pentecost and Glossolalia', JTS N.S. 3 1952, 228-230.

Davies, W. D., Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, New York:1967.

Deissmann, A., Light from the Ancient East, tr. L. R. M. Strachan, 3rd ed., London:1927.

Delcor, M., 'L'immortalité de l'âme dans la Sagesse et dans les documents de Qumran', NRevTh 77 1955, 614-630.

Delling, G., Worship in the New Testament, tr. P. Scott, London:1962.

Derrett, J. D. M., 'Cursing Jesus (I Cor xii.3): The Jews

as Religious "Persecutors"', NTS 21 1975, 544-554.

Dibelius, M., An die Thessalonicher I II; an die Philipper, HNT 11, 3rd ed., Tübingen:1937.

Dibelius, M., Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus, Göttingen:1909.

Dibelius, M., 'Vier Worte des Römerbriefs', Symbolae Biblicae Uppsaliensis 3 1944, 3-17.

Dibelius, M., and Conzelmann, H., The Pastoral Epistles, Hermeneia, tr. P. Buttolph and A. Yarbro, ed. H. Koester, Philadelphia:1972.

Diels, H., Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, hrsg. W. Kranz, 6th ed., Berlin:1951.

Dietzel, A., 'Beten im Geist', ThZ 13 1957, 12-32.

von Dobschütz, E., Christian Life in the Primitive Church, tr. G. Bremner, London/New York:1904.

Dodd, C. H., The Epistle to the Romans, MNTC, London: 1932.

Donfried, K., 'A Short Note on Rom 16', JBL 89 1970, 441-449.

Driver, S. R., and Gray, G. B., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job, ICC, Edinburgh:1921.

Drummond, J., Philo Judaeus, 2 vols., London:1888.

Duncan, G., The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, MNTC, London:1934.

Dunn, J. D. G., Baptism in the Holy Spirit, SBL, 2nd ser. 15, London:1970.

Dunn, J. D. G., 'Jesus -- Flesh and Spirit: An Exposition of Romans I.3-4', JTS N.S. 24 1973, 40-68.

Dunn, J. D. G., Jesus and the Spirit, London:1975.

Dupont, J., O.S.B., Gnosis, Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis. Disserationes ad gradum magistri in Facultate Theologica consequendum conscriptae, Ser. ii, Tome 40, 2nd ed., Louvain/Paris:1960.

Dupont, J., O.S.B., 'Pour l'histoire de la doxologie finale de l'Épître aux Romains', RBén 58 1948, 3-22.

Dupont-Sommer, A., The Essene Writings from Qumran, tr. G. Vermes, Oxford:1961.

Dupont-Sommer, A., Le quatrième livre des Machabées, Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Etudes. Sciences Historiques and Philosophiques, 274, Paris:1939.

Edwards, T. C., A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, London:1885.

Eichrodt, W., Theology of the Old Testament, tr. J. A. Baker, 2 vols., London:1967.

Eissfeldt, O., The Old Testament: An Introduction, tr. P. R. Ackroyd, Oxford:1965.

Ellicott, C. J., St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, London:1867.

Ellicott, C. J., St Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, London:1866.

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

Ellis, E. E., 'Christ and Spirit in I Corinthians', Christ and Spirit in the New Testament, ed. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, Cambridge, England:1973, 269-277.

Ellis, E. E., Paul's Use of the Old Testament, Edinburgh: 1957.

Ellis, E. E., 'The Role of the Christian Prophets in Acts', Apostolic History and the Gospel (F. F. Bruce Festschrift), Exeter:1970, 55-67.

Ellis, E. E., '"Spiritual" Gifts in the Pauline Community', NTS 20 1973-1974, 128-144.

Everling, O., Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie, Göttingen:1888.

Farrer, A., The Revelation of St John the Divine, Oxford: 1964.

Findlay, G. G., The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians, Cambridge Bible for schools and colleges, Cambridge, England:1904.

Fitzmyer, J. A., S.J., 'A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of I Cor xi 10', NTS 4 1957, 48-58.

Fitzmyer, J. A., S.J., 'Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6.14-7.1', CBQ 23 1961, 271-280.

Fitzmyer, J. A., S.J., 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and the New Testament', NTS 7 1960-1961, 297-333.

Foerster, W., Gnosis, tr. R. McL. Wilson et al., 2 vols., Oxford:1972.

Foerster, W., 'Der heilige Geist im spätjudentum', NTS 8 1961-1962, 117-134.

Ford, J. M., 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians or the First Epistle to the Hebrews?', CBQ 28 1966, 402-416.

Frame, J. E., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St Paul to the Thessalonians, ICC, Edinburgh:1912.

France, R. T., 'Exegesis in Practice: Two Examples', New Testament Interpretation, ed. I. H. Marshall, Exeter:1977, 252-281.

Fridrichsen, A., 'Der wahre Jude und sein Lob (Röm 2.28f)', Symbolae Arctoe 1 1927, 39-49.

Fuchs, E., Die Freiheit des Glaubens, BET 14, München:1949.

Funk, R. W., Language, Hermeneutic and Word of God, New York:1966.

Gärtner, B., The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament, SNTS Monograph Series 1, Cambridge, England:1965.

Gaugler, E., Der Epheserbrief, Auslegung neutestamentlicher Schriften 6, Zürich:1966.

Giverson, S., Apocryphon Johannis, Acta Theologica Danica 5, Copenhagen:1963.

Gnilka, J., '2 Cor 6:14-7:1 in the Light of the Qumran Texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', Paul and Qumran, ed. J. P. Murphy-O'Connor, O.P., London:1968, 48-68.

Godet, F., Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Romans, tr. A. Cusin, 2 vols., Edinburgh:1880.

Godet, F., Commentary on St Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, tr. A. Cusin, 2 vols., Edinburgh:1886.

Godet, G., La Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens, ed. P. Comtesse, Fils, Neuchâtel:1914.

Goguel, M., The Primitive Church, tr. H. C. Snape, London:1964.

Goodspeed, E. J., 'Phoebe's Letter of Introduction', HTR 44 1951, 55-57.

Goppelt, L., Der erste Petrusbrief, KEK, hrsg. F. Hahn, Göttingen:1978.

Greeven, H., 'Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus', ZNW 44 1952-1953, 1-43.

Gregg, J. A. F., The Wisdom of Solomon, Cambridge Bible for schools and colleges, Cambridge, England:1909.

Grelot, P., 'L'eschatologie des Essenien et le livre d'Hénoch', RQ 1 1958-1959, 113-131.

Grosheide, F. W., Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, NIC, Grand Rapids:1953.

Grotius, H., Annotationes in Novum Testamentum, 2 vols.,

Groningen:1828.

Gundry, R. H., "'Ecstatic Utterance" (NEB)', JTS N.S. 17 1966, 299-307.

Gundry, R. H., Sōma in Biblical Theology, SNTS Monograph Series 29, Cambridge, England:1976.

Gunkel, H., Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, Göttingen: 1888.

Gunther, J. J., St Paul's Opponents and their Background, NovT Supplements 35, Leiden:1973.

Gutbrod, W., Die paulinische Anthropologie, BWANT 67, Stuttgart/Berlin:1934.

Haenchen, E., The Acts of the Apostles, tr. R. McL. Wilson et al., Philadelphia:1971.

Haenchen, E., 'Das Buch Baruch', Gott und Mensch, Tübingen:1965, 299-334.

Hahn, F., The Titles of Jesus in Christology, tr. H. Knight and G. Ogg, London:1969.

Harrisville, R. A., 'Speaking in Tongues: A Lexicographical Survey', CBQ 38 1976, 35-48.

Haupt, E., Die Gefangenschaftsbriefe, KEK 8-9, Göttingen: 1897.

Hauschild, W.-D., Geist Gottes und der Mensch, BET 63, München:1972.

Heinrici, C. F. G., Das erste Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus an die Korinther, Berlin:1880.

Hengel, M., Judaism and Hellenism, tr. J. Bowden, 2 vols., London:1974.

Hering, J., The Epistle to the Hebrews, tr. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock, London:1970.

Hering, J., The First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians, tr. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock, London:1962.

Hermann, I., Kyrios und Pneuma, SANT 2, München:1961.

Hill, D., Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, SNTS Monograph Series 5, Cambridge, England:1967.

Hodge, C., Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 2nd ed., Edinburgh:1875.

Hodge, C., An Exposition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 6th ed., London:1883.

Holm-Nielson, S., Hodayot -- Psalms from Qumran, Acta Theologica Danica 2, Aarhus:1960.

Holsten, C., Das Evangelium des Paulus, Teil 1, Berlin: 1880.

Holsten, C., Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus, Rostock:1868.

Holtz, T., 'Das Kennzeichnen des Geistes (I Kor xii, 1-3)', NTS 18 1972, 365-376.

Holtzmann, H. J., et al., Hand-commentar zum Neuen Testament, 4 vols., Freiburg:1891.

Hort, F. J. A., 'On the End of the Epistle to the Romans', in J. B. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, London:1893, 321-351.

Houlden, J. L., Paul's Letters from Prison, The Pelican New Testament Commentaries, Hammondsworth:1970.

Huby, J., S.J., Saint Paul: Épître aux Romains, Verbum Salutis 10, new ed. by S. Lyonnet, S.J., Paris:1957.

Hughes, P. E., Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, NIC, Grand Rapids:1962.

Hurd, J. C., Jr., The Origin of I Corinthians, London:1965.

Huther, J. E., Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles of Peter and Jude, tr. P. J. Gloag, Edinburgh:1881.

Isaacs, M. E., The Concept of Spirit, Heythrop Monographs 1, London:1976.

James, M. R., The Biblical Antiquities of Philo, Translations of early documents, Ser. 1, London/New York:1917.

Jaschke, H., '" $\lambda\lambda\epsilon\omega$ " bei Lukas', BZ N.F. 15 1971, 109-114.

Jeremias, J., Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, NTD 9, Göttingen:1963.

Jeremias, J., 'Jac 4,5: $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$ ', ZNW 50 1959, 137-138.

Jeremias, J., 'Nochmals: War Paulus Witwer?', ZNW 28 1929, 321-323.

Jewett, R., 'Enthusiastic Radicalism and the Thessalonian Correspondence', Society for Biblical Literature: Proceedings, vol. i, 1972, 181-232.

Jewett, R., 'The Form and Function of the Homiletic Benediction', AngThR 51 1969, 18-34.

Jewett, R., Paul's Anthropological Terms, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, Bd. x, Leiden:1971.

Johnson, A. R., The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, Cardiff:1942.

Johnson, A. R., The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, Cardiff:1949.

de Jonge, M., 'Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', NovT 4 1960, 182-235.

Käsemann, E., An die Römer, HNT 8a, Tübingen:1974.

Käsemann, E., 'The Cry for Liberty in the Worship of the Church', Perspectives on Paul, tr. M. Kohl, London:1971, 122-137.

Käsemann, E., 'The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus', Essays on New Testament Themes, tr. W. J. Montague, SBTh 41, London:1964, 136-148.

Käsemann, E., '1 Korinther 2,6-16', Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, Bd. I, Göttingen:1964, 267-277.

Käsemann, E., 'Sentences of Holy Law in the New Testament', New Testament Questions of Today, tr. W. J. Montague, London:1969, 66-81.

Käsemann, E., 'The Spirit and the Letter', Perspectives on Paul, tr. M. Kohl, London:1971, 138-166.

Karlsson, G., 'Formelhaftes in Paulusbriefen?', Eranos 54 1956, 138-141.

Kasser, R., 'Le livre secret de Jean', RThPh 3rd Ser. 14 1964, 140-150.

Kasser, R., et al., Tractatus Tripartitus, 2 vols., Bern:1973.

Kaye, B. N., '"To the Romans and Others" Revisited', NovT 18 1976, 37-77.

Kee, H. C., '"Becoming a Child" in the Gospel of Thomas', JBL 82 1963, 307-314.

Kelly, J. N. D., A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, HNTC, New York:1963.

Kelly, J. N. D., The Epistles of Peter and Jude, HNTC, New York:1969.

Kempthorne, R., 'Incest and the Body of Christ: A Study of I Cor vi 12-20', NTS 14 1967-1968, 568-574.

Klöpffer, A., Der Brief an die Epheser, Göttingen:1891.

Knox, J., Chapters in a Life of Paul, Nashville:1950.

Knox, W. L., St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge, England:1939.

Kümmel, W. G., Introduction to the New Testament, tr. H. C. Kee, 2nd ed., London:1975.

Kümmel, W. G., Man in the New Testament, tr. J. J. Vincent, London:1963.

Kümmel, W. G., Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus, UNT 17, Leipzig:1929.

Kuhn, K. G., 'New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament', The Scrolls and the New Testament, tr., ed. K. Stendahl, New York:1957, 94-113.

Kuhn, K. G., 'Les rouleaux de cuivre de Qumran', RQ 61 1954, 193-205.

Kuhn, K. G., 'Die Sektenschrift und iranische Religion', ZTK 49 1952, 296-316.

Kuss, O., Der Römerbrief, 1st and 2nd Lieferungen, Regensburg:1957.

Laeuchli, S., 'Monism and Dualism in the Pauline Anthropology', BibR 3 1958, 15-27.

LaGrange, M.-J., Saint Paul: Épître aux Romains, EB, Paris:1916.

Lake, K., The Earliest Epistles of Paul, London:1911.

Lake, K., and Cadbury, H. J., The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. iv, London:1933.

Laurentin, A., 'Le Pneuma dans la doctrine de Philon', Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis 27 1951, 390-437.

Laurin, R. B., 'The Question of Immortality in the Qumran Hodayot', JSS 3 1958, 344-355.

Leaney, A. R. C., The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning, London:1966.

Leenhardt, F. J., The Epistle to the Romans, tr. H. Knight, London:1961.

Leisegang, H., Pneuma Hagion, Veröffentlichungen des Forschungsinstituts für vergleichende Religionsgeschichte an der Universität Leipzig 4, Leipzig:1922.

Levi, I., The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, Leiden:1969.

Lietzmann, H., An die Korinther I-II, HNT 9, erg. W. G. Kümmel, Tübingen:1969.

Lietzmann, H., An die Römer, HNT 8, Tübingen:1928.

Lightfoot, J. B., Notes on Epistles of St Paul, London: 1895.

Linnemann, E., 'Tradition und Interpretation in Röm. 1,3f', EvTheol 31 1971, 264-275.

Lock, W., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, ICG, Edinburgh:1924.

Lohmeyer, E., Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon, KEK, Göttingen:1953.

Lohmeyer, E., Die Offenbarung des Johannes, HNT 16, 2nd ed., Tübingen:1970.

Lohse, E., Die Texte aus Qumran, 2nd ed., München:1971.

Lüdemann, H., Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus, Kiel: 1872.

Lünemann, G., Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Hebrews, tr. M. J. Evans, Edinburgh:1882.

Lünemann, G., Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles of St Paul to the Thessalonians, tr. P. J. Gloag, Edinburgh:1880.

Luther, M., 'Lectures on Hebrews', tr. W. A. Hansen, Luther's Works, ed. J. Pelikan, vol. xxix, Saint Louis:1968, 297-355.

Luther, M., Lectures on Romans, tr., ed. W. Pauck, LCC vol. xv, London:1961.

Luther, M., 'The Magnificat', tr. A. W. Steinhauser, Luther's Works, ed. J. Pelikan, vol. xxi, St Louis:1956, 295-358.

Luz, U., 'Der dreiteilige Traktat von Nag Hammadi', ThZ 33 1977, 384-392.

Lyonnet, S., 'La circoncision du coeur, celle qui relève de l'esprit et non de la lettre', L'Évangile hier et aujourd'hui. Mélanges offerts au F. J. Leenhardt, Geneve:1968, 87-97.

Maly, K., 'I Kor 12,1-3, eine Regel zur Unterscheidung der Geister?', BZ N.F. 10 1966, 82-95.

Maly, K., Mündige Gemeinde, Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien 2, Stuttgart:1967.

Mansoor, M., The Thanksgiving Hymns, Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah, vol. 3, Leiden:1961.

Marxsen, W., Introduction to the New Testament, tr. G. Buswell, Oxford:1968.

Masson, C., Les deux épîtres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniens, CNT 11a, Neuchâtel:1957.

McKane, W., Proverbs, London:1970.

McKelvey, R. J., The New Temple, Oxford Theological Monographs, Oxford:1969.

Merklein, H., Das kirchliche Amt nach der Epheserbrief, SANT Bd. xxxiii, München:1973.

Metzger, B. M., The Text of the New Testament, New York/Oxford:1968.

Metzger, B. M., A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, London:1971.

Meyer, H. A. W., Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Acts of the Apostles, tr. P. J. Gloag, ed. W. P. Dickson, 2 vols., Edinburgh:1877.

Meyer, H. A. W., Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Galatians, tr. G. H. Venables, Edinburgh:1873.

Meyer, H. A. W., Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans, tr. W. P. Dickson, 2 vols., Edinburgh:1873.

Meyer, H. A. W., Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians, tr. D. D. Bannerman, ed. W. P. Dickson, 2 vols., Edinburgh:1877.

Michel, O., Der Brief an die Römer, KEK 4, 4th ed., Göttingen:1966.

Milik, J. T., The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4, Oxford:1976.

Milligan, G., St Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, London:1908.

Moffatt, J., The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, MNTC, London:1938.

Moffatt, J., The General Epistles, MNTC, London:1928.

Montefiore, H., A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, BNTC, London:1964.

Moore, C. A., Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: the Additions, AnchBib 44, Garden City, New York:1977.

Moore, G. F., Judaism in the First Three Centuries of the Christian Era, 3 vols., Cambridge, Massachusetts:1927.

Mosimann, E., Das Zungenreden geschichtlich und psychologisch untersucht, Tübingen:1911.

Moule, H. C. G., The Epistle to the Philippians, CGT, Cambridge, England:1897.

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

Munck, J., Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, tr. F. Clarke, Richmond:1959.

Murray, J., The Epistle to the Romans, NIC, Grand Rapids:1968.

Mussner, F., Der Galaterbrief, HTKNT Bd. ix, Freiburg:1974.

Mussner, F., Der Jakobusbrief, HTKNT Bd. xiii, 1, Freiburg:1964.

Neil, W., The Acts of the Apostles, NCB, London:1973.

Nielsburg, G. W. E., Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism, Harvard Theological Studies 26, Cambridge, Massachusetts:1972.

Nütscher, F., 'Geist und Geister in den Texten von

Qumran', Mélanges Bibliques en l'honneur de André Robert, Paris: 1957, 305-315.

Nütscher, F., Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-
Texte, Bonner biblische Beiträge 10, Bonn:1956.

Oesterley, W. O. E., 'The Belief in Angels and Demons', Judaism and Christianity, vol. i, London:1937, 193-209.

O'Neill, J. C., Paul's Letter to the Romans, Hammonds-
worth:1975.

von der Osten-Sacken, P., Römer 8 als Beispiel paulinischer
Soteriologie, FRLANT 112, Göttingen:1974.

Parzen, H., 'The Ruah Hakodesh in Tannaitic Literature', JQR 20 1929-1930, 51-76.

Pearson, B. A., 'Did the Gnostics Curse Jesus?', JBL 86
1967, 301-305.

Pearson, B. A., The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in
I Corinthians, SBL Dissertation Series 12, Missoula:1973.

Pedersen, J., Israel: Its Life and Culture, 2 vols.,
London/Copenhagen:1926.

Perrot, C., and Bogaert, P.-M., Les Antiquités Bibliques,
Sources chrétiennes 229-230, 2 vols., Paris:1976.

van der Ploeg, J., 'L'immortalité de l'âme dans la
Sagesse et dans les documents de Qumran', NRevTh 77 1955, 171-
175.

Plummer, A., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the
Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians, ICC, Edinburgh:
1915.

Pope, M. H., Job, AnchBib 15, Garden City, New York:1965.

Porter, F. C., '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, ed. R. F.
Harper et al., Chicago:1908, 205-270.

de la Potterie, I., 'Le chrétien conduit par l'Esprit
dans son cheminement eschatologique', The Law of the Spirit
in Rom 7 and 8, ed. L. de Lorenzi, Monographic Series of Bene-
dictina, Rome:1976, 207-218.

Preisker, H., 'Apollon und die Johannesjünger in Act
18.24-19.6', ZNW 30 1931, 301-304.

Pryke, J., '"Spirit" and "Flesh" in the Qumran Documents
and Some New Testament Texts', RQ 5 1965, 345-360.

Quispel, G., Gnostic Studies, Uitgaven van het Nederlands
Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 2 vols.,

Istanbul:1974.

Quispel, G., 'The Original Doctrine of Valentinus', VigChr 1 1947, 48-73.

Reese, J. M., Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences, AnalectBib 41, Rome:1970.

Reicke, B., 'Body and Soul in the New Testament', StudTheol 19 1965, 200-212.

Reicke, B., The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism, Acta Seminarii neotestamentici Uppsaliensis 13, Copenhagen:1946.

Ridderbos, H., The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia, NIC, 3rd ed., London:1961.

Rigaux, B., Saint Paul: Les épîtres aux Thessaloniens, EB, Paris:1956.

Robertson, A., and Plummer, A., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians, ICC, 2nd ed., Edinburgh:1914.

Robinson, D. W. B., 'Charismata versus Pneumatika: Paul's Method of Discussion', Reformed Theological Review 31 1972, 49-55.

Robinson, H. W., 'Hebrew Psychology', The People and the Book, ed. A. S. Peake, Oxford:1925, 353-382.

Robinson, J. A. T., The Body, SBTh 5, London:1952.

Rohde, E., Psyche, tr. W. B. Hillis, London:1925.

Ropes, J. H., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St James, ICC, Edinburgh:1916.

Ryle, H. E., and Jones, M. R., Ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντες, Cambridge, England:1891.

Sampley, J. P., 'And the Two Shall Become One Flesh', SNTS Monograph Series 16, Cambridge, England:1971.

Sanday, W., and Headlam, A., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, ICC, 5th ed., Edinburgh:1902.

Sanders, J. T., 'First Corinthians 13', Interp 20 1966, 159-187.

Schelke, K. H., Die Petrusbriefe; der Judasbrief, HTKNT Bd. xiii, 2, Freiburg:1961.

Schlatter, A., Gottes Gerechtigkeit, Stuttgart:1975.

Schlatter, A., Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus, Stuttgart:1936.

Schlatter, A., Paulus der Bote Jesu, Stuttgart:1934.

Schlatter, A., Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, Reihe 2, Bd. xxvi, Gütersloh:1932.

Schlier, H., Der Brief an die Epheser, 7th ed., Düsseldorf:1957.

Schlier, H., Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief, BHT 6, Tübingen:1930.

Schlier, H., Der Römerbrief, HTKNT Bd. vi, Freiburg:1977.

Schmithals, W., Gnosticism in Corinth, tr. J. E. Steely, Nashville:1971.

Schmithals, W., Paul and the Gnostics, tr. J. E. Steely, Nashville:1972.

Schnackenburg, R., The Gospel according to John, tr. K. Smith, vol. i, New York:1968.

Schneider, B., 'The Meaning of St Paul's Antithesis "The Letter add the Spirit"', CBQ 15 1953, 163-207.

Schneider, B., 'Κτὲρ Πνεῦμα Ἀγίου (Romans 1, 4)', Bib 48 1967, 359-387.

Schoemaker, W. R., 'The Use of Ruach in the Old Testament, and of Pneuma in the New Testament', JBL 23 1904, 13-67.

Schrenk, G., 'Geist und Enthusiasmus', Studien zu Paulus, Zürich:1954.

Schubert, K., 'The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts', The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, London:1957, 118-128.

Schweitzer, A., The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, tr. W. Montgomery, New York:1968.

Schweizer, E., Church Order in the New Testament, tr. F. Clarke, London:1961.

Schweizer, E., 'Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologische Hoffnung bei Zarathustra, spätjüdischen Gruppen, Gnostikern und den Zeugen des neuens Testaments', The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube, Cambridge, England:1956, 482-508.

Schweizer, E., The Good News according to Mark, tr. D. H. Madvig, London:1971.

Schweizer, E., 'Röm 1,3f und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus', Neotestamentica, Zürich/Stuttgart:1963, 180-189.

Schweizer, E., 'Die sieben Geister in der Apokalypse', Neotestamentica, Zürich/Stuttgart:1963, 190-202.

Scott, E. F., The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians, MNTC, London:1930.

Scott, E. F., The Pastoral Epistles, MNTC, New York:n.d.

Scott, R. B. Y., Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, AnchBib 18, Garden City, New York:1965.

Scroggs, R., 'The Exaltation of the Spirit by Some Early Christians', JBL 84 1965, 359-373.

Seitz, O. J. F., 'Two Spirits in Man: An Essay in Biblical Exegesis', NTS 6 1959-1960, 82-95.

Selwyn, E. G., The First Epistle of Peter, 2nd ed., New York:1947.

Skrinjar, A., S.J., 'Les sept esprits (Apoc 1.4; 3.1; 4.5; 5.6)', Bib 16 1935, 113-140.

Smith, H. P., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel, ICC, Edinburgh:1899.

Snaith, N. H., The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, London:1944.

Sokolowski, E., Die Begriffe Geist und Leben bei Paulus, Göttingen:1903.

Sparks, H. D. F., 'The Books of the Qumran Community', JTS N.S. 6 1955, 226-229.

Spicq, C., O.P., L'épître aux Hébreux, Sources Bibliques, 2 vols., Paris:1952.

Spicq, C., O.P., Les épîtres de Saint Pierre, Sources Bibliques, Paris:1966.

Spicq, C., O.P., 'Une réminiscence de Job XXXVII, 13 dans I Cor VI, 21', RB 60 1953, 509-512.

Stacey, W. D., The Pauline View of Man, London:1956.

Stanley, D. M., S.J., Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology, AnalectBib 13, Rome:1961.

Stein, A., 'Wo trugen die korinthischen Christen ihre Rechtshändel aus?', ZNW 59 1968, 86-90.

von Stempvoort, P. A., 'Eine stilistische Lösung einer alten Schwierigkeit in 1 Thess V 23', NTS 7 1960-1961, 262-265.

Strachan, R. H., The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, MNTC, London:1935.

Sweet, J. P. M., 'A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia', NTS 13 1967, 240-257.

Swete, H. B., The Apocalypse of John, London:1906.

Swete, H. B., The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, London:1910.

Tasker, R. V. G., The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, Tynd, London:1958.

Thistelton, A. C., 'The Meaning of Sarx in I Corinthians

5.5', SJT 26 1973, 204-228.

Thistelton, A. C., 'Semantics and New Testament Interpretation', New Testament Interpretation, ed. I. H. Marshall, Exeter:1977, 78-104.

Thrall, M., 'The Problem of II Cor VI 14 - VII 1 in Some Recent Discussion', NTS 24 1977-1978, 132-148.

Till, W. C., Die gnostische Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, TU 60, Berlin:1955.

van Unnik, W. C., 'Den Geist Löscht Nicht Aus (I Thesalonicher v 19)', NovT 10 1968, 255-269.

van Unnik, W. C., 'Is I Clement Purely Stoic?', VigChr 4 1950, 181-189.

van Unnik, W. C., 'Jesus: Anathema or Kyrios', Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. Studies in honour of C. F. D. Moule, ed. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, Cambridge, England:1973, 113-126.

Verbeke, G., L'évolution de la doctrine du pneuma, Paris/Louvain:1945.

Vermes, G., The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 3rd ed., Hammondsworth:1968.

Volz, P., Der Geist Gottes, Tübingen:1910.

Vos, J. S., Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur paulinischer Pneumatologie, Van Gorcum's theologische bibliotheek 47, Assen:1973.

Wedderburn, A. J. M., 'The Body of Christ and Related Concepts in I Corinthians', SJT 24 1971, 79-96.

Wedderburn, A. J. M., 'Romans 8.26 -- Towards a Theology of Glossolalia?', SJT 28 1975, 369-377.

Weiss, B., Biblical Theology of the New Testament, tr. D. Eaton, 2 vols., Edinburgh:1882.

Weiss, B., Der Brief an die Römer, KEK iv, Göttingen:1891.

Weiss, B., Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus, KEK xi, Göttingen:1902.

Weiss, B., Kritisch exegetisch Handbuch über den Brief an die Hebräer, Göttingen:1888.

Weiss, J., Der erste Korintherbrief, KEK v, Göttingen:1910.

Wendland, H.-D., Die Briefe an die Korinther, NTD, Göttingen:1972.

Wendt, H. H., Die Apostelgeschichte, KEK ix, 5th ed., Göttingen:1913.

Wernberg-Møller, P., The Manual of Discipline, Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah, vol. i, Grand Rapids:1957.

Wernberg-Møller, P., 'A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1Q Serek III, 13 - IV, 26)', RQ 3 1961-1962, 413-441.

Westcott, B. F., The Epistles of John, Grand Rapids:1966.

Westcott, B. F., The Epistle to the Hebrews, London:1889.

Westcott, B. F., Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, London:1906.

Whiteley, D. E. H., The Theology of Saint Paul, Oxford:1964.

Wilckens, U., Weisheit und Torheit, BHT 26, Tübingen:1959.

Wiles, G. F., Paul's Intercessory Prayers, SNTS Monograph Series 24, Cambridge, England:1974.

Wilson, R. McL., The Gnostic Problem, London:1958.

Wilson, R. McL., 'How Gnostic Were the Corinthians?', NTS 1972-1973, 65-74.

Windisch, H., Der Hebräerbrief, HNT IV 3, 2nd ed., Tübingen:1931.

Windisch, H., Der zweite Korintherbrief, KEK vi, Göttingen:1924.

Wohlenberg, G., Der erste und zweite Thessalonicherbrief, KNT xii, 2nd ed., Leipzig:1909.

Wolfson, H. A., Philo, 2 vols., 2nd ed., Cambridge, Massachusetts:1948.

Wood, W. S., '"Prostrate, Prone, Overthrown"', The Expositor, 9th Ser. 3 1925, 444-455.

Wootton, R. W. F., '"Spirit" and "Soul" in the New Testament', Bible Translator 26 1975, 239-244.

Wuellner, W., 'Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans: An Alternative to the Donfried-Karris Debate Over Romans', CBQ 38 1976, 330-351.

Zahn, T., Der Brief an die Römer, KNT vi, Leipzig:1910.

Zahn, T., Das Evangelium Matthäus, KNT i, 3rd ed., Leipzig:1910.

ABBREVIATIONS

Books

- AP Charles, R. H., ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, 2 vols., Oxford:1913.
- BAG Bauer, W., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, tr. (rev. and augm.) W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, Chicago:1957.
- BDB Gesenius, F. H. W., A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, tr. and ed. F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs, Oxford:1953.
- BDF Blass, F., and Debrunner, A., A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, tr. and rev. R. W. Funk, Chicago:1961.
- Cramer Cramer, J. A., Catenae Graecorum Patrium in Novum Testamentum, 8 vols., Oxonni:1838-1844.
- DJDJ Discoveries in the Judean Desert, 5 vols., Oxford:1955-1968.
- Lampe Lampe, G. W. H., ed., A Patristic Greek Lexicon, Oxford:1961.
- LS Liddell, H. G., and Scott, R., A Greek-English Lexicon, rev. and augm. H. S. Jones, 2 vols., Oxford:n.d.
- M Moulton, J. H., A Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol. iii, Syntax, by N. Turner, Edinburgh:1963.
- MM Moulton, J. H., and Milligan, G., The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament, London:1929.
- Moule Moule, C. F. D., An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek, Cambridge, England:19
- PG Migne, J. P., Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca, 163 vols., Paris:1857ff.
- PL Migne, J. P., Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina, 221 vols., Paris:1842ff.
- SB Strack, H. L., and Billerbeck, P., Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, München:1922ff.
- TDNT Kittel, G., and Friedrich, G., eds., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, tr. and ed. G. W. Bromley, Grand Rapids:1964-1976.
- TNT Bultmann, R., Theology of the New Testament, tr. K. Grobel, 2 vols., New York:1951, 1955.

Series

AnalectBib	Analecta Biblica
AnchBib	Anchor Bible
BET	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
CGT	Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges
CNT	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
EB	Études Bibliques
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HNTC	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
HTKNT	Herder's theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ICC	International Critical Commentary
KEK	Kritisch-exegetisch Kommentar über das Neue Testament
KNT	Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
LCC	Library of Christian Classics
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LibFath	Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church
MNTC	Moffatt New Testament Commentary
NCB	New Century Bible
NTD	Neue Testament Deutsch
NtlAb	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBTh	Studies in Biblical Theology
SNTS	Society for New Testament Studies
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
Tynd	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
UNT	Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

AngThR	Anglican Theological Review
Bib	Biblica
BibR	Biblical Research
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
EvQ	Evangelical Quarterly
EvTheol	Evangelische Theologie
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
Interp	Interpretation
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NRevTh	Nouvelle Revue Theologique
NTS	New Testament Studies
RB	Revue Biblique
RBen	Revue Benedictine
RQ	Revue de Qumran
RSR	Revue des Sciences Religieuses
RThPh	Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
StudTheol	Studia Theologica
ThZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
VetT	Vetus Testamentum
VigChr	Vigiliae Christianae
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissen- schaft
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche