The Biblical Annals

October 2022 volume 12 (69) no. 4

THE JOHN PAUL II CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN KUL 1918

The Biblical Annals ΑΩ 1963

e-ISSN: 2451-2168
ISSN: 2083-2222

The Biblical Annals

volume 12 (69) no. 4

INSTITUTE OF BIBLICAL STUDIES KUL
Lublin 2022

THE JOHN PAUL II CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN
FACULTY OF THEOLOGY
The Institute of Biblical Studies

The Biblical Annals is the official scholarly journal of the Institute of Biblical Studies at the Faculty of Theology, the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland. It is dedicated to biblical studies and it is divided into the following sections: Old Testament, Intertestamental Literature, New Testament, Varia, Review Articles, Book Reviews, and Biblical News. The journal covers fields of research such as biblical archeology, history, exegesis, philology, hermeneutics, literary studies, studies on culture and religion, and theological studies.

e-ISSN: 2451-2168
ISSN: 2083-2222

The Biblical Annals, as the journal of the Institute of Biblical Studies, has been published since 1963 by the Institute of Biblical Studies, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Al. Racławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland. From its founding, it has been issued under these previous titles: (1) Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne, fascicle 1 "Pismo Święte" (ISSN 0035-7723), 1963–1990; (2) Roczniki Teologiczne, fascicle 1 "Pismo Święte" (ISSN 12331457), 1991–2008; and (3) Roczniki Biblijne (ISSN 2080-8518), 2009–2010. The periodical is a research journal and appears four times a year. The only reference edition of the quarterly is the digital version which is available on-line at https://czasopisma.kul.pl/ba.

The quarterly is indexed in: SCOPUS, ATLA Catholic Periodical and Literature Index (ATLA CPLI), ATLA Religion Database® (ATLA RDBR), ATLAS, ATLAS plus, Biblioteka Nauki (Library of Science) , Central European Journal of Social Siences and Humanities (CEJSH), Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL), Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH PLUS), Arianta, Baza Artykułow Biblistyki Polskiej (BABP), Humanities Journals (BazHum), Index Copernicus (IC), New Testament Abstracts, Old Testament Abstracts, POL-Index, Polska Bibliografia Naukowa (PBN), Repozytorium Instytucjonalne KUL

Publisher: The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin,
Al. Racławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland

Publishing house: Wydawnictwo KUL, ul. Konstantynów 1H, 20-708 Lublin,
e-mail: wydawnictwo@kul.pl, website: http://wydawnictwo.kul.lublin.pl

Typesetting: Jarosław Łukasik

Cover design: Agnieszka Gawryszuk

Proofreader for Polish texts: Piotr Królikowski

Information about submitting articles and book reviews: Manuscripts submitted for publication in The Biblical Annals should conform to the directions given in "Author Guidelines" on http://czasopisma.kul.pl/ba/about/submissions and are to be sent to the editorial board via the same website (follow the link for "Online Submissions").

Review copies: Books sent to this journal will not be returned to the sender (regardless of whether a review of the book is published), unless such material is sent at the specific request of the editors of The Biblical Annals. Books for review should be addressed

Table of Contents

Articles

Reviews

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 12/4 (2022) 461–472

Human Creativity in the Context of Creativity of God in Gen 1–2

Wojciech Pikor
Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń
wojciech.pikor@umk.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2656-152X

Abstract: In the biblical perspective, stories about the creation of the world in Gen 1–2 remain to be the basis to a discussion about human creativity. The premise of the text – creation of man "in the image of God" – makes us assume that, according to the Bible, creativity of man is to be the image of God's creativity. Verification of this thesis goes from presenting history of interpretation of the biblical idea, namely creation of man "in the image of God," then points to the need of analyzing the narrative of this phrase. Since the image of God presented in Gen 1 is not descriptive, the second part of the paper examines the way God reveals himself in this text through his creative action. The key to God's creativity is his word of creation which he uses to differentiate created beings and establish relationships among them in order to build harmony in the newly founded world. The final part of the paper focuses on the analysis of verbs which in Gen 1–2 refer to human creativity; those verbs also point to their possible association with words as instruments for creating, organizing and arranging reality shaped by man. Following that comes the conclusion that God's creativity is extended into creativity of man who was made "in the image of God."

Keywords: Gen 1–2, creation, creativity, image of God

Creativity is "the ability to produce original and unusual ideas or to make something new or imaginative."[1] We say that a person is creative when he/she is imaginative, resourceful, capable of creating something new and original. Where does this ability come from in a man? Is it innate or has it been acquired through learning, practice and development? For the people of the Bible, creativity is associated with God's work of creation. Without this ingenuity of the Creator there would be no cosmos, no earth, animals nor people. Without God's creativity, there would also be no creativity in a man. One can draw such analogy based on the first chapter of Genesis, which presents creation of man in the image of God. Thus, man's creativity is to be the image of God's creativity. But does every human creativity deserve to be called that? When is man's creativity truly in the image of God's creativity? What is common to God's and man's creativity?[2]

1 Cf. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/pl/dictionary/english/creativity [access: 25.07.2021].

2 The above questions can be brought to just one: "On what basis can an interface between human and divine creativity be established in Sacred Scripture?" (B.W. Liesch – T.J. Finley, "The Biblical Concept of Creativity: Scope, Definition, Criteria," *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 12 [1984] 194).

DOI: 10.31743/biban.13497 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

The answer to these questions will be sought in a key statement to the whole Bible, namely that man is created "in our image, according to our likeness" (Gen 1:26). Analysis of this phrase will allow to discover the specifics of the Hebrew look onto human creativity. To this end, the classic interpretations of the statement about the creation of man in the image of God will be recalled first. In the second part of this study, the phrase in question will be reviewed from a perspective of the narrative hymn of creation in Gen 1. In the last part, the "image" of God in man will be confronted with the story of creation of man in Gen 2, which for the first time mentions fruit of creativity of man following creativity of the Creator.

1. Theological Take on Truth about the Creation of Man in the Image of God

The analysis of the phrase "in the image of God" cannot be detached from the whole hymn of creation in Gen 1:1–2:4a. The way the creation of man (1:26–30) compares to the narrative of the preceding works of creation stands out in both form and content. God's earlier creative activity was described using the same or similar formulas that built parallels between the days of creation. While referring to the creation of man, there is a considerable difference in the length of God's addressing the creation of man and describing this very act, for God speaks as many as three times on the creation of man; this takes three quarters of the text in the narrative of Gen 1:26–30. Unlike other God's works, man is not created at God's behest (the word that is the command), although God's words play an important role in the process of calling man to exist. First, these words emphasize God's direct commitment to the act of creation: the narrative proceeds from the earlier impersonal imperative form to the verb in first person plural, which shifts attention to the speaker. Secondly, God's words there is some sort of recapitulation of the works of creation to date, which makes the creating of man a culmination of the whole process.

The text Gen 1:26–27, which is the subject of direct analysis, is translated as follows:

> [26] Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, to rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, and over all the earth itself and every creature that crawls upon it." [27] So God created man in his image, in the image of God he created him: male and female he created them.

There are few philological problems with the interpretation of the above text: (1) why God, creating a man, speaks of himself in first person plural ("let us make", "in our image", "according to our likeness"; (2) how to translate the Hebrew prepositions *bə* ("in, at") and *kə* ("like, according to"); (3) are the *bəṣalmēnû* ("in our image") and *kiḏmûṯēnû* ("according to our likeness") synonymous or do they have different meanings?

As for the puzzling phrase "let us make" in 1:26 and two successive expressions: "in our image" and "according to our likeness," polytheistic view should be excluded in this

interpretation – the text is based on a Priestly tradition which was the center for renewal of religious life in Israel after Babylonian exile, and it rigorously advocated the concept of monotheism. In this context, leaving the plural form in 1:26 in relation to God is not an omission but an intentional literary procedure of the author. From narrative point of view, this biblical formula "let us make" means God's self-reflection. In the Bible this is a rare example of a plural thought (*pluralis deliberationis*) that expresses an internal monologue[3]. Such a technique of direct presentation of someone's thoughts, deliberation, discussion with self before making a decision is used not only in modern literature, but also in ancient texts.[4] The purpose of this formula in 1:26 is to put a stop to all action so that the act of creating a man is not part of a repetitive scheme of earlier works. Instead of the sequence "order – execution – effect," there is "thought – decision – effect" that emphasizes God's personal and direct action to man.

In the case of semantic relationship in 1:26 between the phrases *bəṣalmēnû* ("in our image") and *kiḏmûṯēnû* ("according to our likeness") we should recall their parallel use in Gen 5:1.3. On the one hand, it refers to the creation of man in the likeness of God (5:1), and on the other, to Seth who, as Adam's son is according to his image, in his own likeness (5:3). Just as there is no semantic difference between the prepositions *bə* and *kə,* neither is there between the nouns *ṣelem* (image) and *dəmûṯ* (likeness). Etymologically, the first term derives from the root *ṣlm*, meaning the act of cutting, splitting, slicing or drilling, and is used when referring to statues or other material depictions (cf. 2 Kgs 11:18; Ezek 16:17; 23:14). The second term, *dəmûṯ*, has an ending typical for nouns of abstract meaning and comes from the core of "to be like something, to resemble something." It defines not so much the identity as the analogy and similarity between the original and its image. Thus, the second term ("similarity") is more than just adding something new, it serves to correct the possibility of understanding of the noun "image" too literally.[5] Both of these terms

3 In this formulation some commentators might hope to see vestige of popular in religions of ancient Near East concept of the heavenly court that surrounded God (this concept is also reflected in 1 Kgs 22:19–22; Job 1:6–2:7; Isa 6:1–8), or an example *pluralis majestaticus* – the form used in the past for monarchs who were referred to per "Thou" to emphasize respect and reverence towards them. The first solution is at odds with the concept of monotheism adopted by the Priestly tradition, which supports not only the uniqueness of YHWH, but also impossibility for other celestial beings to coexist with YHWH (eg. angels), even if they acted as intermediaries (cf. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* [CC; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1994] 144–145). *Pluralis majestaticus* is a calque of modern languages but remains foreign to the language of the Hebrew Bible (or even the courts of the ancient Near East); it is difficult to find there such courtesy formulas (some exegesis experts are looking for such formulations in Ezra 4:18, but the closest context of this phrase proves that when the King Artaxerxes speaks in 1 person plural, he means his royal court as such).

4 Such examples are given in Zdzisław Pawłowski's, *Opowiadanie, Bóg i początek. Teologia narracyjna Rdz 1–3* (RSBibl 13; Warszawa: Vocatio 2003) 334. On the other hand, in the Hebrew Bible they can be identified in three places: Gen 11:7; 2 Sam 24:14; Isa 6:8.

5 Cf. E. van Wolde, *Racconti dell'Inizio. Genesi 1–11 e altri racconti di creazione* (Biblioteca biblica 24; Brescia: Queriniana 1999) 30.

describe how man relates to God. However, biblical scholars have not agreed on how to understand God's "image and likeness" in man among.[6]

In the Christian tradition, beginning with Irenaeus, the image and likeness were considered to be two different aspects of the nature: the "image" would be the innate ability (eg. thinking, feeling, etc.), and "likeness" would refer to the supernatural gifts and graces that man receives directly from the Creator and which make him like Him (e.g. ethical discernment, capability of heroic love, to sacrifice). Such distinction, however, is based on the achievements of Christian theology and not on the message of biblical description of creation.[7] Additionally, when one refers to the text Gen 5:3, where discussed terms define the relationship between Adam and his son Seth, it becomes clear that for the biblical author there are no two different orders (natural and supernatural) in human nature.

Another direction to interpretation was given by Philo of Alexandria in "On the Creation of the World" (*De opificio mundi*, 69), according to which the likeness of man to God is encapsulated in powers and spiritual abilities (followed by Augustine). Based on the biblical text, however, there is no way to determine what spiritual power they might be: the ability to think, free will, intelligence, self-awareness, or other qualities.

In the history of exegesis there was also a solution assuming that the likeness to God refers to the external appearance of man, as would indicate the use of the term *ṣelem*, used to describe specific images, figures or likenesses. Doubts about such an interpretation arise primarily from the conviction of the authors of the Hebrew Bible about the inertia and invisibility of God. Moreover, the Hebrew school of thought, until the Book of Wisdom appeared, did not know Hellenistic dualism, but it looked at man as fully integral psychophysical being.

This "duality" of man is missing in the interpretation that the image of God in man comprises the ability to enter a personal relationship with God, in a partnership in which God speaks to man, and he can respond to him.[8] This interpretation also reveals the uniqueness of human beings, who are the only creatures to have a privilege of having relationship with YHWH. However, following this thought, the "image of God" is not part of human constitution but is a description of the process of creation that makes man different from other creatures.[9]

---

6 Opinions on this subject are compiled and critically reviewed: Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 147–155; D. Dziadosz, *Tak było na początku... Izrael opowiada swoje dzieje. Literacka i teologiczna analiza wiodących tradycji Księgi Rodzaju* (Przemyśl: Wydawnictwo Archidiecezji Przemyskiej 2011) 63–71; D. Simango, "The *Imago Dei* (Gen 1:26–27). A History of Interpretation from Philo to the Present," *SHE* 42 (2016) 173–187.

7 This restriction generally applies to all subsequent interpretations of the image of God identified with an individual cognitive, spiritual or moral faculty (all compared in: Simango, "The *Imago Dei*," 178–180). Contemporary attempts to associate *imago Dei* with human rationality do not come so much from the biblical text, but rather are conditioned by data derived from neuroscience (cf. D. Fergusson, "Humans Created according to the *Imago Dei*. An Alternative Proposal," *Zygon* 48 [2013] 440–443; O.-P. Vainio, "*Imago Dei* and Human Rationality," *Zygon* 49 [2014] 126–130).

8 Cf. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 157–158.

9 K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics*. III/1. *The Doctrine of Creation* (Edinburgh: Clark 1958) 184–187; G.J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC 10; Waco, TX: Word Books 1987) 31.

The most common suggestion in the commentaries is that man, as the only being in semblance to God, is his exclusive representative on earth and represents him to all other creatures.[10] This concept of God's image in man is derived from the royal ideologies in the ancient Near East, according to which a king was the representative of the world of gods, thus receiving an absolute power over a nation or even the world. Such a view of man as a figure of an ancient king wielding power over creation can be mainly found in Ps 8. One should note that for the ancient effigies of gods and kings were considered real and reliable representations of same. Insulting or destroying the image of a deity or a king was synonymous with an actual insult. In the Hebrew Bible there is a kind of democratization of this idea, because not only the ruler, but every man is the image of God, representing him, as well as showing his greatness to the world. Claus Westermann however notes in this context,[11] that in the royal ideology a monarch was a representative of the deity as an individual, which is difficult to transfer to a "man" understood as a human race or as a human community. Besides, in the Priestly tradition the manifestation of God is the Glory of YHWH which appears "before" man, not "in" man (cf. Ezek 1:28).

The above-mentioned proposals for the interpretation of Gen 1:26–28 are not entirely satisfactory, although each of them points to some aspect of the truth concerning human existence, albeit not always directly sourced in Genesis. In this context, two solutions more clearly embedded in the narrative of Genesis deserve special attention: (1) man, against the other creatures, has a direct relationship with God, who (2) entrusts him with world domination. When asking about the "image of God" in man as a source of human creativity, one must first go from analyzing God's relationship to creation, and then look at the way God reigns in the world.

2. Narrative Reading of the "image of God" in Man

What is the image of God emerging from the story of the world's creation in Gen 1? One can look in vain for some descriptive elements of God as a person. The story has nothing in common with some systematic theological or philosophical treatise. The truth about God is discovered in his works. If we were to recall stories from the ancient Near East about the creation of the world, the main difference we notice, compared to the biblical narrative, are images full of violence, destruction and, paradoxically death. It is difficult to call these texts "cosmogonies" – these are rather "theogonies". From the existing *materia prima* emerge gods fighting among themselves which leads to formation of the universe.

10 This opinion is particularly popular among Polish biblical scholars, cf. S. Łach, *Księga Rodzaju. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz* (PST 1/1; Poznań: Pallottinum 1962) 193; T. Brzegowy, *Pięcioksiąg Mojżesza. Wprowadzenie, egzegeza, teologia* (Academica 27; Tarnów: Biblos 2010) 210–211; Dziadosz, *Tak było na początku*, 72–74; J. Lemański, *Księga Rodzaju. Rozdziały 1–11. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz* (NKB.ST 1/1; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2013) 167–168.

11 Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 153–154.

The classic text is the Akkadian poem *Enuma Elish*, which follows the conflict between gods leading to the final battle between Marduk and Tiamat. The victorious Marduk uses the body of defeated Tiamat to give the world its final geomorphological shape. Such images will not appear "in Gen 1 – no death, no destruction, no negation."[12] Even if there are elements of primal chaos (formless earth, darkness, and abyss of water in Gen 1:2), they are eliminated by the creative word of God, which puts order in place of chaos. God's creative action is not about destruction, which is clear when one looks holistically at the process of creating the world described in Gen 1.

In Gen 1, the work of creation is carried out – following the thought of Thomas of Aquinas – by the act of separation *(opus distinctionis)* and the following act of decorating *(opus ornatus)*.[13] The Lord God first establishes relationships in the cosmic dimension, separating light and darkness (day one), upper and lower waters (day two), and finally the sea from the mainland (day three). Within the designated limits, the relationship between the sun, the moon and stars (day four), between birds and fish (day five) and finally between terrestrial animals, vegetation and man (day six) are established. The art of organization of time plays a part in the spatial organization of cosmos and also plays a key role on the fourth day, when God places lights on the dome which are to separate day from night, determine the seasons, days and years. The work of creation is thus presented as an event in which God gives a certain meaning and function to every living and inanimate being.[14] "To exist" means to be in relationship; the ability to enter into relationship constitutes existence. God, therefore, not only does not destroy, but leads every creature into life. In a mosaic of the universe there is a place for all, God sees every mutual relationship with and among all creatures as "good" (1:4.10.12.18.21.25), beneficial to lives of every being. The principle of creation is diversity, which is included by God in a relationship that ultimately constitutes the unity and harmony of the cosmos, which as a whole is assessed as "very good" (1:31).

God looking seven times at the work of his creation ("he saw it was good") is not just an ordinary repetition. It conveys the message of the Creator's looking at and contemplating a very important work that comes from him but is not him.[15] This amazement on God's part makes it clear that creation is not just transformation, production, action. It is also about looking and seeing, which requires God to withhold his own creative power.[16] It is in seeing others, in focusing attention on them that their dignity and their place in the world

12 A. Wénin, *Non di solo pane... Violenza e alleanza nella Bibbia* (Epifania della Parola ns 6; Bologna: EDB 2004) 29.

13 Thomas Aquinatus, *Summa Theologica*, I, q. 70, a. 1c; Cf. P. Roszak, "Creación como relatio, assimilatio y processio. En torno a la exégesis de santo Tomás de Aquino al Gen 1,1–2,3," *BPTh* 4 (2011) 192–197.

14 Cf. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 85.

15 Wénin, *Non di solo pane*, 29. In this evaluation of God's view on the created world one can see a kind of wisdom reflection, which is also present in the inner dialogue that God engages in before creating man (cf. K. Napora, "«Aby służył i strzegł» [Rdz 2,15]. Praca jako powołanie człowieka w świetle Rdz 1–2," *VV* 25 [2014] 21–22).

16 A. Wénin, *Da Adamo ad Abramo o l'errare dell'uomo. Lettura narrativa e antropologica della Genesi*. I. *Gen 1,1–12,4* (Testi e commenti; Bologna: EDB 2008) 25.

is affirmed. This very look expresses God's consent for man to exist and develop, to his well-being and independence.

The work of creation is also comprised in the seventh day, when God "rested from all the work that he had done" (2:2). The verb *šāḇaṯ* used here indicates predominantly the act of refraining from further action. It is not about resting after the earlier work that would cause fatigue. There is not even a slightest suggestion in the text that God, by creating, may have got tired. God creates by the power of his word without any effort. God's Sabbath is in pausing, in imposing certain constraints to his own creative power in the process of creation. In this way, God takes control over his own powers.

In God's rest some commentators see evidence for perfection of creation; its fullness and completeness does not need any further divine intervention.[17] It is possible, however, that God's self-constrain is an expression of his desire to leave space for the autonomy of the world, especially man.[18] To complete creation, we need man who, as the "image" of God, will undertake the work of dominion entrusted to him by God in the world. Thus, God's creativity will have its extension and continuation in man's creativity.

The fundamental question yet remains – how does God rule in the world? This aspect of God's action toward creation is already indicated at the very beginning of Gen 1:2. This verse consists of nominal sentences describing the static and almost inert state of things; then the dynamically evolving action of creation begins to emerge.[19] This initial state of earth invokes the image of original chaos that remains under God's control through the *rûᵃḥ ʾĕlōhîm* hovering over the waters (1:2). The phrase *rûᵃḥ ʾĕlōhîm* can be translated in several ways: God's spirit, breath of God, strong wind.[20] Commentators tend to lean toward the first term, seeing in the Spirit, "the dynamic image of divine omnipotence exercising his indivisible power over" darkness and waters (the initial state of the earth[21]). However, a different interpretation is possible, following the understanding of *rûᵃḥ ʾĕlōhîm* as God's breath. André Wénin points out that further on in the narrative, all the elements that make up the earth's beginning are mentioned in a description of the following days of creation, except for one element – *rûᵃḥ ʾĕlōhîm*. However, this absence of "God's breath" is only apparent, since in fact *rûᵃḥ ʾĕlōhîm* accompanies each consecutive work of creation thus subjecting it, like all the other initial elements (darkness, waters) – to the dominion of God. God rules with his breath, turning it into a creative word.[22] God creates, by speaking the word, that is, by modulating his own breath, the life-giving energy *par excellence* in such a way that it is no longer a destructive hurricane, but a force of life expressed by the word,

17 For example, Pawłowski, *Opowiadanie, Bóg i początek*, 346.

18 The analogical situation occurred after the flood, when God restrained his own anger allowing the harmonious functioning of the world in its diversity of time-determining phenomena (Gen 8:21–22).

19 Cf. Pawłowski, *Opowiadanie, Bóg i początek*, 300–304.

20 Cf. Lemański, *Księga Rodzaju*, 151.

21 Cf. Pawłowski, *Opowiadanie, Bóg i początek*, 304.

22 Cf. Wénin, *Non di solo pane*, 32–33.

calling other beings to existence. God's omnipotence and power are entirely subordinate to God's word. This is the interpretation of *rûᵃḥ ʾĕlōhîm* found in Ps 33:6:

> By the word of YHWH the heavens were made,
> by the breath of his mouth *(bərûᵃḥ pîw)* all their host.

The act of creation as a process of differentiating and relating with one another all beings called to existence is done by the word of the Lord. Thanks to God, elements of chaos can coexist in harmony, finding their own place and positive function in the world. The word expresses the Creator's desire to organize space and time, and serves as further reference points for building cosmic order (cf.1:3–10.14–18). The word of God induces fertility of the earth and waters (cf. 1:11–12.20.24), thus giving the beings the capacity to be a source of fertility on their own accord (1:11–12.22.28a). By his word, God allocates food to each creature, so that there is no conflict and fighting over it (1:29–30). When he utters words while creating a man and a woman, God perceives them as his interlocutors, persons capable of dialogue, he makes them into beings able to speak through the very fact, that he "said to them" (1:28). On the seventh day, God also refrains from speaking. He blesses and sanctifies the Sabbath in silence, as if he wants to leave room for the word of man, for the human response; the word by which man will continue the work of creating and dominating in the world. This word is an expression of God's creativity as well as man's, whose vocation is to continue God's work of creation.

3. A Word That Builds Relationships as an Expression of Human Creativity

Although all creation remains in a relationship with God, it is only man, as the "image of God," who is granted status of a partner to the Creator. This reference of man to the person of God in Gen 1 cannot be interpreted either in terms of physicality, as semblance in external (material) sense, or ontologically as spiritual kinship, nor in a functional sense – unlike God, man cannot be the master of all creation. From the narrative point of view, this similarity must be sought on the level of creative action of God, who, through his word differentiates the world, and at the same time builds unity among all beings created by him. Human creativity must follow the same direction.

Paul Beauchamp notes that "in creating the world God established a status for mankind that remains incomplete today."[23] In a sense, man remains an infinite work. We discover the meaning of this statement in the narrative of the seventh day of creation. In the literal translation, God's activity on this day is as follows:

---

23 P. Beauchamp, *Testamento biblico* (Magnano: Qiqajon – Comunità di Bose 2007) 21.

God completed	*on the seventh day*	his work that he had done
and he rested	*on the seventh day*	from all his work he had done (2:2).

Respecting the parallel structure of this sentence, the verbs "complete" and "rest" are synonymous. From a narrative point of view, the completeness of the world created by God is not about its perfection. The completeness of the world comes from the fact that God stopped working; God paused thus setting limits to His own creative power.[24] God did not enclose the created world in some perfect sterility but made it autonomous. This autonomy is especially shared with man, who is created in the image of God. Through the prism of the seventh day, we can look at the earlier account of man's creation with different eyes.

While in Gen 1 after each piece of creation God states that it was good, there is no such concluding statement following creation of man (cf. 1:27). Some differences too ought to be noted between God's inner dialogue at the intention to create man (1:26) and the narration of this very act in 1:27. In the latter, the verb *bārāʾ* comes up three times to describe the "creation" of man (man and woman) by God, while in the former, in which God announces his idea to create man (1:26), there is only the verb "let us make" (*naʿăśeʰ*). From a narrative point of view, this *cohortativus* can be read differently than the aforementioned *pluralis deliberationis*. Instead of an internal monologue, the *pluralis* points us to see beginning of a dialogue between God and man, in this case the reader of this text, where God encourages him to complete creative work of God with their "makings".[25] This clue is confirmed in 1:27 by the absence of the term "likeness," previously used by God in the phrase "in our image according to our likeness." Doubling the term "image" in 1:27 ("So God created man in his image, in the image of God he created him, male and female created them") emphasizes that the task of men is to "make" themselves in the "likeness" of the "image" of God which they carry in themselves. Man is not likeness of God, because he also bears the likeness to animals with whom he shares sexuality as male and female. Man remains somewhat between animality and divinity. The change of personal pronouns in 1:27 – from singular to plural – does not seem to be accidental either. In the image of God, humanity is one ("created him"), but together with animal kingdom it is also plural ("created them").[26]

Man's searching for the likeness of God happens through actions which, assisted by the word, would build communion in unity.[27] The Priestly relationship in Gen 1 sees this notion in the "dominion" of man (*rāḏāʰ* in 1:26.28) and in the "subduing" of creatures (*kāḇaš* in 1:28). Gerard von Rad calls these two verbs "extremely strong expressions."[28]

---

24 Cf. Wénin, *Da Adamo ad Abramo*, 24.

25 Cf. E. Bianchi, *Adamo, dove sei?*, 149; P. Beauchamp, *All'inizio Dio parla. Itinerari biblici* (Bibbia e Preghiera 14; Roma: ADP 1992) 67; Wénin, *Non di solo pane*, 25.

26 Cf. Beauchamp, *All'inizio Dio parla*, 68; Wénin, *Da Adamo ad Abramo*, 29.

27 Cf. P. Beauchamp, *Leggere la sacra Scrittura oggi. Con quale spirito accostarsi alla Bibbia* (Milano: Massimo 1990) 69.

28 G. von Rad, *Das 1. Buch Mose.* Genesis, 12 ed. (ATD 2/4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1987) 123.

Hans Wildberger's analysis, however, shows that the first verb is rooted in a monarchic ideology of Egypt and Babylon, where it served primarily to emphasize the hierarchy in social relations.[29] In this sense, the verb *rāḏāh* appears in the Hebrew Bible to describe subjection of various social groups to royal authority (cf. 1 Kgs 5:30; 9:23; 2 Chr 8:10).[30] It can therefore be assumed that the verb *rāḏāh* in Gen 1:26.28 expresses the act of domination that is in managing, leading, and perhaps even more so, in shepherding of God-created animals.[31] The dominion entrusted to man over the world of creatures has nothing of ruthlessness or aggression – animals are not part of man's diet and they do not fear him. The second verb, *kāḇaš*, in its basic sense means "to dominate, to tread down, to make subservient." However, in terms of this verb appearing in the texts about Priestly tradition (Num 32:22.29; Josh 18:1), it points more to management and distribution of earthly goods rather than violence against it.[32] Reading the two verbs together, one can conclude that man's creativity must be inscribed in a hierarchical order established by God, the order where a person, such as king, cares for the wellbeing and welfare of his subjects (*rāḏāh*), keeping and using them within the limits outlined by God (*kāḇaš*). "To rule over" and "to fill the earth and subdue it" means above all "to duplicate the order on earth established by God in cosmos."[33] However, the text in Gen 1 does not specify how man should imitate and continue God's work of creation.

The answer is in a Yahvistic story in Gen 2.[34] This narration asserts the principle of unity in diversity, despite a different perspective on the story of creation, in particular regarding man. The world created and defined as unity of "the heavens and the earth" (2:4b), will only be further diversified when it includes the relationship with man (2:5). God's subsequent interventions fill the horizon with these creatures (trees – 2:9; rivers – 2:10–17; animals – 2:18–20); towards them all Adam – already bound by his name (*ʾāḏām*) to

29 Cf. H. Wildberger, "Das Abbild Gottes. Gen 1,26–27," *TZ* 21 (1965) 481–483.

30 Cf. J. Blenkinsopp, *Creazione, de-creazione, nuova creazione. Introduzione e commento, a Genesi 1–11* (Epifania della Parola ns 5; Bologna: EDB 2013) 44.

31 Cf. S. Szymik, "«Czyńcie sobie ziemię poddaną» (Rdz 1,28). Cywilizacyjny postęp ludzkości w świetle Rdz 1–11," *VV* 31 (2017) 27.

32 H. Seebass, *Genesis*. I. *Urgeschichte (1,1–11,16)* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1996) 84; cf. S. Wagner, "*kāḇaš*", *TDOT* VII, 53–54.

33 J. Blenkinsopp, *Pentateuco. Introduzione ai primi cinque libri della Bibbia* (Biblioteca Biblica 21; Brescia: Queriniana 1996) 78.

34 From the historical criticism point of view, Gen 1 and Gen 2 are two separate and independent creation stories that vary in both literary style and theological premise. When we look into the narration, however, these two stories constitute a narrative unity. Robert Alter (*The Art of Biblical Narrative* [New York: Basic Books 2011] 174–175) remarks that to some extent Gen 1–2 is composed in the way that resembles the technique of film editing, when by juxtaposing two independent takes of an event, one obtains not the total of individual takes, but a qualitatively new dynamic image of reality. Gen 1–2 shows two episodes that represent a single narrative event (beginning of the world and humanity) but from two different perspectives. Gen 1:1–2:4a develops the picture of the whole of creation, while Gen 2:4b-25 shows once again the sixth day of creation. To continue with the film metaphor, in Gen 2 this one day of creation is shown not only up close, with an eye on details, but also narration (dialogue) are in a slow motion and show another angle (with the narrator's "camera" on the ground, and not high above the sky as in Gen 1); cf. Pawłowski, *Opowiadanie, Bóg i początek*, 279–281.

the soil (ʾăḏāmāʰ, cf. 2:7) – is to adopt an attitude of service (ʿāḇaḏ in 2:5.15) aimed at guarding (šāmar in 2:15) the principle of unity in these diverse creations. This service is carried first with word. God creates animals, but he leaves definitions of their relationship to man. Adam's word is now needed for the work of creation to be called good. His word, through naming the animals (2:19–20), organizes, assigns and reorganizes their living space. By naming individual creatures, man acts like a Creator in Gen 1:5.8.10.[35] Much like the Creator, man naming various beings does not just assign a name to individual creatures. In this case, the word not only has a communicative function but becomes a real instrument for creating, shaping and organizing reality. Thus, God's creativity finds its extension in creativity of man who was made "in the image of God."

***

We began reading of Gen 1–2 with a question about the relationship between God's creativity and creativity of man. According to Gen 1:26–27, this connection stems directly from man being created in the image of God. In the history of exegesis, various interpretations of the expression "in the image of God" have been proposed and seen as particular cognitive and spiritual faculties, or a role of man as God's representative on earth, or relational nature of human existence. Narrative analysis allows for yet another interpretation of the image of God in man. In Genesis 1, the work of creation is depicted as an event in which God creates by speaking the word. The principle of creation that emerges is the relationship between all creatures and harmony in their diversity. God's creativity is manifested in words that distinguish but also connect individual beings with one another. Similarly, creativity based on word is a human vocation, as the narrative in Gen 2 asserts. As in the creative action of God, man is to differentiate the world through the word, while building unity among created beings. Only in this way will man be able to live and realize the truth about himself as the "image of God."

Translated by Dorota Angowska-Brennan

Bibliography

Alter, R., *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books 2011).

Barth, K., *Church Dogmatics*. III/1. *The Doctrine of Creation* (Edinburgh: Clark 1958).

Beauchamp, P., *Leggere la sacra Scrittura oggi. Con quale spirito accostarsi alla Bibbia* (Milano: Massimo 1990).

Beauchamp, P., *All'inizio Dio parla. Itinerari biblici* (Bibbia e Preghiera 14; Roma: ADP 1992).

Beauchamp, P., *Testamento biblico* (Magnano: Qiqajon – Comunità di Bose 2007).

35 Cf. G.A. Klingbeil, "'He Spoke and It Was.' Human Language, Divine Creation, and the *imago dei*," *HBT* 36 (2014) 47.

Blenkinsopp, J., *Il Pentateuco. Introduzione ai primi cinque libri della Bibbia* (Biblioteca Biblica 21; Brescia: Queriniana 1996).

Blenkinsopp, J., *Creazione, de-creazione, nuova creazione. Introduzione e commento, a Genesi 1–11* (Epifania della Parola ns 5; Bologna: EDB 2013).

Brzegowy, T., *Pięcioksiąg Mojżesza. Wprowadzenie, egzegeza, teologia* (Academica 27; Tarnów: Biblos 2010).

Dziadosz, D., *Tak było na początku... Izrael opowiada swoje dzieje. Literacka i teologiczna analiza wiodących tradycji Księgi Rodzaju* (Przemyśl: Wydawnictwo Archidiecezji Przemyskiej 2011).

Fergusson, D., "Humans Created according to the *Imago Dei*. An Alternative Proposal," *Zygon* 48 (2013) 439–453.

Klingbeil, G.A., "'He Spoke and It Was.' Human Language, Divine Creation, and the *imago dei*," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 36 (2014) 42–59.

Lemański, J., *Księga Rodzaju. Rozdziały 1–11. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny. Stary Testament 1/1; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2013).

Liesch, B.W. – Finley, T.J., "The Biblical Concept of Creativity: Scope, Definition, Criteria," *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 12 (1984) 188–197.

Łach, S., *Księga Rodzaju. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz* (Pismo Święte Starego Testamentu 1/1; Poznań: Pallottinum 1962).

Napora, K., "«Aby służył i strzegł» (Rdz 2,15). Praca jako powołanie człowieka w świetle Rdz 1–2," *Verbum Vitae* 25 (2014) 17–39.

Pawłowski, Z., *Opowiadanie, Bóg i początek. Teologia narracyjna Rdz 1–3* (Rozprawy i Studia Biblijne 13; Warszawa: Vocatio 2003).

von Rad, G., *Das 1. Buch Mose.* Genesis, 12 ed. (Das Alte Testament Deutsch 2/4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1987).

Roszak, P., "Creación como relatio, assimilatio y processio. En torno a la exégesis de santo Tomás de Aquino al Gen 1,1–2,3," *Biblica et Patristica Thoruniensia* 4 (2011) 181–199.

Seebass, H., *Genesis*. I. *Urgeschichte (1,1–11,16)* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1996).

Simango, D., "The *Imago Dei* (Gen 1:26–27). A History of Interpretation from Philo to the Present," *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 42 (2016) 172–190.

Szymik, S., "«Czyńcie sobie ziemię poddaną» (Rdz 1,28). Cywilizacyjny postęp ludzkości w świetle Rdz 1– 11," *Verbum Vitae* 31 (2017) 21–44.

Vainio, O.-P., "*Imago Dei* and Human Rationality," *Zygon* 49 (2014) 121–134.

Van Wolde, E., *Racconti dell'Inizio. Genesi 1–11 e altri racconti di creazione* (Biblioteca biblica 24; Brescia: Queriniana 1999).

Wagner, S., "kāḇaš," *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (eds. G.J. Botterweck – H. Rinnren – H.-J. Fabry) (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1995) VII, 52–57.

Wenham, G.J., *Genesis 1–15* (Word Biblical Commentary 10; Waco, TX: Word Books 1987).

Wénin, A., *Non di solo pane... Violenza e alleanza nella Bibbia* (Epifania della Parola ns 6; Bologna: EDB 2004).

Wénin, A., *Da Adamo ad Abramo o l'errare dell'uomo. Lettura narrativa e antropologica della Genesi*. I. *Gen 1,1–12,4* (Testi e commenti; Bologna: EDB 2008).

Westermann, C., *Genesis 1–11* (A Continental Commentary; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1994).

Wildberger, H., "Das Abbild Gottes. Gen 1,26–27," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 21 (1965) 245–259, 481–501.

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 12/4 (2022) 473–501

The Sick Person's Relationship with God in the Healing Process according to Ben Sira (Sir 38:9–11)

Andrzej Piwowar
The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
andrzej.piwowar@kul.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9316-1791

Abstract: Ben Sira's teaching on medicine and healing in Sir 38:1–15 is divided into two parts: the first (38:1–8) deals directly with the medicine of the time (doctors – 38:1–3 and the medicines they used – 38:4–8), while the second focuses on the healing process (38:9–15). In the latter, the sage first focuses on the attitude of the sick (38:9–11) towards God and the role and tasks of the physician in the process of healing the sick (38:12–15). The article addresses Ben Sira's teaching on the relationship of the sick man to the Lord (38:9–11). The sage, after positively evaluating and responding to modern medicine (a novelty in the Old Testament), returns in 38:9–11 to the *implicitly* expressed conviction found in the Bible that only God can restore health to a sick person – that He is the only physician. He therefore urges the sick person to turn to God. According to the sage, turning to the Most High (38:9a), prayer (38:9b), the rejection of sin and iniquity (38:10) and sacrifices (38:11) play an important role in the process of recovery. Sir 38:9–11 has a concentric structure with a call for a change in moral conduct at its centre (38:10). These are surrounded by appeals to turn to the Lord (38:9 and 38:11). According to Ben Sira, healing from illness is the work of God, so the sick person should make a conversion (abandon sin and turn away from evil) and renew his relationship with the Most High. According to him, conversion is crucial in the healing process – without it, the sick person cannot return to health and full strength. In this way, the sage expresses the Old Testament teaching about illness as the result of sin (retribution) and God as the only physician. What is new in Ben Sira's teaching is the call to offer sacrifices for the recovery of health and healing from suffering.

Keywords: Ben Sira, Sir 38:9–11, illness, healing, treatment, sick person

Sir 38:9–11 is part of a larger literary unit (Sir 38:1–15) in which the sage of Jerusalem refers to modern medicine. He was faced with a difficult situation because, on the one hand, he perceived its positive value; on the other, as a man who believed in the one God, he had to oppose and reject the magical elements with which it was quite clearly associated in antiquity (they were even an integral part of the healing process). Already in the first part of his argument concerning attitudes towards the physician (Sir 38:1–3)[1] and medicines (Sir 38:4–8),[2] Ben Sira made a perfect synthesis between the medicine of his time and faith in God. In the second part of his reflection on the treatment of suffering people, he focused

1 See A. Piwowar, "Respect for the Doctor (Sir 38:1–3)," *BibAn* 10/1 (2020) 31–62.

2 See A. Piwowar, "The Origin and Significance of Medicaments According to Ben Sira (Sir 38:4–8)," *BibAn* 11/1 (2021) 25–62.

DOI: 10.31743/biban.13485 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

first on the sick person's attitude towards God (Sir 38:9–11) – the only Physician who can restore health to the suffering person and cure him of his ailments.

In this article, the Greek text of Sir 38:9–11 will be analysed exegetically and theologically. The reason for choosing this version of the text of the work of the sage from Jerusalem is the fact that it, and not the Hebrew original, has been recognised as canonical. In the course of the analyses, references will also be made to the Hebrew text. Before discussing the actual pericope which is the subject of this article, the teaching of the Old Testament on the attitude of the sick man towards God will first be presented in a very synthetic way. Then a delimitation of Sir 38:9–11 will be made and its translation and structure will be presented. In the following part of the article, an exegetical and theological analysis of the examined text will be carried out, which will allow conclusions to be drawn concerning the teaching of Ben Sira on the attitude of the suffering man towards the Lord in time of illness.

1. The Relationship of the Sick Person with God during Illness in the Old Testament

Throughout the ancient world there was a belief that illness was the result of sin committed by man and a punishment for the evil done[3] (cf. Num 12:11–12; Deut 28:15–69; Ps 38:4).[4]

3 "In the ancient East, illness was regarded as a punishment that was either brought by evil spirits or sent by the gods, who were angry because of certain transgressions in the offering of sacrifices. In order to regain health, exorcisms were practised to expel demons; attempts were also made to win over the gods through prayers and sacrifices" (J. Giblet – P. Grelot, "Choroba-uleczenie," *Słownik teologii biblijnej*, 3 ed. [ed. X. Léon-Dufour] [Poznań: Pallottinum 1990] 121). "At all stages of life sickness makes a profound and at first incomprehensible incision. About the only thing that primitive man can understand as a cause of physical ailment is the wound received in battle. By way of analogy he comes to regard sicknesses which he cannot understand as 'attacks'. The assailants suspected are more or less personally conceived evil powers which either strike man down, bombard him with less powerful but more artful shots, or even take possession of him. He expects healing through the overcoming of these hostile powers by magic, if necessary by countermagic, or by propitiatory offerings" (A. Oepke, "ἰάομαι, ἴασις, ἴαμα, ἰατρός," *TDNT* III, 195). Cf. L.A. Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira (Sir 38:1–15; 41:1–15; 43:11–19;44–50)* (Diss. Queen's College, University of Cambridge; Cambridge 2016) https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1810/255388/Scribal%20Culture%20in%20Ben%20Sira_v2corrected.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y [access: 9.06.2022] 212, 220; F. Graber – D. Müller, "ἰάομαι," *NIDNTT* II, 166; Piwowar, "Respect for the Doctor (Sir 38:1–3)," 32–38; D.P. Sulmasy, "The Covenant within the Covenant: Doctors and Patients in Sir 38:1–15," *Linacre Quaorterly* 55 (1988) 17.

4 See M. Adinolfi, "Il medico in *Sir* 38,1–15," *Anton* 62 (1987) 180; N. Allan, "The Physician in Ancient Israel: His Status and Function," *Medical History* 45 (2001) 377; J.L. Crenshaw, "The Book of Sirach. Introduction, Commentary, and Reflection," *The New Interpreter's Bible* (ed. L.E. Keck) (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press 1997) V, 807; S. Fasce, *La lode del medico nel libro biblico del Siracide* (Genova: ECIG 2009) 34; Giblet – Grelot, "Choroba-uleczenie," 122–123; L. Mazzinghi, "«Poi fa' posto al Medico, perché ti è necessario» (Sir 38,1–15)," *PSV* 40 (1999) 68; J.G. Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus or The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1974) 184; W.M. Stabryła, "Zdrowie i choroba w starożytnym Izraelu," *Więcej szczęścia jest w dawaniu aniżeli w braniu. Memorial Book for Professor Waldemar Chrostowski on His 60th Birthday* (ed. B. Strzałkowska) (Ad Multos Annos; Warszawa: Adam 2011) III, 1317, 1318, 1323; A. Stöger, "Der Arzt nach Jesus Sirach (38,1–15)," *Arzt und Christ* 11/1 (1965) 9; E. Testa, "Le malattie e il medico

The above conviction can still be seen in the time of Jesus (see John 9:2: "Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents, that he was born blind??").[5] Physical suffering and pain was therefore not just a psychosomatic issue, but was more about religion and belief in God.[6] Since the disease was the result of iniquity, its treatment also had a religious dimension and was closely related to faith. As a result of this conviction, in the Old Testament, before the Babylonian captivity (6th century B.C.), the Jews believed that God was the only physician[7] (cf. Exod 15:26[8]; Deut 32:39; 2 Kgs 20:5, 8; Job 5:18; Ps 103:3; 107:20; 147:1–3;

---

secondo la Bibbia," *RivB* 43 (1995) 256–257, 262–263. Maciej Münnich (*Obraz Jahwe jako władcy choroby w Biblii Hebrajskiej na tle bóstw bliskowschodnich* [Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL 2004] 233–305) lists as causes of exile among others: unfaithfulness to the Covenant and the Law, idolatry, disobedience to Yahweh and His messengers, worship offences, sexual offences, murder, social offences, census, sin, rebellion, etc. "Lo schema «delitto-castigo» può essere formulato anche come «peccato-malattia," ove i due piani, fisico e metafisico, s'incrociano senza imbarazzo" (G. Ravasi, "Malattia, Guarigione e medici nell'Antico Testamento," *PSV* 40 [1999] 13). "Gli autori biblici presentano una visione decisamente pre-scientifica della malattia, e immaginano che forze esterne abbiano un ruolo significativo nei fattori che la causano. Talvolta si dice esplicitamente che il malessere ha un'origine maligna, benché permessa da Dio" (L. Ryken – J.C. Wilhoit – T. Longman III [eds.], *Le immagini bibliche. Simboli, figure retoriche e temi letterari della Bibbia* [Dizionari San Paolo; Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo 2006] 831). Cf. Ravasi, "Malattia, Guarigione e medici nell'Antico Testamento," 13–14; Ryken – Wilhoit – Longman III, *Le immagini bibliche*, 832; Sulmasy, "The Covenant within the Covenant," 19–20; M. Zakrzewska, "Choroba – zło dotykające człowieka," *Biblia a medycyna* (ed. B. Pawlaczyk) (Poznań: Księgarnia Świętego Wojciecha 2007) 17, 22–23; B.M. Zapff, *Jesus Sirach 25–51* (NEchtB.AT; Würzburg: Echter 2010) 253.

5 See Adinolfi, "Il medico in *Sir* 38,1–15," 180; Ryken – Wilhoit – Longman III, *Le immagini bibliche*, 832.

6 See G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach/Ben Sira* (ATD. Apokryphen 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2000) 261.

7 "Solo Jahvè è Signore della malattia e della guarigione. Questa è la certezza biblica ininterrotta. Guarigioni naturali e miracolose non vengono fondamentalmente distinte nel Vecchio Testamento. Sia che cooperino-disposizioni umane e pratiche o no, è assolutamente essenziale il fatto che il malato incontra nella sua malattia e il convalescente nella sua guarigione Dio, il quale manda mediatamente o senza mediazioni la malatia e la guarigione" (H.W. Wolff, *Antropologia dell'Antico Testamento*, 4 ed. [Biblioteca Biblica 12; Brescia: Queriniana 2002] 191). Cf. Adinolfi, "Il medico in *Sir* 38,1–15," 176; Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 213; W. Chrostowski, "Lekarz i jego posługa w świetle Biblii," *CT* 3 (2001) 51; Crenshaw, "The Book of Sirach," 807; Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 31; F. Gaiser, "'The sensible will not despise him': Healing Medicine, Human Wisdom and God (Sirach 38:1–15)," *Healing in the Bible. Theological Insight for Christian Ministry* (ed. F.J. Gaiser) (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 2010) 122; Giblet – Grelot, "Choroba-uleczenie," 123; Graber – Müller, "ἰάομαι," 167; H.C. Kee, "Medicine and Healing," *ABD* IV, 659–660; D. Lührmann, "Aber auch Arzt gib Raum (Sir 38,1–15)," *WD* 15 (1979) 56–57; Mazzinghi, "«Poi fa' posto al Medico, perché ti è necessario» (Sir 38,1–15)," 68; Oepke, "ἰάομαι, ἴασις, ἴαμα, ἰατρός," 201; Ravasi, "Malattia, Guarigione e medici nell'Antico Testamento," 17–18, 20; W.M. Stabryła, "'Najlepszego nawet lekarza czeka Gehenna'. Lekarz w starożytnym Izraelu," *AK* 160/1 (2013) 8; Also, "Zdrowie i choroba w starożytnym Izraelu," 1323–1324; Stöger, "Der Arzt nach Jesus Sirach (38,1–15)," 5; Sulmasy, "The Covenant within the Covenant," 16; Testa, "Le malattie e il medico secondo la Bibbia," 253–254, 256, 258–260; Zakrzewska, "Choroba – zło dotykające człowieka," 23–24; Zapff, *Jesus Sirach 25–51*, 253.

8 "Many scholars point to Exod 15:26 as an explanation for the biblical silence on physicians and medical treatment" (I. Cranz, "Advice for a Successful Doctor's Visit: King Asa Meets Ben Sira," *CBQ* 80 [2018] 233). Cf. Gaiser, "The sensible will not despise him," 118; M.P. Scanu, "«Io sono JHWH, colui che ti guarisce»: Es 15,26. Considerazioni sulla metafora terapeutica in prospettiva teologica," *PSV* 40 (1999) 23–39; B.M. Zapff, "Sir 38,1–15 als Beispiel der Verknüpfung von Tradition und Innovation bei Jesus Sirach," *Bib* 92 (2011) 349.

Isa 19:22; 57:18–19; 61:1; Jer 30:17; 33:6 and Hos 6:1; 11:3[9]). "He was the source of health and the root cause of disease."[10] He alone could heal man and free him from ailment and pain. "Any deviation from this rule was considered a betrayal of the purity of faith."[11] Therefore, it is not surprising that a sick Israelite would turn first and foremost to God during his illness, asking Him to restore his health and relieve his pain.[12]

Since the only doctor – in the full sense of the word – was God, and people engaged in healing could only be considered as intermediaries and transmitters of His healing power,[13] the healing process itself was dependent on the sick person's relationship with God.[14] The rejection of evil and sin, which were the cause of the disease, played an important role in it. It was nothing less than a conversion to the Lord.[15] Prayers,[16] sacrifices, fidelity to the Covenant, keeping the Law and deeds towards other people[17] were also important in the process of recovery. Also important was the forgiveness from God and His mercy shown to the sinner – the sick person. Waldemar Chrostowski rightly notes that "healing also has a spiritual sense, coinciding with conversion."[18] God Himself sometimes sent illnesses to people so that they would convert (see 2 Sam 12:15; Job 5:17–18; Ps 32:3–5; 38; Hab 3:3–5).[19]

---

9 Waldemar Chrostowski ("Lekarz i jego posługa w świetle Biblii," 51–54) believes that also the second description of the creation of the world (Gen 2:4b–3:24) presents God as a doctor, a doctor of four specialisations: an anasthesiologist, orthopaedist, surgeon and plastic surgeon. In this role, according to this exegete, He was also shown on His way through the desert during the Exodus from Egypt (Exod 15:22–27). With regard to Exod 15:22–27 cf. M.L. Brown, "רָפָא *rāpā'*," *TDOT* XIII, 601.

10 Stabryła, "Zdrowie i choroba w starożytnym Izraelu," 1324. Cf. Münnich, *Obraz Jahwe jako władcy choroby*, 45–116.

11 Stabryła, "'Najlepszego nawet lekarza czeka Gehenna'," 8. "In pre-exilic Israel, there was no place for the physician, healing being the exclusive preserve of God. Any attempt to infringe this preserve was regarded as a dereliction of faith in God's power to heal" (Allan, "The Physician in Ancient Israel," 393). Cf. Allan, "The Physician in Ancient Israel," 379, 393; G. Pérez Rodríguez, "Eclesiástico," *Biblia Comentada*. IV. *Libros Sapienciales*, 2 ed. (Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 218; Madrid 1967) 1242; Stabryła, "Zdrowie i choroba w starożytnym Izraelu," 1323–1324.

12 "Nelle culture antiche, la preghiera di intercessione nella malattia è una pratica universale e istituzionalzzata, con diversi presupposti ideologici e valenza non solo religiosa" (Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 82).

13 "Il Signore offre la sua guarigione spesso attraverso alcuni mediatori che sono investiti da lui e che quindi partecipano della sacralità. Innanzitutto c'è il profeta che può trasmettere l'energia sanante divina [...]. C'è, poi, il sacerdote che, soprattutto nei casi di malattie causa di impurità rituali, aveva la funzione di suggellare ufficialmente la realtà del morbo e la guarigione" (Ravasi, "Malattia, Guarigione e medici nell'Antico Testamento," 18).

14 "Above all, help must be sought from God, for He is the Lord of life [...]. It is He who sends diseases and cures from them [...]. He is, in the full sense of the word, the physician of man" (Giblet – Grelot, "Choroba-uleczenie," 123). Cf. Graber – Müller, "ἰάομαι," 166; Zakrzewska, "Choroba – zło dotykające człowieka," 22.

15 "[...] although punishment was in the hand of God so was healing if the subject was contrite" (Allan, "The Physician in Ancient Israel," 377). Cf. Zakrzewska, "Choroba – zło dotykające człowieka," 24.

16 See Adinolfi, "Il medico in *Sir* 38,1–15," 180; Oepke, "ἰάομαι, ἴασις, ἴαμα, ἰατρός," 202; Wolff, *Antropologia dell'Antico Testamento*, 192.

17 See Chrostowski, "Lekarz i jego posługa w świetle Biblii," 60–62; Münnich, *Obraz Jahwe jako władcy choroby*, 305–337; Ravasi, "Malattia, Guarigione e medici nell'Antico Testamento," 18–19.

18 Chrostowski, "Lekarz i jego posługa w świetle Biblii," 60. Cf. Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 33.

19 See Ryken – Wilhoit – Longman III, *Le immagini bibliche*, 832.

In the Old Testament, one can find many testimonies depicting the implementation of the above beliefs and convictions in the daily lives of individual people.[20] They are based on the belief expressed in Ps 103:3: "who [God – author's note] forgives all your sins, who heals all your diseases."[21] Moses prayed for his sister Miriam when she was stricken with leprosy because of her murmuring against Moses (see Num 12:9–14).[22] Similarly, David asked the Lord to heal his son whom Bathsheba had borne him (see 2 Sam 12:15–23). Also King Hezekiah, when he fell ill, prayed to the Lord and was healed (see 2 Kgs 20:1–11; Isa 38).[23] Also some of the psalms contain prayers of suffering people, convinced that their suffering is a punishment for the sin they have committed. They express requests to the Most High for healing (see Ps 38; 41; 88[24]; 107:17–20; 116:3–4).[25] Thanks to prayer, not only the sick recovered, but even the dead were raised and brought back to life (see 1 Kgs 17:8–24 and 2 Kgs 4:32–35). In a few cases, certain rituals and symbolic activities were also important in the process of curing the patient of his ailments.[26]

Most certainly, the conviction of the ancient Israelites that sin and wrongdoing were the cause of illness (the principle of retribution) and their belief in the healing power of God, the only Physician who could cure a man who repented of his transgressions and wished to repent and thus be cured, are the background to the teaching of Ben Sira concerning the attitude of the sick person towards the Lord during his illness.

---

20 "L'uomo di fede, che in prima risposta alla sofferenza eleva a Dio la sua preghiera personale, con sincerità e con l'impegno a praticare la giustizia, secondo il modello dell'Antico Testamento, può sperare legittimamente di essere esaudito. Colui che rivolge preghiere, promette offerte e compie sacrifici, ma insiste nell'errore, viene respinto" (Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 81–82). "W biblijnym Izraelu dobrze zdawano sobie sprawę z różnicy między lekarskim rozpoznawaniem i ustalaniem przyczyn chorób po to, aby im zaradzić i przynieść ulgę w cierpieniach, a poleganiem na Bogu i kierowanymi do Niego prośbami o zdrowie" (Chrostowski, "Lekarz i jego posługa w świetle Biblii," 59).

21 See Testa, "Le malattie e il medico secondo la Bibbia," 254.

22 See Testa, "Le malattie e il medico secondo la Bibbia," 262.

23 See Chrostowski, "Lekarz i jego posługa w świetle Biblii," 59–60; Ravasi, "Malattia, Guarigione e medici nell'Antico Testamento," 16.

24 "The situation of the man described in this prayer is tragic. He has been seriously ill since his youth, but it is difficult to determine what kind of illness it is. Sensing death approaching, the suffering man trusts God to the end" (J. Turkiel, "Septuaginta o lekarzu," *Nauki humanistyczne i sozologia. Jubilee Book Dedicated to Prof. Józef M. Dołęga, Doctor Habilitated* [ed. J.W. Czartoszewski] [Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW 2010] 565–566).

25 See H. Duesberg, *Le Psautier des malades* (BVC 3; Maredsous: Editions de Maredsous 1952); L. Manicardi, "Il Salterio dei malati," *PSV* 40 (1999) 41–63; Ravasi, "Malattia, Guarigione e medici nell'Antico Testamento," 18–19; K. Seybold, *Das Gebet des Kranken im Alten Testament. Untersuchungen zur Bestimmung und Zuordnung der Krankheits- und Heilungspsalmen* (BWANT 99; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1973).

26 "Curiosi, anche per il loro valore apotropaico, sono i rituali di «transfer» come il serpente di bronzo nel deserto (Nm 21,8–9?) o il legno gettato nelle acque di Mara (Es 15,25). Significativo è il rito di immersione per sette volte nelle acque lustrali del Giordano imposto da Eliseo a Naaman (2Re 5,10)" (Ravasi, "Malattia, Guarigione e medici nell'Antico Testamento," 19).

2. Sir 38:9–11 and the Closer Context of the Analysed Pericope

Sir 38:9–11 – as already stated in the introduction to this article – forms part of a larger literary unit (Sir 38:1–15) which is devoted to the sage's teaching on contemporary medicine and healing. Ben Sira devoted the first part of his reflection in relation to these issues directly to medicine. He first encouraged the Israelites to use doctors and to reject the fear of them and their practices (Sir 38:1–3).[27] He then drew attention to the fact that the medicines they used were of natural and not magical origin, and that therefore their use for the relief of pain and for the healing process itself should also not be feared (Sir 38:4–8).[28] Immediately following these two sections of the sage's teaching on medicine and the treatment of disease is the pericope examined in the article. It fits perfectly into the preceding context as it deals with the process of recovery and health of a suffering person. It is important to note, however, its slightly different nature in comparison to Sir 38:1–3 and Sir 38:4 Both of these sections refer directly to medicine (the doctor and the medicines he uses). The theme of Sir 38:9–11, on the other hand, is the attitude the sick person should take towards God during his illness. The verses immediately following the section of Sir 8:1–15 under study, i.e. Sir 38:12–15, are devoted to the role and tasks of the physician in the process of healing the sick. Sir 38:9–15, therefore, share a common theme, which is the answer to the question: what should a sick person do to recover and return to full health? On the basis of an analysis of the closer context, it can be concluded that Sir 38:9–11 fits perfectly into the theme of the sage of Jerusalem's teaching on medicine and healing, forming an integral part of it.

Not only does the content of Ecclus 38:1–15 indicate that Sir 38:9–11 is a separate part of this text as an independent and distinct literary unit within it. This is also confirmed by the formal analysis of the text under study. Sir 38:9 begins with the exclamation τέκνον ("child").[29] This is a very clear sign of the beginning of a new pericope[30] or a change of thought in the sage's teaching.[31] Therefore, all scholars of Sir 38:1–15 agree that in

27 See Piwowar, "Respect for the Doctor (Sir 38:1–3)," 41–57.

28 See Piwowar, "The Origin and Significance of Medicaments," 25–62.

29 It is the vocative of the noun τέκνον, with which the sage very often addresses his disciples, wishing to emphasise the importance of the teaching he is imparting to them (see. A. Piwowar, "Wierność w czasie próby [Syr 2,1–6]," *VV* 11 [2007] 101). Cf. Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 76; J. Haspecker, *Gottesfurcht bei Jesus Sirach. Ihre Religiöse Struktur und Ihre Literarische und Doktrinäre Bedeutung* (AnBib 30; Rom: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut 1967) 94, n. 17; L. Schrader, "Beruf, Arbeit und Muße als Sinnerfüllung bei Jesus Sirach," *Der Einzelne und seine Gemeinschaft bei Ben Sira* (eds. R. Egger-Wenzel – I. Krammer) (BZAW 270; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 1998) 139.

30 See Sir 2:1; 3:17; 4:1; 6:18; 16:24; 18:15; 21:1; 37:27; 38:16; 40:28 (cf. A. Minissale, *Siracide. Le radici nella tradizione* [Leggere Oggi la Bibbia 1/17; Brescia: Queriniana 1988] 17).

31 See Sir 3:12; 6:23.32; 10:28; 14:11; 31:22; 38:9 (cf. Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 76; Piwowar, "The Origin and Significance of Medicaments," 31–32; Piwowar, "Zdobycie mądrości według Syracha [Syr 6,18–37]. Część I: Przyjęcie wychowania prowadzi do osiągnięcia mądrości [Syr 6,18–22]," *BibAn* 5/1 [2015] 113–114, 118; Schrader, "Beruf, Arbeit und Muße als Sinnerfüllung bei Jesus Sirach," 134).

Sir 38:9 a new section of this larger pericope begins.[32] Note also that in Sir 38:9–11 almost all verb forms are expressed in the imperative mode[33] (seven out of nine).[34] It is also noteworthy that all the imperatives are in the aorist. This makes Sir 38:9–11 a sequence of very strong (emphatic) exhortations addressed to the sage disciple/listener. It is true that also in Sir 38:12 there are two forms of the aorist imperative mode (δὸς in v. 12a and ἀποστήτω in v. 12b), which could argue for the inclusion of this verse in Sir 38:9–11,[35] but a new character appears in it – the doctor (ἰατρῷ; v. 12a), who is the main protagonist of Sir 38:12–15 (his character ties the present verses together). It should therefore be considered that Sir 38:12, although identical in form to Sir 38:9–11, should be regarded as the beginning of a new – the last – section of Sir 38:1–15[36] because of the new protagonist introduced in it. The belonging of Sir 38:12 to the next section of Ben Sira's teaching on medicine and the process of healing from illness is also justified by the noun ἰατρός ("physician") appearing in Sir 38:15b, which together with Sir 38:12 forms its framework. On the basis of the analysis carried out, therefore, it can be concluded that Sir 38:12 forms a bridge between Sir 38:9–11 and Sir 38:12–15,[37] and is a transition from the attitude of the sick person towards God to the role and task of the physician in the process of healing the sick.

---

32 See L. Alonso Schökel, *Proverbios y Eclesiastico* (Los Libros Sagrados 14; Madrid: Cristiandad 1968) 280; Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 202; Chrostowski, "Lekarz i jego posługa w świetle Biblii," 65; Crenshaw, "The Book of Sirach," 808; Lührmann, "Aber auch Arzt gib Raum (Sir 38,1–15)," 59; Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 76; Mazzinghi, "«Poi fa' posto al Medico, perché ti è necessario» (Sir 38,1–15)," 70; S. Noorda, "Illness and Sin, Forgiving and Healing: the Connection of Medical Treatment and Religious Beliefs in Ben Sira 38,1–15," *Studies in Hellenistic Religions* (ed. M. Vermaseren) (Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans L'Empire Romain 78; Leiden: Brill 1979) 220; Schrader, "Beruf, Arbeit und Muße als Sinnerfüllung bei Jesus Sirach," 134–135, 139; P.W. Skehan – A.A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (The Anchor Bible 39; New York – London – Toronto: Doubleday 1987) 442; Testa, "Le malattie e il medico secondo la Bibbia," 260; Zapff, "Sir 38,1–15 als Beispiel der Verknüpfung," 362.

33 Here is a list of all the imperatives from Sir 38:9–11: παράβλεπε (v. 9a), εὖξαι (v. 9b), ἀπόστησον ι εὔθυνον (v. 10a), καθάρισον (v. 10b), δὸς (v. 11a) oraz λίπανον (v. 11b). See P.C. Beentjes, "A Problematic Symbol in Ben Sira 38,13. Short Note," *Estudios Bíblicos* 76/3 (2018) 455.

34 In Sir 38:9b, there is a form of the future tense indicative mode (ἰάσεταί – "he will heal") which expresses the expected effect of turning to God in time of illness. In 39:11b, on the other hand, there is a present participle of the active voice (ὑπάρχων – "being") which, while not being a personal form and expressing a secondary action, does not play a major role in the section under review.

35 Pancratius C. Beentjes ("A problematic symbol in Ben Sira 38,13," 455–456) considers that Sir 38:12 belongs to the section of Sir 38:1–15 begun in Sir 38:9.

36 See Gaiser, "The sensible will not despise him," 124; Lührmann, "Aber auch Arzt gib Raum (Sir 38,1–15)," 64; J. Marböck, *Weisheit im Wandel. Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira* (BZAW 272; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 1999) 155; Skehan – Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 442; Stöger, "Der Arzt nach Jesus Sirach (38,1–15)," 9. Beentjes ("A problematic symbol in Ben Sira 38,13," 455–459) considers Sir 38:12 to be part of Sir 38:9–12 because, in his view, the verses following it, i.e. Sir 38:13–15, are a later addition.

37 In the Book of Sirach, there are often verses that can be described as bridges connecting parts or sections of his work. On the one hand, they continue the theme or subject matter of an earlier part of the teaching, while on the other they contain elements indicating a transition to another thought or theme. In this way, they constitute a smooth transition, often almost imperceptible between the different parts or sections of the book. They very often give rise to controversy relating to their affiliation with the preceding or succeeding literary unit. An example of this kind of verse being a combination of two sections of the work of Ben Sira is Sir 38:12.

To sum up, the delimitation study made of the pericope analysed in this article, it can be assumed that, on the basis of both content and form, Sir 38:9–11 constitutes a separate section within Sir 38:1–15.[38] Its coherence and literary distinctness are also confirmed by the structure of this text (cf. para. 3).

3. Text of Sir 38:9–11 and Its Structure

The translation of the text of Sir 38:9–11 is based on the critical edition of the Greek version of the Book of Sirach published by Joseph Ziegler.[39]

38:9 My child, when you are ill, do not rebel,
but pray to the Lord and he will heal you.
38:10 Renounce your faults, keep your hands unsoiled,
and cleanse your heart from all sin.
38:11 Offer incense and a memorial of fine flour,
make as rich an offering as you can afford.[40]

Essentially, the Greek text of Sir 38:9–11[41] is identical in the essence of its theological message to its Hebrew prototype, i.e. there are no significant differences between them

38 See Chrostowski, "Lekarz i jego posługa w świetle Biblii," 65–66; V. Morla Asensio, *Eclesiastico* (El Mensaje del Antiguo Testamento 20; Salamanca: Sigueme 1992) 186; M.C. Palmisano, *Siracide. Introduzione, traduzione e commento* (Nuova Versione della Bibbia dai Testi Antichi 34; Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo 2016) 344–345; Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus*, 184–185; H. Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter. Eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor-makkabäischen Sōfēr unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrertum* (WUNT 2/6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1980) 139–140; Stöger, "Der Arzt nach Jesus Sirach (38,1–15)," 8–9; Zapff, *Jesus Sirach 25–51*, 255.

39 See J. Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*, 2 ed. (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gotteingensis editum 12/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1980) 300.

40 For a translation of the Greek text of Sir 38:1–15 cf. Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 125; W. Kraus – M. Karrer (eds.), *Septuaginta Deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 2009) 1142; *Księgi greckie. Grecko-polski Stary Testament. Przekład interlinearny z kodami gramatycznymi i indeksem form podstawowych* (trans. M. Wojciechowski) (Prymasowska Seria Biblijna; Warszawa: Vocatio 2008) 647–648; Mazzinghi, "«Poi fa' posto al Medico, perché ti è necessario» (Sir 38,1–15)," 66; Palmisano, *Siracide*, 345; A. Pietersma – B.G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint. And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title* (New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press 2007) 750; *Septuaginta, czyli Biblia Starego Testamentu wraz z księgami deuterokanonicznymi i apokryfami* (trans. R. Popowski) (Prymasowska Seria Biblijna; Warszawa: Vocatio 2013) 1245.

41 See P.C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew. A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 68; Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill 1997) 66; P. Boccaccio – G. Bernardi, *Ecclesiasticus. Textus hebraeus secundum fragmenta reperta* (Roma: PIB 1986) 25; *The Book of Ben Sira. Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary* (The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language; Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Shrine of the Book 1973) 39; *The Book of Ben Sira*, http://bensira.org/navigator.php?Manuscript=B&PageNum=27 [access: 20.06.2019]. Cf. Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 187; I. Lévi, *The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus* (Semitic Study Series; Leiden: Brill 1904) 44–45; N. Peters, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus. Übersetzt und Erklärt* (EHAT 25; Münster: Aschendorff 1913) 310–311; Also N. Peters, *Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder 1902) 157–158;

that would change the meaning of individual stiches completely or significantly.[42] The two forms of the text do, however, differ on the level of detail contained within them. Attention should also be drawn to the fact that the original text of the verses in question has not been preserved in its entirety to the present day (stichs 38:9ab,10b and 11b have survived in their entirety, while the rest, i.e. 38:10a and 38:11a, contain more or less damage).

The structure of this short literary unit (only six stiches) is quite clear. Its first and third verses refer *explicitly* or *implicitly* to God. Sir 38:9 calls for turning to Him during illness, while Sir 38:11 encourages offering sacrifices to Him. The middle verse (Sir 38:10) focuses on the moral attitude of the sick person and encourages him to repent. This central exhortation is also motivated, albeit indirectly, by the Lord, and more specifically by the principle of retribution (God rewards for good and punishes for evil). The structure of Sir 38:9–11 is therefore concentric.

A – turning to God – personal prayer (Sir 38:9)
    B – moral cleansing (Sir 38:10)
A' – turning to God – cultic sacrifices (Sir 38:11).[43]

At the core is the central thought. It calls for a change of conduct – conversion (abandonment of evil and cleansing of previously committed sins). The fringe verses point on the one hand to God as the motivation for abandoning evil, and on the other hand to specific means to help achieve this goal (prayer and worship). It also should be noted that in Sir 38:9 God is mentioned explicitly (εὔξαι κυρίῳ), while in 38:11 He is mentioned indirectly (the sacrifices referred to here point indirectly to the Lord).

Skehan – Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 440; R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt* (Berlin: Reimer 1906) 340–341; Zapff, *Jesus Sirach 25–51*, 256.

42 For Hebrew text translation see Adinolfi, "Il medico in *Sir* 38,1–15," 174; Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 188–189; Lührmann, "Aber auch Arzt gib Raum (Sir 38,1–15)," 58; Mazzinghi, "«Poi fa' posto al Medico, perché ti è necessario» (Sir 38,1–15)," 66; C. Mopsik, *La Sagesse de ben Sira* (Les Dix Paroles; Paris: Verdier 2003) 220; V. Morla Asensio, *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira. Traducción y notas* (Asociación Bíblica Española 59; Estella: Verbo Divino 2012) 221–222; Noorda, "Illness and Sin, Forgiving and Healing," 218, n. 9; Skehan – Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 438; *The Book of Ben Sira*, http://bensira.org/navigator.php?Manuscript=B&PageNum=27. Cf. A. Minissale, *Siracide (Ecclesiastico)*, 3 ed. (Nuovissima Versione della Bibbia 23; Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo 2002) 179; Palmisano, *Siracide*, 344–345; Peters, *Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus*, 384–385; R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach hebräisch und deutsch* (Berlin: Reimer 1906) 65; Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*, 138; J. Vella, "Ecclesiastico," *La Sagrada Escritura. Texto y comentario. Antiguo Testamento*. V. *Eclesiástico, Isaía, Jeremías, Ezequiel* (ed. A.T. Fernández) (Madrid: La Editorial Católica 1970) 156–157.

43 Cf. Adinolfi, "Il medico in *Sir* 38,1–15," 181; Lührmann, "Aber auch Arzt gib Raum (Sir 38,1–15)," 64; Schrader, "Beruf, Arbeit und Muße als Sinnerfüllung bei Jesus Sirach," 140; Sulmasy, "The Covenant within the Covenant," 22; Testa, "Le malattie e il medico secondo la Bibbia," 261; Zapff, "Sir 38,1–15 als Beispiel der Verknüpfung," 362; Also, *Jesus Sirach 25 – 51*, 255. Helge Stadelmann (*Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*, 139) divides Sirach 38:9 into two separate parts: 38:9a he identifies as an initial call to action, and Sirach 38:9b as a call to prayer.

4. Ben Sira's Advice for the Sick Person in Times of Illness (Sir 38:9–11)

The structure of this paragraph will be based on the construction of Sir 38:9–11. Each of its verses will be devoted to a separate part of it, since each of them constitutes its separate component.

4.1. Encouragement to Unite with God – the Role of Prayer (Sir 38:9)

At the beginning of his teaching on the sick person's attitude towards God in times of illness, the sage addresses his disciple/listener directly using the formula 'child' (τέκνον), traditional in wisdom teaching. On the one hand, this is a clear sign indicating the beginning of a new thought in Ben Sira's reflection (cf. para. 2). On the other hand, this phrase has an extremely important function in the transmission of knowledge by the sage to the adepts of wisdom. For it refers to the relationship that existed in the ancient world between the teacher (considered as a father) and his pupil (son – child). By addressing the listener with the vocative τέκνον, Ben Sira appeals to his personal authority, based on this relationship (father – son), to convince the pupil of the extraordinary importance and significance of his teaching. He does not use religious, rational or practical arguments, but puts his own authority at stake as the most important premise. With this phrase, he wants to inspire confidence in his pupil/listener, which was based on the relationship of master (father) – pupil (child – son), so that he is sure that the knowledge that is passed on to him is for his good and he should necessarily apply it – put it into practice in his life.[44]

Ben Sira, having addressed the disciple and having gained his trust, proceeds to the actual content of his instruction. First, he describes in a very synthetic way the situation to which it would refer. He expresses it in just three words: ἐν ἀρρωστήματί σου (literally: "in thy sickness"). The noun ἀρρώστημα ("weakness," "powerlessness," "sickness") occurs four more times outside of Sir 38:9a in the Greek text of the work of the sage from Jerusalem. Sir 10:10 refers to chronic illness (μακρὸν ἀρρώστημα – literally: "long illness"), and similarly in Sir 30:17 (ἀρρώστημα ἔμμονον – "ongoing/chronic illness"). Sir 31:2 refers to severe illness (ἀρρώστημα βαρὺ). On this basis it can be said that ἀρρώστημα does not express some minor ailment or pain that may pass on its own, but to a serious, prolonged and intractable illness that is a serious threat to the life of the sufferer. Important in the context of the analysis of Sir 38:9a is Sir 31:22. In this verse, as in Sir 38:9a, the sage also appeals to his authority (ἄκουσόν μου τέκνον – "hear me child") and urges the disciple not to reject his teaching (μὴ ἐξουδενήσῃς με), because it will ensure his proficiency and protect him from all disease (πᾶν ἀρρώστημα οὐ μή σοι ἀπαντήσῃ – "no disease will surely befall you") Although Ben Sira did not deal directly with healing – he was not a physician – following his wisdom could save a person from falling into a severe and life-threatening illness (Sir 31:22). On a similar

44 See Piwowar, "Zdobycie mądrości według Syracha (Syr 6,18–37)," 118; Sauer, *Jesus Sirach/Ben Sira*, 263; Zapff, *Jesus Sirach 25–51*, 256.

note, it could help a man suffering from a serious ailment return to health (Sir 38:9a), if only he followed the sage's advice.

This introduction (τέκνον ἐν ἀρρωστήματί σου) is followed by seven very specific indications as to what the disciple/listener should do during a serious illness to regain health and return to full strength. Note the number of these counsels. There are exactly seven of them. This begs the question, is this a mere coincidence – an unintentional coincidence, devoid of meaning – or is it a deliberate use of the number, which in the Bible is a symbol of perfection and fullness?[45] It does not appear to be unintentional and accidental, rather it should be seen as a deliberate and deeply considered detail by Ben Sira in his teaching that should not escape the attention of the recipient. Through it, he emphasised and indirectly made it clear that his instruction in the area taken up was valid and complete, and that putting it into practice would result in the sick person certainly recovering.

The first of the seven counsels is: μὴ παράβλεπε (Sir 38:9aβ) – "do not look away."[46] This is a prohibition (μή) expressed by means of *imperativus praesentis activi*, so it refers not to a single action performed, but to a fixed attitude characterising sustained behaviour during illness. The verb παραβλέπω[47] is formed by adding the preposition παρά ("against," "backwards," "across," "wrong") to βλέπω ("see," "look"[48]). It can thus express not only averting one's gaze, as Takamitsu Muraoka believes, but also an attitude of anger, disdain, indignation and disregard (see Franco Montanari[49]; Silvana Fasce, on the other hand, gives it the sense of "to be discouraged," "to become depressed"[50]). Sir 38:9aβ does not specify the attitude which the sage forbids, i.e. it does not directly indicate from whom the sick person should not look away. It is only from the context of the second stich of the verse (38,9b) that the disciple learns that it is God. Thus, the Sage warns the sick person not only not to turn away from the Lord during his illness, but also not to despise Him, disregard Him, or be indignant about what has come upon him. The symbol of this attitude is the averting of the eyes, and thus the breaking of the interpersonal relationship. Ben Sira thus calls on the sufferer in this indirect way to trust God and turn to Him – to establish or renew a relationship with Him.

---

45 See J. de Fraine – P. Grelot, "Liczby," *Słownik teologii biblijnej*, 3 ed. (ed. X. Léon-Dufour) (Poznań: Pallottinum 1990) 423; M. Lurker, *Dizionario delle immagini e dei simboli biblici* (Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo 1990) 191–192; Ryken –Wilhoit – Longman III, *Le immagini bibliche*, 1329–1330.

46 See *GELS* 524.

47 In the LXX, it occurs three more times besides Sir 38:9a: Song 1:6; Job 20:9 and 28:7.

48 See R. Romizi, *Greco antico. Vocabolario greco italiano etimologico e ragionato*, 3 ed. (Bologna: Zanichelli 2007) 914. Cf. Z. Abramowiczówna (ed.), *Słownik grecko-polski* (Warszawa: PWN 1958) III, 391; Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 79.

49 Sir 38:9a is translated by Franco Montanari (*Vocabolario della lingua greca*, 2 ed. [Torino: Loescher 2004] 1556) to: "Figlio, nella tua malattia non essere sdegnoso." Cf. Morla Asensio, *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira*, 221, n. 2.

50 See Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 79.

The message of the Hebrew text of Sir 38:9a coincides in essence with the Greek version: בני בחולי אל תתעבר ("My son, in sickness do not be inflamed with anger"[51]) In this text, the problematic word is בחולי because it may be an *infinitivus Qal* from the stem חול ("to turn away," "to spin" "to dance," "to strike") preceded by the preposition ב with a first person pronominal suffix ("when I turn/strike") or the word may be considered a noun "disease." The first form would be consistent with Biblical Hebrew, while the second meaning comes from the later development of that language, in which the Talmud and Mishnah were written.[52] A note in the margin of manuscript B suggests that instead of בחולי we read במחלה ("in sickness"). According to Víctor Morla Asensio the two words are synonymous.[53] The inclusion of the proposal written in the margin makes the original text of Sir 38:9a clearer, since the possible meaning of בחולי in the sense of "when I turn away/hit" is too enigmatic and may refer to many other situations than just illness. Furthermore, the words recorded in the main text of manuscript B of the analysed stich would be those spoken by God rather than a sage, which changes the meaning of the content of the text. It should be noted, however, that the "turning away/hitting" done by the Lord referred to in the first stich of Sir 38:9 would agree with the Old Testament concept of illness as a punishment for sin and evil committed.[54] The lesson of בחולי in the sense of במחלה ("sickness") is, however, confirmed not only by the Greek but also by the Syriac[55] version, and we should therefore take it as the original, and not בחולי in the sense of "when I turn away/hit."[56] The Hebrew text confirms that the Greek μὴ παράβλεπε is to be understood in the sense of a negative attitude towards God (anger or indignation) rather than mere disregard or turning away from Him.[57]

The second stich of Sir 38:9 indicates another attitude which Ben Sira urges the sick person to adopt during illness. It is prayer.[58] It is contrasted with the behaviour that the sage called for in the first part of the verse, namely, turning away from God and becoming angry with Him. This is clearly indicated by the opposing conjunction ἀλλά ("but"). The call to prayer in Sir 38:9bα is expressed with the *imperativus aoristi activi* of the second person singular (εὖξαι). It expresses a strong call for immediate prayer (literally: "pray," "ask").[59] From

51 Silvana Fasce (*La lode del medico*, 80) translates the Hebrew test of Sir 38:9a as follows: "Son, in sickness do not procrastinate/delay", while Maria C. Palmisano (*Siracide*, 344): "My son, in sickness do not neglect yourself." Cf. G.L. Prato, *Il problema della teodicea in Ben Sira* (AnBib 65; Rome: Biblical Institute Press 1975) 256, n. 89.

52 See M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Babli, Yerushalmi and Midrashic Literature* (New York: Judaica Press 1996) 468.

53 See Morla Asensio, *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira*, 221, n. 2.

54 See Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*, 142–143.

55 See N. Calduch-Benages – J. Ferrer – J. Liesen, *La Sabiduría del Escriba. Wisdom of the Scribe* (Biblioteca Midrásica 26; Estella: Verbo Divino 2003) 218.

56 See Mopsik, *La Sagesse de ben Sira*, 220; Morla Asensio, *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira*, 221, n. 2; Palmisano, *Siracide*, 344.

57 See Pérez Rodríguez, "Eclesiástico," 1243.

58 See Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 80.

59 See A. Piwowar, *Składnia języka greckiego Nowego Testamentu*, 2 ed. (Materiały Pomocnicze do Wykładów z Biblistyki 13; Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL 2017) paragraph 372.

the point of view of Greek syntax, it can also be regarded as an ingressive aorist, and it is in this sense that it should be interpreted in this stich. Ben Sira thus calls for prayer to begin and continue ("begin to pray/ ask")[60] during illness and suffering. The verb εὔχομαι ("pray," "ask") occurs three more times in the Greek version of Ecclus.[61] In Sir 18:23, the sage encourages his disciple to prepare himself before he prays and not to be like a man who puts God to the test by praying. In Sir 34:24 he contrasts a man who prays with a person who curses the Lord and asks rhetorically: whose prayer will He hear? By calling for prayer during illness in Sir 38:9b, the sage indirectly expresses the ancient Israelites' conviction that the only physician who can heal the sufferer and ensure his full recovery is God (see para. 1).[62] He confirms this conviction in the second part of the stich by stating and justifying his initial exhortation: "and He will heal you" (καὶ αὐτὸς ἰάσεταί σε). The attitude which Ben Sira calls the sick man to have the opposite of that adopted by King Asa. He preferred to turn to the doctors rather than to the Lord (see 2 Chr 16:12).[63]

The conjunction καί, connecting the first part of Sir 38:9b (εὖξαι κυρίῳ) with the second (αὐτὸς ἰάσεταί σε) may not only link them together ("and"), but also express a sequence approaching in its pronunciation to an effect ("so that").[64] Werner Urbanz speaks of an almost immediate – direct response to prayer, which is healing.[65] In the concluding part of Sir 38:9b a reference to Exod 15:26 can be discerned.[66]

It should be noted, however, that the verb εὔχομαι in the LXX in conjunction with the predicate (in Sir 38:9b, the syntagma εὖξαι κυρίῳ, expressed in this way, occurs) can also take on the meaning "to vow."[67] If this meaning of the word was accepted, then Ben Sira would be calling in Sir 38:9bα for a vow. However, a problem would then arise relating to the content and object of this pledge. The final part of the stich would in a general way call for some more strictly undefined vow addressed to God, but would not indicate what it would be about – what its content would be. Perhaps the sage would deliberately not suggest to his disciple any specific proposal of a vow, but would urge him to make some – any vow, leaving him completely free in this matter. Accepting the understanding of εὔχομαι in the sense of "to vow" thus causes understatement and fits worse into the context of Sir 38:9 than "to pray/ask," and must therefore be rejected.

---

60 See Piwowar, *Składnia języka greckiego Nowego Testamentu*, paragraph 332.

61 See W. Urbanz, *Gebet im Sirachbuch. Zur Terminologie von Klage und Lob in der griechischen Texttradition* (Herders biblische Studien 60; Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder 2009) 29–30.

62 See Noorda, "Illness and Sin, Forgiving and Healing," 220, n. 16.

63 See Cranz, "Advice for a Successful Doctor's Visit," 234–237; Palmisano, *Siracide*, 344; Skehan – Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 442.

64 See D.P. Béchard, *Syntax of the New Tetstament Greek. A Student's Manual* (SubBi 49; Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press 2018) 72; F. Blass – A. Debrunner, *Grammatica del greco del Nuovo Testamento*, 2 ed. (Introduzione alla Studio della Bibbia. Supplementi 2; Brescia: Paideia 1997) paragraph 442.2c.

65 See Urbanz, *Gebet im Sirachbuch*, 47.

66 See Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, 340.

67 See *GELS* 307; Urbanz, *Gebet im Sirachbuch*, 47.

The content of the Hebrew version of Sir 38:9b is almost identical to the message of the Greek translation of it: התפלל אל אל כי הוא ירפא ("pray to God because He heals/will heal"[68]). A note in the margin suggests that the imperative *Hithpael* התפלל ("pray," "supplicate") should be replaced by the commanding mode *Piel* פלל ("think" or "praise"[69]). However, this correction should be rejected because it does not agree with either the Greek or Syriac versions.[70] The only difference between the Greek and Hebrew texts of the stich is the absence of the second person singular pronoun in the original version (the Greek translator added σε), which makes the Hebrew text express a general truth that applies to everyone, not just the disciple directly addressed by the sage.

Ben Sira believes that healing from illness is a process in which the sick person should cooperate with God.[71] The first fundamental step in this process is not to take offence at the Lord, not to reject Him because one has fallen ill and is suffering. To the contrary, the sick person should turn to God and ask Him to restore him to health, because only the Most High can heal him.

Werner Urbanz draws attention to the parallel between Sir 38:9 and Num 21:7. Only in these two texts does the form εὖξαι occur in the entire LXX. Moreover, the imperative was used in the context of a prayer/request for rescue from imminent mortal danger (severe illness in Sir 38:9 and death from the bite of venomous snakes in Num 21:7; cf. Exod 8:4, 24; 9:28 and Jer 7:16).[72] Furthermore, he sees a chiastic structure in the construction of Sir 38:9: A: τέκνον; B: μὴ παράβλεπε; B': εὖξαι; A': σε.[73] At its centre, as the most important part of the message of this verse, are the two attitudes to which the sage calls the suffering man.

In Sir 38:9, the sage of Jerusalem refers directly to the faith of the Israelites, which held that God was the only physician who could heal the sick. This belief is the source of the first two pieces of advice, as well as the rest of the advice contained in Sir 38:10–11, concerning the behaviour of the sick during their illness. First of all, he should not turn away from God and become angry with Him (38:9a), secondly, he should turn to Him in prayer and ask for healing (38:9b).[74]

4.2. Call for Cleansing and Rejection of Evil (Sir 38:10)

Sir 38:9 calls for the first two of the seven attitudes that the sick person should take during his illness. Both refer to God (not turning away from Him and prayer). The next two

68 See Morla Asensio, *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira*, 221, n. 3.

69 See Peters, *Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus*, 157; Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, 340.

70 See Calduch-Benages – Ferrer – Liesen, *La Sabiduría del Escriba*, 218.

71 See Urbanz, *Gebet im Sirachbuch*, 48.

72 See Urbanz, *Gebet im Sirachbuch*, 48.

73 See Urbanz, *Gebet im Sirachbuch*, 47.

74 See Lührmann, "Aber auch Arzt gib Raum (Sir 38,1–15)," 64–65; Schrader, "Beruf, Arbeit und Muße als Sinnerfüllung bei Jesus Sirach," 140.

stichs – found in the centre of Sir 38:9–11 – concern a change in the moral conduct of the sick person.[75]

First, the sage calls upon his disciple to remove the transgression (ἀπόστησον πλημμέλειαν) from his life (Sir 38:10aα). He demands this in a very strong and unambiguous way, using the aorist imperative mode form. It is a firm call to fulfil this demand immediately. The verb ἀφίστημι ("to put away," "to set aside," "to remove," "to dismiss," "to detach") occurs twenty-five more times[76] in the Greek version of the work of the sage from Jerusalem besides Sir 38:10a. Very often, as in Sir 38:10a, it is presented in a religious context, expressing departure from God or abandonment of sin and evil. In Sir 2:3, the author urges to cling to God and never to depart from Him. According to him, the beginning of pride is distancing oneself from the Creator (see Sir 10:12). It is not the Lord who makes man abandon Him (see Sir 15:11). The giants of old departed from God (see Sir 16:7). Despite the activity of Elijah and Elisha, the people did not depart from their sins (see Sir 48:15). In Sir 7:2, the sage appeals to his disciple to forsake iniquity, and then it too will move away from him. But the most important text for the analysis of the verb ἀφίστημι in Sir 38:10a are the words written in Sir 35:3: "To abandon wickedness is what pleases the Lord (ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ πονηρίας), to give up wrong-doing is an expiatory sacrifice (ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ ἀδικίας)." The Lord hates evil and sin, and therefore the man who wishes to please Him and be accepted by Him should depart from them, purify himself from them, and follow the commandments and the Law. Since the only true physician is God, therefore the sick person, if they wish to recover, should remove iniquity and all transgressions – sins – from their lives. Conversion is therefore an important attitude in the process of healing from illness.

The noun πλημμέλεια ("error," "mistake," "transgression," "transgression," "sin") occurs five times in the Greek text of Sir, except 38:10. In Sir 7:31, Ben Sira commands that a portion of the sacrifice to be offered because of the transgression (περὶ πλημμελείας) should be given to the priest. The wise will be cautious in everything, in sinful times will take care not to offend (see Sir 18:27), while it is difficult for a merchant to avoid it (see Sir 26:29). Because of a transgression one should be ashamed before the judge and the superior (see Sir 41:18). Apart from David, Hezekiah and Josiah, all kings committed transgressions (see Sir 49:4). It is difficult to determine exactly what sin πλημμέλεια refers to, or what type of transgression it specifically means. It seems to denote some general transgression which may apply to any sphere of human life. However, it seems to denote a serious offence rather than a minor one that can be easily concealed and covered up from others. It may be moreover presumed that the word expresses an offence intended and willed by the one who commits it, and not a sin which someone has committed involuntarily, perhaps under the influence of human weakness. If the above conclusions drawn from the analysis of the use of πλημμέλεια in the Greek version of Sir are correct, it means that Ben Sira in Sir 38:10a

75 See Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 80.

76 See Sir 2:3; 7:2; 10:12, 12; 13:10; 15:11; 16:7; 19:2; 23:11,12; 27:20,22; 30:23; 31:1, 2; 35:3,3, 8; 38:12, 20; 39:9; 42:9; 47:23,24 and 48:15.

calls upon the sick man to reject the evil consciously committed with premeditation. Such transgressions should be removed from the sick person's life in order to gain God's favour and through it, healing.

Although in the Greek text of Sir 38:10a the noun πλημμέλεια occurs in the singular form, it does not refer to a single morally reprehensible act, but on a *pars pro toto* basis expresses a category of human actions. It does not refer, therefore, to an individual act, but to the totality of sinful deeds.[77]

The second attitude relating to the moral conduct of the sick person is the straightening of the hands (εὔθυνον χεῖρας; see Sir 38:10aβ). The verb εὐθύνω ("to lead straight," "to straighten," "to mend") occurs five more times outside of Sir 38:10a in the Greek text of the work of the sage from Jerusalem.[78] It is always used in a figurative sense, as is clearly indicated by the direct complements with which it is combined (heart in Sir 2:2,3; way/roads in Sir 37:15 and 49:9; and friendship in Sir 6:17). It expresses the idea of appropriate – righteous behaviour, which corresponds to God's will as expressed in the commandments and the Law. To act righteously means to act well, to do no evil to anyone, and to keep the covenant with God. Such is the meaning of the syntagma εὐθυνεῖν τὸν ὁδόν/τοὺς ὁδούς ("to straighten the way[s]"). Sir 38:10aβ refers to straightening hands, not roads. The hand symbolises human action.[79] Therefore, by analogy with "straightening the roads" we can say that to make one's hands straight does not express stretching them out so that they are straight (not bent at the elbow), but it refers to the appropriate – righteous behaviour of man, interpreted as doing something (action) rather than as a generally understood moral attitude.[80] Both of these expressions referring to human behaviour ("straightening of the road(s)" and "straightening of the hand(s)") can be considered akin, and perhaps even synonymous. However, it seems that straightening roads has a more general and broader meaning than straightening hands (action). This idea is also expressed in Job 17:9 and Isa 1:15–16.[81]

The two exhortations in Sir 38:10a complement each other. Ben Sira first calls the sick person to remove transgressions (negative attitude – they must get rid of something, reject something), and then to do good and act properly – in accordance with the covenant and the Law (positive attitude – they must do something, take a specific action).

The Hebrew text of Sir 38:10a is incomplete – its beginning has not survived. In the B manuscript it reads as follows סו]ר מעול ומהכר פנים[[82] ("Depart from injustice and

77 See Piwowar, *Składnia języka greckiego Nowego Testamentu*, paragraph 6.

78 See Sir 2:2, 3; 6:17; 37:15 and 49:9.

79 See Lurker, *Dizionario delle immagini e dei simboli biblici*, 121; E. Lohse, "χείρ," *TDNT* IX, 425–427; A. Ridouard, "Ramię i ręka," *Słownik teologii biblijnej* (ed. X. Léon-Dufour) (Poznań: Pallottinum 1990) 852; Ryken – Wilhoit – Longman III, *Le immagini bibliche*, 854.

80 Maria C. Palmisano (*Siracide*, 344) translates the expression εὔθυνον χεῖρας as: "agisci rettamente." Cf. Skehan – Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 442.

81 See Mopsik, *La Sagesse de ben Sira*, 220, n. 4; Skehan – Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 442.

82 Based on the publication of the texts of the Syriac Hebrew manuscripts published by P.C. Beentjes (*The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 66), the beginning of Sir 38:10a is even more corrupted: עול ומהכר פנים[...]. Cf. Peters, *Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus*, 157.

from being partial[83]"). Lindsey A. Askin sees in the first part of this stich a reference to the synonymous expression עָרַם רוּס from Prov 3:7.[84] A note in the margin suggests that instead of [סו]ר מצול ומהבר we should read מסיר מ׳ והבר[85] ("Depart from injustice and cleanse your face"). Morla Asensio believes that on the basis of the Greek version (χεῖρας) the noun פנים should be replaced by כפים ("hands").[86] If the marginal readings of manuscript B and the correction of the last word proposed by Morla Asensio are accepted, the Hebrew text of Sir 38:10a does not differ significantly from its translation into Greek.[87] Lindsey A. Askin sees in the original version of Sir 38:10a references to the language and wording contained in the Psalms (cf. Ps 24:4). On this basis, he concludes that through this reference, Ben Sira emphasises the importance of liturgy and prayer in the healing process.[88]

In the second stich of Sir 38:10, the sage exhorts the sick man to purify his heart from every sin (ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας καθάρισον καρδίαν). The verb καθαρίζω ("to cleanse," "to purify") occurs three more times in the Greek text of Sir apart from the verse in question. In Sir 23:10, the sage states that the individual who swears and calls upon the name of God in every situation will not be cleansed from their sin (ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας οὐ μὴ καθαρισθῇ). In 34:4 Ben Sira asks rhetorically: "What can be cleansed by uncleanness?." And in describing the work of the potter, he speaks of cleansing the kiln in which the vessels are made (see Sir 38:30). In Sir 38:10b, as in Sir 23:10 and 34:4, this verb is used in a figurative sense to refer to man's sin. Just as the person engaged in doing the cleaning cleanses the rooms or objects from the dirt with which they have been covered (see Sir 38:30), so too must sin and iniquity be removed from man's life so that he may shine with purity (in the moral sense) and original splendour. The point of Sir 38:10b is not to free oneself from sins in the sense of forgiving them, since this can only be done by God (see Sir 2:11; 5:6; 34:19 and

---

83 Concerning the meaning of the syntagma ומהכר פנים cf. Deut 1:17; 16:19 and Prov 24:13 (see Morla Asensio, *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira*, 221, n. 4; Peters, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach*, 313). Cf. Lührmann, "Aber auch Arzt gib Raum (Sir 38,1–15)," 58, 65; Mazzinghi, "«Poi fa' posto al Medico, perché ti è necessario» (Sir 38,1–15)," 66; Noorda, "Illness and Sin, Forgiving and Healing," 218, n. 9; Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*, 138, n. 1; Vella, "Eclesiastico," 157; Zapff, "Sir 38,1–15 als Beispiel der Verknüpfung," 355; Also, *Jesus Sirach 25 – 51*, 256.

84 See Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 203.

85 See *The Book of Ben Sira. Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary*, 39; *The Book of Ben Sira*, http://bensira.org/navigator.php?Manuscript=B&PageNum=27. Another text of Sir 38:10a is contained in the publication of the Hebrew Sir manuscripts by P.C. Beentjes (*The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 66). Another version is proposed by V. Morla Asensio (*Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira*, 221, n. 4). Lindsey A. Askin (*Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 203–204) believes that the reconstructed final part of Sir 38:10a should read: ותבר כפים. Cf. Peters, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach*, 313.

86 See Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 203; Morla Asensio, *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira*, 221, n. 4; Peters, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach*, 313; Also, *Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus*, 157.

87 See Mopsik, *La Sagesse de ben Sira*, 220; Morla Asensio, *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira*, 221; Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*, 138. Maria C. Palmisano (*Siracide*, 344), on the other hand, favours the wording of this stich based on the main text of manuscript B and thus translates: "Fuggi dall'iniquità e dall'essere di parte verso le persone."

88 See Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 204.

47:11), though according to the teaching of Ben Sira also almsgiving, respect towards parents and mercy towards others take away sins (see Sir 3:14, 30; 28:2). In this stich, the sage calls for the rejection of every sin, regardless of its type or the gravity of the transgression, and for not committing any transgression again. The thought expressed here approaches in its message those contained in Sir 17:25: "Return to the Lord and renounce your sins" (ἐπίστρεφε ἐπὶ κύριον καὶ ἀπόλειπε ἁμαρτίας; cf. 17:26: ἀπόστρεφε ἀπὸ ἀδικίας – "turn away from iniquity") and in Sir 21:2: "Flee from sin as from a snake" (ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου ὄφεως φεῦγε ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας).[89] Ben Sira urges the sick man to turn away from sin, reject it and free himself from it. The content of this exhortation is reminiscent of the appeal expressed in the first stich of Sir 38:10 ("Renounce your faults and straighten your hands"), but it is important to note an important difference between the message of these two stichs. The first (v. 10a) of them refers – at least the second exhortation contained therein clearly indicates this – to the external sphere of the sick person – their moral conduct and actions. The second (38,10b), on the other hand, is directed at his interiority. The sage's appeal expressed therein refers to the purification of the heart from all sin (cf. Ps 51:12). Ben Sira thus moves over from the external plane of the life of the suffering man to its interior. The conversion described in Sir 38:10 is to be expressed not only in a change of an external attitude (action), but also an internal one. Consequently, it should encompass his thinking and desires, that is, the whole volitional-intellectual sphere symbolised by the heart.[90] Ben Sira thus demands of the sick person a complete conversion consisting in the rejection of all sin committed not only in deed, but also in thought, as well as through wrong desire or lust.[91] He demands fidelity to the covenant and fulfilment of the Law, not only in deeds, but also at the level of intentions that guide man.[92] The call to repentance expressed in Sir 38:10 can be related to the attitude that the sage of Jerusalem condemned several times in other parts of his work, namely, adding sin to sin (see Sir 3:27; 5:5; 7:8), multiplying iniquity (see 23:3; 47:24; 48:16), and failing to repent (see Sir 48:15).

The message of the Hebrew text of Sir 38:10b is identical to the Greek translation: ומכל פשעים טהר לב ("and from all transgressions cleanse your heart"). The only difference between the two versions is the number: ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας is singular, while ומכל פשעים is plural.[93] Burkard M. Zapff further points out that the Hebrew verb טהר refers to, and indirectly links, the purification of the heart mentioned in Sir 38:10b with ritual-cultic purity.[94] By doing so, it creates a transition to Sir 38:11, where the cultic dimension of the sick person's attitude towards God is mentioned.

89 See Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*, 142–143.

90 See J. de Fraine – A. Vanhoye, "Serce," *Słownik teologii biblijnej*, 3 ed. (ed. X. Léon-Dufour) (Poznań: Pallottinum 1990) 871; Lurker, *Dizionario delle immagini e dei simboli biblici*, 67; Wolff, *Antropologia dell'Antico Testamento*, 58–79; Ryken – Wilhoit – Longman III, *Le immagini bibliche*, 357–359.

91 See Mopsik, *La Sagesse de ben Sira*, 220, n. 5.

92 See Zapff, *Jesus Sirach 25–51*, 256.

93 See Morla Asensio, *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira*, 221, n. 5.

94 See Zapff, *Jesus Sirach 25–51*, 256. Cf. H. Ringgren, "טָהַר *ṭāhar*," *TDOT* V, 291–294; Stöger, "Der Arzt nach Jesus Sirach (38,1–15)," 8.

In Sir 38:10 clearly reflects the prevalent conviction of the ancient Israelites – expressed as *implicite* by Ben Sira – that sickness is a punishment for sins and misdeeds of various kinds (cf. Deut 28:21–29; Prov 3:7–8).[95] Its basis was the retribution principle, according to which God responds to evil with punishment (cf. Sir 16:9 and 26:28), and rewards man for good by giving him His blessing and all the graces he needs.[96] The sage calls on the sick to abandon sin and to undergo a complete conversion – removing iniquity both in deeds and in the inner sphere, since transgressions are, according to him, the cause of his suffering and illness (cf. Ps 32:1–5). Without turning away from evil deeds and getting rid of them, recovery will not be possible.[97]

In Sir 38.10, a concentric structure can be seen. It is framed by negative exhortations, i.e. exhortations to reject sin: "give up your faults" (38:10aα) and "cleanse your heart from all sin" (38:10b). At the centre is a positive exhortation, the content of which is an appeal to morally correct behaviour and action ("direct your hands rightly" – 38:10aβ). It would follow that Ben Sira mainly emphasises the process of healing – conversion – was not on giving up evil and the rejection of sin but on a change of conduct that involves living in accordance with the covenant and the Law – living righteously. This is logical because if one begins to act in a righteous manner, he will thereby reject sin and wickedness.

4.3. Call for Offerings (Sir 38:11)

In the last verse of the pericope dealing with man's attitude during sickness, Ben Sira returns to the sick person's relationship with God. In Sir 38:9, the sage called for a renewed personal relationship expressed by turning to God – not rejecting Him – and prayer. In Sir 38:11, the focus is on the cultic aspect of this relationship.[98] This phrase should not surprise anyone since a particular predilection for worship is evident in the work of Ben Sira.[99]

In the first stich of the verse in question (Sir 38:11a), the Greek version of the work of Ben Sira calls for an incense offering (δὸς εὐωδίαν – "offer a sweet-smelling sacrifice"). The noun εὐωδία ("sweet perfume," "sweet fragrance," "incense") occurs four more times in the Greek text of Sir besides Sir 38:11a. In Sir 24:15, he refers to the sweet perfume that Wisdom gave off like myrrh. It should be noted that in this text, εὐωδία forms synonymous parallelism with ὀσμή ("savour," "fragrance," "perfume") and λιβάνου ἀτμίς ("incense smoke"). The other three times it appears in a liturgical context (see Sir 35:5; 45:16 and 50:15). The noun refers to a sweet perfume – a sweet fragrance that is produced by the offering of sacrifices (see Sir 35:5 and 50:15) or is the result of an incense offering (see

95 See Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 203; Lührmann, "Aber auch Arzt gib Raum (Sir 38,1–15)," 65; Mazzinghi, "«Poi fa' posto al Medico, perché ti è necessario» (Sir 38,1–15)," 70; Palmisano, *Siracide*, 344; Sauer, *Jesus Sirach/Ben Sira*, 263; Skehan – Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 442; Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*, 143.

96 See Scanu, "«Io sono JHWH, colui che ti guarisce»: Es 15,26," 32.

97 See Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 80–81.

98 See Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 82–83.

99 See Minissale, *Siracide. Le radici nella tradizione*, 36–38; J.G. Snaith, "Ben Sira's Supposed Love of Liturgy," *VT* 25 (1975) 167–174.

Sir 45:16). Thus, it means a pleasant aroma that spreads during the sacrifice of the cultic rites.[100] It is not about incense but the sweet fragrance produced during sacrificial rites. The etymological origin of the word also points to the above meaning. For it derives from the combination of εὐ- ("well") with the stem ὠδ/ὀδ contained in ὄξω ("I smell"), to which the nominal suffix -ία indicating quality has been added.[101] On this basis, we can surmise that Ben Sira in Sir 38:11aα does not call for an incense offering but for some sacrifice – strictly unspecified – that will give off a sweet fragrance.[102] However, there is no doubt that it is linked to the sacrificial ritual. The above understanding of the analysed Greek word is confirmed by the fact that in the LXX, it occurs with few exceptions, almost always in the phraseme ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας.[103] Ben Sira very often in his work proceeds in the same way as in Sir 38:11aα, i.e. he calls for some deed or action but does not specify it or define it precisely. It encourages him to take action to react and develop rather than stand still and maintain a state of decadence and passivity. The sage, however, does not impose a specific sacrifice but in a general way, leaving the sick man to choose according to his resources and possibilities. He calls in a general way for an offering that will give off a sweet fragrance.[104] Perhaps a reference should be seen here to the numerous texts, especially in the Pentateuch, that say that when God smelled a sweet fragrance, he changed his decision to one favourable to humans (see, e.g. Gen 8:21). If so, the task of making a sacrifice that gives off a pleasant fragrance would be to change God's will regarding the sick person and forgive him for the faults for which he suffered, which would then result in healing.

Ben Sira calls unambiguously and very clearly for a sacrifice. This is not an encouragement or suggestion but, as in the earlier stichs, a strong injunction expressed using the aorist imperative mood (δός). It refers not only to εὐωδίαν but also to μνημόσυνον σεμιδάλεως (literally: "an offering worthy of the remembrance of the choice wheat flour"). The noun μνημόσυνον ("memory," "remembrance") occurs sixteen more times in the Greek version of the work of the sage of Jerusalem, in addition to the style under analysis (Sir 38:11aβ).[105] It overwhelmingly refers to the reminiscence or remembering of someone[106] or something.[107] It also expresses the memory of persons, events or things that were or happened in the past that can be recalled to memory or remembered. It is important to stress that for the dead, remembrance is the only form of survival for them, i.e. life after death. Memory also plays an extraordinary role in building and preserving Israel's religious and social identity. Five

100 Víctor Morla Asensio translates the Greek word εὐωδία as "ofrenda aromática" – "fragrant/aromatic offering" (Morla, *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira*, 221, n. 7).

101 See Romizi, *Greco antico*, 580.

102 See A. Stumpff, "εὐωδία," *TDNT* II, 808.

103 See Stumpff, "εὐωδία," 809.

104 See Vella, "Eclesiastico," 157.

105 See Sir 10:17; 23:26; 24:20; 35:6; 38:23; 39:9; 41:1; 44:9; 45:1, 9, 11, 16; 46:11; 49:1, 13; 50:16.

106 These are the nations – the Gentiles (Sir 10:17), the adulterous woman (Sir 23:26), the dead (Sir 38:23), the scribe (Sir 39:9), some figures from Israel's history (Sir 44:9), Moses (Sir 45:1), the judges (Sir 46:11), Josiah (Sir 49:1) and Nehemiah (Sir 49:13).

107 These are Wisdom (Sir 24:20), sacrifice (Sir 35:6) and death (Sir 41:1).

times, as in Sir 38:11aβ, μνημόσυνον occurs in a cultic and liturgical context.[108] The sacrifice of the righteous man will be accepted and the memory of it will last – it will not be forgotten (see Sir 35.6). The sons of Aaron, during the liturgy celebrated by High Priest Simon, made a great noise to be heard for remembrance before the Most High (see Sir 50:16). As many as three times, this noun appears in the description of Aaron in Praise of the Fathers (see Sir 45:9, 11, 16). The bells attached to his robe were to make a sound in the temple as a reminder to the people (v. 9). Also, the inscription engraved on the breastplate was intended as a memorial to the Israelites (v. 11). Aaron was chosen from among the people to offer fruitful sacrifices to the Lord, incense and a pleasing aroma as a remembrance to secure reconciliation for the people (v. 16). In the context of the analysis of Sir 38:11aβ, Sir 35:6 is particularly important. The verse states that the memory of the sacrifice of the righteous man (τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς; the pronoun αὐτῆς refers to θυσία ἀνδρὸς δικαίου – "the sacrifice of the righteous man") will not be forgotten. It features a syntagma reminiscent of that in Sir 38:11aβ. In 35:6, the noun μνημόσυνον is combined with the genitive αὐτῆς, and in 38:11, with σεμιδάλεως. The genetive in this phraseme can, according to Greek syntax, be considered as *genetivus obiectivus* (memory/memorial concerning the sacrifice), *originis* (memory/memorial derived from the sacrifice), *causae* (memory/memorial because of the sacrifice) or *epexegeticus* (memory/memorial meaning sacrifice). In Sir 35:6, all three *genetivus obiectivus*, *causae* and *epexegeticus* seem best suited to the context of the verse. However, the situation changes in Sir 38:11aβ. In this stich, the noun μνημόσυνον does not refer to an intellectual act of recollection or remembrance, but to a sacrifice which is worthy of remembrance (=אַזְכָּרָה; cf. Lev 2:2, 9, 16; 5:12), therefore the genitive in the expression μνημόσυνον σεμιδάλεως is to be understood as a *genetivus materiae* ("a sacrifice worthy of remembrance from choice wheat flour," i.e. the sacrifice is choice wheat flour).

The noun σεμίδαλις ("choice wheat flour") forms the complement μνημόσυνον in Sir 38:11aβ occurs two more times in the Greek version of Sir. In Sir 35:2, it is mentioned that a man who wishes to repay God for His graciousness should offer choice wheat flour. According to Sir 39:26, flour of this kind belongs to the basic necessities of human life. Sir 38:11aβ thus refers to the use of the word in Sir 35:2. Choice wheat flour was one of the offerings made to God (see Lev 2:1, 2, 4, 5, 7; 5:11; 6:8,13; 7:12; 14:10, 21; 23:13, 17; 24:5 etc.). Its exceptional quality made it a worthy offering to the Lord made not of superfluous things or in excess, but of a product necessary for man's daily life.[109]

Summing up the analysis of the syntagma μνημόσυνον σεμιδάλεως in Sir 38:11aβ, it should be considered a unique offering of choice wheat flour that will be worthy of remembrance. Thus, it is not about a simple food offering but a unique one that will be remembered and recalled by others. Here, in contrast to Sir 38:11aα ("give off a sweet fragrance"), the text specifies more precisely what kind of sacrifice the sick person should make to the divine Physician to be healed and return to full strength.

108 See Vella, "Eclesiastico," 157.

109 See P.D. Wegner, "סֹלֶת," *NIDOTTE* III, 269.

The passage of Sir 38:11a in Hebrew is incomplete – one could even argue it is incomprehensible: אזכרה[.....]. In Hebrew, the noun אזכרה means "memorial" i.e. the burnt portion of a food offering (see Lev 2:2).[110] A note in the margin suggests replacing אזכרה with אזכרתה, i.e. the same word but with a third person singular feminine pronominal suffix. The preserved part of the Hebrew version of Sir 38:11a is fully consistent with its translation into Greek. Morla Asensio reconstructs the missing first part of stich 38:11a as follows: הגש ניחח ("give/bring a pleasant fragrance").[111]

Both the Greek version and the existing passage in the original text of Sir 38:11a make a clear allusion to Lev 2:2.[112] On this basis, it can be concluded that the sacrifice the sage urges the sick to make is probably a food offering.

The second stich of Sir 38:11 contains another indication relating to the attitude of the sick towards God. It too refers to sacrificial worship. The sage calls for a man suffering from illness to make the sacrifice fat (λίπανον προσφοράν). Much like the first command in this verse (δός), λίπανον is also a form of *imperativus aoristi* of the second person singular expressing a firm and unequivocal command that should be carried out immediately, without any procrastination or reflection. The verb λιπαίνω ("to grease," "to oil") occurs only once more in the Greek version of the work of the Sage of Jerusalem. The passage 35:5a mentions that the sacrifice of the righteous man shall make the altar fat (προσφορὰ δικαίου λιπαίνει θυσιαστήριον). Most likely the making the altar fat referred to here is to be understood in the sense that the offering of a righteous man is so generous and delectable that when it is burned, the fat flows out of it and covers the entire altar in abundance. The righteous person, in worshipping God, offers him what is best. He is not concerned with saving resources by offering a lean and meagre sacrifice, but offers to the Lord a gift of fat meat that is pleasing to Him. On this basis, we can surmise that also in Sir 38:11b the sage urges the sick person to offer a generous tribute for his healing and not to be concerned with the costs just to make any contribution/offer something. The sick should make the proper sacrifice without trying to deceive God through it. Moreover, it seems that making the sacrifice fat advocated for in Sir 38:11bα may refer to the special preparation of the sacrifice before it offering it, involving the greasing of the sacrifice (perhaps an adding more fat to it) so that it is even more generous and magnanimous, and thus more pleasing to the Lord.

The noun προσφορά ("gift," "offering") occurs eight more times in the Greek version of the Ben Sira's work, besides 38:11b.[113] It is difficult to determine what type of offering this word exactly means. It most likely does not refer to any particular type of sacrifice, but expresses the general idea of offering – giving something as a gift to God.[114]

---

110 See R.E. Averbeck, "אַזְכָּרָה," *NIDOTTE* I, 335–338; Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, 340–341.

111 See Morla Asensio, *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira*, 222, n. 7. Cf. Peters, *Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus*, 157.

112 See Mopsik, *La Sagesse de ben Sira*, 220, n. 6.

113 See Sir 14:11; 34:18, 19; 35:1, 5; 46:16 and 50:13, 14.

114 See K. Weiss, "φέρω κτλ.," *TDNT* IX, 68.

It would appear that the interpretation offered above on greasing the sacrifice expressed in Sir 38:11bα is supported in the second part of this stich (ὡς μὴ ὑπάρχων). The expression there is quite enigmatic as it is not specified *Participium praesentis activi* preceded by the negative participle μή together with the relative adverb ὡς ("as," "as if," "as if") is of key importance in this expression. The verb ὑπάρχω ("to exist," "to be"; it is a synonym of εἶναι) expresses existence, but when combined with the dative case it can also denote possession (it is a Semitism – "to be for someone" i.e. that someone has/possesses something; cf. Sir 20:16). In the Greek version of the Sir, it occurs once in substantivised participle form meaning "property," "possessions," "riches" (see Sir 41:1). In Sir 38:11bβ, it does not combine either with a dative case or have any object. Therefore, it expresses existence. Sir 44:9b includes practically the same syntagma as in Sir 38:11b (ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρξαντες). They only difference is the form of negative participle (οὐχ in 44:9b, while μή in 38:11b) and in the *particiupium* tense and its number (*aoristi pluralis*) in 44:9b – ὑπάρξαντες, and *praesentis singularis* in 38:11b – ὑπάρχων). Sir 44:9b states that throughout the history of Israel, in contrast to the great figures of the Jewish nation, there were also many people who did not make their mark – they left no memory behind and died as if they had never existed at all. On this basis, ὡς μὴ ὑπάρχων is to be understood in the sense of "as if not being/existing."[115] The thought expressed in Sir 38:1bβ seems to be incomplete, making it quite puzzling and mysterious. This begs the question about: "as if not being" who or in what state? Based on the context of Sir 38:9–11, we can surmise that the last stich of this pericope refers to the condition of its main character, i.e. a sick man. Therefore it stands to reason that Sir 38:11b should be interpreted as: "and make the offering fat as if as not being sick." Perhaps the Greek text urges the suffering man not to make the sacrifice primarily because of his illness, as if in an attempt to "bribe" God (cf. Sir 35:11),[116] but that he should offer it without any ulterior motives.[117] However, we should not forget that Ben Sira urges the sick person to pray and offer sacrifices for his healing. This is why the second part of the last stich of the analysed pericope remains enigmatic and unclear.[118] It is because of this mysteriousness that the final words of Sir 38:1b were omitted in some witnesses to the Greek text and in the Latin version.[119]

The Hebrew version of Sir 38:11 was preserved as: ודשן ערוך בכנפי הוניך (literally: "arrange/prepare fat within the reach of your wealth"[120]). The first note in the margin,

115 Norbert Peters (*Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus*, 158) believes that the Greek syntagma ὡς μὴ ὑπάρχων is an arbitrary explication of the original text.

116 See Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 81–82.

117 "L'insegnamento del Siracide interiorizza l'atto di offerta, poiché non attribuisce valore al dato materiale, ma all'intenzione e alla qualità del cuore" (Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 84).

118 See Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 84, n. 132; Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, 341.

119 See Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 84, n. 132; Palmisano, *Siracide*, 345; Peters, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach*, 313; Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*, 300 (critical apparatus).

120 See Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 205, n. 89; *DCH* IV, 439; VI, 559; *The Book of Ben Sira*, http://bensira.org/navigator.php?Manuscript=B&PageNum=27; Vella, "Eclesiastico," 157. Cf. Mopsik, *La Sagesse de ben Sira*, 222; Morla Asensio, *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira*, 222; Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*,

referring to this stich, suggests the lesson ערך ("spread"[121]) instead of ערוך, the second /הנך הונך ("your wealth") in the place of הוניך. The first part of the stich, i.e. the words ודשן ערוך, can also have a different meaning: "grease the arranged/prepared [sacrifice]." Then דשן is *Piel* in imperative mode derivative from the stem דשן ("to grease"), while ערוך *participium passivi Qal* from the stem ערך ("to arrange," "prepare").[122] This interpretation seems to be more in line with the Greek version than "arrange/prepare" the fat.

The original text from Sir 38:11b seems to be clearer than its version translated into Greek. Firstly, it clarifies that it is about offering a sacrifice of fat, secondly, it clarifies the message contained in the second part of this stich – it is about offering a sacrifice that is proportional to the wealth of the sick person (cf. Lev 5:7–13; 12:8; Sir 14:11).[123]

Sir 38:11b certainly makes a reference to Lev 2:1–2 (cf. Lev 2:9,16; 6:8).[124] Both of these excerpts mention sacrificial food. It seems, however, that the intention in the Greek version of this particular stich was to make this reference to Lev 2:1–2 more clear and direct.[125] This is expressed through a number of words common to both texts: σεμίδαλις (Sir 38:11a; Lev 2:1, 2), μνημόσυνον (Sir 38:11a; Lev 2:2) and εὐωδίας (Sir 38:11a; Lev 2:2). Imperative of λίπανον may also be reference to the olive oil (ἔλαιον) mentioned in Lev 2:1,2. Perhaps the person translating the original text into Greek wanted to be more specific about the kind of sacrifice Ben Sira had in mind.

It is no surprise that after the call to repentance, Ben Sira calls for sacrifice. Helge Stadelmann points out that the call for a healing offering is something unique and special in the Old Testament – cannot be found anywhere else. It could perhaps be reasoned only by the incredible bond the sage has for the worship, which can be easily noticed in his work.[126]

Conclusion

Ben Sira, after expressing a change in his attitude towards modern medicine and accepting the actions of doctors (Sir 38:1–3), as well as the medicines they use in the healing process

138, n. 4. The last part of this stich (בכנפי הוניך) can be translated in the sense of "to the best of one's ability" (L. Kochler – W. Baumgartner – J.J. Stamnn (eds.), *Wielki słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu* [Prymasowska Seria Biblijna; Warszawa: Vocatio 2008] I, 459). Cf. Pérez Rodríguez, "Eclesiástico," 1243; Peters, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach*, 313; Peters, *Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus*, 158.

121 See *DCH* VI, 559.

122 See Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*, 138, 143.

123 See Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 205; Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 83–84.

124 See Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 204–205; Cranz, "Advice for a Successful Doctor's Visit," 244; Lührmann, "Aber auch Arzt gib Raum (Sir 38,1–15)," 65–66; Skehan – Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 442; Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus*, 185; Zapff, *Jesus Sirach 25–51*, 256.

125 See Askin, *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*, 205.

126 See Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*, 144–146. Cf. Cranz, "Advice for a Successful Doctor's Visit," 144; Stöger, "Der Arzt nach Jesus Sirach (38,1–15)," 8. Cf. Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 85.

(Sir 38:4–8),[127] in Sir 38:9–11, he revisits the belief – traditional to the Israelite faith – that God is one and only healer.[128] It is true that he did not express this explicitly, but by outlining the attitude of the sick man towards God he clearly alludes to the conviction that recovery depends primarily on the Lord, although not exclusively, since in Sir 38:12, he encourages people to use the services of a physician. The Sage wants the sick person to turn to God, not to neglect Him (Sir 38:9a) and to renew his relationship with the Most High. Ben Sira believes it has to be expressed by prayer (Sir 38:9b), by a changing our ways – abandoning evil and sin (Sir 38:10), and by offering food sacrifices (Sir 38:11). Through these indications, he calls the suffering person to a radical conversion, i.e. not only to transform the external attitude, but also, and perhaps above all, of the internal one.[129] The fundamental condition for healing is a complete change of one's life, both in a religious and moral sense. It is not enough to renew or establish a spiritual relationship with God, changing one's ways is also necessary – to refrain from doing evil and wickedness (cf. Ps 51:18–19).[130] In the teaching of Ben Sira, both attitudes are equally important, although the structure of Sir 38:9–11 seems to emphasise and accentuate the change relating to the external attitude. These two dimensions (external and internal) condition each other – for it is not possible to turn to God without rejecting evil deeds, nor is it possible to abandon iniquity without renewing the relationship with God. The Sage of Jerusalem had already expressed this idea in the earlier parts of his work (cf. Sir 34:18–19; 35:5). Healing from illness and full recovery are therefore closely linked and depend on deep conversion. This way Ben Sira alluded, in an *implicite* manner, to the principle of retribution and the belief that illness and suffering are punishment for committed iniquity and sin.[131] However, he does not merely repeat beliefs and convictions already known from other books of the Old Testament; he brings his own personal theological touch to them, which is expressed in the call for the sick to make a food offering in order to be healed of his ailments.[132] Moreover, later in his advice on physicians and treatment, he encourages the use of a medic,[133] yet another *novum* in the approach to medicine of the time in ancient Israel.

127 See Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*, 140.

128 See Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus*, 185; Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*, 146.

129 See Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 78.

130 See Scanu, "«Io sono JHWH, colui che ti guarisce»: Es 15,26," 35; Skehan – Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 442.

131 See Fasce, *La lode del medico*, 85–86.

132 However, Luis Alonso Schökel (*Proverbios y Eclesiastico*, 280–281) points out that Ben Sira is quite arbitrary in his use of the vocabulary connected to sacrifice and worship, in a manner that does not make it possible to accurately determine which sacrifices he is referring to.

133 This matter will be further discussed in another article, entitled: "Ben Sira's idea on the role and tasks of a healer in the process of healing the sick (Sir 38:12–15)."

Bibliography

Abramowiczówna, Z. (ed.), *Słownik grecko-polski* (Warszawa: PWN 1958–1965) I–IV.

Adinolfi, M., "Il medico in *Sir* 38,1–15," *Antonianum* 62 (1987) 172–183.

Allan, N., "The Physician in Ancient Israel: His Status and Function," *Medical History* 45 (2001) 377–394.

Alonso Schökel, L., *Proverbios y Eclesiastico* (Los Libros Sagrados 14; Madrid: Cristiandad 1968).

Askin, L.A., *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira (Sir 38:1–15; 41:1–15; 43:11–19;44–50)* (Diss. Queen's College, University of Cambridge; Cambridge 2016) https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1810/255388/Scribal%20Culture%20in%20Ben%20Sira_v2corrected.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y [access: 9.06.2022].

Averbeck, R.E., "אזְכָרָה," *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (ed. W.A. Van Gemeren) (Carlisle: Paternoster 1996) I, 335–339.

Béchard, D.P., *Syntax of the New Tetstament Greek. A Student's Manual* (Subsidia Biblica 49; Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press 2018).

Beentjes, P.C., "A Problematic Symbol in Ben Sira 38,13. Short Note," *Estudios Bíblicos* 76/3 (2018) 453–459.

Beentjes, P.C., *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew. A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 68; Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill 1997).

Blass, F. – Debrunner, A., *Grammatica del greco del Nuovo Testamento*, 2 ed. (Introduzione alla Studio della Bibbia. Supplementi 2; Brescia: Paideia 1997).

Boccaccio, P. – Bernardi, G., *Ecclesiasticus. Textus hebraeus secundum fragmenta reperta* (Roma: PIB 1986).

The Book of Ben Sira, http://bensira.org/navigator.php?Manuscript=B&PageNum=27 [access: 20.06.2019].

The Book of Ben Sira. Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary (The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language; Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Shrine of the Book 1973).

Brown, M.L., "רָפָא *rāpā'*," *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (eds. G.J. Botterweck – H. Ringgren – H.-J. Fabry) (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge: Eerdmans 2004) XIII, 593–602.

Calduch-Benages, N. – Ferrer, J. – Liesen, J., *La Sabiduría del Escriba. Wisdom of the Scribe* (Biblioteca Midrásica 26; Estella: Verbo Divino 2003).

Chrostowski, W., "Lekarz i jego posługa w świetle Biblii," *Collectanea Theologica* 71/3 (2001) 51–67.

Clines, D.J.A., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press 2011) I–VIII.

Cranz, I., "Advice for a Successful Doctor's Visit: King Asa Meets Ben Sira," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 80 (2018) 231–246.

Crenshaw, J.L., "The Book of Sirach. Introduction, Commentary, and Reflection," *The New Interpreter's Bible* (ed. L.E. Keck) (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press 1997) V, 603–867.

Duesberg, H., *Le Psautier des malades* (Bible et vie chrétienne 3; Maredsous: Editions de Maredsous 1952).

Fasce, S., *La lode del medico nel libro biblico del Siracide* (Genova: ECIG 2009).

de Fraine, J. – Grelot, P., "Liczby," *Słownik teologii biblijnej*, 3 ed. (ed. X. Léon-Dufour) (Poznań: Pallottinum 1990) 421–425.

de Fraine, J. – Vanhoye, A., "Serce," *Słownik teologii biblijnej*, 3 ed. (ed. X. Léon-Dufour) (Poznań: Pallottinum 1990) 871–873.

Gaiser, F., "'The sensible will not despise him': Healing Medicine, Human Wisdom and God (Sirach 38:1–15)," *Healing in the Bible. Theological Insight for Christian Ministry* (ed. F.J. Gaiser) (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 2010) 117–131.

Giblet, J. – Grelot, P., "Choroba-uleczenie," *Słownik teologii biblijnej*, 3 ed. (ed. X. Léon-Dufour) (Poznań: Pallottinum 1990) 121–125.

Graber, F. – Müller, D., "ἰάομαι," *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (ed. C. Brown) (Carlise – Grand Rapids, MI: Paternoster 1986) II, 166–169.

Haspecker, J., *Gottesfurcht bei Jesus Sirach. Ihre Religiöse Struktur und Ihre Literarische und Doktrinäre Bedeutung* (Analecta Biblica 30; Rom: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut 1967).

Jastrow, M., *Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Babli, Yerushalmi and Midrashic Literature* (New York: Judaica Press 1996).

Kee, H.C., "Medicine and Healing," *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. D.N. Freedman) (New York – London – Toronto: Doubleday 1992) IV, 659–664.

Kochler, L. – Baumgartner, W. – Stamnn, J.J. (eds.), *Wielki słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu* (Prymasowska Seria Biblijna; Warszawa: Vocatio 2008) I–II.

Kraus, W. – Karrer, M. (eds.), *Septuaginta Deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 2009).

Księgi greckie. Grecko-polski Stary Testament. Przekład interlinearny z kodami gramatycznymi i indeksem form podstawowych (trans. M. Wojciechowski) (Prymasowska Seria Biblijna; Warszawa: Vocatio 2008).

Lévi, I., *The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus* (Semitic Study Series; Leiden: Brill 1904).

Lohse, E., "χείρ," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (eds. G. Kittel – G. Friedrich) (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1995) IX, 424–434.

Lührmann, D., "Aber auch Arzt gib Raum (Sir 38,1–15)," *Wort und Dienst* 15 (1979) 55–78.

Lurker, M., *Dizionario delle immagini e dei simboli biblici* (Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo 1990).

Manicardi, L., "Il Salterio dei malati," *Parola, Spirito e Vita* 40 (1999) 41–63.

Marböck, J., *Weisheit im Wandel. Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 272; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 1999).

Mazzinghi, L., "«Poi fa' posto al Medico, perché ti è necessario» (Sir 38,1–15)," *Parola, Spirito e Vita* 40 (1999) 65–74.

Minissale, A., *Siracide (Ecclesiastico)*, 3 ed. (Nuovissima Versione della Bibbia 23; Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo 2002).

Minissale, A., *Siracide. Le radici nella tradizione* (Leggere Oggi la Bibbia 1/17; Brescia: Queriniana 1988).

Montanari, F., *Vocabolario della lingua greca*, 2 ed. (Torino: Loescher 2004).

Mopsik, C., *La Sagesse de ben Sira* (Les Dix Paroles; Paris: Verdier 2003).

Morla Asensio, V., *Los manuscritos hebreos de Ben Sira. Traducción y notas* (Asociación Bíblica Española 59; Estella: Verbo Divino 2012).

Morla Asensio, V., *Eclesiastico* (El Mensaje del Antiguo Testamento 20; Salamanca: Sigueme 1992).

Münnich, M., *Obraz Jahwe jako władcy choroby w Biblii Hebrajskiej na tle bóstw bliskowschodnich* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL 2004).

Muraoka, T., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters 2009).

Noorda, S., "Illness and Sin, Forgiving and Healing: the Connection of Medical Treatment and Religious Beliefs in Ben Sira 38,1–15," *Studies in Hellenistic Religions* (ed. M. Vermaseren) (Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans L'Empire Romain 78; Leiden: Brill 1979) 215–224.

Oepke, A., "ἰάομαι, ἴασις, ἴαμα, ἰατρός," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (eds. G. Kittel – G. Friedrich) (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1995) III, 194–215.

Palmisano, M.C., *Siracide. Introduzione, traduzione e commento* (Nuova Versione della Bibbia dai Testi Antichi 34; Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo 2016).

Pérez Rodríguez, G., "Eclesiástico," *Biblia Comentada*. IV. *Libros Sapienciales*, 2 ed. (Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 218; Madrid 1967) 1072–1307.

Peters, N., *Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus* (Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 25; Münster: Aschendorff 1913).

Peters, N., *Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus. Übersetzt und Erklärt* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder 1902).

Pietersma, A. – Wright, B.G. (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint. And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title* (New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press 2007).

Piwowar, A., "The Origin and Significance of Medicaments According to Ben Sira (Sir 38:4–8)," *The Biblical Annals* 11/1 (2021) 25–62.

Piwowar A., *Składnia języka greckiego Nowego Testamentu*, 2 ed. (Materiały Pomocnicze do Wykładów z Biblistyki 13; Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL 2017).

Piwowar, A., "Respect for the Doctor (Sir 38:1–3)," *The Biblical Annals* 10/1 (2020) 31–62.

Piwowar, A., "Wierność w czasie próby (Syr 2,1–6)," *Verbum Vitae* 11 (2007) 99–126.

Piwowar A., "Zdobycie mądrości według Syracha (Syr 6,18–37). Część I: Przyjęcie wychowania prowadzi do osiągnięcia mądrości (Syr 6,18–22)," *The Biblical Annals* 5/1 (2015) 111–135.

Prato, G.L., *Il problema della teodicea in Ben Sira* (Analecta Biblica 65; Rome: Biblical Institute Press 1975).

Ravasi, G., "Malattia, Guarigione e medici nell'Antico Testamento," *Parola, Sprito e Vita* 40 (1999) 11–22.

Ridouard, A., "Ramię i ręka," *Słownik teologii biblijnej*, 3 ed. (ed. X. Léon-Dufour) (Poznań: Pallottinum 1990) 852–853.

Ringgren, H., "טָהַר *ṭāhar*," *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (eds. G.J. Botterweck – H. Ringgren – H.-J. Fabry) (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge: Eerdmans 2004) V, 287–296.

Romizi, R., *Greco antico. Vocabolario greco italiano etimologico e ragionato*, 3 ed. (Bologna: Zanichelli 2007).

Ryken, L. – Wilhoit, J.C. – Longman III, T. (eds.), *Le immagini bibliche. Simboli, figure retoriche e temi letterari della Bibbia* (Dizionari San Paolo; Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo 2006).

Sauer, G., *Jesus Sirach/Ben Sira* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch. Apokryphen 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2000).

Scanu, M.P., "«Io sono JHWH, colui che ti guarisce»: Es 15,26. Considerazioni sulla metafora terapeutica in prospettiva teologica," *Parola, Spirito e Vita* 40 (1999) 23–39.

Schrader, L., "Beruf, Arbeit und Muße als Sinnerfüllung bei Jesus Sirach," *Der Einzelne und seine Gemeinschaft bei Ben Sira* (eds. R. Egger-Wenzel – I. Krammer) (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 270; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 1998) 117–149.

Septuaginta czyli Biblia Starego Testamentu wraz z księgami deuterokanonicznymi i apokryfami (trans. R. Popowski) (Prymasowska Seria Biblijna; Warszawa: Vocatio 2013).

Seybold, K., *Das Gebet des Kranken im Alten Testament. Untersuchungen zur Bestimmung und Zuordnung der Krankheits- und Heilungspsalmen* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 99; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1973).

Skehan, P.W. – Di Lella, A.A., *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (The Anchor Bible 39; New York – London – Toronto: Doubleday 1987).

Smend, R., *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt* (Berlin: Reimer 1906).

Smend, R., *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach hebräisch und deutsch* (Berlin: Reimer 1906).

Snaith. J.G., "Ben Sira's Supposed Love of Liturgy," *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975) 167–174.

Snaith, J.G., *Ecclesiasticus or The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach* (The Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1974).

Stabryła, W.M., "'Najlepszego nawet lekarza czeka Gehenna'. Lekarz w starożytnym Izraelu," *Ateneum Kapłańskie* 160/1 (2013) 7–13.

Stabryła, W.M., "Zdrowie i choroba w starożytnym Izraelu," *Więcej szczęścia jest w dawaniu aniżeli w braniu. Memorial Book for Professor Waldemar Chrostowski on His 60th Birthday* (ed. B. Strzałkowska) (Ad Multos Annos; Warszawa: Adam 2011) III, 1313–1334.

Stadelmann, H., *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter. Eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor-makkabäischen Sōfēr unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrertum* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1980).

Stöger, A., "Der Arzt nach Jesus Sirach (38,1–15)," *Arzt und Christ* 11/1 (1965) 3–11.

Stumpff, A., "εὐωδία," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (eds. G. Kittel – G. Friedrich) (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1995) II, 808–810.

Sulmasy, D.P., "The Covenant within the Covenant: Doctors and Patients in Sir 38:1–15," *Linacre Quaorterly* 55 (1988) 14–24.

Testa, E., "Le malattie e il medico secondo la Bibbia," *Rivista Biblica* 43 (1995) 253–267.

Turkiel, J., "Septuaginta o lekarzu," *Nauki humanistyczne i sozologia. Jubilee Book Dedicated to Prof. Józef M. Dołęga, Doctor Habilitated* (ed. J.W. Czartoszewski) (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW 2010) 563–570.

Urbanz, W., *Gebet im Sirachbuch. Zur Terminologie von Klage und Lob in der griechischen Texttradition* (Herders biblische Studien 60; Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder 2009).

Vella, J., "Eclesiastico," *La Sagrada Escritura. Texto y comentario. Antiguo Testamento*. V. *Eclesiástico, Isaía, Jeremías, Ezequiel* (ed. A.T. Fernández) (Madrid: La Editorial Católica 1970) 3–218.

Wegner, P.D., "סלח," *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (ed. W.A. Van Gemeren) (Carlisle: Paternoster 1996) III, 269–270.

Weiss, K., "φέρω κτλ.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (eds. G. Kittel – G. Friedrich) (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1995) IX, 56–87.

Wolff, H.W., *Antropologia dell'Antico Testamento*, 4 ed. (Biblioteca Biblica 12; Brescia: Queriniana 2002).

Zakrzewska, M., "Choroba – zło dotykające człowieka," *Biblia a medycyna* (ed. B. Pawlaczyk) (Poznań: Księgarnia Świętego Wojciecha 2007) 15–27.

Zapff, B.M., *Jesus Sirach 25–51* (Die Neue Echter Bibel. Altes Testament; Würzburg: Echter 2010).

Zapff, B.M., "Sir 38,1–15 als Beispiel der Verknüpfung von Tradition und Innovation bei Jesus Sirach," *Biblica* 92 (2011) 347–367.

Ziegler, J., *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*, 2 ed. (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gotteingensis editum 12/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1980).

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 12/4 (2022) 503–511

Jesus' Friends in John 15 and the Hellenistic Royal Court

Jacek Rzepka
University of Warsaw
e-mail: jrzepka@uw.edu.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4786-5493

Abstract: The present contribution utilizes the reference to disciples as Jesus' friends in Jesus' Farewell Talk to the Apostles in John 15 as evidence of the contemporary understanding of the Hellenistic royal in essentially non-Greek circles of the Greco-Roman East. It also argues that this passage may help to explain the very nature of the Hellenistic royal friends (*philoi*) as compared to other possible types of relation to monarchs (servants – *douloi*, companions – *hetairoi*) in the earlier Hellenistic Age.

Keywords: hellenistic court, companions, friends, Jesus' disciples as friends

The present contribution starts from an observation that Jesus' Farewell Talk to his disciples (John 15), with an assertion that the disciples were his friends, not – servants, may reflect the awareness of the Hellenistic royal patterns in the circles of the disciples of Christ in the 1st cent. AD (both the times of Jesus and the times of the composition of John are meant here).[1] As primarily an ancient historian, interested in the Hellenistic monarchy, I believe that this piece of evidence may be used to make a difference between the Companions (*hetairoi*) and Friends (*philoi*) of Hellenistic kings more nuanced. That is why I decide to delve into a New Testament passage famous for and analyzed mainly owing to its theological content. The idea begins with a conviction that the political consciousness of people of various origin in that period was increasingly influenced by the growth of personal monarchies, which emerged from the division of the empire of Alexander the Great. In fact, the model of kingship elaborated by the Graeco-Macedonian elite appeared to be attractive to non-Greek peoples as well. In some non-Greek cultures the Hellenistic model of monarchy has been fiercely discussed. The Jews, surrounded by (and subject to) two Hellenistic superpowers were not unlike, and gradually the monarchy the Maccabees and of Herod the Great borrowed more and more from the rich language of power of Hellenistic monarchs. It was also the language that heavily impacted the ways of thinking of almost

1 Any effort to extract Jesus' actual teaching from the gospel's authorial text was not ever accepted more widely in the Bible scholarship, and perhaps never will be. The public teaching of Jesus and the writing down of the Gospel are relatively close each other and both belong to the world of the Principate, very much different from the epoch when the concept of the Hellenistic kingship was shaped. That is why I think it is justified to treat John's allusions to the monarchy integrally as testimonies of the post-Alexandrian Hellenistic kingship's reception in the circle of Jesus.

DOI: 10.31743/biban.12393 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

all circles of the society depicted in the Gospels. Therefore, the Hellenistic loan-terms in New Testament may be utilized as a supplementary context for better understanding of Hellenistic society.

John's account of Jesus' last talk to the disciples before the Passion with its crucial notions of the Hellenistic court terminology is not the only reference to Jesus' kingship in the fourth Gospel as it is generally acknowledged that the issue of Jesus' kingship underlies the whole Passion narrative of John thematically (cf. not only John 18:33–19:3 but also John 19:19–22). John determined to deal with this issue with three different perspectives (Jesus' self-statement as the Lord; Jesus' kingship discussed with Pilate; Pilate's notice to be fixed on the cross), and certainly the vision of God's monarchy in John results from someone's careful reflection and study.

In the last talk to the disciples Jesus names them friends, and not slaves or servants of himself and refers to the relation as *philia* (John 15:14–15).[2] Admittedly, too, Jesus identifies himself in this passage as the Lord (*kyrios*), not as the king. Indeed, in John Jesus never, except for the descriptions of the Passion, refers to himself as to a king. John, however, uses the notion of Jesus as *basileus* while reporting others' attitude to Jesus. Thus Nathanael confesses his belief in Jesus as the Son of God and the king of Israel (John 1:49), which agrees with a quote from Zecharias (Zech 5:5) in the account of Jesus' ceremonial entry into Jerusalem (John 12:15). The political sense of the kingship, which some supporters had projected for Jesus is clearly implied in John 6:15, too (Ἰησοῦς οὖν γνοὺς ὅτι μέλλουσιν ἔρχεσθαι καὶ ἁρπάζειν αὐτὸν ἵνα ποιήσωσιν βασιλέα, ἀνεχώρησεν πάλιν εἰς τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸς μόνος. – "Therefore when Jesus perceived that they were about to come and take Him by force to make Him king, He departed again to the mountain by Himself alone").[3] Still, the noun *kyrios* had been used for a century at least as a synonym of the royal title in the Greek world,[4] and one may assume that Jesus (and then Paul, too) used it as a safer, seemingly less obviously political notion than that of *basileus*.

Modern commentaries usually focus on purely moral or theological aspects of the disciples' elevation to the status of the friends. When using the Classical context to explain this passage, they go to Greek philosophical treatises dealing with issues like friendship or slavery, most notably Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*. Sometimes, they also try to explain the friendship between Jesus (as the Lord) and his disciples in the context of the Old Testament as well as in the conditions of the Church *in statu nascendi*. It was not overlooked that

2 John 15:14: ὑμεῖς φίλοι μού ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε ἃ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν. 15. οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους, ὅτι ὁ δοῦλος οὐκ οἶδεν τί ποιεῖ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος: ὑμᾶς δὲ εἴρηκα φίλους, ὅτι πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν. – "You are My friends if you do whatever I command you. 15 No longer do I call you servants, for a servant does not know what his master is doing; but I have called you friends, for all things that I heard from My Father I have made known to you." The English Bible translations are NKJV.

3 P. Beskow, *Rex gloriae, the Kingship of Christ in the Early Church* (Stockholm – Goteborg – Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell 1962) 39–44.

4 See: L. Cerfaux, "Le Titre Kyrios et la dignité royale de Jésus," *RSPT* 11 (1922) 58–59 on usages of Herodes Agrippa; D. Cuss, *Imperial Cult and Honorary Terms in the New Testament* (Fribourg: University Press 1974) 53–59.

the new friends remain servants of the Lord (John 15:20), which at first glance may seem contradictory.[5] On the other hand, in more recent scholarship students of John do not fail to notice that Jesus' styling of his disciples as friends resembles practices known from the political practice of his age (friends of "Eastern rulers," *amici Caesaris*).[6] Of course, friendship is not the main theme driving the Gospel of John.[7] Rather, the language of friendship – *philia*[8] was the most natural to both the author and the intended readers of the text.[9] It is clear that in the Hellenistic societies this language was well understood and everyone was aware that the concept of *philia* may have mask many various types of relationships including that of personal dependence.[10]

Thus the theme of friendship, being omnipresent in the Ancient, especially Greco-Roman thought for many centuries, has been borrowed and developed by Hellenistic monarchs to explain their relation to their subjects. I think that we should set the words of Jesus in the context of the Hellenistic discourse on the monarchy, kinship, and court societies more firmly as it has been hitherto done. It is well known fact that in the Hellenistic kings (both the ones descending from Macedonian families as well as non-Macedonians) relied in administering their kingdoms on loose structures of *philoi* – Friends (courtiers, administrative officers, advisors, ambassadors).[11] In the monarchies of Alexander's Successors

---

5 R. Kieffer, "John," *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (eds. J. Burton – J. Muddiman) (Oxford: University Press 2001) 989.

6 E.g. J.H. Bernard – A.H. McNeile, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John* (New York: Scribner's Sons 1929) II, 487–488; W. Grundmann, "Das Wort von Jesu Freunden (Joh. XV, 13–16) und das Herrenmahl," *NovT* 3 (1959) 62–69; L.B. Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America 2007) 167–168.

7 M.M. Culy, *Echoes of Friendship in the Gospel of John* (New Testament Monographs 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix 2010) 178–180.

8 Still, the Gospel of John is unique among New Testament writings in its use of φιλέω (and cognates) which may also be understood as equivalent to ἀγαπάω (to love), see: T. Haraguchi, "Philia as agapē: the Theme of Friendship in the Gospel of John," *AsJT* 28 (2014) 250–262.

9 G.R. O'Day, "Jesus as Friend in the Gospel of John," *Int* 58/2 (2004) 145; Culy, *Echoes* (n. 7), 20 (for the author) and 180–184 (for the readers). Cf. D. Estes, "Echoes of Friendship in the Gospel of John," *JETS* 55/1 (2012) 184–186.

10 See: Z.A. Crook, "Fictive-friendship and the Fourth Gospel," *HTS Theological Studies* 67/3 (2011) 1–7.

11 The literature on the subject is immense, perhaps one cannot omit from the list Christian Habicht ("The Ruling Class in the Hellenistic Monarchies," C. Habicht, *The Hellenistic Monarchies. Selected Papers* [Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Press 2006] 32–35) and F.W. Walbank, "Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas," *CAH* VII/1, 68–71. Of the remaining scholarship cf. esp: G. Herman, "The 'Friends' of the Early Hellenistic Rulers: Servants or Officials?," *Talanta* 12–13 (1980–1981) 103–149; S. Le Bohec, "Les *Philoi* des Rois Antigonides," *REG* 98 (1985) 93–124; L. Mooren, "The Ptolemaic Court System," *CdE* 60 (1985) 214–222; G. Herman, "The Court Society of the Hellenistic Age," *Hellenistic Constructs. Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography* (Berkeley, CA – Los Angeles, CA – London: California University Press 1997) 199–224; I. Savalli-Lestrade, "Courtisans et citoyens: le cas des philoi attalides," *Chiron* 26 (1996) 149–181; I. Savalli-Lestrade, *Les philoi royaux dans l'Asie hellénistique* (Genève: Droz 1998) *passim* and esp. 289–290; F. Muccioli, "La scelta delle titolature dei Seleucidi. Il ruolo dei philoi e delle classi dirigenti cittadine," *Simbolos* 3 (2001) 295–318; B. Meißner, "Hofmann und Herrscher. Was es für die Griechen hieß, Freund eines Königs zu sein," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 82 (2000) 1–36; A. Mehl, "Gedanken zur «herrschenden Gesellschaft» und zu den Untertanen im Seleukidenreich," *Historia* 52 (2003) 147–160; T. Brüggemann, "Vom Machtanspruch zur Herrschaft.

the Friends replaced an earlier structure of the *hetairoi* – the Companions of the Argead kings of Macedon (who in the first line were the heavy cavalrymen in royal service). In the court context it is not easy to distinguish between the *hetairoi* and the *philoi*, and indeed some historians prefer to speak about one structure with two names, of which one was preferred in the Classical Age of Greek history, while the other gained more popularity in the Hellenistic Age.[12] It might be argued, however, that the terms *hetairoi* and *philoi* were sometimes utilized by ancient authors in a prejudiced way, and that there was always a lot of space for possible semantic manipulations.[13]

A possible utilization of the contrast between friends and servants in John 15:14 as a piece of evidence on Hellenistic courts was not considered in the literature on St. John Gospel. In the previous scholarship such a possibility was excluded by statements like a one by George Mervyn Lee.[14] I am afraid, however, that his argument that "here we have to do with friends in a private station, more or less on terms of equality" does suggest a misunderstanding of Hellenistic court ideology, rightly corrected by later Biblical scholars – the ostensible (and obviously forged) equality of kings and friends was a trait of Hellenistic monarchies, and Jesus' stress on his own devotion to his friends perfectly echoes Hellenistic ideals.[15]

One may also anchor the possible reference to the Hellenistic court friends in other Greek language usages, reflecting a degree of understanding of Hellenistic monarchies in some circles of Jesus' disciples. Thus, the authors of the Gospels use the word προσκυνέω

Prolegomena zu einer Studie über die Organisation königlicher Herrschaft im Seleukidenreich," *Studia hellenistica et historiographica. Festschrift für Andreas Mehl* (eds. T. Brüggemann *et al.*) (Gutenberg: Computus 2010) 19–57; R. Strootman, "Hellenistic Court Society: The Seleukid Imperial Court under Antiochos the Great, 223–187 BCE," *Royal Courts in Dynastic States and Empires. A Global Perspective* (eds. J. Duindam – T. Artan – M. Kunt) (Leiden: Brill 2011) 69–70.

12 On hetairoi, see: R.M. Errington, "Hetairoi," *ODC* 702; G. Plaumann, "ἑταῖροι," PW, VIII, 1376; H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (München: Beck 1926) I, 30; G. Stagakis, "Observations on the *ἑταῖροι* of Alexander the Great," *Ancient Macedonia* (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies 1970) I, 86–102. Helmut Berve (*Das Alexanderreich*, 30–37) included all persons named by the sources as the friends among the *hetairoi*. Eugene Borza (*In the shadow of Olympus. The Emergence of Macedon* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 1990] 241) warns that "the distinctions made by our sources between 'companions' and 'friends' should not be pressed, as there is rather little understanding and consistency in the use of such terms by the ancient writers." In Savalli-Lestrade, *Les philoi royaux*, 289–290 a switch from the courts of *hetairoi* to those of *philoi* is explained by the fact that the rulers of multi-component Hellenistic states required rather fidelity rather than obeisance.

13 See: J. Rzepka, "Conspirators – Companions – Bodyguards: A Note on the So-Called Mercenaries' Source and the Conspiracy of Bessus (Curt. 5.8.1–11)," *AHB* 23 (2009) 19–31; J. Rzepka, "How Many Companions Did Philip II Have?," *Electrum* 19 (2012) 131–135.

14 G.M. Lee, "John XV 14 'Ye are My Friends'," *NovT* 15 (1973) 260.

15 Here one may recall an argument of Gail R. O'Day that Jesus' stress on his sacrifice of life for his friends in John 15:13 corresponds with Platonic and Aristotelian concepts of friendship up to one's devotion of life in Plato, *Symp.* 179B or Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 9.8.9. Additionally O'Day draws attention to equality among friends in the Greek thought resulting in *parrhesia* (equal or frank speech) which is reflected by Jesus' frankness, boldness or plainness in John 7:4; 13:26; 10:24; 11:14 and 54; 16:25 and 29; 18:20. See: O'Day, "Jesus as Friend," 149–150.

and its cognates to describe a way, in which the faithful should worship Jesus.[16] Although the exact meaning of the word in the Biblical context (with reference to the Greek Old Testament usages) is fiercely debated as a part of the Trinitarian – anti-Trinitarian argument, one must say that in the Greek cultural background of the Hellenistic kingdoms the word προσκυνέω (meaning an act of ritual prostration) was closely linked with the question of the cult of the kings – the first ever demand of *proskynesis* from his friends by a Greek (indeed Macedonian) monarch (Alexander the Great) shocked his subjects, and was almost immediately interpreted as a claim to divine status.[17]

It is also well known that Jesus on numerous occasions contrasts his spiritual realm with the earthly kingdoms of his age (as in John 18:36). Most of Jesus' statements about the contemporary kingdoms and kings in the Gospels are not technical and do not allude to particular traits of the monarchies of his times. A notable exception is Luke 22:25 with a criticism of the Gentile monarchs calling themselves benefactors (ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἐξουσιάζοντες αὐτῶν εὐεργέται καλοῦνται).[18] The passage is widely recognized as a polemics with the ubiquitous Hellenistic practice of praising *euergetai*, especially royal ones, by the Greeks.[19]

---

16 See: M.L. Bowen, "'They Came and Held Him by the Feet and Worshipped Him': Proskynesis before Jesus in its Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Context," *Studies in the Bible and Antiquity* 5 (2013) 63–89.

17 The literature on the subject is again more than immense, so I will restrict quotations to a few more detailed or more recent studies. In contrast to the Greeks the Persians did not treat the ritual prostration as an act of divine worship, and modern scholars wonder whether Alexander's demand of *proskynesis* indeed meant for him a claim to divinity or was a mistaken and misunderstood unifying measure within the Empire – for *status quaestionis*, see: E. Fredricksmeyer, "Alexander's Religion and Divinity," *Brill's companion to Alexander the Great* (ed. J. Roisman) (Leiden: Brill 2003) 274–275 with n. 97 and 98. I do not think Alexander's own judgement might be so distant from the views of his people. For convincing arguments that Alexander intended to achieve the divine worship through the introduction of *proskynesis*; see: E. Badian, "The Deification of Alexander the Great," *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson* (ed. H.J. Dell) (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies 1981) 48–52, 64–65; I. Worthington, *By the Spear. Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Rise and Fall of the Macedonian Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2014) 265–269. The early history and Near Eastern sources of *proskynesis* in C. Materese, "Proskynēsis and the Gesture of the Kiss at Alexander's Court: The Creation of a New Élite," *Palamedes* 8 (2013) 75–86 and H. Bowden "On Kissing and Making Up: Court Protocol and Historiography in Alexander the Great's 'Experiment with Proskynesis,'" *BICS* 56/2 (2013) 55–77.

18 "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and those who exercise authority over them are called 'benefactors.'" The parallel passages in Matt 20:25 and Mark 10:44 do not include mention of *euergetai*, but I would still underscore that the stress on the service of the leader towards his people (ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος and ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος, ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος respectively) may be a looser, less learned recollection of the words of Jesus about the role of the true leader. On the other hand, Luke 22:24 is the only New Testament occurrence of the noun φιλονεικία (*love of strife,* in later Greek thought very much assimilated erroneously to φιλονικία *love of victory*), which fits perfectly into the discourse on the Hellenistic monarchy. Apparently, Luke's informer or Luke himself was very sensitive about this discourse, whereas the writers of the two other synoptic gospels did not see it so precisely.

19 The use of the word Εὐεργέτης, as well as of its cognates εὐεργετέω or εὐεργεσία in the New Testament was thoroughly analysed by Frederick W. Danker (*Benefactor. Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* [Saint Louis, MO: Clayton 1982] 324–329); on the conceptual relation between salvation and benefaction in Antiquity, see: A.D. Nock, "*Soter* and *Euergetes*," *The Joy of Study* (ed. S.E. Johnson) (New York: Macmillan 1951) 136.

The above examples are on the one hand dispersed in gospels written down by four different people, and may look at the first glance casual. On the other hand, once having grouped them together, one cannot easily resist a conclusion that awareness of the Hellenistic monarchy and its peculiar traits was indeed deep in the circle of Jesus' disciples.

Jesus' words on the Hellenistic kingship may be therefore treated also as an additional source of evidence we should take into consideration in our attempts at explaining the Hellenistic court. We should come back to St. John Gospel and Christ's words on disciples as his *philoi*. Jesus inserts in his teaching about friendship a comment on why the disciples may be *philoi*: 15:16 οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς καὶ ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε καὶ ὁ καρπὸς ὑμῶν μένῃ ("You did not choose Me, but I chose you and appointed you that you should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should remain, that whatever you ask the Father in My name He may give you"). Except for the theological content Jesus offers here what could be a dictionary definition of the Hellenistic royal friend. His stress on a personal choice and appointment of friends by the king (ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην[20] ὑμᾶς), instead of a choice of the king by his people (οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε)[21] may reflect Hellenistic discussions about monarchy. It may also explain why in the Hellenistic court terminology the *philoi* eventually replaced the *hetairoi*. The structure of the court composed of *philoi* was indeed looser, more flexible, and less rooted in traditional aristocracies (certainly new Hellenistic kingdoms lacked established Greek or Macedonian aristocracies, numerous enough to man the royal administration), and to much lesser a degree linked with the military service (which was crucial for *hetairoi*). The stress on the personal choice of the friends by the sovereign (and perhaps, on the appointment to a particular role as well: ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς ἵνα) in the Gospel reflects well the position of the Hellenistic

20 Nota bene, the verb ἐκλέγω, used by John here, quite commonly denotes a selection of the best people (to a particular mission or as elite units, see: Xenophon, *Hell.* 1.6.19; cf. also: Plato, *Resp.* 535a).

21 A question of the methods of appointment of the Macedonian and Hellenistic monarchs (including a problem of election, assemblies of the friends, of the Companions, of the people) belongs to the most debated issues in the field of ancient history. Numerous scholars argue for some constitutional restrictions of royal power in Macedonia, and especially for the appointment of the kings by the assemblies or the Companions, most notably Nicholas G.L. Hammond, (*The Macedonian State. The Origins, Institutions and History* [Oxford: Oxford University Press 1989]) and Miltiadis B. Hatzopoulos (*Macedonian Institutions under the Kings* [Athens – Paris: De Boccard 1996] I–II) or even in the Successors' states (F. Granier, *Die makedonische Heeresversammlung. Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht* [München: Beck 1931], arguing for the exclusive right of assembly to acclaim new kings). Most experts, while acknowledge that one can speak about influence of the people on some royal appointments in Macedonia, do not see any rule in those cases (e.g. Borza, *In the Shadow of Olympus*, 243–244; R.M. Errington, *History of Macedonia* [Berkeley, CA: University of California Press 1990] 220–221); the clearest review of earlier debate in L. Mooren, "The Nature of the Hellenistic Monarchy," *Egypt and the Hellenistic World* (eds. E. Van't Dack – P. van Dessel – W. van Gucht) (Studia Hellenistica 27; Leuven: Peeters 1983) 205–240. Perhaps one can sum up this debate with cautious observations of M.B. Hatzopoulos (*Ancient Macedonia* [Trends in Classics – Key Perspectives on Classical Research 1; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 2020] 116) that the assessment of the Macedonian monarchy was very much a matter of perception: for enemies and people who grew up in Classical democracies, the kings of Macedon were absolute rulers, while insiders used to be more aware of customary limitations of royal power and tended to see in Macedon a kind of an ideal Homeric kingdom.

court *philos* and his duties – one can guess that this reflects the origins of the institution of the royal *philoi* introduced as a replacement or originally as a task-related supplement of the old-fashioned Macedonian *hetairoi* (Companions). The *hetairoi* were very much a military guard of the king, then his entire heavy cavalry corpus, selected routinely from the elites, and their name was very much politicized due to the elevation of the Macedonian infantrymen to the ranks of the *pezhetairoi* – Foot Companions (needless to say that kings' personal influence on the selection of their infantry companions, being multiple thousands in number, was even weaker).

Thus, John 15 helps us to understand that in the Hellenistic age the *philoi* were simply king's men chosen personally by the king himself. More generally, the whole discourse on Jesus' kingship in the Gospels, and particularly in John reminds us that the historians of Antiquity may learn a lot from the reflections of the Classical world and its social practices in the texts from the outer edge of the Classical tradition. Especially, New Testament and other early Christian writing should not escape attention of scholars dealing with the pagan world in the last centuries BC and the very first centuries AD.

Bibliography

Badian, E., "The Deification of Alexander the Great," *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson* (ed. H.J. Dell) (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies 1981) 27–71.

Bernard, J.H. – McNeile, A.H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John* (New York: Scribner's Sons 1929) II.

Berve, H., *Das Alexanderreich Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (München: Beck 1926) I.

Beskow, P., *Rex gloriae, the Kingship of Christ in the Early Church* (Stockholm – Goteborg – Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell 1962).

Borza, E., *In the Shadow of Olympus. The Emergence of Macedon* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 1990).

Bowden, H., "On Kissing and Making Up: Court Protocol and Historiography in Alexander the Great's 'Experiment with Proskynesis'," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 56/2 (2013) 55–77.

Bowen, M.L., "'They Came and Held Him by the Feet and Worshipped Him': Proskynesis before Jesus in its Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Context," *Studies in the Bible and Antiquity* 5 (2013) 63–89.

Brüggemann, T., "Vom Machtanspruch zur Herrschaft. Prolegomena zu einer Studie über die Organisation königlicher Herrschaft im Seleukidenreich," *Studia hellenistica et historiographica. Festschrift für Andreas Mehl* (eds. T. Brüggemann *et al.*) (Gutenberg: Computus 2010) 19–57.

Cerfaux, L., "Le Titre Kyrios et la dignité royale de Jésus," *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 11 (1922) 40–71.

Crook, Z.A., "Fictive-friendship and the Fourth Gospel," *HTS Theological Studies* 67/3 (2011) 1–7.

Culy, M.M., *Echoes of Eriendship in the Gospel of John* (New Testament Monographs 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix 2010) 178–180.

Cuss, D., *Imperial Cult and Honorary Terms in the New Testament* (Fribourg: University Press 1974).

Danker, F.W., *Benefactor. Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (Saint Louis, MO: Clayton 1982).

Errington, R.M., *History of Macedonia* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press 1990).

Errington, R.M., "Hetairoi," *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3 ed. (eds. S. Hornblower – A. Spawforth) (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1995) 702.

Estes, D., "Echoes of Friendship in the Gospel of John," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 55/1 (2012) 184–186.

Fredricksmeyer, E., "Alexander's Religion and Divinity," *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great* (ed. J. Roisman) (Leiden: Brill 2003) 253–278.

Granier, F., *Die makedonische Heeresversammlung. Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht* (München: Beck 1931).

Grundmann, W., "Das Wort von Jesu Freunden (Joh. XV, 13–16) und das Herrenmahl," *Novum Testamentum* 3 (1959) 62–69.

Habicht, C., "The Ruling Class in the Hellenistic Monarchies," C. Habicht, *The Hellenistic Monarchies. Selected Papers* (Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Press 2006) 26–40 (translated from "Die herrschende Gesellschaft in den hellenistischen Monarchien," *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 45/1 [1958] 1–16).

Hammond, N.G.L., *The Macedonian State. The Origins, Institutions and History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1989).

Haraguchi, T., "Philia as agapē: the Theme of Friendship in the Gospel of John," *The Asia Journal of Theology* 28 (2014) 250–262.

Hatzopoulos, M.B., *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings* (Athens – Paris: De Boccard 1996) I–II.

Hatzopoulos, M.B., *Ancient Macedonia* (Trends in Classics – Key Perspectives on Classical Research 1; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 2020).

Herman, G., "The 'Friends' of the Early Hellenistic Rulers: Servants or Officials?," *Talanta* 12–13 (1980–1981) 103–149.

Herman, G., "The Court Society of the Hellenistic Age," *Hellenistic Constructs. Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography* (eds. P. Cartledge – P. Garnsey – E. Gruen) (Berkeley, CA – Los Angeles, CA – London: California University Press 1997) 199–224.

Kieffer, R., "John," *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (eds. J. Burton – J. Muddiman) (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2001) 960–1000.

Lee, G.M., "John XV 14 'Ye are My Friends'," *Novum Testamentum* 15 (1973) 260.

Le Bohec, S., "Les *Philoi* des Rois Antigonides," *Revue des Études Grecques* 98 (1985) 93–124.

Materese, C., "Proskynēsis and the Gesture of the Kiss at Alexander's Court: The Creation of a New Élite," *Palamedes* 8 (2013) 75–86.

Mehl, A., "Gedanken zur «herrschenden Gesellschaft» und zu den Untertanen im Seleukidenreich," *Historia* 52 (2003) 147–160.

Meißner, B., "Hofmann und Herrscher. Was es für die Griechen hieß, Freund eines Königs zu sein," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 82 (2000) 1–36.

Mooren, L., "The Ptolemaic Court System," *Chronique d'Égypte* 60 (1985) 214–222.

Mooren, L., "The Nature of the Hellenistic Monarchy," *Egypt and the Hellenistic World* (eds. E. Van't Dack – P. van Dessel – W. van Gucht) (Studia Hellenistica 27; Leuven: Peeters 1983) 205–240.

Muccioli, F., "La scelta delle titolature dei Seleucidi. Il ruolo dei philoi e delle classi dirigenti cittadine," *Simbolos* 3 (2001) 295–318.

Nock, A.D., "*Soter* and *Euergetes*," *The Joy of Study* (ed. S.E. Johnson) (New York: Macmillan 1951) 127–148.

O'Day, G.R., "Jesus as Friend in the Gospel of John," *Interpretation* 58/2 (2004) 144–157.

Plaumann, G., "ἑταίροι," *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (eds. G. Wissowa – W. Kroll) (Stuttgart: Metzler 1913) VIII, 1376.

Richey, L.B., *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America 2007).

Rzepka, J., "Conspirators – Companions – Bodyguards: A Note on the So-Called Mercenaries' Source and the Conspiracy of Bessus (Curt. 5.8.1–11)," *Ancient History Bulletin* 23 (2009) 19–31.

Rzepka, J., "How Many Companions Did Philip II Have?," *Electrum* 19 (2012) 131–135.

Savalli-Lestrade, I., "Courtisans et citoyens: le cas des philoi attalides," *Chiron* 26 (1996) 149–181.

Savalli-Lestrade, I., *Les philoi royaux dans l'Asie hellénistique* (Genève: Droz 1998).

Stagakis, G., "Observations on the *ἑταίροι* of Alexander the Great," *Ancient Macedonia* (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies 1970) I, 86–102.

Strootman, R., "Hellenistic Court Society: The Seleukid Imperial Court under Antiochos the Great, 223–187 BCE," *Royal Courts in Dynastic States and Empires. A Global Perspective* (eds. J. Duindam – T. Artan – M. Kunt) (Leiden: Brill 2011) 63–90.

Walbank, F.W., "Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas," *Cambridge Ancient History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1984) VII/1, 62–100.

Worthington, I., *By the Spear. Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Rise and Fall of the Macedonian Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2014).

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 12/4 (2022) 513–543

Divine and Human Spirit in Rom 8:16. Paul and Epictetus on Free Will

Marcin Kowalski
The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
xmkowal@kul.pl
http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8732-6868

Abstract: The article focuses on the phenomenon of free will in Paul, taking as the starting point Rom. 8:16. At the beginning, a concise exegetical analysis of Rom 8:16 is presented, placed in the rhetorical context of Rom 8. Subsequently, a comparison is drawn between Paul's and Epictetus's views on divine and human agency. First, the Epictetus's idea of freedom is presented with a special emphasis on the notion of proairesis, understood as the true self of a person, responsible for free moral choices and actions. Next, the similarities and differences between the Epictetus's and Pauline vision of free will are discussed. What connects the apostle and the philosopher are convictions that free will can exist in a divinely determined world and that human volition requires continuous education and subordination to God's will. The elements that clearly distinguish Paul from Epictetus are the natural image of deity to be imitated in the human pursuit of freedom, and a genuinely relational, corporeal and emotive character of free will in the apostle. The psycho-somatic nature of human personality and will in Paul invites a dialogue between the apostle and modern science but it has to be carried out cautiously, bearing in mind the different methodologies, the idea of transcendent deity and Christological foundation upon which the Pauline idea of freedom and free will is built.

Keywords: Rom 8:16, divine Spirit, human spirit, Epictetus, proairesis, freedom, free will, determinism

The question of the relationship between human will and divine action has been the focus of interest for representatives of various religions and fields of science for centuries. Since the Qur'an did not give a clear answer to it, one hundred years after Muhammad's death, Islamic scholars asked the caliphs for the permission to study the writings of ancient Greek philosophers, where the key to solving this mystery might be hidden.[1] The Bible also does not explain how to reconcile an individual's absolute dependence on God and the faculty to freely decide one's fate. One of the most important New Testament authors on the subject is, of course, Paul. In Pauline vision, Christian freedom is a divine gift, closely related to the Christ event and the work of the Spirit; it means the new life in Christ, being free from sin, and directed towards God's righteousness, sanctification

1 R. Kane, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will* (Fundamentals of Philosophy Series; New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press 2005) 148.

DOI: 10.31743/biban.13786 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

and eternal life (Rom 6:22).[2] Does the new life in Christ, marked so distinctly by the primacy of God's grace and action, leave any room for a truly free human will and agency? The starting point of this paper will be Rom 8:16, describing in a more explicit and detailed way than other Pauline elocutions the interaction between the human and divine Spirit, and placing it in a dense network of divine agency in Rom 8. The specific text we will focus on does not preclude the use of others, but it gives us a chance to avoid too general and shallow an analysis of Pauline pronouncements on the issue, additionally detached from their argumentative context. Pondering on Rom 8:16 and adding other relevant passages from the apostle's letters, I will try to draw a picture of the relationship between human free will and divine all-determining action in Paul. To help us better understand the interaction between free will and the divine determinant in the apostle, I will refer to the Stoic thought as represented by Epictetus, roughly contemporary with Paul. His idea of freedom constructed around the notion of *proairesis* presents both striking similarities and important differences with respect to the apostle, which will help us better capture the specificity of the Pauline notion of volition and its relatedness to the Graeco-Roman and Jewish atmosphere.[3]

1. Rom 8:16 in the Context of Chapter 8

Rom 8:16 belongs to the section of Rom 8:14–17, which plays a pivotal role in chapter 8. In this chapter, we are dealing with the climax of Paul's argumentation in Rom 5–8.[4] Here,

2 See the context in which the stem ἐλευθ- appears in Paul: Rom 6:18, 20, 22; 8:2, 21; 1 Cor 7:22; 2 Cor 3:17; Gal 2:4; 4:31; 5:1, 13. On the word group in the Graeco-Roman, Jewish and New Testament context, see H. Schlier, "ἐλεύθερος κτλ.," *TDNT* II, 487–502; K. Niederwimmer, "ἐλεύθερος κτλ.," *EDNT* I, 432–434.

3 On the methodological challenges awaiting those who compare the New Testament authors and the Stoics, see C.K. Rowe, *One True Life. The Stoics and Early Christians as Rival Traditions* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 2016) 175–262. The author practically denies a possibility of any fruitful comparison between the Christian and Stoic views, heavily criticising the "encyclopedic" mind frame in which such a comparison is oftentimes carried out. Christopher K. Rowe points to the blurring of the distinctions between the Stoic and Christian authors characteristic of the modern approach and argues for the radical untranslatability of the Stoic and Christian concepts, turned into artificial abstracts and detached from ordinary life in which they took on their proper meanings. The author accentuates exclusively differences between the Stoa and Christianity, presented by him as competing and rival projects of living. He eventually admits some points of contact between them on behalf of the common Graeco-Roman atmosphere they share (see "Appendix," *ibidem*, 260), but it remains largely irrelevant to his methodological views. Although they are hard to agree with, as shown by a vast majority of scholars, we should welcome his caution and care in accentuating important dissimilarities between Paul and the Stoics. On a possible search for a common intellectual and historic-cultural background among different ancient authors and its methodological premises, see also K. Crabbe, *Luke/Acts and the End of History* (BZNW 238; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2019) 33 and more on pp. 32–56.

4 On the rhetorical structure of Rom 5–8, see J.-N. Aletti, "The Rhetoric of Romans 5–8," *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture. Essays from the 1995 London Conference* (eds. S.E. Porter – T.H. Olbricht) (JSNTSup 146; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1997) 294–308; A. Gieniusz, *Romans 8,18–30. Suffering Does Not Thwart the Future Glory* (USFSJH 9; Atlanta, GA: Scholars 1999) 40–49; C.H. Talbert, "Tracing Paul's Train of Thought in Romans 6–8," *RevExp* 100/1 (2003) 53–63. On the rhetorical analysis of Rom 5–8, see J.-N. Aletti,

Paul describes the believers' new life in Christ by introducing a figure who is responsible for it, namely, the Spirit. In the complementary thesis (*subpropositio*) of Rom 8:1–2, the apostle states that there is no condemnation for those "in Christ," because the law of the Spirit has set them free from the law of sin and death.[5] Verse 2 explicates Paul's statement in v. 1: the law of the Spirit means the new *aeon* which the Spirit introduces, the *aeon* of God's love and justification working through Christ, which effectively abolishes the previous condemnation. The Spirit liberates (ἐλευθερόω) Christians from the slavery of sin and death. The first argument (Rom 8:3–4) with which the apostle illustrates his thesis is focused on God and Christ: God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, condemned sin in the flesh (Rom 8:4). This way the just requirement of the Law can be fulfilled in those who walk according to the Spirit (Rom 8:3–4). In other words, the Christians' new life is possible thanks to the saving work of the Father and the Son and it becomes accessible to those who let themselves be guided by the Spirit.

The Spirit binds together the first (Rom 8:3–4) and the second argument (8:5–13), in which the apostle elaborates on the topic of new life. First, the Spirit liberates the believers from walking according to the flesh, that is, according to the old, sinful self, granting them life and peace with God (Rom 8:5–8). Second, life in the Spirit means belonging to Christ and resurrection similar to his resurrection (Rom 8:9–11). Third, it also means putting to death the deeds of the body, which results in being more and more immersed in the baptismal death and resurrection of Christ (Rom 8:12–13). The indicative, with which Paul describes the new status of the believers in Rom 8:1–13, is interwoven with the imperative. The gifts of the Spirit remain ineffective in those, who do not collaborate with the Spirit (Rom 8:4,13). The new life in Christ is a joint effort of the Christian and the Spirit.

Closing the first part of his argumentation in chapter 8, the apostle depicts the believers guided by the Spirit and enjoying their new status of children of God (Rom 8:14). Paul uses the rhetorical *gradatio*, picturing first the Spirit that enables the baptised to cry to God "Abba! Father!" (Rom 8:15). Then, it continually supports the testimony of their own human spirit that they are God's children (Rom 8:16) and finally introduces them to the glorious inheritance awaiting those who participate in the sufferings of Christ (Rom 8:17). The work of the Spirit cannot be limited simply to reminding the believers who they are, as it consists in bringing them ever more deeply into communion with the Father, thanks to which they become more and more similar to the Son and capable of moral life.[6]

New Approaches for Interpreting the Letters of Saint Paul. Collected Essays. Rhetoric, Soteriology, Christology and Ecclesiology (SubBi 43; Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press 2012) 61–138.

5 On the rhetorical role of Rom 8,1–2, see J.-N. Aletti, "Romans 8. The Incarnation and Its Redemptive Impact," J.-N. Aletti, *New Approaches for Interpreting the Letters of Saint Paul. Collected Essays. Rhetoric, Soteriology, Christology and Ecclesiology* (SubBi 43; Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press 2012) 114–115; Gieniusz, *Romans 8,18–30*, 45; C. Grappe, "Qui me délivrera de ce corps de mort? L'esprit de vie! Romains 7,24 et 8,2 comme éléments de typologie adamique," *Bib* 83/4 (2002) 491. See also J. van Rensburg, "The Children of God in Romans 8," *Neot* 15 (1981) 155; Talbert "Tracing Paul's Train of Thought in Romans 6–8," 59.

6 Cf. V. Rabens, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul. Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life* (WUNT 2/283; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2010) 172; Aletti "Romans 8," 116.

In this context Rom 8:16, which belongs to the pivotal section of Rom 8:14–17, that can be labeled as a rhetorical *transitio*, appears. On the one hand, it closes the Pauline argumentation in Rom 8:1–17 and, on the other, foreshadows the new argument in Rom 8:18–30.[7] Verse 18 can be qualified as the next subsidiary thesis (*subpropositio*), which focuses on the topic of the believers' sufferings alluded to in v. 17.[8] Paul argues that the present distress cannot thwart the future glory that awaits the believers. According to Andrzej Gieniusz, in Rom 8:18, the apostle responds to the dilemma related to the Deuteronomistic theory of retribution, according to which the trials are irrevocably resulting from one's sins.[9] Paul seems to be arguing that the hardships not only do not obliterate the perspective of eternal inheritance, but they also provide an occasion for an even deeper assimilation to Christ and thus participating in his glory. As the Son took upon himself the lowly condition of mankind (Rom 8:3) and thus reached the glorious resurrection (Rom 8:11), so also the baptised, bearing the burdens of the present life, are destined for the future glorious existence.[10] Rom 8:18 alludes to Rom 8:1, but also to the principle thesis of Rom 5:20–21. Sufferings, still present in this world, are not a sign of being subject to the curse of the Law (Rom 8:1) and do not abolish the reign of grace leading to eternal life (Rom 5:20–21).

How does then the Pauline argumentation develop with respect to the thesis that Paul put forward in Rom 8:18? The apostle consequently presents three arguments in which the key role is again played by the Spirit. First, in Rom 8:19–22, it helps to turn the unproductive sighs of the creation into the labour pains out of which the future freedom and glory of the children of God emerges.[11] At the end, the whole creation (κτίσις), signifying here the sub-human world, will participate in the renewed condition of the believers. Second, the Spirit, together with its first fruits deposited in the baptised, ignites and sustains in them the hope of the awaited full redemption of their bodies, that is, resurrection (Rom 8:23–25). Finally, it approaches the Christians in their weakness and lets them experience the power of its prayer and intercession on their behalf (8:26–27).[12] Verses 28–30 conclude the Pauline argumentation in Rom 8:18–30, reinforcing what Paul stated in v. 18.[13] The present sufferings cannot thwart the future glory of the believers because all things work together for good of those who are called, foreknown and predestined by God

7 Cf. J.-B. Matand Bulembat, *Noyau et enjeux de l'eschatologie paulinienne. De l'apocalyptique juive et de l'eschatologie hellénistique dans quelques argumentations de l'apôtre Paul. Étude rhétorico-exégétique de 1 Co 15,35–58; 2 Co 5,1–10 et Rm 8,18–30* (WUNT 84; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 1997) 204–206.

8 Cf. J.-N. Aletti, "Romans 5–8. The Arrangement and Its Theological Relevance," J.-N. Aletti, *New Approaches for Interpreting the Letters of Saint Paul. Collected Essays. Rhetoric, Soteriology, Christology and Ecclesiology* (SubBi 43; Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press 2012) 66; Gieniusz, *Romans 8,18–30*, 81–82; Grappe "Qui me délivrera de ce corps de mort?," 491; Talbert "Tracing Paul's Train of Thought in Romans 6–8," 60.

9 See Gieniusz, *Romans 8,18–30*, 110–111, 160–161.

10 Cf. Aletti "Romans 8," 116.

11 See the double appearance of the vocabulary connected with liberation and freedom in Rom 8:21: ἐλευθερόω and ἐλευθερία.

12 Cf. J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Dallas, TX: Word 1988) 477; D.J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1996) 523; Gieniusz, *Romans 8,18–30*, 212–214.

13 Cf. Gieniusz, *Romans 8,18–30*, 251–253, 287.

to be conformed to the image of his Son (Rom 8:28–29). The Christian path overseen by the Spirit inevitably ends in the glorious inheritance of heaven (8:30).

Getting back to the pivotal section of Rom 8:14–17 and v. 16, Paul portrays here the Spirit who testifies together with our own spirit that we are children of God. The identity of God's children is strictly connected with love which helps the baptised to fulfil the just requirement of God's Law (Rom 8:3–4). It also enhances freedom from the old way of living according to the flesh, which results in the dominion of sin and death (Rom 8:5–8, 12–13). Having the Spirit residing in them, the believers belong to the Father and Son (Rom 8:9–11), waiting for the final transformation of their bodies for the full conformity to Christ (Rom 8:23, 29). Given such an importance of the Spirit in every key aspect of Christian life, one may wonder what kind of collaboration it requires from the believers. How does their freedom and action relate to the work of the Spirit? Does the Spirit collaborating with God also predestines (προορίζω) Christians for salvation (cf. Rom 8:29)? To answer these questions, we need to take a closer look at Rom 8:16, where the human and divine Spirit are put side by side.

2. A Closer Look at Rom 8:16 and the Phenomenon of Human Freedom

In Rom 8:16, Paul describes the Spirit supporting our spirit with its testimony (συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν) that we are God's children. While the first mention of *pneuma* in Rom 8:16 undoubtedly refers to the divine Spirit, the second one gives rise to some interpretative problems. What does "our spirit" mean and what role does it play in Rom 8:16? Robert Jewett, despite the logical difficulties he acknowledges, states that in the analysed verse Paul speaks of God's infused Spirit given to man, supported by the testimony of ... the same divine Spirit.[14] To avoid such a loop, it is better to follow those who interpret τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν as a reference to the human spirit. Adolf Schlatter and Marie-Joseph Lagrange argue that it stands for the human nature renewed by Christ's grace, which finds general support in the context of Rom 8.[15] Joseph Fitzmyer, in turn, sees here an allusion to a personal space in which we offer our prayers as God's children.[16] Similarly, Douglas Moo explains "our spirit" as part of the human personality that receives the witness of the Spirit and also "bears witness with it" (συμμαρτυρεῖ) that we are God's children.[17]

14 See R. Jewett – R.D. Kotansky, *Romans. A Commentary on the Book of Romans* (Hermeneia, MN; Minneapolis: Fortress 2007) 500.

15 See M.-J. Lagrange, *Saint Paul. Épître aux Romains* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda 1931) 202; A. Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief*, 3 ed. (Stuttgart: Calwer 1959) 266.

16 See J.A. Fitzmyer, *Romans. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday 1993) 501.

17 See Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 503–504. On the human spirit here, see also Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 454; G.D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence. The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson 1994) 568; T.J. Burke, "Adoption and the Spirit in Romans 8," *EvQ* 70 (1998) 322; C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and*

Assuming that "our spirit" here denotes the human self that communicates with God, what role does Paul assign to it in Rom 8:16? Is it just a passive recipient of the testimony of the divine Spirit that confirms our dignity as God's children? The verb συμμαρτυρέω, which Paul uses here, can mean that God's Spirit "testifies" to the human spirit that we are God's children, but taking into full consideration the construct συν-, it makes better sense to translate it as joint witnessing.[18] The Spirit of God would then confirm the witness of the human spirit, which expresses the believers' new consciousness as God's children.[19] Schlatter and Lagrange are right, seeing here not only an allusion to the spiritual dimension of the human person, but to a dimension touched by the transforming grace of Christ. The objections raised against this interpretation by some commentators, claiming that the human spirit cannot testify to our dignity as God's children, stem rather from the Lutheran *simul iustus et peccator* than from Paul's logic of argumentation in Rom 8.[20] Paul regularly pictures here the believers collaborating with the divine Spirit (8:4–5, 9, 13, 14–15). Thus, the human spirit in Rom 8:16, imbued with the power of the divine Spirit, embraces its new identity and belonging to God's family. With the help of the divine Spirit, it also translates it into the moral life of an individual (Rom 8:5–8, 12–13). In the midst of the absolute domination of God's grace, as depicted in Rom 8, there is room for human free will and ethical action that results from it. Free will seems to be quite compatible with divine determinism. How exactly does this process take place? What part of our personality is responsible for interacting with God's Spirit? Paul is silent about the details of this interaction, but we can look for them in his contemporary, the Stoic philosopher Epictetus.

Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Introduction and Commentary on Romans I–VIII (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark 2004) 403.

18 See "συμμαρτυρέω," *A Greek-English Lexicon* (ed. H.G. Liddell – R. Scott – H.S. Jones – R. McKenzie) (Oxford – New York: Clarendon – Oxford University Press 1996) 1677: "to bear witness with or in support of another." Thus W. Sanday – A.C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; New York: Scribner 1897) 203; R.C.H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Columbus, OH: Lutheran Book Concern 1936) 524; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 454; E.A. Obeng, "Abba, Father. The Prayer of the Sons of God," *ExpTim* 99/12 (1988) 365; B. Byrne, *Romans* (SP 6; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press 1996) 253; G.R. Osborne, *Romans* (The IVP New Testament Commentary Series; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press 2004) 207; T.J. Burke, *Adopted into God's Family. Exploring a Pauline Metaphor* (New Studies in Biblical Theology 22; Nottingham – Downers Grove, IL: Apollos – InterVarsity Press 2006) 149; Jewett – Kotansky, *Romans*, 500; R.N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2016) 705.

19 Cf. R.H. Mounce, *Romans* (NAC 27; Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman 1995) 183.

20 See H. Strathmann, "μάρτυς κτλ.," *TDNT* IV, 509; L. Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (The Pillar New Testament Commentary; Leicester, England – Grand Rapids, MI: Apollos – Eerdmans 1988) 316-317 and his reference to Luther.

3. Paul and Epictetus on Free Will and the Self

The intuition of drawing a comparison between the thought of Paul and the ideas of ancient philosophers, especially the Stoics, is not a new one. It has been pursued from antiquity to the present times, the proof of which is the famous pseudonymous correspondence between Paul and Seneca.[21] The connection between the Pauline and the Stoic anthropology and ethics has recently been picked up by Troels Engberg-Pedersen and Susan Eastman.[22] Comparing the notion of free will in Paul and Epictetus in his *Cosmology and Self* (2010), Engberg-Pedersen is following in the footsteps of many scholars who, in the past and present century, were interested in this philosopher in relation to Paul.[23]

---

21 See J.N. Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca* (Leiden: Brill 1961); J.R. Dodson – D.E. Briones (eds.), *Paul and Seneca in Dialogue* (Ancient Philosophy and Religion 2; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2017).

22 See the numerous publications by Engberg-Pedersen on Paul and the Stoics: T. Engberg-Pedersen, "Stoicism in Philippians," *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* (ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen) (Minneapolis, MA: Fortress 1995) 256–290; T. Engberg-Pedersen, "The Hellenistic Offentlichkeit: Philosophy as a Social Force in the Greco-Roman World," *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World* (eds. P. Borgen – V.K. Robbins – D.B. Gowler) (Emory Studies in Early Christianity 6; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press 1998) 15–37; T. Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and the Stoics* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 2000); T. Engberg-Pedersen, "The Reception of Graeco-Roman Culture in the New Testament: The Case of Romans 7.7–25," *The New Testament as Reception* (eds. M. Müller – H. Tronier) (JSNTSup 230; London – New York: Sheffield Academic Press 2002) 32–57; T. Engberg-Pedersen, "The Relationship with Others. Similarities and Differences between Paul and Stoicism," *ZNW* 96/1–2 (2005) 35–60; T. Engberg-Pedersen, "Paul's Stoicizing Politics in Romans 12–13. The Role of 13.1–10 in the Argument," *JSNT* 29/2 (2006) 163–172; T. Engberg-Pedersen, "Complete and Incomplete Transformation in Paul. A Philosophical Reading of Paul on Body and Spirit," *Metamorphoses. Resurrection, Body, and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity* (eds. T.K. Seim – J. Økland) (Ekstasis 1; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 2009) 123–146; T. Engberg-Pedersen, "The Material Spirit. Cosmology and Ethics in Paul," *NTS* 55/2 (2009) 179–197; T. Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul. The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2010); T. Engberg-Pedersen, "A Stoic Concept of the Person in Paul? From Galatians 5:17 to Romans 7:14–25," *Christian Body, Christian Self. Concepts of Early Christian Personhood* (eds. C.K. Rothschild – T.W. Thompson) (WUNT 284; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2011) 85–112; T. Engberg-Pedersen, "On Comparison. The Stoic Theory of Value in Paul's Theology and Ethics in Philippians," *Der Philipperbrief des Paulus in der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (eds. J. Frey – B. Schliesser – V. Niederhofer) (WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2015) 289–308; T. Engberg-Pedersen, "Paul in Philippians and Seneca in Epistle 93 on Life after Death and Its Present Implications," *Paul and Seneca in Dialogue* (eds. J.R. Dodson – D.E. Briones) (Ancient Philosophy and Religion 2; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2017) 276–284. See also S.G. Eastman, *Paul and the Person. Reframing Paul's Anthropology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2017).

23 Among the predecessors whom Engberg-Pedersen cites, see A. Bonhöffer, *Epiktet und das Neue Testament* (RVV 10; Gießen: Töpelmann 1911); A. Bonhöffer, "Epiktet und das Neue Testament," *ZNW* 13 (1912) 281–292; S. Vollenweider, *Freiheit als neue Schöpfung. Eine Untersuchung zur Eleutheria bei Paulus und in seiner Umwelt* (FRLANT 147; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1989); A.A. Long, *Epictetus. A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life* (Oxford – New York: Clarendon 2002). On Paul and Epictetus in contemporary scholarship, see N. Huttunen, *Paul and Epictetus on Law. A Comparison* (LNTS 405; London: Clark 2009); R.M. Thorsteinsson, "Paul and Roman Stoicism. Romans 12 and Contemporary Stoic Ethics," *JSNT* 29/2 (2006) 139–161; R.M. Thorsteinsson, *Roman Christianity and Roman Stoicism. A Comparative Study of Ancient Morality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2010); Rowe, *One True Life*; J.R. Dodson – A.W. Pitts (eds.), *Paul and the Greco-Roman Philosophical Tradition* (LNTS 527; London *et al.*: Bloomsbury 2017);

In fact, there are numerous themes in Epictetus and Paul that seem to be worth putting in a dialogue with one another. Both authors distance themselves from ancient rhetoric and probably did not have a professional rhetorical training. Although they know how to speak persuasively, their focus falls primarily on teaching and giving their disciples an example to emulate (cf. *Diatr*. 1.15.2; 2 Cor 11:5–6).[24] Epictetus, similarly to Paul (cf. 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Rom 8:9–11), depicts god dwelling in an individual and does so in a profoundly personalist terms, which distinguishes him from other Stoics.[25] The philosopher's teaching based on a dialogue in which "I" overlaps with "we," correcting and advising his students on making progress as Stoics, also seems to be close to the Pauline epistles, constituting a kind of a long-distance dialogue with his communities, directed at their progress in Christian life.[26] Epictetus, who in the eyes of other philosophers is not worthy of emulating (*Diatr*. 3.8.7), also resembles Paul criticised by his opponents for his weakness (cf. 2 Cor 10:1–11). Finally, he is all the more suitable as a partner in dialogue with the apostle, as the question of human freedom and god's work lies, according to Engberg-Pedersen, at the very core of his thought.[27] Also, according to Susan Eastman, Epictetus seems to come „closest to contemporary ideas of persons as autonomous, self-contained individuals" and has „a working model of what it means to be a human being."[28] Following this thought, we shall first have a look at Epictetus to compare it later with Paul, searching for the similarities and differences in the apostle in relation to the Stoic notion of free will.

3.1. Epictetus's Freedom and Notion of *proairesis*

The world of Epictetus, which Long calls "God-directed world," is a deterministically constructed space where everything depends on the Creator, but at the same time leaves us room which is "exclusively and wonderfully ours" for free will and autonomous human acts.[29]

J.R. Dodson – D.E. Briones (eds.), *Paul and the Giants of Philosophy. Reading the Apostle in Greco-Roman Context* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic 2019).

24 Long, *Epictetus*, 13. On Paul's Graeco-Roman education, see W.C. van Unnik, *Tarsus or Jerusalem, the City of Paul's Youth* (London: Epworth Press 1962) 18–39; U. Vanni, "Due Città nella Formazione di Paolo: Tarso e Gerusalemme," *Atti del I Simposio di Tarso su S. Paolo Apostolo* (ed. L. Padovese) (Turchia. La Chiesa e la Sua Storia 5; Roma: Istituto Francescano di Spiritualià. Pontificio Ateneo Antoniano 1993) 17–29; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul a Critical Life* (Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press 1997) 46–52; S.E. Porter, "Paul of Tarsus and His Letters," *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period (330 B.C.–A.D. 400)* (ed. S.E. Porter) (Leiden: Brill 1997) 533–538; M. Rastoin, *Tarse et Jérusalem. La double culture de l'Apôtre Paul en Galates 3,6–4,7* (AnBib 152; Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico 2003) 21–28; R.F. Hock, "Paul and Greco-Roman Education," *Paul in the Greco-Roman World. A Handbook* (ed. J.P. Sampley) (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press 2003) 198–227; A.W. Pitts, "Hellenistic Schools in Jerusalem and Paul's Rhetorical Education," *Paul's World* (ed. S.E. Porter) (Pauline Studies 4; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2008) 19–50.

25 Cf. *Diatr*. 1.1.3; 1.3.2; 1.9.6; 1.12.1–3; 1.16.16–21; 2.8.12–13; 2.16.42; 4.10–14–17. On Epictetus's idea of god, see Long, *Epictetus*, 17, 143, 156; Rowe, *One True Life*, 44–49.

26 Long, *Epictetus*, 61. On the philosophy depicted as a practical training and the art of living in Epictetus, see *Diatr*. 1.4.131–5; 1.17.17–18; 2.17.34–36; *Ench*. 29;

27 Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 108.

28 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 31–34.

29 Long, *Epictetus*, 180.

The freedom that Epictetus talks about is not a political or social idea, but an internal and psychological phenomenon, related to happiness and human peace.[30] It consists in the fact that an individual is not forced to do anything, be it by external factors or by internal errors and limitations. Quoting Epictetus:

> For what is it that every man is seeking? To live securely, to be happy, to do everything as he wishes to do, not to be hindered, not to be subject to compulsion (*Diatr*. 4.1.46).[31]

The freedom meant by the philosopher is a freedom from passion, pain, fear, and confusion; from the body, property, office, and reputation; from an unhappy life, from being hampered and hindered (*Diatr*. 4.3.7–12). This kind of freedom can be achieved only by focusing on what belongs to us and detaching ourselves from everything that is not ours. According to Epictetus, Zeus himself established the things that are ours, free from impediment and hindrance, and those that are not ours, subject to impediment and hindrance. We received this instruction from him the moment we were born: to cherish completely what is ours, and not to seek after things that do not belong to us (*Diatr*. 1.25.3–5). What is then within our control and what is not?

> What has He given me for my own and subject to my authority, and what has He left for Himself? Everything within the sphere of the moral purpose He has given me, subjected them to my control, unhampered and unhindered. My body that is made of clay, how could He make that unhindered? Accordingly, He has made it subject to the revolution of the universe—my property, my furniture, my house, my children, my wife (*Diatr*. 4.1.100–101).

Epictetus argues that everything that can be situated outside a human being does not depend of us and slips out of our control. The external things comprise: property, equipment, house, children, wife and even the body. We cannot be free unless we detach our desires and aversions from everything that pertains to the outside world. On the other hand, among the things belonging to us, god, our father included the possession of good and evil (*Diatr*. 3.24.2–3). In consequence, the only sphere that a person is capable of controlling and that truly belongs to us is the faculty of making choices, προαίρεσις. It is the basic concept which Epictetus uses to describe human freedom.[32] One can render it as "volition" or "choice."[33] The concept, which also appears in Aristotle, in Epictetus acquires a rather

30 Long, *Epictetus*, 27.

31 Translations of Epictetus after LCL, unless stated otherwise.

32 On the concept, see especially A.A. Long, "Representation and the Self in Stoicism," A.A. Long, *Stoic Studies* (HCS 36; Berkeley, CA: University of California Press 2001) 264–285; Long, *Epictetus*, 207–230. See also a detailed study by R. Dobbin, "Prohairesis in Epictetus," *Ancient Philosophy* 11 (1991) 111–135. Additionally A. Dihle, *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity* (Sather Classical Lectures 48; Berkeley, CA: University of California Press 1982) 60–61 (pp. 80–89 on the Pauline perspective on free will presented by the author in a dubiously voluntarist manner); Rowe, *One True Life*, 6–62, 275.

33 Thus Long, *Epictetus*, 210–220. Other possible renderings of *proairesis* include: choice, decision, and prechoice.

distinct and original meaning, emphasising our capacity for autonomy to a degree, which according to Anthony Long, is without clear parallel in the preceding Stoic tradition.[34]

Proairesis in Epictetus shows a couple of distinguishable traits.[35] It is a portion of divinity, a share in the divine nature within a person (*Diatr*. 1.1.12). *Proairesis* enjoys freedom from any constraint and hindrance, since it can be compelled only by itself; it enables one to live freely and in accord both with one's own intelligence and with god (*Diatr*. 1.17.21–28). The divinity granted human beings the faculty of moral choice, to some extent withdrawing its power: "He has put the whole matter under our control without reserving even for Himself any power to prevent or hinder" (*Diatr*. 1.6.40–41). In short, *proairesis* is absolutely free and gives a person a true mastery over their own life (*Diatr*. 2.2.1–7). In Epictetus's own words, being a human means to have "no quality more sovereign than moral choice" and to keep "everything else subordinate to it, and this moral choice itself free from slavery and subjection" (*Diatr*. 2.10.1–2). It is here that human freedom and free will manifest their full potential, not being directly influenced even by the deity itself. Human body can be bound and fettered in chains, but not even Zeus can overcome *proairesis* (*Diatr.* 1.1.21–24).

Proairesis differs from the governing part of the soul (ἡγεμονική) by its freedom, self-awareness, and moral capabilities.[36] By making judgements through *proairesis*, an individual gains autonomy and responsibility. It is an "ego" that is even capable of speaking to itself. According to Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *proairesis* shows universal traits; it is not an individual self, but a "self-identically shared by all human beings who operate human cognition in the proper way."[37] Engberg-Pedersen calls it "a true human self," while A. A. Long speaks of "the ideally rational and normative self."[38] As such, *proairesis* stands in a stark contrast with the created world, including one's own body:

> For when the tyrant says to a man, "I will chain your leg," the man who has set a high value on his leg replies, "Nay, have mercy upon me," while the man who has set a high value on his moral purpose replies, "If it seems more profitable to you to do so, chain it." "Do you not care?" "No, I do not care." "I will show you that I am master." "How can *you* be my master? Zeus has set me free. Or do you really think that he was likely to let his own son be made a slave? You are, however, master of my dead body, take it. (*Diatr*. 1.19.8–10).

On the other hand, *proairesis* is totally dependent on deity understood as rationality permeating the created world. The first duty of an individual is to please god:

> I have one whom I must please, to whom I must submit, whom I must obey, that is, God, and after Him, myself. God has commended me to myself, and He has subjected to me alone my moral purpose (*proairesis*), giving me standards for the correct use of it (*Diatr*. 4.12.11–12).

---

34 See Long, *Epictetus*, 161. On *proairesis* in Aristotle, see Long, *Epictetus*, 211–212.

35 Cf. Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 113. See also Long, *Epictetus*, 207–208.

36 Long, *Epictetus*, 211.

37 Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 113.

38 Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 118; Long, *Epictetus*, 166.

Being free and a friend of god entails obeying willingly the deity, following its instructions, laws and commandments to which one should be subordinated more than to the laws of Masurius and Cassius (*Diatr*. 4.3.7–12). Being free in Epictetus does not mean the freedom from the all-determining deity; it is rather equivalent to an unconditional subordination to god. The road that leads to freedom, and the only release from the world's enslavement, is to be able to wholeheartedly say: "Lead me, Zeus and you, Fate, wherever you have ordained for me" (4. 1.131).[39] This kind of freedom ultimately consists in accepting everything what may come upon us as ordained by god, so that "we may keep our minds in harmony with what happens" (*Diatr*. 1.12.15–17).[40]

Proairsesis understood as individual's faculty of moral choice has a dynamic character: it can and should be properly formed.[41] A training programme, according to Epictetus, consists in withdrawing from external things and focusing on our *proairesis*, cultivating and perfecting it to make it harmonious with nature: elevated, free, unimpeded, trustworthy, and honorable (*Diatr*. 1.4.18–21). For that purpose, an individual needs a philosophical education, because, over time, our innate and divinely given faculty of *proairesis* gets distorted.[42] This happens because we are part of a society that gets us off track and assigns value to things that do not really matter, such as status, reputation, or property. The goal of philosophy is to teach an individual how to seek god's will and how to live according to nature, that is, to align our reasoning faculty with a divinely ordered cosmos and society.[43] Ultimately, the human way of freedom consists in keeping the inner reasoning faculties intact from external contamination:

> How, then, is a citadel destroyed? Not by iron, nor by fire, but by judgements. [...] But here is where we must begin, and it is from this side that we must seize the acropolis and cast out the tyrants; we must yield up the paltry body, its members, the faculties, property, reputation, offices, honours, children, brothers, friends—count all these things as alien to us (*Diatr*. 4.1.87).

This kind of freedom from passions and error, does not so much belong to every person as it constitutes a programme for each and every one of us. It is actualised in those who cultivate their *proairesis* and make a proper use of their impressions. Free will is in fact a philosophical programme rather than an innate faculty of a human being.[44]

A well-shaped, freedom-granting *proairesis* demands self-sufficiency with respect to one's own body and ordinary values in the world, but it does not exclude genuinely caring for other human beings (*Diatr*. 3.24.60–65). It is true that when discussing the notion of *proairesis* Epictetus puts much more stress on the natural self-interestedness of human motivations, but not to the point of excluding our relationships with others. Good volition

---

39 Translation after Long, *Epictetus*, 221.
40 Translation after Long, *Epictetus*, 153.
41 Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 113. See also Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 36–37.
42 On the philosophy as a training ground and exercise in living in Epictetus, see Rowe, *One True Life*, 52–59.
43 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 54–55.
44 Long, *Epictetus*, 221.

promotes integrity, which in turn involves honoring one's ties to kin, social roles, and other acquired relations.[45] Epictetus states that a philosopher should want to remain unmoved and undisturbed, but he should also know what his duties are towards gods, parents, brothers, country, and strangers (*Diatr*. 2.17.31). As a dutiful man, son, brother, father, and citizen, a person cannot remain "unfeeling like a statue" (*Diatr*. 3.2.2–4).

The priority given to our "ego" results from the fact that only a properly developed *proairesis* enables us to perform our social roles well. In effect, only those who are wholly at peace with themselves have the right kind of disposition to effectively care about other people.[46] Epictetus refuses to call such an approach a mere self-love (φῐλαυτία), but rather qualifies it as being in harmony with one's nature and Zeus's insight. God shaped the nature of every rational animal in such a way that it cannot attain its own goods unless it contributes something to the common interest. Hence it is not antisocial to do everything for one's own sake (*Diatr*. 1.19.11–15). For that reason, an individual should put together their own interests, piety, and what is honorable for their country, parents, and friends on one scale. If we pay proper attention to our *proairesis*, then and only then will we be friends, and sons, and fathers that we should be. Thus, to preserve our human relationships, we have to preserve our integrity first (*Diatr*. 2.22.18–21). *Proairesis* and one's own interest are a priority strictly bound to social relations (*Diatr*. 2.10.7–12; 3.3.5–10; *Ench*. 30). Epictetus also explains it with the classic Stoic imagery of an individual as a citizen of the world (*Diatr*. 2.10.3–4) and a member of the body, that is society (*Diatr*. 2.5.24–26; 3.7.19–21). The way we fulfil our social duties ultimately testifies to our value as persons and philosophers (*Diatr*. 3.21.1–6).[47]

Internal freedom is also strictly bound to how an individual manages their emotions and desires. Even though the Stoics treat the majority of them rather harshly, they nevertheless advise cultivating "good feelings" (εὐπάθεια), classifying these under three broad categories: joy, caution, and well-wishing.[48] Morbid emotions such as fear, anger, sadness, or jealousy are nothing but an effect of our false judgements, while the good emotions are born out of the correct assessment of our existential situation (*Diatr*. 3.3.17–19). Tempering one's emotions is related to the exercise of detaching oneself from the externals. An individual should be constantly mindful of the fact that the things and persons they are attached to are fragile and they do not belong to them (*Diatr* 3.24.84–88). Wishes and desires are to be aligned with the will of Zeus (*Diatr*. 2.17.23–26). When seeing somebody in distress, Epictetus recommends not to be carried away by our impressions that something wrong happened, because ill and bliss are only a matter of our judgement. Ultimately, the philosopher recommends showing sympathy to the one who weeps either in words or even by sharing in another's groans, provided that we do not groan within ourselves (*Ench*. 16).[49]

45 Long, *Epictetus*, 30.
46 Long, *Epictetus*, 114.
47 For more on that, see Long, *Epictetus*, 256–257.
48 Long, *Epictetus*, 244.
49 For more on emotions in the Stoics, see Long, *Epictetus*, 257–258.

3.2. Similarities and Differences between Paul and Epictetus

In his reflection on Christian freedom, Paul does not use the term *proairesis*, employed as a key term by Epictetus. The apostle does not recommend either a radical focus on one's own self or detachment from relationships with others. This does not mean that there are no points in common between him and Epictetus. According to Engberg-Pedersen, these two thinkers essentially agree on two issues. The first is the inner orientation of a person towards God and the knowledge through which God acts and in which human and divine freedom meet.[50] According to Engberg-Pedersen, Paul, similarly to Epictetus, connects God's action with knowledge that generates understanding in humans. Divine knowledge, received by a person, gives rise, in turn, to individual action and responsibility, which should be perceived as free.[51]

The second point linking Paul to Epictetus is the necessity to turn away from the body and the world so that human "ego" might be realised in its freedom (cf. Gal 5:24; 6:14).[52] To be sure, according to Engberg-Pedersen, there are also clear differences between Paul and Epictetus. For instance, the philosopher's divinity is predictable while Christian God is not – his ways are inscrutable and can only be known by revelation (cf. Rom 4:17–25; 11:33–36). Yet, after having known God, Paul and Epictetus describe the human path of moral life in quite a similar way, entailing being directed towards a deity and freedom from the body and this world.[53] Ultimately, according to Engberg-Pedersen, the freedom of believers is based on the understanding that in the present world the ultimate power belongs to Christ, whom they are to follow. Here, the apocalyptic Paul meets the philosopher, Epictetus.[54]

Susan Eastman does not share Engberg-Pedersen's optimism in relation to the similarities between Paul and Epictetus with regard to human self and its autonomy. According to Eastman, the differences between Paul and Epictetus's dualistic and individualistic vision of a person seem to exceed by far the similarities. She lists the dissimilarities between them in her extensive discussion of the Epictetus's concept of "ego," which is thoroughly rational, self-referential, and deprived of the true second-person perspective.[55] Epictetus is characterised by rampant individualism and self-referentiality. His "self" is both the subject and the object of human loyalty, detached from the outside world, evaluating, and self-controlled. Epictetus perceives human beings exclusively through a first-person perspective. The philosopher's cognition, according to Eastman, begins and ends with self-perception, so that all human knowledge is viewed in relation to oneself and filtered through one's

50 See Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 123–128. The author cites the following Pauline texts: 1 Thess 2:13; Gal 1:11–16; 4:8–11; Phil 2:12–13; 3:12–14; 1 Cor 4:6–7; 8:1–4; 13:12; 15:7–11. See also Rom 1:18–21; 8:28–30; 9:6–12; 9:16–24; 10:12–11:7 where, according to Engberg-Pedersen, the same dynamics are present vis-a-vis non-Christ-believers.

51 Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 129–130.

52 Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 121–123.

53 Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 134–136.

54 Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 138.

55 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 37–42.

inner evaluative faculties.[56] Epictetus, speaking of *proairesis* as our true self and postulating its detachment from the body, also manifests an alien to Paul, dualistic vision of a person.

How then can Epictetus help us understand the paradoxical connection between human free will and God's all-determining action in Paul? First, it seems that the ancients viewed this connection, puzzling for us, modern people, as quite natural.[57] Epictetus, to be sure, does not discuss the problem of how to reconcile human freedom with divine determinism. He is interested in a practical dimension of freedom applied to our moral choices and translated into our happy life. In his teaching, he argues both for the completely unimpeded human volition and divine determinism.[58] Also in Paul, we will find no trace of contemporary philosophical debates related to the issues of determinism and freedom of human will. The apostle clearly believes in the primacy of God's will (θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ), which establishes the order of creation (1 Cor 12:18; 15:38), is responsible for the salvation of mankind (Gal 1:4; Eph 1:5, 9, 11; Col 1:27), and freely elects and shows mercy or hardens the heart of whomever God chooses (Rom 9:18, 22). The will of God called Paul to be the apostle of Christ (1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Eph 1:1; Col 1:1) and directs his steps (Rom 1:10; 15:32; 1 Cor 4:19).

At the same time, both Paul and Epictetus have no difficulty saying that in the world that absolutely depends on God, we are given the power to make decisions. Human will (θέλω, θέλημα) in Paul is empowered and free to choose and put into effect what an individual thinks good,[59] but it can also choose evil.[60] The proof of that are the numerous exhortations to moral action in Paul, the argument raised already by Erasmus of Rotterdam in his famous debate with Martin Luther. Erasmus points to the Pauline appeals to lay aside the works of darkness in Rom 13:12 or to strip off the old man with his deeds in Col 3:9. By stating in Rom 7:18 that one cannot find strength to accomplish what is good, Paul also admits that good is in the power of a person.[61] To these examples we might add the plea in Rom 6:12–13 regarding the sin that should not exercise power over the believers' bodies; instead they should present their limbs to God as instruments of righteousness (cf. Rom 6:19). Rom 8, referring oftentimes to the guidance of the Spirit, also constitutes a thinly veiled appeal to collaborate with its power in expanding the inner space of Christian freedom and holiness (8:4, 5–8, 12–13, 14–15). Such exhortations would make no

56 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 44–48.

57 Long, *Epictetus*, 230: "Epictetus leaves no room for a freedom that is actually independent of divine causation." For more on this, see especially S. Bobzien, *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon 2005).

58 Long, *Epictetus*, 162; 230 following Bobzien, *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy*.

59 Cf. 1 Cor 4:21; 7:1, 32, 36, 37, 39; 10:20; 14:5, 19; 16:12; 2 Cor 8:10, 11, 12; Phlm 14.

60 Cf. Gal 1:7; 4:9, 17, 21; 6:12, 13; Eph 2:3; Col 2:18.

61 E.F. Winter (ed.), *Erasmus, Desiderius, and Martin Luther. Discourse on Free Will* (London *et al.*: Bloomsbury 2013) 50: "'Let us lay aside the works of darkness' (Romans 13:12), 'Strip off the old man with his deeds' (Colossians 3:9), exclaims Paul. How can we be commanded to lay aside something if we are incapable? The same: 'To wish is within my power, but I do not find the strength to accomplish what is good' (Romans 7:18). Paul obviously admits here that it is in the power of man to want to do good."

sense if Paul believed that human salvation was utterly determined by God, to the exclusion of our freedom.[62]

Secondly, even if Paul does not employ the Epictetus's *proairesis*, the notion seems to be somehow close to Rom 8:5–6, where the apostle speaks of the Spirit which inculcates in the believers its own thinking and acting, moral attitudes and choices (cf. the vocabulary of φρονέω and φρόνημα).[63] The active, thinking, and morally-directed divine Spirit awaits a response from the human "self" which is responsible not only for critical judgements but also for embracing divine values, and for standing, as Engberg-Pedersen puts it, on God's side. Such a response and "self" also come into view in Rom 8:12–13, where Paul states that the believers are not the debtors of the flesh, yet he does not qualify them as the debtors of the Spirit either. Their status of God's children excludes coercion implied in the metaphor of "debtors" and promotes freedom with which from now on they are to embrace the guidance of the Spirit.[64] Finally, the divine Spirit communicating with the human spirit in Rom 8:16 resembles the Stoic notion of *proairesis*, in which the divinity respects the person's autonomy, collaborating with them, instead of superimposing its will.

Third, for both Paul and Epictetus, free will requires education and cooperation with God's will, which makes us truly free.[65] According to the apostle, the discernment of and obedience to God's will are crucial for an individual's salvation and moral life.[66] This cooperation can be seen in Rom 8:16, but also in our walking and living according to the Spirit in Rom 8:4–5, in putting to death the deeds of the body with its help (Rom 8:13). In other similar texts, Paul explicitly connects his apostolic efforts and achievements with the grace of God (1 Cor 15:10; Rom 15:15–19), calls the Philippians to work on their salvation with fear and trembling, pointing to God who is at work in them, enabling their will (Phil 2:12–13), and speaks of God who makes the believers share abundantly in every good deed (2 Cor 9:8–10).[67] Having been set free from sin entails for the baptised becoming slaves to righteousness (Rom 6:18, 22), and not submitting again to the yoke of the Law (Gal 5:1) or the flesh (Gal 5:17). The divine-human character of Christian agency was also

62 See also similar exhortations in Rom 12:1–15:13; 1 Cor 5–6; 8:1–13; 10:1–11:1; 2 Cor 6:1–2, 14–18; Gal 5:16–26; Phil 1:27–2:16; 3:16–4:9; 1 Thess 4:1–5:24.

63 On the Spirit's mindset in Rom 8:5–6, see M. Kowalski, "The Cognitive Spirit and the Novelty of Paul's Thought in Rom 8,5–6," *Bib* 100/1 (2020) 47–68. Dihle, *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity*, 79–89 in his discussion of free will in Paul, he refers to the notions of conscience, knowledge and intention but not to the Stoic idea of *proairesis*.

64 On the function of anacoluthon in Rom 8:12–13 in stressing the identity of the believers, see A. Gieniusz, "'Debtors to the Spirit' in Romans 8.12? Reasons for the Silence," *NTS* 59/1 (2013) 61–72.

65 The argument was also raised by Erasmus of Rotterdam in his *Discourse on Free Will*: "The same in another passage: 'His grace in me has not been fruitless' (1 Corinthians 15:10). The Apostle informs us that he has not left unused divine grace. How could he assert this, if he had done nothing?" See Winter, *Erasmus, Desiderius, and Martin Luther. Discourse on Free Will*, 50–51.

66 Cf. Rom 12:2; 2 Cor 8:5; Eph 5:17; 6:6; Col 1:9; 4:12; 1 Thess 4:3; 5:18.

67 See the discussion of the texts in which divine grace and human agency are intertwined in J.M.G. Barclay, "By the Grace of God I Am What I Am. Grace and Agency in Philo and Paul," *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment* (eds. J.M.G. Barclay – S.J. Gathercole) (London: Clark 2008) 151–156.

highlighted by Engberg-Pedersen, who saw its foundations in the gift the divine knowledge is for us.[68]

At the same time, some fundamental differences between Paul's and Epictetus's vision of the person and their freedom should be emphasised. These discrepancies can be of equal or even greater value than the similarities in understanding the Pauline notion of free will. The first important dissimilarity between Paul and Epictetus regards the image of the deity.[69] Even though they both speak of God, the father and present him in a profoundly personalist manner, in Epictetus, the divinity does not assume transcendent traits. As pointed out by Long, it results in the lack of distinction between the deity and the Stoic sage. For Epictetus, as for other Stoics, our minds are literally "offshoots" of god, parts of the divinity assigned to each person. The omnipresent deity and nature are one, which explains the Stoic appeal to live according to nature (*Diatr*. 1.26.1).[70] In the ethics, moral choices and freedom promoted by the Stoa, everything is played out in our physical world; there is no supernatural realm in which we shall experience God's judgement after death.[71] In effect, there is no divinity transcending human nature in Epictetus, there is no need for savior and a guide besides the one contained within us. Thus, individuals are capable of liberating themselves from fear and their internal malice by their own efforts (*Diatr*. 2.1.23–4).

This vision is obviously alien to Paul, according to whom an individual cannot live morally and aspire to good, relying only on their human strength (Rom 3:1–20; 7:7–25). Human will (θέλω, θέλημα) can be fatally frustrated by sin (Rom 7:15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21; Gal 5:17) or Satan (1 Thess 2:18). Neither the mind nor volition are capable of liberating themselves from the power of evil (Rom 7:15–25). The corruption, enslavement by sin and incapacity to do good, which Paul describes in such vivid images in Rom 3:1–20 and 7:7–25, constitute the fate of humanity outside Christ.[72] In Christ and thanks to his Spirit, the believers are freed from the slavery of sin and death; their freedom comes as a gift from God which transcends human mind and volition (Rom 3:21–26; 7:24b; 8:1–4; 10:9). The divine Spirit described by the apostle in Rom 8 is also much more active than the Stoic *pneuma* or Zeus, the giver of laws whom an individual must simply obey. The Spirit of God guides us, helping us to fulfil the divine will in our lives (Rom 8:3–4), inculcates Christ's mindset in us (Rom 8:5–6), ensures our resurrection (Rom 8:9–11), helps us put to death

68 Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 123–128.

69 On the Epictetus's vision of god, see Rowe, *One True Life*, 42–49.

70 On the Stoic ideal of life in accord with nature, see Diogenes Laërtius, *Vit. phil.* 7.1 Zeno (87–89); Epictetus, *Ench*. 26; *Diss*. 4.1.89, 100; Marcus Aurelius, *Med*. 9.1–2; Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.58. For more on the concept of nature and life in accord with it, see *SVF* 3.5–9, 12–15, 17, 142–146; 178–181, 186–188, 190–191, 194–195; B. Inwood, *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism* (Oxford – New York: Clarendon – Oxford University Press 1985) 107–109; 160, 194–215; A.A. Long, "The Logical Basis of Stoic Ethics," A.A. Long, *Stoic Studies* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 36; Berkeley, CA: University of California Press 2001) 134–155.

71 Long, *Epictetus*, 145–146, 188.

72 Cf. J.-N. Aletti, "Romans 7:7–25 and Galatians 5:17. Questions and Proposals," J.-N. Aletti, *New Approaches for Interpreting the Letters of Saint Paul. Collected Essays. Rhetoric, Soteriology, Christology and Ecclesiology* (SubBi 43; Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press 2012) 82, 91–109.

the deeds of the body (Rom 8:12–13), testifies to our dignity as God's children, bringing us into communion with the Father and the Son (Rom 8:14–17), abides within us (Rom 8:9–11, 23) and intercedes on our behalf (Rom 8:26–27).

This Spirit also does much more than the divinity which, according to Ben Sira, leaves the believers in the power of their own free choices with the hope that they can succeed (Sir 15:14; Sir 17:6).[73] According to Jason Maston, in Rom 7:7–25, Paul engages in a polemic with Ben Sira's moral optimism, arguing that the two-way tradition does not produce an adequate obedience and in consequence an individual, being left on their own, is destined to death. In Rom 8:1–13, the apostle moves on to show that the problem can be solved only by the empowering gift of God's Spirit. According to Maston, the pattern adopted in Rom 8:1–13 bears a remarkable similarity to that of the *Hodayot*; both of them highlight the divine action, the crucial role of the divine Spirit, and weakness of the human will. However, Paul modifies the Jewish model in a significant way by placing God's saving act in a specific moment in history, instead of a pre-temporal predestination, and by organising it around Christ. The Christological modification results in the new situation of mankind which now, freed from the power of sin, is capable of leading life obedient to God in Christ's Spirit. The Spirit reestablishes human ability to do good, which is not an independent response to God's gracious deliverance, but rather a continuation of divine work.[74]

Essentially agreeing with Maston's comparison between Ben Sira, Qumran and Paul, one should also highlight two points which were not stressed by the author enough. First, in Paul, the Spirit acts much more as a personal and transcendent agent than in the authors of the Second Temple period. Albeit being strictly connected with the work of Christ, it assumes the traits of an independent agent to the extent rare in the Jewish literature.[75] Second, the believers guided by the Spirit in Rom 8 differ significantly from the Essenes who, even possessing the Spirt of God, still consider themselves a vessel of clay and a thing kneaded with water, a foundation of shame and impurity, a furnace of iniquity, and a structure of sin, a spirit of error, devoid of understanding and terrified of God's righteous judgements (1QH^a 9:23–25).[76] Looking at his life, the Qumran initiate concludes that he is just a man, and for this reason justice does not belong to him, just as the path of justice does not belong to Adam's offspring. A human being is ultimately merely a body, a sinner from the maternal womb to the grave (1QH^a 12:30).[77]

---

73 On the divine and human agency in Ben Sira, see J. Maston, *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul. A Comparative Study* (WUNT 2/297; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2010) 23–74.

74 See Maston, *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul*, 124–174.

75 See the Spirit as an acting entity in Ps 139:7; Mic 2:7; Isa 48:16; 63:10, 14, in which, however, it still appears as an extension of God's work.

76 See the translation in F. García Martínez – E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (Translations)* (Leiden – New York: Brill 1997) 159; E.M. Schuller – C.A. Newsom, *The Hodayot (Thanksgiving Psalms). A Study Edition of 1QHa* (EJL 36; Williston, ND: SBL Press 2012) 31.

77 Jörg Frey ("The Notion of 'Flesh' in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage," *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* [eds. D. Falk – F. García Martínez – E.M. Schuller]

This negative anthropology is absent from Paul, who in Rom 8 underlines the capacity of the believers to align their will with the will of God. In Rom 6, Paul describes the baptised as dead to sin and free from it, an indicative that becomes an imperative to persevere and keep living their new life in Christ (Rom 6:12–13, 19). It is continues in Rom 8:1–13, with the pivotal Rom 8:14–17, presenting the Spirit's guidance and presence in the believers. Christians witness the fulfilment of the prophetic visions of Jer 31:31–34 and Ezek 36:26–27; 37:1–14 in their lives, in which the gifts of new heart and Spirit make them the new creation capable of obeying God's will and participating in God's glory.[78] Their freedom reaches its peak in Christ, with the divine Spirit actively collaborating with their human volition. All the indicated similarities notwithstanding, the Pauline view of the junction between the divine agency and human freedom presents significant novelty with respect both to the Stoic and Jewish traditions.

Second, the freedom in Paul, unlike in Epictetus, is not focused on "ego" and an individual's mastery over their life. As we could see, central to Epictetus's moral programme is self-relation and a first-person perspective, which heavily influences his view of relations with others. One can agree with Eastman arguing that "the network of human relationships within which Epictetus and his students exist is the arena for practice in making right judgements about impressions. It is a training ground for *proairesis*, nothing more and nothing less."[79] Engberg-Pedersen, who maintains that both Paul and Epictetus recommend detachment from the body and this world, but not from the interpersonal relations, is much less persuasive here. According to him, "the principle of non-dependence does not either in the least exclude an attitude of real care and love for other human beings, that is, of being genuinely 'affectionate' towards them."[80] Here, he quotes from Epictetus describing Socrates loving his children and Diogenes showing genuine care for others (*Diatr*. 3.24.60–65). In another work of his, Engberg-Pedersen argued in favour of the similarity between Paul's and the Stoics' ethics and deep structure of the conversion process. Both in the apostle and in the Stoa, the process would proceed from the self-centered "I" toward "X," which denotes yielding to a deity, and further toward "S," signifying human existence centered on a community.[81]

[Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2000] 205–206) rightly points here to the image of a member of the community, their sinfulness and resistance to the Creator. Similarly, E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM 1977) 277–278; *Maston, Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul*, 87.

78 Cf. S. Lyonnet, "Rom 8,2–4 a la lumiere de Jeremie 31 et d'Ezechiel 35–39," *Etudes sur l'Epître aux Romains* (AnBib 120; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico 1990) 231–241; T.R. Schreiner, *Romans* (BECNT 6; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1998) 415; J.W. Yates, III, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul* (WUNT 2/251; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008) 143–156; Maston, *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul*, 160; C.S. Keener, *The Mind of the Spirit. Paul's Approach to Transformed Thinking* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2016) 127.

79 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 58–59.

80 Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 114.

81 Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and the Stoics*, 33–36, 53–79.

The interpretations of Enberg-Pedersen were criticised by many scholars, recently by Susan Eastman who rightly argues that instead of talking about the passage from "self" to "shared" in Epictetus, one should speak of the circular movement „from self to shared to self."[82] Such a loop, according to Eastman, results from the Stoic cosmology. Putting ourselves ahead of everything else is essentially equivalent to putting god ahead of everything else, because god is in the self and constitutes our true self. According to Eastman, the Christian idea of placing God first, others second, and oneself last would make little sense to a Stoic.[83] Epictetus obviously knows the outside world and external relations, but they cede the first place to the all-important relationship which a human being has with their own "self."[84] Social roles, relations and obligations are mediated by the primary allegiance to an individual's own moral purpose and their commitment to what is good for them.[85] The latter also requires doing the good for others. Epictetus's stance, although sympathising with Socrates and his social inclination, is also qualified by Long as utterly one-sided: "us in relation to them, not them in relation to us."[86]

A markedly different approach is characteristic of Paul, who in many places of his correspondence calls Christians not only to take into account the good of others, but also to put it ahead of their own. In 1 Cor 8:1–11:1, the apostle appeals to the "strong" in Corinth to abandon their rights to participate in pagan meals for the sake of the "weak" members whose conscience can thus be defiled (1 Cor 8:7).[87] The problem discussed by Paul regards the status of the "strong" which necessitates a socio-economic interaction with their equals taking place in the pagan temples.[88] Yet, it also sheds important light on the Pauline perception

82 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 59.

83 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 45, 53.

84 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 50–53.

85 The roles performed by an individual are called by Long "secondary identities," while the primary identity is the one that a person has with their "self." See Long, *Epictetus*, 232–234.

86 Long, *Epictetus*, 237. On Socrates as a role model for Epictetus, see Long, *Epictetus*, 244.

87 On the argumentative dynamics of 1 Cor 8:1–11:1, see M.M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation. An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox 1993) 126–149; J.F.M. Smit, "1 Cor 8:1–6. A Rhetorical Partitio. A Contribution to the Coherence of 1Cor 8:1–11:1," *The Corinthian Correspondence* (ed. R. Bieringer) (BETL 125; Leuven: Leuven University Press – Peeters 1996) 577–591; J.F.M. Smit, "The Rhetorical Disposition of First Cor 8:7–9:27," *CBQ* 59 (1997) 476–491; J.F.M. Smit, "Do Not Be Idolaters. Paul's Rhetoric in 1 Cor 10:1–22," *NovT* 39 (1997) 40–53; A. Eriksson, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof. Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians* (ConBNT 29; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell 1998) 97–99, 120–127, 135–173.

88 On the "strong" and "weak" in Corinth, see J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Freedom or the Ghetto (1 Cor., VIII, 1–13; X, 23–XI, 1.)," RB 85 (1978) 543–574; R.A. Horsley, "Consciousness and Freedom among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8–10," *CBQ* 40 (1978) 574–589; G. Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity. Essays on Corinth* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1982) 121–143; D.B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation. The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 1990) 119–120; J.K. Chow, *Patronage and Power. A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* (JSNTSup 75; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1992) 141–157; D.G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence. Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement* (SNTW; Edinburgh: Clark 1996) 105–108; A.T. Cheung, *Idol Food in Corinth. Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy* (JSNTSup 176; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1999) 69–74; K. Ehrensperger, "To Eat Or Not to Eat – This Is the Question? Table Disputes in Corinth," *Decisive Meals. Table*

of personal freedom.[89] The "weak" mean for Paul not only the materially deprived members of the community, but also stumbling brothers and sisters who need care and special protection. Paul shares the knowledge of the "strong," convinced that pagan idols do not exist (8:4–6), however, this conviction does not have to be shared by everybody (8:7). The freedom and rights of the "strong" are evaluated on the basis of whether or not they become a stumbling block to the "weak" (1 Cor 8:9–10). The knowledge possessed by some can bring destruction upon those for whom Christ died (1 Cor 8:11).

One can see how the apostle relativises here not only personal liberty but also knowledge, so dear to Epictetus, subordinating both of them to the principle of community-building love (1 Cor 8:1–3).[90] The sin against the weak in Corinth is sin against the Lord (1 Cor 8:12), so, concluding, Paul decides emphatically to never eat (pagan) meat so that he may not cause others to fall (1 Cor 8:13). In 1 Cor 8, hints of which are also present in Rom 14–15, a second-person perspective, so alien to the Stoic "self," clearly resounds. Paul, who, being free, (ἐλεύθερος) declares in 1 Cor 9:19 to have made himself a slave to all, is, according do Abraham Malherbe, very distant from the Stoics and Cynics alike, who never would have described themselves this way.[91] Christian freedom (ἐλευθερία) is not determined solely by one's own conscience, but also by the conscience of others (1 Cor 10:29), the common good and God's glory (1 Cor 10:30–32).[92] Ultimately, in 1 Cor 10:24, the apostle appeals: "Let no one seek his own good, but the good of his neighbour," giving himself as an example: "just as I try to please all men in everything I do, not seeking my own advantage, but that of many, that they may be saved" (1 Cor 10:33) (cf. also Phil 2:20–21; Rom 15:1–2). The ideal for Paul is the kenotic Christ who did not treat equality with God as something to be exploited, but emptied himself by taking the form of a slave and humbled himself to the point of death on the cross (Phil 2:6–8). The believers should have the same mindset as Christ, pursuing not their own interests, but the interests of others (Phil 2:4–5; cf. also Rom 15:3).

Third, Long, followed by Eastman, rightly states that Epictetus's vision of an individual is dualistic.[93] Our essential self is not the body but the volition, which is a portion of

---

Politics in Biblical Literature (eds. N. MacDonald – L. Sutter Rehmann – K. Ehrensperger) (LNTS 449; London – New York: Clark 2012) 119–122.

89 See particularly A.J. Malherbe, "Determinism and Free Will in Paul. The Argument of 1 Corinthians 8 and 9," *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* (ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen) (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1995) 231–255. The author interprets 1 Corinthians 8 and 9 in light of the Stoic discussions on freedom and determinism.

90 Malherbe "Determinism and Free Will in Paul," 233. On 1 Cor 8,1b being the Corinthians' maxim, see A.C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI – Carlisle: Eerdmans – Paternoster 2000) 620. On the danger connected with an indiscriminate use of power, see Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 126.

91 Malherbe "Determinism and Free Will in Paul," 251-253. Cf. also the freedom that Paul gives up for the sake of the Gospel in 1 Cor 9:1.

92 On this notoriously difficult passage, see Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 788–792; D.E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2003) 497–500.

93 Long, *Epictetus*, 28, 157–158, 160, 208; Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 42. Long (*Epictetus*, 208) who qualifies Epictetus's contrast between body and mind not as a metaphysical one, but, nonetheless, as a dualistic conception, with close affinities to Plato's *Phaedo*.

divinity within us. "I am not a paltry body" (*Diatr*. 4.6.34), states the philosopher, and my "paltry body" is not my own (*Diatr*. 4.1.158). This "paltry body" does not belong to us, being nothing more than a cleverly compounded clay (*Diatr*. 1.1.10–12; cf. also 4.11.27).[94] Epictetus depicts the body as "mud" and "chains," along with all other "externals" such as property and family relationships (cf. *Diatr*. 4.1.99–111). Taking pride in his inner freedom, the philosopher states to a tyrant: "Zeus has set me free. Or do you really think that he was likely to let his own son be made a slave? You are, however, master of my dead body, take it" (*Diatr*. 1.19.9). "Paltry body" together with its limbs and faculties must be given up and counted as alien to us, to keep intact the inner citadel of one's moral judgement (*Diatr*. 4.1.87; cf. also 4.7.18).

Engberg-Pedersen claims that the body in Epictetus, although regarded by the Stoics as inferior to the mind (*Diatr*. 1.9.11, 16–17), nevertheless constitutes a divine gift and creation. According to him, there is a stark asymmetry between the body and the mind in Epictetus, „but there is no rigid dualism" between them.[95] Agreeing rather with Long and Eastman on the dualistic vision of the body in the Stoics, one can also quote Marcus Aurelius who calls it a mere bloody mixture of bones, veins and arteries.[96] In the same vein, Epictetus describes the true human self, προαίρεσις ("volition," "choice") as qualitatively different from our body, standing in a clear and direct contrast with it and in need of liberating itself from its influence. Although the philosopher honours his "paltry body" and tries to keep it sound, his true concern remains the inner freedom as exemplified by Diogenes, who would let go of his entire "paltry body" (*Diatr*. 4.1.151–153). Epictetus recommends keeping our body clean, according to its nature, but he describes it in an animalistic manner, comparing it to other creatures (*Diatr*. 3.1.42–43). The duty of the philosopher is not to guard the external matters, like the "paltry body," which is not his and is dead by nature, but his governing principle (τὸ ἴδιον ἡγεμονικόν) (3.10.15–16). Socrates did not care to save his "paltry body," but his moral conduct (*Diatr*. 4.1.163). By admiring the body, one becomes a slave to it (*Diatr*. 1.25.24). To those who want to depart from this world and the body imagined as prison, fetters, burden and tyrant, Epictetus advises to wait for god's signal, without refuting their pessimistic views on corporeality (*Diatr*. 1.9.12–17; cf. also 1.29.28). "Paltry body" is nothing to the philosopher (*Diatr*. 3.12.21), while leaving it means departing from the slavery of this world (*Diatr*. 3.24.71–72). Now we live in "the body of death" (ἐν τῷ σωματίῳ τούτῳ τῷ νεκρῷ) (*Diatr*. 2.19.27), but "the paltry body must be separated from the bit of spirit, either now or later, just as it existed apart from it before" (*Diatr*. 2.1.17). It was never meant to be our essential part.

The body as such does not bear negative connotations in Paul. In those outside Christ it falls prey to sin (Rom 7:7–25), but in the believers it becomes a dwelling place of the Spirit and the space of new life in Christ. The flesh of Christ, in which God condemned

94 On the "paltry body" (τὸ σωμάτιον) in Epictetus, see e.g. Epictetus, *Diatr*. 1.9.3, 12, 15; 1.25.21–24; 1.29.6, 10, 16, 17; 2.25.28; 3.1.43; 3.10.15–16; 3.18.4; 4.1.151–153, 158, 163.

95 Engberg-Pedersen, Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul, 111.

96 Marcus Aurelius, *Med*. 2.2.

sin, becomes the model of how the Christian corporeality should be understood and lived (Rom 8:3). The bodies of the believers, by the power of the Spirit that inhabits them, are to experience resurrection and full similarity to the glorious body of the Son (Rom 8:9–11, 23, 29).[97] Paul is an heir to the Old Testament anthropology, according to which a person constitutes a psycho-somatic unity, an ensouled body and an embodied soul.[98] At the same time, he elevates human body to the dignity unheard of in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman authors: it becomes a dwelling place of God and his Holy Spirit (1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Rom 8:9–11). While according to the Old Testament and Philo the divine Spirit can inhabit only the great ones such as Moses, Joshua, Daniel or the Messiah, the Stoics excluded the body as a dwelling place of a divinity altogether.[99] God in *propria persona* could reside only in the human mind.[100] Human freedom and volition in Paul ceases to be a "noetic abstraction," as Frederick Tappenden puts it, becoming a phenomenon strictly connected with our somatic nature.[101]

Fourth, Epictetus also practically eliminates from his definition of human self not only corporeality but also emotions, as having nothing to do with personhood or freedom in Stoic terms. For him, "rationality" counts as the center of the self.[102] In this respect, he also differs from Paul, who in his correspondence often refers to the power of *pathos*. It serves him to strengthen the bonds between him and his communities and to make his message more appealing.[103] It is clear e.g. in 1 Thessalonians and Philippians, where Paul speaks of his longing and desire to visit his communities, which he calls his joy, love and a crown of boasting (1 Thess 2:17–20; 3:10–12; Phil 1:3–8; 2:12, 19–30; 3:1, 18; 4:1, 4–7, 10). Love, which for Paul is a driving force behind his relations with the communities, for Epictetus is a destructive power that inevitably causes havoc for those who cherish it and upon their beloved (*Diatr*. 2.22.34–37). The apostle grieving for sinners and fellow Christians walking away from the path of Christ (Phil 3:18; 2 Cor 2:1–7), concerned for his spiritual children to the point of abandoning his mission in Troas (2 Cor 2:12–13), is also very distant from the sage that, according to Epictetus, cannot be "broken in spirit" (*Disc*. 3.24.58) or "groan inwardly" (*Ench*. 16).

---

97 On the Spirit of resurrection and its function, see M. Kowalski, "The Spirit of Resurrection in Romans 8 and Its Jewish Correspondences," *JSNT* 44/2 (2021) 254–283.

98 H.W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1974) 7–9.

99 See Num 11:17; 27:18; Isa 11:2; Dan 5:12; 6:4; Philo, *Gig.* 19–55.

100 A.A. Long, "Soul and Body in Stoicism," A.A. Long, *Stoic Studies* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 36; Berkeley, CA: University of California Press 2001) 249.

101 F.S. Tappenden, *Resurrection in Paul. Cognition, Metaphor, and Transformation* (ECL 19; Atlanta, GA: SBL Press 2016) 3. On the Pauline logic of the body, see also Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 85–105.

102 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 59. For more on the Stoic doctrine of emotions and their relation to mind, see Inwood, *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism*, 139–145; Long, *Epictetus*, 244–254; R. Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind. From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation* (The Gifford Lectures; Oxford: Oxford University Press 2000).

103 Cf. 1 Cor 6:15; 2 Cor 1:8; 7:2–4; 6:14–15; 10:1–2; 11:1; 12:13, 16, 20–21; 13:2, 6–7; Phil 1:7–8; 2:26–30; 4:1; Gal 4:19–20; 6:11, 17; 1 Thess 1:2–4; 2:13–14, 17–20; 3:8–10; 2 Thess 1:2–4.

Pathos is also an effective tool in revealing the true identity of Pauline opponents (cf. 2 Cor 11:12–15, 20; Gal 1,6–10; 3,1–5; 5,7, 12), employed by Paul to teach and show the community the right example to emulate.[104] Aristotle himself dedicated a substantial part of his *Rhetoric* to emotions, regarding them an important element of persuasive speech (see Book II, Chapters 2–11). Here the apostle seems to follow not only the conventions of popular rhetoric, but, more importantly, the anthropology of the Old Testament, which does not censure emotions, speaking even of God's anger and jealousy.[105] Paul himself, imitating the jealous love of God, stands up to fight for the good of the Corinthians, threatened by the false example given by his opponents (cf. 2 Cor 11:2–4).[106] While the Stoics wanted to erase them from the image of a perfectly rational deity, Paul keeps them as a part of human nature, a valid motivation for our actions and an element influencing our decisions.[107]

Finally, the apostle certainly shares with Epictetus the idea that a true sage should imitate divinity in all things:

> Next we must learn what the gods are like; for whatever their character is discovered to be, the man who is going to please and obey them must endeavour as best he can to resemble them. If the deity is faithful, he also must be faithful; if free, he also must be free; if beneficent, he also must be beneficent; if high-minded, he also must be high-minded, and so forth; therefore, in everything he says and does, he must act as an imitator of God (*Diatr*. 2.14.12–13).[108]

The idea of *mimesis* lies at the very core of Pauline teaching and apostolic example (cf. 1 Thess 1:6; 2 Thess 3:7–9; Phil 2:5–8; 3:17; 1 Cor 4:16; 11:1; Rom 15:1–3). The crucial difference between Paul and Epictetus regards the image of God to be imitated. The Stoic deity, purely rational, unmoved and high-minded, commanding detachment from this world, has little to do with God in Christ who takes the form of a slave, being

---

104 On the use of *pathos* in Paul, see M.M. DiCicco, *Paul's Use of Ethos, Pathos, and Logos in 2 Corinthians 10–13* (Mellen Biblical Press Series 31; Lewiston: Mellen 1995).

105 On the theological topics of God's wrath and jealousy, see H. Kleinknecht *et al.*, "ὀργή κτλ.," *TDNT* V, 382–447; K.-D. Schunck, "chēmāh," *TDOT* IV, 462–465; G. Herion – S.H. Travis, "Wrath of God," *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary* (eds. D.N. Freedman *et al.*) (New York: Doubleday 1992) VI, 989–998; E. Reuter, "qnʾ," *TDOT* XIII, 47–58.

106 Paul's jealous concern about his community is similar to God's jealousy for his people, which burns because of their sin and idolatry (cf. Exod 20:5; Ezek 23:25; Deut 6:15; Josh 24:19–20; Nah 1:2). The expression θεοῦ ζήλῳ can be interpreted as a dative of manner in which the first element qualifies the Pauline "jealousy" as "divine," imitating God's love (genitive of quality). Cf. M.E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of the Corinthians*. II. *Commentary on II Corinthians VIII–XIII* (ICC; London – New York: Clark 2004) 659–660; M.J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2013) 734–735. Ralph Martin (*2 Corinthians* [WBC 40; Waco, TX: Word 1986] 327) sees here a genitive of origin, interpreting the Pauline jealousy as "inspired by God."

107 For the ancient philosophers erasing god's emotions, see Plutarch, *Per*. 39; Plutarch, *Suav. viv*. 22; Cicero, *Off*. 3.102 Philo, *Sacr*. 95; *Deus* 59. Cf. also Kleinknecht *et al.*, "ὀργή κτλ.," 385–387, 417–418.

108 Long, *Epictetus*, 170. According to the author, Epictetus speaking of "seeking to become like God" follows Plato, *Theaetetus* (176A–B), where the expression stands for contemplation of eternal values, disengagement from mundane life and "becoming just and pure, with understanding."

born in human likeness, sharing our joys and tears and suffering the gruesome death of the cross out of love for us (Phil 2:6–8). Therefore, also the ideal of Christian freedom will be different from the Stoic one. While for the Stoics it consists in focusing on our inner self, keeping it intact, unpolluted by morbid desires and by relationships with the external world, for the followers of Christ it will consist in practicing his law of love, radically dedicating themselves to others, being close to the weak and stumbling, and bearing their burdens (cf. Gal 6:2; 1 Cor 8:13; 9:19–22; 2 Cor 11:28–29). What for Epictetus results in a complete loss of god's image within us, the loss of peace of mind and divine perfection, for Paul becomes a path to imitate Christ in his free and willing sacrifice, so that we might also share in his glory (Phil 3:10–11; Rom 8:17).

Conclusions

In conclusion, Rom 8:16 constitutes a valid starting point for the reflection on free will and the juncture between the human and divine agency in Paul. The fragment presents the divine Spirit which collaborates with the human spirit in testifying to our dignity as God's children. The work of the Spirit in the context of Rom 8 cannot be reduced to simply reminding the believers who they are. The Spirt guarantees the fulfilment of God's will in their lives (Rom 8:1–4), inculcates Christ's mindset in them (Rom 8:5–6), foreshadows their resurrection (Rom 8:9–11), helps put to death the deeds of the body (Rom 8:12–13), mediates the gift of divine filiation, introduces the baptised into the full communion with the Father and the Son (Rom 8:14–17, 23, 29), and intercedes on their behalf (Rom 8:26–27). At the same time, as suggested in Rom 8:16, it performs its role by cooperating with the human spirit, capable of embracing God's will in a free manner.

Reference to Epictetus allows us to understand how the Stoic current, important and popular in Paul's time, perceived the phenomenon of free will and human freedom. Epictetus speaks of the freedom in an inner, psychological and attitudinal sense. He explains it with the notion of *proairesis*, which can be translated as "volition," and which constitutes our true self, a rational particle of divinity within us. Thanks to it, we are capable of making free moral choices which Zeus himself does not interfere with. *Proairesis*, to function properly, needs our constant attention and effort of keeping it at peace and unimpeded, not frustrated by desires and morbid emotions, detached from the external world: the body, possessions, career, and even relations with others. These external things, over which we do not exercise any actual control, can obfuscate our rational judgements and thus cripple our freedom. Epictetus does not recommend severing all our ties with the surrounding world; we still remain the citizens of it and members of the social body. Focusing on *proairesis* and cultivating our inner freedom allows us rather to properly fulfil the social roles entrusted to us.

Epictetus does not conceive of human freedom as detached from the deity. Our free will, to remain truly free, demands subjection and obedience to the divine will. Here

the philosopher presents himself as close to Paul. Both Epictetus and Paul have no problem with situating human freedom within the frame of the divinely determined world. The apostle does not make use of the term *proairesis*, but his vision of the rational and capable of ethical choices human spirit in Rom 8:1–17 shows some affinities to the Epictetus's notion of volition. Similarly to the philosopher, human will, according to Paul, should be shaped and guided by the divine Spirit.

Deeper understanding of the Pauline notion of free will comes to us if we pay attention to the important differences between the apostle and Epictetus. First of all, their image of the divinity is different. According to the Stoics, it is immanent, material, strictly connected with the mind and nature, and deprived of any supernatural horizon. An individual in Epictetus can achieve true freedom with their own efforts, with no need of calling upon any other deity than their reason. For Paul, a person without Christ, whether the Jew or the Greek, is hopelessly torn apart, with their intellect and will being paralysed by sin and incapable of escaping its slavery (Rom 1:16–17; 3:1–20; 7:7–25). Here, Paul is critical not only of the Stoic but also of the Jewish optimism regarding the capacity of free will to choose what is good on its own (cf. Sir 15:14; 17:6). Only in Christ and thanks to his Holy Spirit, human freedom can be restored to its full potential and a person can become a partner in a dialogue with God. This partnership, new heart and new spirit, distinguish Paul from the Qumranic vision, pointing also to the fulfilment of the prophecies of the New Covenant in Christians (Jer 31:31–34; Ezek 3:26–27).

The second difference between Paul and Epictetus regards the absolute focus on *proairesis* in the latter, with the external relationships treated as "secondary identities," a mere training ground for the ego's perfection. The apostle, following the kenotic Christ, puts the others' good ahead of his own and treats the love of neighbour as a path to realis our freedom. Third, while Epictetus clearly separates *proairesis* from the body, Paul, as an heir to the Old Testament anthropology, reads an individual as a psycho-somatic unity and interprets the phenomenon of human will in the same way. In Christ, the human body becomes a dwelling place of the divine Spirit coming into a close reaction with the human spirit, which also gives a novel twist to the apostle's notion of free will. Additionally, our volition is not severed from emotions, which are an obstacle and undesired element in the highly intellectualised Stoic vision. Finally, getting back to the first difference, the imitation of the deity, highlighted as a principle goal of an individual both in Epictetus and Paul, also constitutes a major dissimilarity between them. Contrary to the philosophical vision of the unmoved, rational sage, Paul presents the believer following again the kenotic Christ and shaping their freedom in his image. Christ brings all the novelty to the Pauline idea of freedom which is nothing but a radical dedication to serve others.

To be sure, Paul, similarly to Epictetus, does not engage in the theoretical problem of how to reconcile human free will with divine determinism. They perceive such a symbiosis as natural and possible to argue for, as many contemporary philosophers would also do.[109]

109 See Kane, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, esp. 163–171.

Pauline idea of volition strictly bound to our corporeality and emotions also enters into an interesting conversation with what modern empirical sciences claim about free will.[110] To continue the discourse between Paul, philosophy and modern science, not only another paper is needed, but also an awareness that all of the above employ different methodological approaches which cannot be blurred. Paul, unlike Epictetus and modern empiricists, is no naturalist. He firmly believes in the supernatural and transcendental God of the Jewish-Christian revelation. His vision of human free will is rooted in this belief and built around the ideal of Christ. These two factors determine the Pauline specificity and have to be taken into serious consideration by anybody who investigates the theme of free will in the apostle.

Bibliography

Aletti, J.-N., "The Rhetoric of Romans 5–8," *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture. Essays from the 1995 London Conference* (eds. S.E. Porter – T.H. Olbricht) (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 146; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1997) 294–308.

Aletti, J.-N., *New Approaches for Interpreting the Letters of Saint Paul. Collected Essays. Rhetoric, Soteriology, Christology and Ecclesiology* (Subsidia Biblica 43; Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press 2012).

Aletti, J.-N., "Romans 5–8. The Arrangement and Its Theological Relevance," J.-N. Aletti, *New Approaches for Interpreting the Letters of Saint Paul. Collected Essays. Rhetoric, Soteriology, Christology and Ecclesiology* (Subsidia Biblica 43; Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press 2012) 61–78.

Aletti, J.-N., "Romans 7:7–25 and Galatians 5:17. Questions and Proposals," J.-N. Aletti, *New Approaches for Interpreting the Letters of Saint Paul. Collected Essays. Rhetoric, Soteriology, Christology and Ecclesiology* (Subsidia Biblica 43; Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press 2012) 79–109.

Aletti, J.-N., "Romans 8. The Incarnation and Its Redemptive Impact," J.-N. Aletti, *New Approaches for Interpreting the Letters of Saint Paul. Collected Essays. Rhetoric, Soteriology, Christology and Ecclesiology* (Subsidia Biblica 43; Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press 2012) 111–138.

Barclay, J.M.G., "By the Grace of God I Am What I Am. Grace and Agency in Philo and Paul," *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment* (eds. J.M.G. Barclay – S.J. Gathercole) (London: Clark 2008) 140–157.

Bobzien, S., *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon 2005).

Bonhöffer, A., *Epiktet und das Neue Testament* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 10; Giessen: Töpelmann 1911).

110 Cf. Kane, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, 132–146 See also A.R. Mele, "Free Will and Science," *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will*, 2 ed. (ed. R. Kane) (Oxford Handbooks; New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012) DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195399691.003.0026; H. Walter, "Contributions of Neuroscience to the Free Will Debate," *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will*, 2 ed. (ed. R. Kane) (Oxford Handbooks; New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012) DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195399691.003.0027; J. Knobe – S. Nichols, "Free Will and the Bounds of the Self," *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will*, 2 ed. (ed. R. Kane) (Oxford Handbooks; New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012) DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195399691.003.0028.

Bonhöffer, A., „Epiktet und das Neue Testament," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 13 (1912) 281–292.

Burke, T.J., "Adoption and the Spirit in Romans 8," *Evangelical Quarterly* 70 (1998) 311–324.

Burke, T.J., *Adopted into God's Family. Exploring a Pauline Metaphor* (New Studies in Biblical Theology 22; Nottingham – Downers Grove, IL: Apollos – InterVarsity Press 2006).

Byrne, B., *Romans* (Sacra Pagina 6; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press 1996).

Cheung, A.T., *Idol Food in Corinth. Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 176; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1999).

Chow, J.K., *Patronage and Power. A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 75; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1992).

Crabbe, K., *Luke/Acts and the End of History* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 238; Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter 2019).

Cranfield, C.E.B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Introduction and Commentary on Romans I–VIII* (International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: Clark 2004).

DiCicco, M.M., *Paul's Use of Ethos, Pathos, and Logos in 2 Corinthians 10–13* (Mellen Biblical Press Series 31; Lewiston: Mellen 1995).

Dihle, A., *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity* (Sather Classical Lectures 48; Berkeley, CA: University of California Press 1982).

Dobbin, R., "Prohairesis in Epictetus?" *Ancient Philosophy* 11 (1991) 111–135.

Dodson, J.R. – Briones, D.E. (eds.), *Paul and Seneca in Dialogue* (Ancient Philosophy and Religion 2; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2017).

Dodson, J.R. – Briones, D.E. (eds.), *Paul and the Giants of Philosophy. Reading the Apostle in Greco-Roman Context* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic 2019).

Dodson, J.R. – Pitts, A.W. (eds.), *Paul and the Greco-Roman Philosophical Tradition* (The Library of New Testament Studies 527; London *et al.*: Bloomsbury 2017).

Dunn, J.D.G., *Romans 1–8* (Word Biblical Commentary 38A; Dallas, TX: Word 1988).

Eastman, S.G., *Paul and the Person. Reframing Paul's Anthropology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2017).

Ehrensperger, K., "To Eat Or Not to Eat – This Is the Question? Table Disputes in Corinth," *Decisive Meals. Table Politics in Biblical Literature* (eds. N. MacDonald – L. Sutter Rehmann – K. Ehrensperger) (Library of New Testament Studies 449; London – New York: Clark 2012).

Engberg-Pedersen, T., "Stoicism in Philippians," *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* (ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen) (Minneapolis, MA: Fortress 1995) 256–290.

Engberg-Pedersen, T., "The Hellenistic Offentlichkeit: Philosophy as a Social Force in the Greco-Roman World," *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World* (eds. P. Borgen – V.K. Robbins – D.B. Gowler) (Emory Studies in Early Christianity 6; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press 1998) 15–37.

Engberg-Pedersen, T., *Paul and the Stoics* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 2000).

Engberg-Pedersen, T., "The Reception of Graeco-Roman Culture in the New Testament: The Case of Romans 7.7–25," *The New Testament as Reception* (eds. M. Müller – H. Tronier) (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 230; London – New York: Sheffield Academic Press 2002) 32–57.

Engberg-Pedersen, T., "The Relationship with Others. Similarities and Differences between Paul and Stoicism," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 96/1–2 (2005) 35–60.

Engberg-Pedersen, T., "Paul's Stoicizing Politics in Romans 12–13. The Role of 13.1–10 in the Argument," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29/2 (2006) 163–172.

Engberg-Pedersen, T., "Complete and Incomplete Transformation in Paul. A Philosophical Reading of Paul on Body and Spirit," *Metamorphoses. Resurrection, Body, and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity* (eds. T.K. Seim – J. Økland) (Ekstasis 1; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 2009) 123–146.

Engberg-Pedersen, T., "The Material Spirit. Cosmology and Ethics in Paul," *New Testament Studies* 55/2 (2009) 179–197.

Engberg-Pedersen, T., *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul. The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2010).

Engberg-Pedersen, T., "A Stoic Concept of the Person in Paul? From Galatians 5:17 to Romans 7:14–25," *Christian Body, Christian Self. Concepts of Early Christian Personhood* (eds. C.K. Rothschild – T.W. Thompson) (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 284; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2011) 85–112.

Engberg-Pedersen, T., "On Comparison. The Stoic Theory of Value in Paul's Theology and Ethics in Philippians," *Der Philipperbrief des Paulus in der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (eds. J. Frey – B. Schliesser – V. Niederhofer) (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2015) 289–308.

Engberg-Pedersen, T., "Paul in Philippians and Seneca in Epistle 93 on Life after Death and Its Present Implications," *Paul and Seneca in Dialogue* (eds. J.R. Dodson – D.E. Briones) (Ancient Philosophy and Religion 2; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2017) 276–284.

Eriksson, A., *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof. Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians* (Coniectanea Neotestamentica or Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series 29; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell 1998).

Fee, G.D., *God's Empowering Presence. The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson 1994).

Fitzmyer, J.A., *Romans. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 33; New York: Doubleday 1993).

Frey, J., "The Notion of 'Flesh' in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage," *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (eds. D. Falk – F. García Martínez – E.M. Schuller) (Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2000) 197–226.

García Martínez, F. – Tigchelaar, E.J.C. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (Translations)* (Leiden – New York: Brill 1997).

Garland, D.E., *1 Corinthians* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2003).

Gieniusz, A., *Romans 8,18–30. Suffering Does Not Thwart the Future Glory* (University of South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 9; Atlanta, GA: Scholars 1999).

Gieniusz, A., "'Debtors to the Spirit' in Romans 8.12? Reasons for the Silence," *New Testament Studies* 59/1 (2013) 61–72.

Grappe, C., "Qui me délivrera de ce corps de mort? l'esprit de vie! Romains 7,24 et 8,2 comme éléments de typologie adamique," *Biblica* 83/4 (2002) 472–492.

Harris, M.J., *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2013).

Herion, G. – Travis, S.H., "Wrath of God," *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary* (eds. D.N. Freedman *et al.*) (New York: Doubleday 1992) 989–998.

Hock, R.F., "Paul and Greco-Roman Education," *Paul in the Greco-Roman World. A Handbook* (ed. J.P. Sampley) (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press 2003) 198–227.

Horrell, D.G., *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence. Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement* (Studies of the New Testament and Its World; Edinburgh: Clark 1996).

Horsley, R.A., "Consciousness and Freedom among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8–10," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978) 574–589.

Huttunen, N., *Paul and Epictetus on Law. A Comparison* (The Library of New Testament Studies 405; London: Clark 2009).

Inwood, B., *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism* (Oxford – New York: Clarendon – Oxford University Press 1985).

Jewett, R. – Kotansky, R.D., *Romans. A Commentary on the Book of Romans* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2007).

Kane, R., *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will* (Fundamentals of Philosophy Series; New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press 2005).

Keener, C.S., *The Mind of the Spirit. Paul's Approach to Transformed Thinking* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2016).

Kleinknecht, H. *et al.*, "ὀργή κτλ.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (eds. G. Kittel – G. Friedrich – G.W. Bromiley) (Grand Rapids, MI – London: Eerdmans 1967) V, 382–447.

Knobe, J. – Nichols, S., "Free Will and the Bounds of the Self," *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will*, 2 ed. (ed. R. Kane) (Oxford Handbooks; New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012).

Kowalski, M., "The Cognitive Spirit and the Novelty of Paul's Thought in Rom 8,5–6," *Biblica* 100/1 (2020) 47–68.

Kowalski, M., "The Spirit of Resurrection in Romans 8 and Its Jewish Correspondences," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 44/2 (2021) 254–283.

Lagrange, M.-J., *Saint Paul. Épître aux Romains* (Etudes Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda 1931).

Lenski, R.C.H., *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Columbus, OH: Lutheran Book Concern 1936).

Liddell, H.G. – Scott, R. – Jones, H.S. – McKenzie, R., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford – New York: Clarendon – Oxford University Press 1996).

Long, A.A., "Representation and the Self in Stoicism," A.A. Long, *Stoic Studies* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 36; Berkeley, CA: University of California Press 2001) 264–285.

Long, A.A., "Soul and Body in Stoicism," A.A. Long, *Stoic Studies* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 36; Berkeley, CA: University of California Press 2001) 224–249.

Long, A.A., "The Logical Basis of Stoic Ethics," A.A. Long, *Stoic Studies* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 36; Berkeley, CA: University of California Press 2001) 134–155.

Long, A.A., *Epictetus. A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life* (Oxford – New York: Clarendon 2002).

Longenecker, R.N., *The Epistle to the Romans. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2016).

Lyonnet, S., "Rom 8,2–4 a la lumiere de Jeremie 31 et d'Ezechiel 35–39," *Etudes sur l'Epître aux Romains* (Analecta Biblica 120; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico 1990) 231–241.

Malherbe, A.J., "Determinism and Free Will in Paul. The Argument of 1 Corinthians 8 and 9," *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* (ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen) (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 1995) 231–255.

Martin, D.B., *Slavery as Salvation. The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 1990).

Martin, R.P., *2 Corinthians* (Word Biblical Commentary 40; Waco, TX: Word 1986).

Maston, J., *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul. A Comparative Study* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/297; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2010).

Matand Bulembat, J.-B., *Noyau et enjeux de l'eschatologie paulinienne. De l'apocalyptique juive et de l'eschatologie hellénistique dans quelques argumentations de l'apôtre Paul. Étude rhétorico-exégétique de 1 Co 15,35–58; 2 Co 5,1–10 et Rm 8,18–30* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 84; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 1997).

Mele, A.R., "Free Will and Science," *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will*, 2 ed. (ed. R. Kane) (Oxford Handbooks; New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012). DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195399691.003.0026.

Mitchell, M.M., *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation. An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox 1993).

Moo, D.J., *The Epistle to the Romans* (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1996).

Morris, L., *The Epistle to the Romans* (The Pillar New Testament Commentary; Leicester, England – Grand Rapids, MI: Apollos – Eerdmans 1988).

Mounce, R.H., *Romans* (New American Commentary 27; Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman 1995).

Murphy-O'Connor, J., "Freedom or the Ghetto (1 Cor., VIII, 1–13; X, 23–XI, 1.)," *Revue biblique* 85 (1978) 543–574.

Murphy-O'Connor, J., *Paul a Critical Life* (Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press 1997).

Niederwimmer, K., "ἐλεύθερος κτλ.," *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* (eds. H.R. Balz – G. Schneider) (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1990) 432–434.

Obeng, E.A., "Abba, Father. The Prayer of the Sons of God," *Expository Times* 99/12 (1988) 363–366.

Osborne, G.R., *Romans* (The IVP New Testament Commentary Series; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press 2004).

Pitts, A.W., "Hellenistic Schools in Jerusalem and Paul's Rhetorical Education," *Paul's World* (ed. S.E. Porter) (Pauline Studies 4; Leiden – Boston: Brill 2008) 19–50.

Porter, S.E., "Paul of Tarsus and His Letters," *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period (330 B.C.–A.D. 400)* (ed. S.E. Porter) (Leiden: Brill 1997) 533–538.

Rabens, V., *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul. Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/283; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2010).

Rastoin, M., *Tarse et Jérusalem. La double culture de l'Apôtre Paul en Galates 3,6–4,7* (Analecta Biblica 152; Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico 2003).

van Rensburg, J., "The Children of God in Romans 8," *Neotestamentica* 15 (1981) 139–179.

Reuter, E., "qnʾ," *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (eds. G.J. Botterweck – H. Ringgren – H.-J. Fabry) (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans 1991) XIII, 47–58.

Rowe, C.K., *One True Life. The Stoics and Early Christians as Rival Traditions* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 2016).

Sanday, W. – Headlam, A.C., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (International Critical Commentary; New York: Scribner 1897).

Sanders, E.P., *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM 1977).

Schlatter, A., *Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief*, 3 ed. (Stuttgart: Calwar 1959).

Schlier, H., "ἐλεύθερος κτλ.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (eds. G. Kittel – G. Friedrich – G.W. Bromiley) (Grand Rapids, MI – London: Eerdmans 1964) II, 487–502.

Schreiner, T.R., *Romans* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament 6; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1998).

Schuller, E.M. – Newsom, C.A., *The Hodayot (Thanksgiving Psalms). A Study Edition of 1QHa* (Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 36; Williston, ND: SBL Press 2012).

Schunck, K.-D., "chēmāh," *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (eds. G.J. Botterweck – H. Ringgren – H.-J. Fabry) (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans 1977) IV, 462–465.

Sevenster, J.N., *Paul and Seneca* (Leiden: Brill 1961).

Smit, J.F.M., "1 Cor 8:1–6. A Rhetorical Partitio. A Contribution to the Coherence of 1 Cor 8:1–11:1," *The Corinthian Correspondence* (ed. R. Bieringer) (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 125; Leuven: Leuven University Press – Peeters 1996) 577–591.

Smit, J.F.M., "Do Not Be Idolaters. Paul's Rhetoric in 1 Cor 10:1–22," *Novum Testamentum* 39 (1997) 40–53.

Smit, J.F.M., "The Rhetorical Disposition of First Cor 8:7–9:27," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59 (1997) 476–491.

Sorabji, R., *Emotion and Peace of Mind. From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation* (The Gifford Lectures; Oxford: Oxford University Press 2000).

Strathmann, H., "μάρτυς κτλ.," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (eds. G. Kittel – G. Friedrich – G.W. Bromiley) (Grand Rapids, MI – London: Eerdmans 1967) IV, 474–514.

Talbert, C.H., "Tracing Paul's Train of Thought in Romans 6–8," *Review & Expositor* 100/1 (2003) 53–63.

Tappenden, F.S., *Resurrection in Paul. Cognition, Metaphor, and Transformation* (Early Christianity and Its Literature 19; Atlanta, GA: SBL Press 2016).

Theissen, G., *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity. Essays on Corinth* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1982).

Thiselton, A.C., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI – Carlisle: Eerdmans – Paternoster 2000).

Thorsteinsson, R.M., "Paul and Roman Stoicism. Romans 12 and Contemporary Stoic Ethics," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29/2 (2006) 139–161.

Thorsteinsson, R.M., *Roman Christianity and Roman Stoicism. A Comparative Study of Ancient Morality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2010).

Thrall, M.E., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of the Corinthians*. II. *Commentary on II Corinthians VIII–XIII* (International Critical Commentary; London – New York: Clark 2004).

van Unnik, W.C., *Tarsus or Jerusalem, the City of Paul's Youth* (London: Epworth Press 1962).

Vanni, U., "Due Città nella Formazione di Paolo: Tarso e Gerusalemme," *Atti del I Simposio di Tarso su S. Paolo Apostolo* (ed. L. Padovese) (Turchia. La Chiesa e la Sua Storia 5; Roma: Istituto Francescano di Spiritualià. Pontificio Ateneo Antoniano 1993) 17–29.

Vollenweider, S., *Freiheit als neue Schöpfung. Eine Untersuchung zur Eleutheria bei Paulus und in seiner Umwelt* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 147; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1989).

Walter, H., "Contributions of Neuroscience to the Free Will Debate," *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will*, 2 ed. (ed. R. Kane) (Oxford Handbooks; New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012). DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195399691.003.0027.

Winter, E.F. (ed.), *Erasmus, Desiderius, and Martin Luther. Discourse on Free Will* (London *et al.*: Bloomsbury 2013).

Wolff, H.W., *Anthropology of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1974).

Yates, J.W., III, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/251; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008).

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 12/4 (2022) 545–563

Dwelling and Clothing as Metaphors for the Human Body in 2 Cor 5:1–4

Franciszek Mickiewicz
Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
fmickiewicz@o2.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3945-8169

Abstract: There is an allegory of the human body in 2 Cor 5:1–4 that is discussed by many scholars and has many different interpretations. The author of this article joins this discussion and tries to answer the question of what the theological message of this pericope is. The metaphors that make it up can be divided into two groups: 1) home metaphors; 2) metaphors of putting on and taking off of clothes. In his text, Paul arranges them in an antithetical way and refers to two stages of human life: the earthly life of believers, which a person leads in a destructible body and which ends in death, and the future condition of believers, which begins with the reception of the resurrection body. The analysis carried out in the article leads to the conclusion that, in his reflection, Paul does not write anything about the intermediate state which is referred to by the followers of Platonic and Gnostic thought in the Hellenistic environment. He eagerly wishes to stand before the Lord during the Parousia without losing his mortal body in order to pass to eternal life without the experience of death by putting on the glorious body.

Keywords: body, anthropology of St. Paul, death, resurrection, eternal life

In Paul's theological reflection on the physical and spiritual existence of a person, the term "body" (σῶμα) appears frequently (as many as 91 times). It takes on many differing meanings. It might refer to the physical body, which for a person is the cause of suffering and sin, and is subject to death (Rom 4:19; 6:6, 12; 7:24; 1 Cor 6:18 etc.); physical body whose drives a person should control (1 Cor 9:27; 13:3; 2 Cor 4:10; Gal 6:17; Col 2:23); the physical body which has a close relationship with the temporal, earthly life of a person, and is made up of many parts (Rom 12:4; 1 Cor 5:3; 6:13; 2 Cor 5:6, 8, 10 etc.); physical body – temple of the Holy Spirit which can be the space to worship God (Rom 12:1; 1 Cor 6:19; 7:4; Phil 1:20); the spiritual body in which a person is to live after the resurrection (1 Cor 15:35–44); the glorious body of Christ (Phil 3:21); the eucharistic body of Christ (1 Cor 11:24, 27, 29); the body of Christ represented by the Church (Rom 12:5; 1 Cor 6:15; 10:16–17; 12:12–13, 27 and many others).

There have been many studies of all these meanings in theological literature. However, it should be noted that when referring to the human body, Paul, at times, also uses highly meaningful metaphors to describe its nature, dignity or future destiny. Such is the case in 2 Cor 5:1–4. In this short passage, the apostle uses as many as four words to describe

DOI: 10.31743/biban.13643 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

the human body – σῶμα (this term appears in 2 Cor 5:6, 8, 10). Those words belong to the semantic field of dwelling: οἰκία (2 times: v. 1 – "house," "dwelling"); σκῆνος (2 times: v. 1 and 4 – "tent"); οἰκοδομή (1 time: v. 1 – "building"); οἰκητήριον (1 times: v. 2 – "dwelling," "seat"). Subsequently, when writing about the loss of his body, he weaves the metaphor of clothing into this image by using the verb ἐκδύσασθαι (1 time: v. 4 – "to unclothe") and even the adjective γυμνός (v. 3 – "naked"), and when referring to the recovery of the body, he uses the words ἐνδύσασθαι (1 time: v. 3: "to clothe") and ἐπενδύσασθαι (2 times: v. 2 and 4: "to put on outer clothing").

This peculiar accumulation of metaphors creates a rich and very complex allegory of the human body, which has been discussed at length in scholarly commentaries and articles (hardly ever noticed in the Polish language literature) and leads exegetes to many divergent conclusions. In interpreting this accumulation, however, most exegetes fail to consider the fact that the metaphors it contains are arranged in an antithetical manner and that it is precisely this literary structure which plays an important role in the proper understanding of theological message of the pericope of 2 Cor 5:1–4. That is why, this article joins the exegetes' discussion and makes a renewed attempt to portray the content of these metaphors, starting the exegesis of Paul's text with an analysis of its antithetical structure.

1. The Antithetical Structure of 2 Cor 5:1–4

There is a fairly widespread view in the exegesis of 2 Cor 5:1–4 that in this passage of his epistle, Paul makes an allusion to an intermediate state between the death of the body and its resurrection. He distinguishes three states in human existence: 1) temporal life, 2) the state of the dead, living a life separated from the body, and 3) life after the resurrection and the transformation accomplished on the day of the Parousia. In 2 Cor 5:1–4, he finds the prospect of the third state much more desirable than the second, but in turn in 2 Cor 5:6–8 he is of the opinion that the second state is superior to the first because it includes "being with the Lord." He does not explain what exactly this intermediate state involves as he does not know. He is merely convinced in 5:3 that in his state of waiting for the Parousia he will be deprived of the body (naked). This very thought fills him with fear and revives his desire to receive a transformed body in heaven at the time of the Parousia.[1]

1 Cf. I.K. Smith, "Does 2 Corinthians 5,1–8 Refer to an Intermediate State?," *RTR* 55 (1996) 14 and 23. In antiquity, this view was proclaimed by Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, while of modern exegetes it is supported by, among others, Murray J. Harris ("2 Corinthians 5:1–10: A Watershed in Paul's Theology?," *TynBul* 22 [1971] 45–48), Lorin Cranford ("A New Look at 2 Cor 5:1–10," *SwJT* 19 [1976] 95–100), Romano Penna ("Vivere con Cristo dopo la morte [2 Cor 5,1–10; Fil 1,23]," *PSV* 8 [1983] 141), Joseph Osei-Bonsu ("Does 2 Cor 5,1–10 Teach Reception of the Resurrection Body at the Moment of Death?," *JSNT* 28 [1986] 89–95), William L. Craig ("Paul's Dilemma in 2 Corinthians 5.1–10: a «Catch-22»?," *NTS* 34/1 [1988] 145–147), Raymond O. Zorn ("II Corinthians 5:1–10: Individual Eschatology or Corporate Solidarity, Which?," *RTR* 48/3 [1989] 93–104), James D.G. Dunn (*The Theology of Paul the Apostle* [Edinburgh: Clark 1998] 490),

When analysing the text of the entire pericope of 2 Cor 5:1–10, other exegetes pay more attention to the immediate literary context in which the passage is placed (2 Cor 4–5) and on Paul's eschatological ideas, contained in Rom 5:12–21 and 1 Cor 15, among others, as well as taking into account the Jewish background of the first century, from which Paul came, and where apocalyptic texts testifying to the belief in a transitional state in which the righteous are to abide between death and resurrection were written. Based on this, they conclude that although Paul uses a remarkably peculiar language in 2 Cor 5:1–10, it is impossible to find the idea of an intermediate state in which a person would expect to be resurrected, deprived of his body in this text.[2] Still other exegetes, opposing the intermediate state view, believe that Paul does not address either anthropological or eschatological problems in his text, but merely uses the life-death antithesis to express his confidence that his apostolic ministry will bear the expected fruits, and that in the end he will be crowned with glory when he will be able to "stand in the presence of the Lord" (2 Cor 5:8).[3]

Works cited here indicate that the presence of the idea of an intermediate state in 2 Cor 5:1–4 is vigorously debated in scholarly literature and divides scholars into several groups, although it is, in fact, completely irrelevant in this pericope. In fact, it is not the adjective γυμνός itself in verse 3, which has become an object of exaggerated interest and philosophical speculation for many exegetes, that plays an important role in it, but a whole, content-rich set of body metaphors of which this adjective is an integral part of and which will become the main focus of analysis in this article. It should be noted here that metaphors, images and statements contained in this pericope are arranged in an antithetical manner and this literary construction, consciously employed by the apostle, greatly influences the understanding of the theological message of his reflection on life. Consequently, the text of this pericope (given in its own literal translation, the justification for which is found in the analyses that follow) can be presented in the following two columns:

N.T. Wright (*Surprised by Hope. Rethinking Heaven, the Resurrection, and the Mission of the Church* [New York: Harper One 2008] 172), Ralph P. Martin (*2 Corinthians*, 2 ed. [WBC 40; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan 2014] 260–262).

2 See e.g. R. Hettlinger, "2 Corinthians 5,1–10," *SJT* 10 (1957) 174–194; E.E. Ellis, "II Corinthians v. 1–10 in Pauline Eschatology," *NTS* 6 (1960) 224; R.J. Cassidy, "Paul's Attitude to Death in II Corinthians 5:1–10," *EvQ* 43 (1971) 210–217; P. Hoffmann, *Die Toten in Christus. Eine Religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur paulinischen Eschatologie*, 3 ed. (NTAbh. Neue Folge 2; Münster: Aschendorff 1978) 4–20; F. Lindgard, *Paul's Line of Thought in 2 Corinthians 4:16–5:10* (WUNT 2/189; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2005) 164–165; K. Daugherty, "Naked Bodies and Heavenly Clothing: ΓΥΜΝΟΣ In 2 Corinthians 5.3," *JGRChJ* 8 (2011–2012) 199–222; F. Bianchini, "2 Co 5,6–8 et Ph 1,23: État intermédiaire et immortalité de l'âme chez Paul?," *ScEs* 66 (2014) 433–444.

3 Cf. K. Hanhart, "Paul's Hope in the Face of Death," *JBL* 88 (1969) 445–457; J.W. McCant, "Competing Pauline Eschatologies. An Exegetical Comparison of 1 Corinthians 15 and 2 Corinthians 5," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 29 (1994) 23–49; E. Reynolds, "Away from the Body and at Home with the Lord: 2 Corinthians 5:1–10 in Context," *JATS* 24 (2013) 138–151.

1a For we know that if the tent (σκῆνος) that is our earthly home (οἰκία) is destroyed, ...	1b we have a building (οἰκοδομή) from God, a house (οἰκία) not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.
2 For in this tent we groan, longing to ...	put on (ἐπενδύσασθαι) our heavenly dwelling (οἰκητήριον),
	3 if indeed by putting it on (ἐνδυσάμενοι) we may not be found naked (γυμνοί).
4a For while we are still in this tent (σκῆνος), we groan, being burdened—not that we would be unclothed (ἐκδύσασθαι),	4b but that we would be further clothed (ἐπενδύσασθαι), so that what is mortal may be swallowed up by life.

It is evident that the left-hand column refers to a temporal, earthly life, filled with longing, sighing, constant striving towards a goal and trust, while the right-hand column features a vision of heaven, and therefore of what is the goal of the desires shown in the first column. If one were to create a third, middle column in this construction in order to place something that would lie between temporal life and eternal life, the result would be that it would remain empty, for there is no explicit word in Paul's text for anything concerning a state bridging these two realities. Such a two-part arrangement may also be related to the Semitic bipolar way of perceiving the world, in which heaven, the kingdom of God, is placed at one end and earth, the place of person's kingship, at the other (see e.g. Gen 1:1–8; Deut 30:19; Ps 115:15–16 and many others).

Such representation of Paul's text makes it easy to realise that when the apostle refers to temporal life and, in this context, writes (verse 6) about dwelling (verb ἐνδημῆσαι) in the body (ἐν τῷ σώματι), uses metaphors to describe this body: οἰκία ("dwelling"), σκῆνος ("tent"), and he describes the loss of this body with the verb ἐκδύσασθαι (literally: "to unclothe"). When, on the other hand, he refers to the reality of heaven (still in the realm of expectation and hope), he describes the human body by means of metaphors, which include as many as three nouns: οἰκοδομή ("building"), οἰκία ("house") and οἰκητήριον ("dwelling," "seat"), and verbs ἐπενδύσασθαι ("to put on outer clothing") and ἐνδύσασθαι ("to clothe"). Two complementary groups can therefore be distinguished throughout this allegory: 1) metaphors of the house; 2) metaphors of putting on and taking off clothes. Each of these groups deserves a little more discussion here.

2. House as a Metaphor for the Body

At the beginning of the pericope under discussion (2 Cor 5:1), the term οἰκία appears on both sides of the antithesis, that is, in the context of both earthly life and eternal life in heaven. It is worth noting at this point that the Greek language used two simple nouns having the root *oik-*: οἰκία and οἶκος. Originally, οἰκία meant a residence, the very building inhabited by people, while the noun οἶκος means the house with everything in it, and therefore also the family goods and its inhabitants. In the Septuagint, however, this distinction disappeared, so that both terms acquired the same meaning and indicated both family and house.[4] Since the noun οἰκία had a very general meaning of a house, indispensable for life, without specifying the material of which it is built, Paul can use it to refer to two completely different realities, considering that wherever a person is, they need some kind of a house. He thus implies that in earthly life we have an earthly dwelling (ἐπίγειος), and at its end we shall receive "a house not made with hands (ἀχειροποίητον)" in heaven.

It is evident from this statement that the nature of the house to which Paul is referring is closely related to the successive stages of human existence, the temporal, transitional and eternal stage. At each of these stages the idea is of a house as a dwelling place, but the wider context of 2 Cor 5:1 leads to the conclusion that οἰκία here does not literally mean a building of some kind, but has a metaphorical sense. In 2 Cor 4:7 there is a picture of clay pots signifying the body, which in verse 10 are referred to as σῶμα, and in verse 11 even as θνητή σάρξ ("mortal body"). In turn, in 4:16, the apostle states that although the "outer self" (ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος) is wasted away, the "inner self" (ὁ ἔσω) is being renewed day by day. Reading this sentence against the background of the statement in 4:7, 10–11, it is clear that also the expression "outer person" means a body that is subject to death.[5] In 5:1, Paul clearly continues the reflection contained in 4:7–18 and enriches it with the metaphor of a house, describing bodily life as being in a dwelling (similar to the author of Job 4:19).

Since the kind of house depends on the mode of life which men lead, the apostle states that at the earthly stage, person's dwelling is οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους. This expression uses the genitive (*genetivus epexegeticus*) or the appositive (*appositionis*), which explains the preceding noun,[6] so it can be translated literally: "a house which is a tent." This portrayal, one could say, fits the author, whose occupation was σκηνοποιός,[7] that is person making tents, and so it seems strange that it appears only once in all of Paul's texts. However, as many exegetes

4 Cf. J. Goetzman, "Haus, bauen," *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*, 7 ed. (eds. L. Coenen – E. Beyreuther – H. Bietenhard) (Wuppertal: Brockhaus 1986) 637.

5 Cf. J. Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians* (SP 8; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press 1999) 80–81. This author rightly points out that both expressions: "outer person" and "inner person," although they may be of Hellenistic origin, do not have a dualistic tinge and indicate the whole person, but from a different point of view.

6 M.E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. I. *Introduction and Commentary on II Corinthians I–VII* (Edinburgh: Clark 1994) 360, n. 1172; Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians*, 82.

7 E. Dąbrowski, *Listy do Koryntian. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału, komentarz* (PŚNT 7; Poznań: Pallottinum 1965) 424.

note[8] – the metaphor of a tent (σκηνή or σκῆνος) as a temporary, impermanent and movable structure is often used in non-biblical Greek literature to describe human body (in the works of the Pythagoreans, Democritus, Plato, Hippocrates, or Philo of Alexandria). In the Septuagint, however, the metaphor in this sense appears only twice: in Isa 38:12, where Hezekiah, speaking of his death, laments: "My dwelling place is being pulled down. It is carried away from me like a shepherd's tent." and in Wis 9:15, where in turn the expression γεῶδες σκῆνος ("earthly tent") means the same as the expression φθαρτόν σῶμα ("mortal body") standing at the beginning of the verse. While Hellenistic literature, following Plato's thought, wrote of the tent as a temporary dwelling, or even a prison of the soul, which at death will be freed from it forever, no such dualistic distinction between soul and body can be found in Paul's theology. Writing in Greek, he had to use a vocabulary understandable to his readers, which can sometimes give the impression that along with the terminology he also adopted the anthropological ideas of Greek philosophers,[9] in essence, however, he remained faithful to Jewish tradition, which considered a person as a psycho-physical unity and pointed out that if, at the moment of death, there is a definitive separation of the soul from the body, then a person would become an incomplete being.[10]

Mathias Rissi argues that in his reflection, Paul uses a metaphor like that found in Isa 38:12 and Job 4:19. Notably, it portrays being in a tent-like dwelling, whereby symbolising the entirety of human existence, which by its very nature is bodily and mortal.[11] It should be stated, however, that the overall portrayal is much more complex. On the one hand, it is clear that in contrast to Wis 9:15, where the author notes with sadness that "the corruptible body burdens the soul," in 2 Cor 5:1 the apostle makes no mention of the soul, and there is no indication that, in the Hellenistic manner, he treats body and soul as two separately existing sides of being human.[12] Therefore, it cannot be claimed that Paul regards the body, portrayed in the tent symbol, as the present dwelling place of the soul and spirit of the believer.[13] On the other hand, however, we find that throughout the passage (2 Cor 4:7–5:10) there is a kind of anthropological dualism that Paul realises when he begins to reflect on the

8 Regarding this, see e.g. W. Michaelis, "σκῆνος," *TWNT* VII, 383; R. Bultmann, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Augsburg 1985) 130–131; A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians* (Edinburgh: Clark 1985) 142–143; Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 357–358; C.S. Keener, *1–2 Corinthians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005) 177–178; D.E. Aune, "Anthropological Duality in the Eschatology of 2 Cor 4:16–5:10," *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity. Collected Essays II* (WUNT 303; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2013) 365–366.

9 This issue is discussed in more detail by Nikolaus Walter ("Hellenistische Eschatologie bei Paulus? Zu 2 Kor 5,1–10," *TQ* 176/1 [1996] 53–64).

10 Cf. W. Lillie, "An Approach to 2 Corinthians 5.1–10," *SJT* 30 (1977) 62; Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians*, 88; T.F. Glasson, "2 Corinthians v. 1–10, Versus Platonism," *SJT* 43 (1990) 145–155; Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 261.

11 M. Rissi, *Studien zum zweiten Korintherbrief. Der alte Bund, Der Prediger, Der Tod* (Zürich: Zwingli 1969) 74.

12 Cf. A. Paciorek, *Drugi List do Koryntian. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz* (NKB.NT 8; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2017) 257.

13 So writes, for example, Cornelius R. Stam (*Commentary on the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* [Chicago, IL: Berean Bible Society 1992] 73–74).

mystery of death.[14] Sharing the conviction of both Jewish biblical authors and Hellenistic writers that death constitutes the beginning of a new life, he does not suggest that it is in death that the separation of the soul and the body takes place, but he does state clearly that this crucial moment in human existence is experienced differently by the "outer person" and the "inner person" of whom he writes in 4:16. This physical aspect of being human is impermanent and deteriorates like a tent, while the spiritual aspect continues on.

A person, however – according to biblical authors' vision, is by their very nature not a soul or spirit, but always a body-spiritual being, and therefore Paul holds out the hope that when the temporary earthly home crumbles, he will receive a new, everlasting dwelling from God in heaven, which he terms οἰκοδομή and οἰκητήριον. The noun οἰκοδομή does not mean some ordinary house, but (apart from the act of building itself) indicates a stately structure, splendid edifice; hence several times in the Septuagint and always in the Gospels it refers to the Jerusalem Temple, regarded as the house of God (see e.g. 1 Chr 26:27; 29:1; Matt 24:1; Mark 13:1–2). In the Pauline epistles, it most often means a process of construction (see e.g. Rom 14:19; 15:2), but it is used twice to describe God's edifice, which together with Christ is constituted by those who believe in him (1 Cor 3:9; Eph 2:21). For this reason, some scholars believed that also in 2 Cor 5:1 οἰκοδομή means the mystical body of Christ, which is the messianic community of believers and which at the time of the Parousia would begin a new phase of its existence as a new temple,[15] or the glorious body of Christ, which at death is given to the believer who enjoys the presence of the risen Lord.[16] The antithetical structure of 2 Cor 5:1–2, however, precludes such an interpretation. Paul contrasts the building in heaven with the tent on earth and declares that it will be given to each believer by God, not to the whole community, taken globally as one organism.[17] While that tent is impermanent and easily destroyed, the building given in heaven is eternal because it is not made by human hand and is solely a gift of God.

The adjective ἀχειροποίητος, as used here, still occurs throughout the Bible only in Mark 14:48 in reference to the death and resurrection of Christ and in Col 2:11 in reference to the baptism of the believers. The idea contained in it, however, is rooted in the Old Testament, where the authors of poetic texts (especially Exod 15:17; Ps 78:69) express the conviction that the Jerusalem temple was built by the hands of God, and in this essential way it differs from the temples of pagan deities made by human hands.[18] It is possible that Paul is referring to this Old Testament idea and incorporating it into his metaphor. By this means,

14 Cf. Aune, "Anthropological Duality," 380.

15 J.A.T. Robinson, *The Body. A Study in Pauline Theology* (SBT 5; London: SCM 1952) 76–77; Ellis, "II Corinthians," 217–218.

16 A. Feuillet, "La demeure céleste et la destinée des chrétiens. Exégèse de 2 Co 5,1–10 et contribution à l'étude des fondements de l'eschatologie paulinienne," *RSR* 44 (1956) 367–378.

17 Cf. I.R. Kitzberger, *Bau der Gemeinde. Das paulinische Wortfeld οἰκοδομή/(ἐπ)οικοδομεῖν* (FB 53; Würzburg: Echter 1986) 121.

18 Cf. A. Kuśmirek, "Sanktuarium uczynione ręką," *Słowo pojednania. Księga Pamiątkowa z okazji siedemdziesiątych urodzin Księdza Michała Czajkowskiego* (ed. J. Warzecha) (Biblioteka „Więzi" 160; Warszawa: Więź 2004) 119–120.

in contrast, he makes it clear that person's earthly body comes by birth from another person and therefore decays like the material (cloth or leather) making up the tent, while the heavenly building is the work of God alone, and therefore is durable like the beautifully adorned stones making up the edifice of the Jerusalem Temple[19] (cf. Mark 13:1). The nature of this edifice is further described in verse 2 by the expression τὸ οἰκητήριον τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. The noun οἰκητήριον as used here is still found in the Bible only in 2 Macc 11:2 and Jude 1:6, and in both these texts it means a domicile, a usual residence. Likewise, in Paul's allegorical portrayal, he points to the permanence of the edifice that will become person's possession in eschatological times and which will then be their permanent and proper residence.[20]

In the tent metaphor, words: "For we know that if our earthly tent which is our house is torn down" (2 Cor 5:1a) unambiguously refer to death. In contrast to this phrase comes the statement in verse 1b: "we have a building from God, a house not made by hands, eternal in the heavens." The antithetical construction of the whole sentence allows this second part to be interpreted as a demonstration of faith in the resurrection, which Paul has extensively described and convincingly justified in 1 Cor 15:35–53. In this rather lengthy argument, he first uses the telling portrayal of grain, making it a metaphor for the body (vv. 37–38), he then notes by contrast that the body (σῶμα) associated with earthly existence is sensual, corruptible, and inglorious, while the body associated with post-resurrection life is spiritual, incorruptible, and glorious (vv. 42–44), and finally concludes that only an incorruptible body can possess the kingdom of God (vv. 50–53). Based on a detailed analysis of 1 Cor 15:35–53 and 2 Cor 5:1–10, exegetes indicate that in the latter text Paul continues the idea found in the former and expresses it anew through the use of complex metaphors.[21] Although the word "resurrection" itself does not appear, the contrast he uses allows us to conclude that it is precisely the resurrection that will make it possible to obtain an incorruptible body in heaven.

The radical contrast between earthly and heavenly reality at the same time indicates that there is no continuity between this sensual body, which will disintegrate like a tent, and the new eternal, spiritual body. Paul does not state that by the resurrection the temporal body will be perfected and conformed to the new reality of the heavenly kingdom but he makes himself and his readers aware of two contrasting truths: first - our earthly "dwelling" will one day fall apart, but, second – this should not be an object of our despair, because in heaven we "possess" an incorruptible house. Again, not a word suggests that there may be some transitional stage in human existence between the decay of the temporal "tent" and receiving spiritual "building" as a gift. However, the interpretation of the word ἔχομεν ("we possess") used by him in the present tense raises some difficulties, since the future tense would seem more natural here: "we shall possess." Exegetes suggested many different

19 Kuśmirek, "Sanktuarium uczynione ręką," 126.

20 Cf. J. Gillmann, "A Thematic Comparison: 1 Cor 15,50–57 and 2 Cor 5,1–5," *JBL* 107 (1988) 452; R. Metts, "Death, Discipleship, and Discourse Strategies, 2 Cor 5:1–10 – Once Again," *CTR* 4 (1989) 69; Lillie, "An Approach to 2 Corinthians," 67.

21 Cf. Gillmann, "A Thematic Comparison," 454; McCant, "Competing Pauline Eschatologies," 24–48.

interpretations of this form, which Margaret E. Thrall and Murray J. Harris present in brief in their comments.[22] Four of them arguably deserve more attention. 1) Word ἔχομεν is closely linked with the words ἐὰν καταλυθῇ, and expresses the idea that receiving home in heaven, as a consequence of the loss of an earthly home, takes place immediately after death.[23] It is true that in 1 Cor 15:23 the apostle suggests that the resurrection will take place not at death, but at the time of the Parousia,[24] yet in 1 Cor 15:51–53 he declares solemnly that those who reach the Parousia while still alive on earth will at that moment be changed to clothe themselves with immortality.[25] 2) The present tense form used by Paul has a future tense sense and actually points to receiving the body at the time of the Parousia.[26] 3) The one who died has from now on a body from God instead of a corrupted body. It is not yet real, but already a perfect possession that will be fully embodied at the time of the Parousia.[27] 4) The present tense form ἔχομεν might have a future tense sense, but by its use the apostle expresses primarily the certainty of receiving a new home from God.[28]

When reviewing the various theological speculations of exegetes, it is worth noting that Paul himself does not even ask the question of when he hopes to come into possession of the body, which he views as a permanent building in heaven. Whenever he attempts to describe eschatological realities, he uses either symbolic language drawn from Jewish apocalyptic, as he does, for example, in 1 Cor 15:50–63; 1 Thess 4:13–5:3; 2 Thess 2:1–12, or metaphorical language, as is the case in 1 Cor 15:35–49; 2 Cor 5:1–10. When interpreting these passages, one should not fantasise, going beyond the text itself and guessing at what the author himself did not even try to say, but should adapt to the specific way of speaking that he used to express truths that are humanly difficult to define. Therefore, it seems that among many proposed meanings of the verb ἔχομεν, the last one is the most appropriate, as it best accounts for the metaphor and lack of precision in Paul's text: his faith in the resurrection is so strong that he even considers the future state of the risen person as an object of knowledge (he begins a whole sentence with the word "we know") and writes about it as if he already possessed it in the present.[29]

---

22 Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 368–370; M.J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2005) 375–380.

23 H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (KEK 6; Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1970) 160; Harris, "2 Corinthians 5:1–10," 42; D.A. Garland, *2 Corinthians. An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture* (NAC 29; Nashville: Broadman & Holman 1999) 258.

24 This is noted, for example by Margaret E. Thrall (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 368).

25 Harris, "2 Corinthians 5:1–10," 43.

26 A.T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 4 ed. (Nashville, TN: Broadman 1934) 881–882.

27 H.A.W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistles to the Corinthians* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls 1884) 508; Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 380.

28 Cf. C. Wolff, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus and die Korinther* (THKNT 8; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 1989) 107; F. Zeilinger, *Wiara w zmartwychwstanie w Biblii* (Kraków: WAM 2011) 149; Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians*, 82; Paciorek, *Drugi List do Koryntian*, 259–260.

29 Cf. F. Manzi, *Seconda lettera ai Corinzi. Nuova versione, introduzione e commento* (I Libri Biblici. Nuovo Testamento 9; Milano: Paoline 2002) 200.

3. Metaphors of Clothing and Unclothing

In 2 Cor 5:2 Paul confesses his desire to "be clothed with our heavenly dwelling," whereas in verse 4 he states that he does not wish "to be unclothed (ἐκδύσασθαι) but clothed (ἐπενδύσασθαι) so that what is mortal may be swallowed up by life." In both of these sentences, there is a quite unique move from the metaphor of a building to the metaphor of clothing. More precisely, there is no noun in them denoting any kind of clothing, but the verb ἐπενδύσασθαι is used, suggesting something paradoxical, namely that a person can dress himself in a dwelling. This unusual way of speaking is due to the fact that Paul considers the body simultaneously as a dwelling and as outer clothing[30]: on earth, both of these things give a person (in a different way) shelter, warmth, a sense of his own dignity and security, and in this sense, they can also serve as a metaphor for the body received from God in heaven. For this reason, the act of dwelling or entering heaven and putting on clothes can also metaphorically mean the same thing: receiving the spiritual body (σῶμα πνευματικόν) in eternal life, of which Paul writes in 1 Cor 15:44.

The verb ἐπενδύσασθαι ("to put something on top of," "to put on oneself"), used twice in 2 Cor 5:2 and 4, does not appear anywhere else in either the New Testament or the Septuagint. It is etymologically related to the noun ἐπενδύτης, which occurs in 2 Sam 13:18 and John 21:7 and means a top garment. Many exegetes question whether this verb has the same sense as the simpler word ἐνδύσασθαι, which the apostle uses once in 2 Cor 5:3 and four times in 1 Cor 15:53–54. Some of them believe that there is a significant difference between the two. They claim that Paul uses the form ἐνδύειν when writing about the resurrection of the dead, by contrast, he introduces more elaborate form ἐπενδύειν to denote the special experience of believers who, during their life on Earth, have reached the Parousia and are then clothed with a resurrected body.[31] Such a distinction, however, receives strong criticism from other scholars. Although it might be admitted that the two prefixes ἐπεν- reinforce the idea of superimposing something that is outside the body,[32] but they do not significantly change the sense of the word with one prefix ἐν- (ἐνδύσασθαι). The two verbs, therefore, are synonyms and each refers to putting on clothes.[33]

In 1 Cor 5:1, the phrase ἐὰν καταλυθῇ ("if he be destroyed") introduces a conditional mode referred to as *typus probabilis*. When writing his epistle, Paul is still living on Earth, but he can tell from experience that one day his earthly life will come to an end. He writes about this moment using passive voice as the causes of the destruction of his temporary

30 Cf. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 145.

31 This is what T.S. Evans, for example, claimed. As cited in: Harris, "2 Corinthians 5:1–10," 43. The difference in meaning between the two verbs is also noted by Charles K. Barrett (*A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* [HNTC; New York: Harper and Row 1973] 152–153) and Roy Metts ("Death, Discipleship," 73).

32 As noted by e.g. Lambrecht (*Second Corinthians*, 83).

33 Cf. among others – Harris ("2 Corinthians 5:1–10", 43–44), Thrall (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 371–372), Osei-Bonsu ("Does 2 Cor 5,1–10", 88), Reynolds ("Away from the Body", 144, n. 12), Garland (*2 Corinthians*, 258), Paciorek (*Drugi List do Koryntian*, 263–264).

"dwelling" are beyond his control, and yet, he, for his part, must submit to them. In verses 2 and 4, he continues this idea and argues that this very state of affairs is the cause of inward anguish and sighing, and he depicts the corruption of the temporal body, which is compared to a tent (σκῆνος), by means of the metaphor of unclothing (ἐκδύσασθαι). In this case, he uses the aorist form of the *medium* voice, but it does not presuppose that a person, for their part, will have any share in his own desolation at death. As in verse 1, verses 2 and 4 the implicit subject of the action of putting on and taking off the garment is God, the Lord of life and death, who predestined us "so that the mortal may be swallowed up by life" (vv. 4b–5).[34] In 2 Cor 5:2 and 4, the opposite of both the verb καταλύω, referring to the destruction of the earthly tent, and ἐκδύω introducing the image of barenesses is the infinitive ἐπενδύσασθαι. The image of putting on clothing contained therein continues the idea of verse 1b: expressing confidence in the existence of a spiritual building in heaven that makes eternal life possible, immediately afterwards, the apostle, in metaphorical language, confesses that, as a human being, he feels a deep longing in his heart to experience a more complete and fulfilling life than our present mortal existence.[35]

Between verses 2 and 4, there is a very short interjected sentence which causes exegetes the greatest difficulty. It should first be noted that it was given in three different versions in ancient manuscripts: 1) εἴ γε καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι οὐ γυμνοὶ εὑρεθησόμεθα ("if, indeed, we are found clothed (ἐνδυσάμενοι) and not naked"); this reading is found in papyrus P^{46}, in codices ℵ, B, C D^2, Ψ, 075, 0150 and in many other ancient manuscripts, lectionaries, translations and works of the Church Fathers. 2) εἴ γε καὶ ἐκδυσάμενοι οὐ γυμνοὶ εὑρεθησόμεθα ("if, indeed, we are found unclothed and not naked"); this reading is found in $D^{*,c}$, $it^{ar.d.fv.r.g.o}$, in the Georgian translation, in the works of Marcion, Tertullian, Ambrose and other ancient writers. 3) εἴ γε καὶ ἐκλυσάμενοι ... ("if, indeed, freed..") – appears only in codices F, G.

The third reading is the result of misreading of the letter Δ and mistaking it for Λ. As for the first and second readings, the juxtaposition of their ancient witnesses provides insight into the fact that the former is found in the oldest and most important manuscripts. Nevertheless, some scholars regarded the second reading as primary, believing that in it the vividness and paradoxicalness characteristic of Paul is preserved, whereas the first reading contains a trite and tautological statement.[36] Meanwhile, it should be noted that it is precisely this second reading that appears as a corrective to the one that might have appeared trivial and tautological, although in reality this triviality is apparent.[37]

---

34 T. Stegman, *Second Corinthians* (Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2009) 123.

35 Cf. Stegman, *Second Corinthians*, 122.

36 R. Bultmann, *Exegetische Probleme des zweiten Korintherbriefes* (SymBU 9; Uppsala: Wretman 1947) 11; B.M. Metzger (ed.), *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societes Greek New Testament*, 4 ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 1994) 579–580.

37 This is what is claimed, for example, by Alfred Plummer (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 148). The internal reasoning in support of the ἐνδυσάμενοι reading is discussed in more detail: M.E. Thrall, "'Putting on' or 'Stripping of' in 2 Corinthians 5,3," *New Testament Textual Criticism. Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in*

Paul begins this sentence with the conjunction εἴ, followed by the particle γε, which has several different functions in Greek, and καὶ, which here has an adverbial and emphatic meaning. The whole expression εἴ γε καὶ, depending on which meaning of the particle γε one adopts, can express doubt: "as far as" or certainty: "if, of course," "provided, of course, that."[38] As these particles begin a remark interjected between two sentences containing true longing and hope, and in verse 1b the certainty is expressed of having a dwelling in heaven from God, it seems that also here, the apostle declares with certainty that his hope is not without purpose, and states positively: "I presume, of course."[39] Paul's idea follows the same direction as the interjected sentence contained in Gal 3:4, where εἴ γε καὶ is to be translated: "if indeed," and in Rom 5:6 (in codex B); Eph 3:2; 4:21; Col 1:23, where εἴ γε introduces a positive conviction: "for indeed."[40] In these sentences, Paul uses a conditional sentence to express what is actually a fact and to state that his assumption is true.[41] In 2 Cor 5:3, this expression is followed by the participle ἐνδυσάμενοι, which is grammatically subordinate to the verb εὑρεθησόμεθα ("we shall be found," "we shall turn out"), but on the other hand is a continuation of the metaphor in verse 2 and has the same complement as the infinitive ἐπενδύσασθαι.[42] Therefore, it might be assumed that the whole statement: εἴ γε καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι εὑρεθησόμεθα confirms the apostle's deep hope: "I presume, of course, that we shall appear clothed (in our dwelling from heaven)."

After the participle ἐνδυσάμενοι, expressing a positive reality, Paul adds the words οὐ γυμνοὶ, which indicate its possible negation: "not naked." There are two main ways of interpreting the adjective γυμνός contained in this verse in the exegetical literature on it.

1) Moral significance. Those who accept this sense of nakedness in 2 Cor 5:3 point out that in the Bible, nakedness is often a metaphor for the shame resulting from guilt incurred before God (Gen 3:10–11; Isa 32:11; Ezek 16:39; Hos 2:5; Rev 3:17; 16:15) and revealed at his judgment (Isa 20:2–4; 47:3; Ezek 23:26, 29), which is also mentioned in 2 Cor 5:10. In his text, Paul takes up this tradition and fears to face Christ at the moment of the Parousia naked, that is, "without the garment of righteousness," with shame and guilt caused by the sins committed (there is also a similar image in Matt 22:11).[43] Other theologians, assuming a moral meaning, point out that the participle ἐνδυσάμενοι refers to being clothed with Christ at the moment

Honour of Bruce M. Metzger (eds. E.J. Epp – G.D. Fee) (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1981) 221–237; K. Hanhart, "Hope in the Face of Death: Preserving the Original Text of 2 Cor 5:3," *Neot* 31/1 (1997) 77–86.

38 Cf. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 376; Paciorek, *Drugi List do Koryntian*, 265.

39 Cf. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 367–368; F.W. Danker, "Consolation in 2 Cor. 5:1–10," *CTM* 39 (1968) 554; D. Zeller, "Versuch über 2 Kor 5,1–5," *Der zweite Korintherbrief: Literarische Gestalt – historische Situation – theologische Argumentation. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Dietrich-Alex Koch* (ed. D. Sänger) (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2012) 386.

40 Cf. N. Baumert, *Täglich sterben und auferstehen. Der Literalsinn von 2. Kor. 4,12–5,10* (München: Kösel 1973) 382.

41 Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 384.

42 Cf. among others – Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians*, 83.

43 Such moral significance is assumed, for example, by E. Earle Ellis ("II Corinthians," 220–221), G. Wagner ("Le tabernacle et La vie «en Christ». Exégèse de 2 Corinthiens 5:1 à 10," *RHPR* 41 [1961] 391–392), Hanhart

of baptism, as Paul writes about in Gal 3:27. In 2 Cor 5:3, on the other hand, he expresses his desire not to lose this union with Christ until the time of the Parousia, since this would mean that he is morally and spiritually naked before him.[44] The idea that in this verse, as in 2 Cor 11:27 and Rom 8:35, Paul lists nakedness as one of the many afflictions he experiences in his apostolic work, can probably also be included in this group.[45]

2) Anthropological meaning. Exegetes in this group point out that in his letter Paul refers to Greek literature of the time. At that time, Plato's view of the soul deprived of its body was still widespread, and there were also ideas put forward by Gnostics, who called the soul deprived of its body naked. Also Paul, referring to these views, writes about nakedness in his letter, in relation to the future existence devoid of the body.[46] By setting the sentence in 2 Cor 5:3 against such a background, exegetes suggest various ways of interpreting the portrayal of nakedness contained therein.[47] Some believe that Paul's desire is for believers in Christ not to lose their bodies before the Parousia, at which, according to 1 Cor 15:51–52, the dead will receive a resurrected body and the living a transfigured body.[48] Paul fears entering such a state of nakedness because he would like to be immediately clothed in a dwelling from heaven.[49] Conversely, others argue that Paul takes a stand here against the Platonic and Gnostic views according to which a soul without a body enters the kingdom of heaven, and reminds the Corinthians that an existence without a body is not the object of Christian hope.[50] Still others believe that the nakedness in Paul's text – as in 4 Ezra 7:80 – refers to the future state of unbelievers, wandering without a body.[51]

("Paul's Hope," 454–456), Norbert Baumert (*Täglich sterben*, 183–186), Christian Wolff (*Der zweite Brief*, 110). This issue is discussed in more detail by Kevin Daugherty ("Naked Bodies," 202–204).

44 Hettlinger, "2 Corinthians 5,1–10," 191–193; R. Berry, "Death and Life in Christ. The Meaning of 2 Corinthians 5,1–10," *SJT* 14 (1961) 71–76.

45 Zeller, "Versuch über 2 Kor 5,1–5," 393.

46 These meanings are assumed, among others, by Hans Windisch (*Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 157–175) and Osei-Bonsu ("2 Cor 5,1–10," 90–92). A more extensive discussion of this interpretation is given, e.g. in Daugherty, "Naked Bodies," 201–202; Paciorek, *Drugi List do Koryntian*, 264–265.

47 Cf. Aune, "Anthropological Duality," 369–370; Daugherty, "Naked Bodies," 201.

48 It is in accordance with the following: "A New Look," 97–98; Smith, "Does 2 Corinthians 5,1–8," 18; Zorn, "II Corinthians 5:1–10," 103. Lambrecht (*Second Corinthians*, 86–87) believes that Paul did not want to die before the Parousia, but wished to clothe his earthly body with a heavenly body.

49 Cf. P. Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1997) 262; P. Verster, "Abode in Heaven. Paul and Life After Death in 2 Corinthians 5:1–10," *Missionalia* 44/1 (2016) 25.

50 Cf. Glasson, "2 Corinthians v. 1–10," 153–155; Cassidy, "Paul's Attitude to Death," 215; C. Demke, "Zur Auslegung von 2 Korinther 5,1–10," *EvT* 29 (1969) 597; R. Bultmann, *Teologia del Nuovo Testamento* (Brescia: Queriniana 1985) 194–195; Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 149; Osei-Bonsu, "Does 2 Cor 5,1–10," 90–91; Metts, "Death, Discipleship," 60; Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 379–380; McCant, "Competing Pauline Eschatologies," 48; Aune, "Anthropological Duality," 370; Paciorek, *Drugi List do Koryntian*, 266.

51 This is what is believed, for example by Wilhelm Mundle ("Das Problem des Zwischenzustandes in dem Abschnitt 2 Kor. 5,1–10," *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag* [eds. R. Bultmann – H.V. Soden] [Tübingen: Mohr 1927] 101–102); A. Oepke, "γυμνός," *TWNT* I, 774.

Since each of these opinions is based on a reliable analysis of the text of 2 Cor 5:1–10 and its Hebrew or Hellenistic context, it is difficult to say unequivocally which of them better represents Paul's idea. However, it should be emphasised here (which was not fully appreciated by many exegetes) that in verses 1–4, the apostle uses only metaphorical language and arranges metaphors used in the text next to each other in an antithetical way. Furthermore, there is a parallelism between verses 2–3 and verse 4. In both these passages of his reflection, Paul speaks of sighing ("now" meaning "in this tent"), of the desire to clothe oneself symbolising new life, and of the loss of clothing, the consequence of which is nakedness.[52] All the metaphors used in 2 Cor 5:1–4 – as well as the portrayals in 2 Cor 4:14–18 – refer to one of the two stages of human life. The first one is the present, earthly life of believers, which a person lives in a corruptible body, and which ends in death. Linked to it are metaphors: "earthly home," "tent," "sigh," "anguish" "nakedness," "existence without clothing." The second stage, on the other hand, is the future state of believers, which begins with the reception of the resurrected body. It is referred to by the metaphors: "a building from God," "a house not made with hands, eternally abiding in heaven," "put on a dwelling from heaven," "the absorption of what is mortal by life."[53] In such a juxtaposition, it is clear that the metaphors of loss of clothing and nakedness refer to death, which ends the earthly stage of human life and destroys the present temporary dwelling, rather than to some esoteric eschatological state.[54]

Using clothing terminology, also in 1 Cor 15:53, Paul writes: "For the perishable must clothe itself with the imperishable, and the mortal with immortality." In this sentence, he uses the verb ἐνδύσασθαι, which occurs in 2 Cor 5:3, twice. He combines four abstract nouns with it, putting them next to each other in an antithetical way: φθαρτόν – ἀφθαρσία, θνητόν – ἀθανασία. The same structure is found in 2 Cor 5:4, in which the apostle writes: "because we do not wish to be unclothed but to be clothed (ἐπενδύσασθαι) instead with our heavenly dwelling, so that what is mortal may be swallowed up by life (ζωή)." In both texts, "mortal" means the body, which is "corruptible" (cf. 1 Cor 5:1), and the incorruptibility and immortality of 1 Cor 15:53 implies the same reality as life in 2 Cor 5:4. In 1 Cor 15:54, Paul continues the idea of the previous verses and draws the conclusion that in the event of the resurrection the words of Isa 25:8 will be fulfilled: "death has been swallowed up in victory" (κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νῖκος). An echo of this phrase can also be heard in 2 Cor 5:4, where the apostle states, in the form of a conclusion derived from the preceding metaphors, that the clothing itself is for the purpose of not being unclothed "but clothed, so that our mortality may be swallowed up by life"(καταποθῇ τὸ θνητὸν ὑπὸ τῆς ζωῆς).[55]

---

52 Cf. A.C. Perriman, "Paul and the Parousia: 1 Corinthians 15.50–57 and 2 Corinthians 5.1–5," *NTS* 35 (1989) 518.

53 Cf. Daugherty, "Naked Bodies," 220–221.

54 This is also what Andrew C. Perriman believes ("Paul and the Parousia," 519).

55 For a more detailed analysis and comparison of 1 Cor. 15:50–57 with 2 Cor 5:1–5, see J. Lambrecht, "La vie engloutit ce qui est mortel: Commentaire de 2 Co 5, 4c," *La Pâque du Christ, mystère de salut. Mélanges offerts*

Although there are many differences between 1 Cor 15:53–57 and 2 Cor 5:1–4, the latter pericope cannot be understood without the former. The whole of 1 Cor 15:53–57, on the other hand, is the conclusion of the truth expressed in verses 50–52 that entry into the kingdom of God requires a complete transformation. In an indirect way, Paul makes it clear here (vv. 35–50) that this transformation pertains to the body of believers. Also in 2 Cor 5:1–4, by means of sublime metaphors, he writes about the transition from temporal to eternal life, expressing the hope that when his temporal tent is destroyed, i.e. when he loses his temporal, destructible body, he will be clothed with an eternal body. Convinced that on the day of the glorious return of Christ, the dead will rise to new life, and that those then still living on earth will be transformed (1 Cor 15:51–52), he desires then to stand before the Lord without losing his mortal body and without experiencing death to pass into eternal life by being clothed with a glorious body.[56]

Finally, it should be added that – as many of the exegetes mentioned above note – a polemical accent can also be discerned in the pericope 2 Cor 5:1–4, as an integral part of a larger literary unit including 2 Cor 4:7–5:10. Corinthians, influenced by Platonic and Gnostic thought, claimed that after death, the soul enjoys a happy existence without the body. Opposing them, Paul preaches an entirely different doctrine. First, he affirms from human experience that in temporal life the body is fragile like an earthen vessel (4:7) and transitory like a tent or clothing (5:1–4), and is even the cause of suffering, affliction and anguish (4:8–12, 17; 5:4). However, immediately afterwards he declares that the resurrected Jesus Christ (4:14) gives an unfailing hope to those who believe in him. Moreover, his resurrection actually brings certainty that in God's kingdom they will share in a new life, in a body transfigured and subject to immeasurable glory (4:17; 5:1–4). By sketching images of dwelling and clothing right before his readers' eyes, Paul reminds them that the hope of the Gospel lies in the resurrection of the body, not the disembodied existence of a naked soul. Salvation, which God grants through Jesus Christ, means entering into a new existence (5:4), into eternal life, which is radically different from the present life, which is similar to being in a tent, but is not the end of bodily existence. On the contrary, it is to bring this existence to perfection.[57]

---

au Patre F.-X. Durrwell pour son 70e anniversaire (ed. M. Benzerath) (LD 112; Paris: Cerf 1982) 237–248; Gillmann, "A Thematic Comparison," 448–454. Regarding this, see A. Lindemann, "Paulus und die korinthische Eschatologie. Zur These von einer «Entwicklung» im paulinischen Denken," *NTS* 37 (1991) 373–399.

56 Cf. Manzi, *Seconda lettera ai Corinzi*, 201; F.J. Matera, "Apostolic Suffering and Resurrection Faith. Distinguishing Between Appearance and Reality (2 Cor 4,7–5,10)," *Resurrection in the New Testament. Festschrift J. Lambrecht* (eds. R. Bieringer – V. Koperski – B. Lataire) (Leuven: Leuven University Press 2002) 402–403.

57 Cf. M.A. Seifrid, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians* (The Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2014) 227.

Conclusions

A detailed analysis of 2 Cor 5:1–4, taking into account the antithetical structure of this pericope, allows formulating some important conclusions regarding its theological message. In this text, Paul perceives the body as both a dwelling and an outer clothing. Both of these metaphors refer to a person experiencing the need to possess a house as well as clothing no matter where they are on earth. These metaphors also point to the fact that the fullness of human existence in heaven also requires the possession of a body, the nature of which is closely related to the spiritual nature of the kingdom of God. Therefore, Paul cherishes the hope that when his temporal body breaks down on earth like a humble and temporary tent, he will receive a new body as a gift from God in heaven, This body will be similar to a magnificent building, which is eternal because it is not made by human hands, so it can become a permanent and proper means of his future existence. This conviction of the apostle is based on the belief in a resurrection, in which the temporal body will be perfected and adapted to the new reality of the heavenly kingdom. This faith of his is so strong that he writes about the future state of the risen person as if it were already his experience.

In this context, it is important to note that both the words about the corruption of the earthly body shown in the metaphor of the movable tent (2 Cor 5:1a), the metaphor of the loss of clothing (v. 4) as well as the metaphor of nakedness, widely discussed by exegetes (v. 3), refer to death, which ends the temporal stage of human life and leads to eternal life (it is impossible to find an allusion to an intermediate state between death and the Parousia in verse 3). When writing about this passage, Paul expresses his deep hope that when he loses his temporal, corruptible body, he will be able to clothe himself with an eternal body. He earnestly desires to stand before the Lord at the moment of the Parousia without losing his mortal body and without experiencing death, to pass into eternal life by being clothed with a glorious body.

Bibliography

Aune, D.E., "Anthropological Duality in the Eschatology of 2 Cor 4:16–5:10," *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity. Collected Essays II* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 303; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2013) 353–380.

Barnett, P., *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1997).

Barrett, C.K., *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Harper's New Testament Commentaries; New York: Harper and Row 1973).

Baumert, N., *Täglich sterben und auferstehen. Der Literalsinn von 2. Kor. 4,12–5,10* (München: Kösel 1973).

Berry, R., "Death and Life in Christ. The Meaning of 2 Corinthians 5,1–10," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 14 (1961) 60–76.

Bianchini, F., "2 Co 5,6–8 et Ph 1,23: État intermédiaire et immortalité de l'âme chez Paul?," *Science et Esprit* 66 (2014) 433–444.

Bultmann, R., *Exegetische Probleme des zweiten Korintherbriefes* (Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses 9; Uppsala: Wretman 1947).

Bultmann, R., *The Second Letter to the Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Augsburg 1985).

Bultmann, R., *Teologia del Nuovo Testamento* (Brescia: Queriniana 1985).

Cassidy, R.J., "Paul's Attitude to Death in II Corinthians 5:1–10," *Evangelical Quarterly* 43 (1971) 210–217.

Craig, W.L., "Paul's Dilemma in 2 Corinthians 5.1–10: a «Catch-22»?," *New Testament Studies* 34/1 (1988) 145–147.

Cranford, L., "A New Look at 2 Cor 5:1–10," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 19 (1976) 95–100.

Dąbrowski, E., *Listy do Koryntian. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału, komentarz* (Pismo Święte Nowego Testamentu 7; Poznań: Pallottinum 1965).

Danker, F.W., "Consolation in 2 Cor. 5:1–10," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 39 (1968) 552–556.

Daugherty, K., "Naked Bodies and Heavenly Clothing: ΓΥΜΝΟΣ In 2 Corinthians 5.3," *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 8 (2011–2012) 199–222.

Demke, C., "Zur Auslegung von 2 Korinther 5,1–10," *Evangelische Theologie* 29 (1969) 589–602.

Dunn, J.D.G., *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Edinburgh: Clark 1998).

Ellis, E.E., "II Corinthians v. 1–10 in Pauline Eschatology," *New Testament Studies* 6 (1960) 211–224.

Feuillet, A., "La demeure céleste et la destinée des chrétiens. Exégèse de 2 Co 5,1–10 et contribution à l'étude des fondements de l'eschatologie paulinienne," *Recherches de science religieuse* 44 (1956) 161–192, 360–402.

Garland, D.A., *2 Corinthians. An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture* (New American Commentary 29; Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman 1999).

Goetzman, J., "Haus, bauen," *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament* (eds. L. Coenen – E. Beyreuther – H. Bietenhard) (Wuppertal: Brockhaus 1986) 636–640.

Gillmann, J., "A Thematic Comparison: 1 Cor 15,50–57 and 2 Cor 5,1–5," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988) 439–454.

Glasson, T.F., "2 Corinthians v. 1–10, Versus Platonism," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 43 (1990) 145–155.

Hanhart, K., "Paul's Hope in the Face of Death," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969) 445–457.

Hanhart, K., "Hope in the Face of Death: Preserving the Original Text of 2 Cor 5:3," *Neotestamentica* 31/1 (1997) 77–86.

Harris, M.J., "2 Corinthians 5:1–10: A Watershed in Paul's Theology?," *Tyndale Bulletin* 22 (1971) 32–57.

Harris, M.J., *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (The New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2005).

Hettlinger, R., "2 Corinthians 5,1–10," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 10 (1957) 174–194.

Hoffmann, P., *Die Toten in Christus. Eine Religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur paulinischen Eschatologie*, 3 ed. (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen. Neue Folge 2; Münster: Aschendorff 1978).

Keener, C.S., *1–2 Corinthians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005).

Kitzberger, I.R., *Bau der Gemeinde. Das paulinische Wortfeld οἰκοδομή/(ἐπ)οικοδομεῖν* (Forschung zur Bibel 53; Würzburg: Echter 1986).

Kuśmirek, A., "Sanktuarium uczynione ręką," *Słowo pojednania. Księga Pamiątkowa z okazji siedemdziesiątych urodzin Księdza Michała Czajkowskiego* (ed. J. Warzecha) (Biblioteka "Więzi" 160; Warszawa: Więź 2004) 118–126.

Lambrecht, J., "La vie engloutit ce qui est mortel: Commentaire de 2 Co 5, 4c," *La Pâque du Christ, mystère de salut. Mélanges offerts au Pater F.-X. Durrwell pour son 70e anniversaire* (ed. M. Benzerath) (Lectio Divina 112; Paris: Cerf 1982) 237–248.

Lambrecht, J., *Second Corinthians* (Sacra Pagina 8; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press 1999).

Lillie, W., "An Approach to 2 Corinthians 5.1–10," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 30 (1977) 59–70.

Lindemann, A., "Paulus und die korinthische Eschatologie. Zur These von einer «Entwicklung» im paulinischen Denken," *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991) 373–399.

Lindgard, F., *Paul's Line of Thought in 2 Corinthians 4:16–5:10* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/189; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2005).

Manzi, F., *Seconda lettera ai Corinzi. Nuova versione, introduzione e commento* (I Libri Biblici. Nuovo Testamento 9; Milano: Paoline 2002).

Martin, R.P., *2 Corinthians*, 2 ed. (Word Biblical Commentary 40; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan 2014).

Matera, F.J., "Apostolic Suffering and Resurrection Faith. Distinguishing Between Appearance and Reality (2 Cor 4,7–5,10)," *Resurrection in the New Testament. Festschrift J. Lambrecht* (eds. R. Bieringer – V. Koperski – B. Lataire) (Leuven: Leuven University Press 2002) 387–405.

McCant, J.W., "Competing Pauline Eschatologies. An Exegetical Comparison of 1 Corinthians 15 and 2 Corinthians 5," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 29 (1994) 23–49.

Metts, R., "Death, Discipleship, and Discourse Strategies, 2 Cor 5:1–10 – Once Again," *Criswell Theological Review* 4 (1989) 57–76.

Metzger, B.M. (ed.), *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societes' Greek New Testament*, 4 ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 1994).

Meyer, H.A.W., *Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistles to the Corinthians* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls 1884).

Michaelis, W., "σκῆνος," *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (eds. G. Kittel – G. Friedrich) (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1936) VII, 383–385.

Mundle, W., "Das Problem des Zwischenzustandes in dem Abschnitt 2 Kor. 5,1–10," *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag* (eds. R. Bultmann – H.V. Soden) (Tübingen: Mohr 1927) 93–109.

Oepke, A., "γυμνός," *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (eds. G. Kittel – G. Friedrich) (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1933) I, 773–775.

Osei-Bonsu, J., "Does 2 Cor 5,1–10 Teach Reception of the Resurrection Body at the Moment of Death?," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28 (1986) 81–101.

Paciorek, A., *Drugi List do Koryntian. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny. Nowy Testament 8; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2017).

Penna, R., "Vivere con Cristo dopo la morte (2 Cor 5,1–10; Fil 1,23)," *Parola, Spirito e Vita* 8 (1983) 133–145.

Perriman, A.C., "Paul and the Parousia: 1 Corinthians 15.50–57 and 2 Corinthians 5.1–5," *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989) 512–521.

Plummer, A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians* (Edinburgh: Clark 1985).

Reynolds, E., "Away from the Body and at Home with the Lord: 2 Corinthians 5:1–10 in Context," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 24 (2013) 137–152.

Rissi, M., *Studien zum zweiten Korintherbrief. Der alte Bund, Der Prediger, Der Tod* (Zürich: Zwingli 1969).

Robertson, A.T., *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 4 ed. (Nashville, TN: Broadman 1934).

Robinson, J.A.T., *The Body. A Study in Pauline Theology* (Studies in Biblical Theology 5; London: SCM 1952).

Seifrid, M.A., *The Second Letter to the Corinthians* (The Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2014).

Smith, I.K., "Does 2 Corinthians 5,1–8 Refer to an Intermediate State?," *Reformed Theological Review* 55 (1996) 14–23.

Stam, C.R., *Commentary on the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (Chicago, IL: Berean Bible Society 1992).

Stegman, T., *Second Corinthians* (Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2009).

Thrall, M.E., "'Putting on' or 'Stripping of' in 2 Corinthians 5,3," *New Testament Textual Criticism. Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (eds. E.J. Epp – G.D. Fee) (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1981) 221–237.

Thrall, M.E., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. I. *Introduction and Commentary on II Corinthians I–VII* (Edinburgh: Clark 1994).

Verster, P., "Abode in Heaven. Paul and Life After Death in 2 Corinthians 5:1–10," *Missionalia* 44/1 (2016) 19–33.

Wagner, G., "Le tabernacle et La vie «en Christ». Exégèse de 2 Corinthiens 5:1 à 10," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 41 (1961) 379–393.

Walter, N., "Hellenistische Eschatologie bei Paulus? Zu 2 Kor 5,1–10," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 176/1 (1996) 53–64.

Windisch, H., *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 6; Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1970).

Wolff, C., *Der zweite Brief des Paulus and die Korinther* (THKNT 8; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 1989).

Wright, N.T., *Surprised by Hope. Rethinking Heaven, the Resurrection, and the Mission of the Church* (New York: Harper One 2008).

Zeilinger, F., *Wiara w zmartwychwstanie w Biblii* (Kraków: WAM 2011).

Zeller, D., "Versuch über 2 Kor 5,1–5," *Der zweite Korintherbrief: Literarische Gestalt – historische Situation – theologische Argumentation. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Dietrich-Alex Koch* (ed. D. Sänger) (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2012) 380–393.

Zorn, R.O., "II Corinthians 5:1–10: Individual Eschatology or Corporate Solidarity, Which?," *The Reformed Theological Review* 48/3 (1989) 93–104.

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 12/4 (2022) 565–588

The Human Being in Eschatology according to 1 Thess 5:23

Andrés García Serrano
San Damaso Ecclesiastical University, Madrid
andresgs@sandamaso.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4509-2423

Abstract: In his earliest letter, 1 Thessalonians, Paul addresses the issue of eschatology, leaving us a surprising anthropological description of the human being as "spirit, soul, and body." Paul uses terms that are familiar to his readers. However, the first term in this threefold division of a human being, "spirit," is the most emphasised, since the human being is no longer made up exclusively of "body and soul." In this brief contribution, I will attempt to examine this term, "spirit," as illuminated by its immediate narrative context and by other Pauline pneumatological texts and by its first reception. In this way, the reader will better understand the Pauline vision of the human being in the eschatology, in his ultimate destiny.

Keywords: Pauline anthropology, Pauline pneumatology, Pauline eschatology, Spirit, 1 Thess, history of reception

In this brief contribution, I will explore the subject of Pauline anthropology in the eschatology, that is to say, how Paul understands the human being in the end times.[1] This will involve an in-depth examination of the text of 1 Thess 5:23 (Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἁγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὁλοτελεῖς, καὶ ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τηρηθείη), supplemented, at times, with other Pauline texts that deal with eschatology. Throughout the research, I will make use of the early interpretation of some Fathers of the Church, the reception history, as a *Wirkungsgeschichte* example. Ultimately, the questions guiding my investigation are: What is proper to the human being in eschatology? Is there any sort of relationship or progress among people from protology to eschatology? What does the resurrection of the Man Jesus Christ contribute to Paul's anthropological conception?

Paul has neither a systematic nor a consistent anthropology, but rather adapts to his argumentative necessities and changes his nomenclature as he wishes. In 1 Thess 5:23, Paul's surprising anthropological description, "spirit (πνεῦμα), soul (ψυχή), and body (σῶμα)," uses the vocabulary of the time,[2] but referring to the whole person, with the unitary vision

1 With regard to the anthropology of the eschatological culmination and, therefore, the goal of humanity, see X. Pikaza, «Antropología paulina», *Diccionario de san Pablo* (ed. F. Fernández Ramos) (Burgos: Monte Carmelo 1999) 87–91.

2 With respect to the philosophical background of Paul's tripartite expression, Van Kooten claims that Paul adopts a Platonic vision of the person, similar to that of Philo. In Van Kooten, «The Anthropological Trichotomy», 87–119, he argues that both Philo and Paul make a transition from νοῦς to πνεῦμα. However,

DOI: 10.31743/biban.13473 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

typical of the Jewish tradition.[3] Paul does not intend here, or anywhere else in his writing, to offer a complete reflection on Christian anthropology.

For example, this text does not include other essential components of Pauline anthropology, such as the heart (καρδία)[4] and the mind (νοῦς),[5] which are present in Matt 22:37, following Deut 6:5. However, since in his first writing, 1 Thess, Paul positions himself in eschatology (1 Thess 1:9–10; 4:13–18; 5:1–11; 5:23–24), Paul addresses anthropology in eschatology (without using those terms) with this anthropological presentation, dealing with the human being in the end times.[6]

The tripartite division of the human being that appears in 1 Thess 5:23 has drawn the attention of commentators and theologians throughout the ages, and therefore its reception history is not brief.[7] What does Paul mean when he defines the person as "spirit, soul, and body"?[8]

Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 8–38, states that Paul adopts a Stoic vision of the person, understanding πνεῦμα as a physical substance, characteristic of celestial bodies. John Barclay («Stoic Physics and the Christ-Event: A Review of Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010]», *JSNT* 33 [2011] 406–414), on the other hand, strongly disagrees with both; for him, the philosophical background of the anthropological expressions is much debated, meaning that clear conclusions cannot be drawn. I agree with Barclay that Paul's language is not drawn from a philosophical context, but from an event, the novelty of which stems from the appearance of God in Christ (*ibidem*, 412).

3 This totality is explicitly expressed with the words ὁλοτελεῖς, καὶ ὁλόκληρον. Tertullian emphasised this interpretation of the entirety of the person when he quoted 1 Thess 5:23, commenting that "Here you have the entire substance of man destined to salvation" (Tertullian, *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, 47).

4 *Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms. A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings* (AGSU 10; Leiden: Brill 1971) 447–448, states that Paul follows the traditional Jewish usage of "heart," or καρδία, in which it represents the centre of the person, the source of their will, emotions, thoughts, and affections.

5 Van Kooten, «The Anthropological Trichotomy», 88, demonstrates that in Greek, and, especially, Platonic philosophy, νοῦς was a characteristic part of ψυχή, a quality of the soul. John Dillon («Plutarch and the Separable Intellect», *Estudios sobre Plutarco. Misticismo y Religiones Mistéricas en la Obra de Plutarco* [eds. A. Pérez Jiménez – F. Casadésus] [Madrid – Málaga: Clásicas 2001] 36–37) argues that Aristotle formulated incipient anthropological trichotomy, clearly distinguishing between the mind (νοῦς) and the soul (ψυχή), which were joined to the body (σῶμα). This is likely an antecedent to Paul's tripartite division of πνεῦμα, ψυχή, and σῶμα.

6 See Fadini, «Tamporalità escatologicafre. San Paolo nella lettura di Heidegger», *StPatr* 50 (2003) 357–375.

7 Anthony Thiselton (*1 & 2 Thessalonians Through the Centuries* [Blackwell Bible Commentaries; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell 2011] 161ff) in compiling a reception history of this tripartite expression, shows that it has been frequently misinterpreted and, therefore, much debated since the time of the Church Fathers. Various theories regarding Pauline anthropology, dichotomous or trichotomous, can be found in B. Rigaux, *Saint Paul. Les Épitres aux Thessaloniciens* (Paris – Gembloux: Gabalda – Duculot 1956) 596ff.

8 With regard to this tripartite expression, see César A. Franco Martínez, «El hombre cristiano – "espíritu, alma y cuerpo" – en 1 Tes 5,23», *Concepto cristiano de hombre. 50º Aniversario de ordenación sacerdotal del Emm. Cardenal Primado* (Semana de Teología Espiritual 17; Toledo: Centro de Estudios de Teología 1992) 45–74, which I follow at times.

1. Pauline Anthropology in the Light of Christology and Pneumatology

We often try to fit Paul's thinking into an earlier system of thought.[9] However, I believe that Paul's terminology is more closely related to his personal Christian experience, and therefore I will limit myself almost exclusively to the Pauline corpus, leaving various proposed influences on Pauline terms for the footnotes. I maintain that the hypothetical origin of Paul's expressions does not really illuminate them, but that what is decisive is what was later referred to as the Christian doctrinal context. For Paul, the event of the risen Christ is the centre of the revelation and of the gospel that he received, not from human beings, but from God Himself (Gal 1:11–17). I believe that Pauline Christology and pneumatology are principally based on Paul's experience, and this experience leads him to understand himself, and humanity, in a new way. Thus, it is possible to come to know the Pauline vision of the person in eschatology, in their[10] final destiny. It is considered that, according to Paul, the person in eschatology is determined, is completed or perfected, by the gift of the Spirit.

The first term in the tripartite division of the human being, "spirit," is the most emphasised because of its position,[11] indicating that, in eschatology, the human being is no longer composed exclusively of "body and soul," as the philosophical anthropology of the time claimed.[12] I intend to address the novelty of this term, "spirit," as illuminated by its immediate context, and by other Pauline pneumatological texts. The difficulty lies not in determining what the apostle thinks about the soul and the body, but in specifying the content

9 Regarding the relationship of the term "spirit" in Paul and in *Qumran*, see J. Frey, «Paul's View of the Spirit in the Light of Qumran», *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature* (ed. J.-S. Rey) (STDJ 102; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2014) 237–260.

10 For the sake of simplicity, I will avoid using inclusive language throughout the body of the paper, with the understanding that the human being should be interpreted as man and woman.

11 Of course, Paul's call to holiness in 1 Thess 5:23 also invites his readers to preserve the body blameless given that, in the previous chapter, he described holiness as upholding the body's honour, without allowing oneself to be dominated by concupiscence or fornication (1 Thess 4:3–5). Now, the order of the anthropological terms, i.e. "spirit, soul, and body," suggests that the body is guarded with honour insofar as the spirit directs it, preserving the unity of the blameless human being, body included.

12 The best-known expression of ancient philosophical anthropology is the distinction that Plato makes between the body and soul. With regard to this dichotomy of the body and soul in Plato, see T.M. Robinson, «The Defining Features of Mind-Body Dualism in the Writings of Plato», *Psyche and Soma. Psysicians and Metaphysicians on the Mind-Body Problem from Antiquity to Enlightenment* (eds. J.P. Wright – P. Potter) (Oxford: Clarendon 2002) 37–55. This division of the person into "body and soul" was the most frequent in classical Greek philosophy in general, as demonstrated in Patrick Miller, «Greek Philosophical Dualism», *Light Against Darkness. Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World* (eds. A. Lange *et al.*) (Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2011) 107–144, with implications in the anthropology of Second Temple Judaism, as noted in L.T. Stuckenbruck, «The Interiorization of Dualism», within the Human Being in Second Temple Judaism: the Treatise of the Two Spiritus (1QS III: 13- IV:26) in its Tradition-Historical Context», *Light Against Darkness. Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World* (eds. A. Lange *et al.*) (Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2011) 145–168. See also V. Rabens, «Reframing Paul's Anthropology in the Light of the Dichotomies of Pauline Research», *JSNT* 40 (2018) 503–515.

of the concept πνεῦμα. The first task of the entire exegesis is to determine the meaning of words, especially those that are emphasised by their position and by their novelty.

The immediate literary context of 1 Thess 5:23 does shed some light on the meaning of the noun πνεῦμα. In 1 Thess 5:19, the apostle says, "Do not quench the Spirit." Here he is referring to the divine Spirit that acts in believers, giving rise to all kinds of gifts and charisms in them. The other three instances of the word πνεῦμα in 1 Thess also refer to the Holy Spirit (1:5,6; 4:8). Thus, the context of the word πνεῦμα in 1 Thess 5:23 certainly relates it, in some way, to the divine Spirit.[13]

The analysis of various occurrences of πνεῦμα in Paul's other letters, in their different anthropological uses, indicates that the word πνεῦμα cannot be interpreted as human spirit only, apart from God. In fact, there is no merely human πνεῦμα in Paul's texts. This term expresses the possibility of an encounter between the human being and God, a human aptitude for communication with God, because the person has received this ability from Him as grace.[14] The conception of πνεῦμα as a gift from God, communicated to the human being, is typical of Christian anthropology, just as it appears in Paul. As Jean-Pierre Lemonon[15] and Robert Jewett[16] rightly state, in the Pauline corpus, especially in primarily anthropological contexts, πνεῦμα has a theological connotation.

In his *Antropología teológica*, Ladaria correctly affirms:

> New Testament anthropology, and in particular that of Paul, always contemplates the human being in the light of God; it is not interested in an idea of the person *in themselves*, perhaps because of the tacit conviction that this person does not exist. In the concrete coordinates, in which Paul and the other New Testament authors move, the mystery of the person is illuminated by the presence of God in them, the only presence capable of allowing them to go beyond sin and to live fully. The idea of the person in Paul is Christologically oriented (1 Cor 15:44–45).[17]

Next, we will look at other texts in the Pauline corpus where πνεῦμα appears in relation to the human being in eschatology. This exposition attempts to follow the logical order of events that explain the tripartite division in 1 Thess 5:23, as opposed to a chronological itinerary.[18]

---

13 Rinaldo Fabris (*1–2 Tessalonicesi* [I libri Biblici. Nuovo Testamento 13; Milano: Paoline 2014] 171) states that it refers to the person as a recipient of God's action by means of His Spirit.

14 As we will see further on, including in 1 Cor 2:11, where parallelism is established between the Spirit of God and the spirit of the person, the meaning of πνεῦμα is not purely anthropological, since it reveals this human capacity to open themselves to the Spirit of God. Rom 8:16, another text that speaks of a human spirit – "our spirit" – shows a direct relation between this spirit and the divine Spirit: αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ (both bear joint witness). We will look at both of these texts later, in paragraph 1.3.

15 J.-P. Lemonon, «L'Esprit Sant dans le corpus paulinien», *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplement* 60–61 (1986–1987) 309.

16 Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 195.

17 Ladaria, *Antropología teológica*, 97. Translations of all direct quotations, when not available in English, are my own.

18 I would like to thank Professor Engberg-Pederson for his contribution, pointing out the importance of chronological aspects in Pauline theology. Nevertheless, I prefer to follow a logical, rather than chronological, order, which helps us to understand Paul's reasoning better based, in any case, on letters indisputably written by Paul.

Firstly, we will examine the risen Christ as the perfect human being – Pauline eschatology in 1 Cor 15:42–49. Then, we will move to the relation between Christ and the Spirit – Pauline pneumatology in 2 Cor 3:17–18. Thirdly, we will study the gift of the Spirit of the risen Christ that perfects the human being – Pauline anthropology in 1 Cor 2:6–16. Finally, we will illuminate these ideas with the Pauline expressions "first instalment" (2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; Eph 1:14) and "firstfruits" (Rom 8:23; 2 Thess 2:13; 1 Cor 15:20,23) of the Spirit.

2. Christ, the Last Adam, a Life-Giving Spirit, according to 1 Cor 15:42–49

The whole chapter of 1 Cor 15 is focused on the resurrection of the dead, i.e. on eschatology, which began with the unique event of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the foundation of the resurrection of all people (1 Cor 15:12–14). In 1 Cor 15:44–45, Paul again uses the term πνεῦμα in relation to ψυχή and σῶμα, as he did in 1 Thess 5:23; therefore, this can help us to understand the tripartite expression that we are studying Christologically, and to comprehend the human being in eschatology in relation to the perfect realisation of the risen Christ.

In 1 Cor 15:35–50, Paul draws a comparison between Adam and Christ. This is a typological comparison between the first human being, the first Adam, who pointed towards Christ, the second or definitive Adam.[19] In the same way that Adam is considered representative of all humanity, Christ is the origin of all new humanity.[20] What it is said of the first Adam, as a representative of all, can also be said of the last Adam. James Dunn affirms: "Adam is humankind, an individual who embodies or represents a whole race of people. But in that case, so also does Christ."[21] Just as the first Adam came into existence at the creation, in the same way, the last Adam comes into new existence at the resurrection (1 Cor 15:20–22; Rom 8:29; Col 1:18).

This parallelism between the first and the last Adam, between protology and eschatology, places us at the heart of Paul's anthropology and spirituality. The risen Christ inaugurates a different order from that of the first Adam. For Paul, the resurrection marks the beginning of the humanity of the last Adam. Christ's role as new man does not begin with

19 The intuition of the parallelism with Adam is not originally Paul's, but may have arisen from Hellenistic (W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. IV. *1 Kor 15,1–16,24* [EKKNT 7; Zürich – Braunschweig – Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 2000] 303) or rabbinic Judaism (S. Hultgren, «The Origin of Paul's Doctrine of the Two Adams in 1 Corinthians 15:45–49», *JSNT* 25 [2003] 343–370). Regarding this underlying Adam-Christ typology, see Felipe de Jesús Legarreta-Castillo, *Adam in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15. The New Creation and Its Ethical and Social Reconfigurations* (Emerging Scholars; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2014) 5–32, who develops a *status quaestionis*.

20 Van Kooten («The Anthropological Trichotomy», 89) affirms: "In *1 Cor.* 15, Paul gives us an insight into his anthropological views by distinguishing between 'the first human being' (ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος), Adam, and 'the second human being' (ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος), Christ."

21 J.D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1998) 200.

pre-existence, or with incarnation, but with resurrection. The person's ultimate destiny and the key to understanding is not protology, but eschatology. The new humanity comes from the resurrection, which permits the new man to participate in the life-giving Spirit. The mystery of the person is clarified in the light of the perfect man, the risen Jesus Christ.[22]

Paul conceives of the first Adam as "psychic human being" (from the Greek *psyche*, soul), in contrast to the new, eschatological Adam, called "spiritual human being." In fact, 1 Cor 15:45b, using the expression "so it is written" (οὕτως γέγραπται), quotes Gen 2:7, according to the Septuagint, which says "And God formed the man of dust of the earth, and breathed upon his face the breath of life, and the man became a living soul" (καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν).[23] That is to say, 1 Cor 15:45b quotes Gen 2:7 almost literally, adding a reference to Adam, the first human being.[24] In this way, it relates the "psychic" or "animal" human being to creation in protology, whereas it relates the new Adam, composed not only of the soul and body, but also of the spirit, σῶμα πνευματικόν, to Christ, the last Adam, in eschatology. The "animal human being" is the human being who has been given an *anima*, a soul – that is to say, the human being in their double dimension of the soul and body. Now, this "animal human being" has transformed or become a "spiritual human being." Dunn affirms: "A theology which reckons seriously with the ἐγένετο of John 1:14 must reckon just as seriously with the ἐγένετο implied in 1 Cor 15:45b."[25] In the same way that the Word became flesh, this resurrected incarnate Word, the new Adam, has become a "life-giving Spirit," transforming into a vital principle with the power to give life.

---

22 In view of this Adam-Christ parallelism, we can better understand the well-known text from *Gaudium et spes*, 22: "The truth is that only in the mystery of the incarnate Word does the mystery of man take on light. For Adam, the first man, was a figure of Him Who was to come, namely Christ the Lord. Christ, the last Adam, by the revelation of the mystery of the Father and His love, fully reveals man to man himself and makes his supreme calling clear."

23 I believe that Paul reads the verse from Genesis in the light of the eschatological event of the risen Christ. Regarding the reading that the *Targumim* give of Gen 2:7, see R. Hayward, «Adam, Dust, and the Breath of Life according to the Targumim of Gen 2:7», *Dust of the Ground and Breath of Life (Gen 2:7). The Problem of a Dualistic Anthropology in Early Judaism and Christianity* (eds. J. van Ruiten – G. H. van Kooten) (Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2016) 154–172.

24 With respect to the relationship between Gen 2:7 and 1 Cor 15:45, and Christ's role in creation, see Reinhard Feldmeier, «Christ as Creator: Paul's Eschatological Reading of Gen 2:7 in 1 Cor 15:45», *Dust of the Ground and Breath of Life (Gen 2:7). The Problem of a Dualistic Anthropology in Early Judaism and Christianity* (eds. J. van Ruiten – G.H. van Kooten) (Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2016) 127–137, which examines these texts, as well as other Pauline texts, demonstrating the identity that Paul establishes between Christ and the creator God. With regard to how Paul's pneumatology is never independent, but is rather always related to Christology, see R. Del Colle, «Christian Theology: the Spirit», *The Blackwell Companion to Paul* (ed. S. Westerholm) (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell 2011) 561–575. The author claims that, in Paul, the mystery of the Spirit is the mystery of God in Christ, directly connecting the Spirit to Christ, which is most characteristic of the gospel preached by Paul.

25 J.D.G. Dunn, «1 Corinthians – Last Adam, Life-Giving Spirit», *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. In Honor of Charles Francis Digby Moule* (eds. B. Lindars – S.S. Smalley) (Cambridge: University Press 1973) 139.

According to Dunn, a transformation analogous to that of the incarnation occurs in the resurrection.[26] Commenting on this passage, Irenaeus states:

> But if the Spirit be wanting to the soul, he who is such is indeed of an animal [psychic] nature, and being left carnal, shall be an imperfect being, possessing indeed the image [of God] in his formation (*in plasmate*), but not receiving the similitude through the Spirit; and thus is this being imperfect. [...] For that flesh which has been moulded is not a perfect man in itself, but the body of a man, and part of a man. Neither is the soul itself, considered apart by itself, the man; but it is the soul of a man, and part of a man. Neither is the spirit a man, for it is called the spirit, and not a man; but the commingling and union of all these constitute the perfect man.[27]

Therefore, this exalted Jesus possesses a spiritual body (1 Cor 15:44, σῶμα πνευματικόν). Paul presents the first Adam as an "animal" or "psychic" body (v. 44, σῶμα ψυχικόν), and the last Adam as a spiritual body (v. 44, σῶμα πνευματικόν). Just as the "animal" or "psychic" body receives its life from the soul, or ψυχή (ψυχήν ζῶσαν, v. 45), σῶμα πνευματικόν is not a body made of spirit, immaterial, composed of an ethereal substance, but a body enlivened by the Spirit (πνεῦμα ζῳοποιοῦν, v. 45).[28] Augustine affirms: "And so they will be spiritual, not because they shall cease to be bodies, but because they shall subsist by the quickening spirit."[29] An emphasis is placed on the difference between, on the one hand, the body animated by the principle of natural or "animal" life (ψυχικόν), and, on the other hand, the eschatological condition of this body, inasmuch as it is enlivened by the Spirit (πνευματικόν). The adjectives contrast existence animated by human, "animal," criteria and powers with existence animated by the criteria and power of the Spirit of God. The contrast does not regard the composition of the body, but rather the principle that energises it.[30]

Adam	Christ
First person	Last person
Protology	Eschatology
σῶμα ψυχικόν	σῶμα πνευματικόν
εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν	εἰς πνεῦμα ζῳοποιοῦν

26 Perhaps this transformation of the risen Christ is the reason why Mary Magdalene, and many others, do not recognise Him at first, after His resurrection (cf. John 20:14).

27 Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, V.6.1. With regard to Irenaeus' use of Paul, see the recent publication T.D. Still – D.E. Wilhite (eds.), *Irenaeus and Paul* (London: Bloomsbury 2020). In particular, regarding Irenaeus' anthropology, based on Paul, see D.E. White, «The Personal/Substantial Spirit of Prophecy: Irenaeus's Use of Paul against the Heresies», *ibidem*, 89–112.

28 A.J.M. Wedderburn («Philo's "Heavenly Man"», *NT* 15 [1973] 323–326) demonstrates that the transition from earthly-physical to heavenly-pneumatical as distinguished in 1 Cor 15 does not come from proto-Gnosticism. With respect to the bipartite and tripartite conceptions of the person in Nag Hammadi, see L.R. Lanzillotta, «Anthropological Views in Nag Hammadi: The Bipartite and Tripartite Conceptions of Human Being», *Dust of the Ground and Breath of Life (Gen 2:7): The Problem of a Dualistic Anthropology in Early Judaism and Christianity* (eds. J. van Ruiten – G.H. van Kooten) (Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2016) 136–153.

29 Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, 13.22.

30 See Á. Pereira Delgado, *Primera carta a los corintios* (Comprender la Palabra 31B; Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 2017) 462.

Thus, the open opposition of ψυχή to πνεῦμα, applied to the first and the last Adam, defends the irreducibility of one term to the other, since they are not interchangeable concepts.[31] The "psychic" human being is thus contrasted with the spiritual human being. The passage from one human being to the other can only be achieved by the last Adam in eschatology, when he has become a life-giving (active) spirit. A person without the enlivening gift of the Spirit of Christ is, at most, no more than a living soul, an earthly human being (passive).

In this new manner of existence, the exalted Jesus possesses a representative capacity that He can transmit, as evidenced by the use of πνεῦμα ζῳοποιοῦν (v. 45), and not merely πνεῦμα ζῶν. The risen Jesus is not characterised simply as πνευματικός, but as πνεῦμα; not as ζῶν, but as ζῳοποιοῦν. Whereas the first Adam received life passively, the last Adam gives it actively, as shown by the present active participle of the verb ζωοποιέω.[32] Moreover, in this early Christian literature, πνεῦμα cannot denote a theological dogma, but a spiritual experience, an experience of being caught by a mysterious power that vitalises, startles, inspires and directs through a supernatural force; an experience of a new life.[33] What is distinctive here is that Paul identifies the risen Christ with this life-giving Spirit. Jesus, in His person, is the source of such experience of the Spirit. The spiritual experience that the believer has of this life-giving Spirit is the evidence of the resurrection of Christ.

The Spirit did not enliven σῶμα ψυχικόν, which was given to us in eschatology. But when is this change from σῶμα ψυχικόν to σῶμα πνευματικόν made? According to vv. 44–45, it is the risen Jesus, the new Adam, who became σῶμα πνευματικόν, πνεῦμα ζῳοποιοῦν. In this way, Paul wants to convince his audience that the risen Christ possesses a new existence, which He can communicate, since He is a πνεῦμα ζῳοποιοῦν, i.e. a Spirit which gives life to people – and not merely human life, but divine life as well, enlivened by the Spirit of God.[34] That is, eschatology begins with the resurrection of Jesus Christ, whose body is already completely inundated by the Spirit, and, for this reason, can communicate this life-giving Spirit. Ladaria says:

> Jesus Himself, in His resurrection, becomes a life-giving Spirit, that is, He becomes the source of the Spirit which, as His gift, all people receive; only because He has gone on to exist in this new

31 In addition to Paul's letters, see Heb 4:12, which says, "For the word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit."

32 In the expression πνεῦμα ζῳοποιοῦν, the present active participle, in neuter accusative singular, agreeing with πνεῦμα, is striking. Paul thus emphasises that the last Adam, Jesus Christ, has become a Spirit capable of giving life, by conferring His own Spirit.

33 As noted in Dunn, «1 Corinthians 15:45», 132, this experience of πνεῦμα at the beginning of Christianity was characterised by an ecstatic phenomenon (Acts 2:4,33; 8:18; 10:46; 19:6; 1 Cor 1:5,7; Gal 3:5; Heb 2:4), by a strong emotional content (Rom 5:5; 1 Thess 1:6; Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6), by an experience of liberation (Rom 8:2; 2 Cor 3:17; Gal 5:18), and at other times, by intellectual enlightenment (2 Cor 3:16ff; Eph 1:17ff; Heb 6:4).

34 A similar statement, expressed with different words, can be found in Rom 1:1–4. It reads that Jesus Christ was "established as Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness through resurrection from the dead." Thus, this other Pauline text also positions the resurrection from the dead as the moment in which Jesus Christ was fully vested with power by the Spirit. For more on this passage, see X. Pikaza, «Espíritu Santo», *Diccionario de san Pablo* (ed. F. Fernández Ramos) (Burgos: Monte Carmelo 1999) 471–476.

dimension of full union and intimacy with God the Father can He communicate to believers the gift that He possesses in fullness.[35]

The definition of the risen Christ as a "life-giving Spirit" reveals that a different order, distinct from that of the first Adam, has begun with eschatology. This is what Dunn argues, affirming that "the exalted Jesus has a representative capacity in this mode of existence."[36] The last Adam possesses a rank of life that is superior with respect to the state of the Adamic human being; the divine life that the Spirit of God grants is superior to a mere human life. It is, moreover, a life that has the capacity to give.

3. The Lord, the Risen Jesus Christ, is the Spirit according to 2 Cor 3:17–18

We find an expression similar to a "life-giving Spirit" in 2 Cor, where the risen Jesus, the Lord, is identified with the Spirit: "the Lord is the Spirit" (2 Cor 3:17a, ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν). Paul uses the verb "to be" in a broad sense with a relative frequency, meaning simply "to signify, to be manifested, to act" as, for example, in 1 Cor 10:4 and Gal 4:24–26. Moreover, other texts (1 Cor 6:17, 12:3; 2 Thess 2:8) show that all of Jesus' activity after His resurrection is carried out through His Spirit. Therefore, as I have demonstrated elsewhere,[37] we can conclude that the identity of 2 Cor 3:17a is functional and not substantial – it is a dynamic equivalency. It does not affirm that the Lord and the Spirit are the same substantially, but rather that whoever experiences the Spirit of Christ also experiences Christ Himself, who, after His resurrection, acts through His Spirit, which permits an intimate and authentic communion with Him. In the experience of the believer, there is no distinction between Christ and the Spirit. Furthermore, according to Dunn, Paul's understanding of the risen Christ emerges from his experience of the Spirit, and not the other way around.[38]

In fact, in Rom 8:1–11, there is a very striking alternation. Paul's language is surprising, because Christ and the Spirit seem to be equivalent in their relationship with the Christian. There is a parallelism between the expressions "in Christ" and "in the Spirit." Paul affirms

35 Ladaria, *Antropología teológica*, 382.

36 Dunn, «1 Corinthians 15:45», 131. See also J.D.G. Dunn, «"The Lord, the Giver of Life": The Gift of the Spirit as Both Life-giving and Empowering», *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology. Essays In Honor of Max Turner* (eds. I.H. Marshall – V. Rabens – C. Bennema) (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans 2012) 1–17, though it has a broader perspective, since it encompasses texts from the entire New Testament. John Levinson (*Filled with the Spirit* [Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge: Eerdmans 2009] 253–316) stresses the importance of the expression "filled with the Spirit" both in Jewish and in early Christian literature, dedicating a chapter to the analysis of this expression in the Pauline corpus.

37 For the Christological use of the title "Lord" to refer to the risen Christ and, above all, the functional identification of the Lord with the Spirit, see A. García Serrano, «The Pauline Sense of the Expression "Now the Lord is the Spirit" (2 Cor. 3:17a)», *ExpTim* 127 (2016) 479–487.

38 See Dunn, «1 Corinthians 15:45», 140.

not only that the Christian is as much "in Christ" (vv. 1–2) as "in the Spirit" (v. 9a), but also that Christ "is in the Christian" (v. 10a) as the Spirit "is in the Christian" (vv. 9b,11).[39] There is no distinction between these expressions. Everything acquires meaning with the important Pauline designation in Rom 8:9: "the Spirit of Christ."[40] Schweizer states "πνεῦμα is defined as the manner of existence of the κύριος."[41]

Now, what is striking about this second passage is that, unlike the first one of paragraph 1.1, in which Paul spoke in the singular, referring exclusively to the risen Christ (1 Cor 15:45), here he speaks in the plural: "And we all, with unveiled faces reflecting (κατοπτριζόμενοι) the glory of the Lord, are being transformed (μεταμορφούμεθα) into the same image from one degree of glory to another, which is from the Lord, who is the Spirit (ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος)"[42] (2 Cor 3:18). Speaking in the first-person plural, Paul refers to all Christians, himself included. Christians are progressively transformed into this glorious image, which is the face of Christ, according to what is said in 2 Cor 4:4–6: "the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God [...] has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." This indicates that the transformation of the Christian always has to be Christification[43] given that Christ is the image of God who reflects all of His glory.

It is interesting to note that this transformation is presented in passive voice, μεταμορφούμεθα, meaning that Christians are transformed. The agent of this transformation comes later, through the expression ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος. This is a prepositional construction that governs a double genitive, and that can be translated as follows: "by the Lord, who is the Spirit." The preposition ἀπό expresses the principal cause of a particular action. Therefore, the agent is expressed with a double genitive that depends on the preposition ἀπό. Murray Harris argues that if a preposition is followed by two nouns, the preposition governs and qualifies the first noun.[44] That is why the entire prepositional construction, interpreting the second genitive as epexegetical, can be translated as "by the Lord, who is the Spirit."[45]

---

39 Rom 8:27b speaks of the Spirit who intercedes for us, and Rom 8:34 speaks of Christ who intercedes for us. The risen Christ intercedes for us and in our favour in the Spirit, with whose power He was raised. In Rom 15:14–22, Paul emphasises that it is Christ Himself who accomplishes the action of the apostles by means of the Spirit: "by the power of signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit (of God)" (v. 19).

40 Equivalent expressions can be found in Gal 4:6 ("the Spirit of his Son") and Phil 1:19 ("the Spirit of Jesus Christ").

41 E. Schweizer, «πνεῦμα, πνευματικός», *TDNT* VI, 419.

42 Regarding this translation and interpretation, see García Serrano, «Now the Lord is the Spirit», 484–486.

43 The images of "clothing oneself with Christ" in Gal 3:27 or 1 Cor 15:53–54 are in the same vein.

44 M.J. *Harris, Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament. An Essential Reference Resource for Exegesis* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan 2012) 44. Other examples of the same phenomenon can be found in Rom 3:20 and Gal 2:16, 3:2, 5:10.

45 In this regard, see, for example, Charles Moule, «2 Cor. iii. 18b, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος», *Essays in New Testament Interpretation* (ed. C.F.D. Moule) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1982) 227–234, who defends and justifies the translation, "Such is the influence of the Lord, who, as we have already said, is Spirit."

If this interpretation is correct, then 2 Cor 3:18 affirms that the transformation of Christians is brought about by the Lord, Jesus Christ, who, after His resurrection, acts through the Spirit. In fact, this transformation comes about through contemplating Jesus Christ, the glory of the Lord, as in a mirror. This contemplation tends to reflect Him, because the participle κατοπτριζόμενοι is a *hapax* in the New Testament, which some interpreters translate as "contemplate" and others as "reflect."[46] It may serve as ambivalence that Paul consciously accepted to imply that, to the extent to which one contemplates Him, so also will one reflect Him. This interior Christification is brought about by the Spirit of the Lord. This means that it is the Spirit that brings about the interior transformation in us in order to liken us to that which we contemplate. In this way, we reflect the risen Christ as in a mirror. Christ without the Spirit would not be able to transform internally, and the Spirit without Christ would not have anyone to configure. George van Kooten affirms:

> By participating in Christ's death and resurrection in baptism (Rom 6:3–11), the human identity starts to fuse with that of Christ, the second Adam, the second human being who, in contrast to the first human being, is from heaven. Whereas humankind still bears the image of the first, earthly Adam (1 Cor 15:49), Christians increasingly bear the image of the heavenly human being and are increasingly transformed into his likeness (2 Cor 3:18). In this way their *pneuma* is restored and they turn again into trichotomous human beings, the *pneumatikoi*.[47]

It is the Spirit, which the risen Christ gave us upon becoming a "life-giving Spirit," that transforms us and likens us to Christ, the image of God. Firstly, Jesus possessed the Spirit during His life; then, He possessed it in fullness in His resurrection; and finally, He gave it to human beings. The life that Christ offers us, the way in which He enlivens us, is by giving us His Spirit,[48] which dwells in us in order to liken us to Him. In eschatology, the Christian receives the Spirit who conforms the believer internally to Christ, the Lord. Christ is the means par excellence of this new humanity that opens up in eschatology. This eschatological transformation of believers, who receive the Spirit of the Lord, goes far beyond the beginning, beyond Adam and Eve, since it internally likens us to the image of God, to His eternal glory incarnate in Jesus Christ, to the perfect human being.

---

46 See I. Nayak, «The Meaning of καταπτριζόμενοι in 2 Cor. 3:18», *Euntes Docete* 55 (2010) 33–44.

47 Van Kooten, «The Anthropological Trichotomy», 118.

48 A similar affirmation can be found in Rom 5:15: "But the gift is not like the transgression. For if by that one person's transgression the many died, how much more did the grace of God and the gracious gift of the one person Jesus Christ overflow for the many." The grace and the gift of God is the Spirit (Rom 5:5). In the glorious Jesus Christ, this gift overflows, and therefore, He can give it to us. Outside of the Pauline corpus, in the corpus of his disciple Luke, the following can be found: "Exalted at the right hand of God, he received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father and poured it forth, as you (both) see and hear" (Acts 2:33). Scripture again affirms that Jesus Christ, once exalted, received the Spirit fully and, therefore, was able to pour it forth perfectly.

4. Those Who Are "spiritual/perfect" in 1 Cor 2:6–16

In 1 Cor 2:6, Paul speaks of a "wisdom among the perfect," but who are these perfect people? He begins to clarify it in the same verse, specifying that the wisdom is "not a wisdom of this age, nor of the rulers of this age," and he explains further shortly thereafter: it is a wisdom that "God has revealed to us through the Spirit" (v. 10), "God's wisdom, mysterious, hidden" (v. 7). This means that the perfect are those who have received the Spirit of God, which reveals a hidden wisdom to them, the wisdom of God.[49] It is thus connected to the texts that analysed before, both 2 Cor 3:1–4,18 and 1 Cor 15:42–47.[50] The Christian has received the Spirit of God, which the risen Jesus Christ, as a life-giving Spirit, has given them as a gift from on high, thus perfecting their nature; therefore, such Christian can be called "perfect." According to Dunn, "that reception of the Spirit was the decisive and determinative element [in the eschatological times and] in the crucial transition of conversion."[51]

Christians in eschatology are defined as "perfect" (1 Cor 2:6; Phil 3:15),[52] and, synonymously, as "spiritual" (1 Cor 2:13,15; 3:1; 15:44; Gal 6:1). In these texts, the adjectives τέλειος or πνευματικός are used in place of the noun, defining Christians who, enlivened by the Spirit, become "spiritual" or "perfect," mature human beings, called to the perfection of their nature.[53] The apostle suggests that the "perfect person" becomes such when such person has received the Spirit (1 Cor 2:6), thus completing them as "spirit, soul, and body" (1 Thess 5:23). The "perfect person" is the person (soul and body) endowed with the Spirit, which, according to 1 Cor 2:6–8, is not of this age, but of God.[54]

It is worth noting that Paul addresses the Corinthians in the present tense: "*we speak* (λαλοῦμεν) wisdom among the perfect" (v. 6). This "perfect person" already exists, insofar as such person is perfected with the gift of the Spirit. It follows that the "perfect person" is not a concept that belongs exclusively to the *Parousia*, only attainable in the future, at the final consummation, but it is already present in eschatology, in the end times inaugurated by the resurrection of Jesus Christ and the gift of the Spirit. The hope of future perfection is

---

49 See Pereira Delgado, *Primera carta a los corintios*, 48–61.

50 Regarding the interrelation of the different anthropological texts, also in relation to neuroscience, see A. Gignac, «La mise en discours de l'humain chez saint Paul et ses interprétations anthropologiques en christianisme. Relecture de 1Co 6,12–20; 1Co 2,10–3,4 et 1Co 15,35–53», *Théologiques* 12 (2004) 95–124. The author states that each part of the human being – spirit, soul, body, flesh, etc. – indicates the totality of the person, but seen from a concrete aspect. For example, the spirit denotes the person with regard to his relationship with God.

51 Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 425.

52 In Deutero-Pauline literature, this also appears in Eph 4:13 and Col 1:28, 4:12.

53 See L. Cerfaux, *La Théologie de l'Église suivant Saint Paul* (Unam Sanctam 54; Paris: Cerf 1965) 191.

54 Of course, Paul's use of the nominalised adjective τέλειος, "perfect" could be ironic, employed as a kind of criticism of the Corinthians, who continue to behave like children, with jealousy and rivalry, as befits fleshly behaviour (1 Cor 3:1–3). However, this ironic usage does not undermine the fact that Paul reminds the Corinthians that, as spiritual (πνευματικοί), they have been perfected with the gift of the Spirit, which opposes all fleshly behaviour (σαρκικοί).

fulfilled in the *Parousia*, when the Lord will return and raise the dead; then, having borne the image of the earthly person, the human being will bear the image of the heavenly person (1 Cor 15:49), bringing this process that is already underway to fulfilment.

It is striking that Paul once again (as in 1 Cor 15:47) contrasts the "perfect/spiritual person" with the "carnal/psychic person." Moreover, in this contrast, Paul yet again uses the same terms as in 1 Thess 5:23.

The person	The new person
Protology	**Eschatology**
ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος (1 Cor 2:14)	ὁ δὲ πνευματικὸς (1 Cor 2:13,15; 3:1; 15:44; Gal 6:1)
ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος (1 Cor 2:14)	τέλειος (1 Cor 2:6; Phil 3:15; Eph 4:13; Col 1:28, 4:12)

We should take a look at the texts. The "psychic" person (1 Cor 2:14, ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος) does not perceive the things of the Spirit of God, but the spiritual person (1 Cor 2:15, ὁ δὲ πνευματικὸς)[55] does, and therefore can judge everything. The "psychic" person is animated by the natural vital principle in the present order of creation, the body and soul, whereas the spiritual person is enlivened by the divine Spirit;[56] such person already possesses the Spirit of God, which unites itself to the person's body and soul. This contrast highlights, once again, the essential difference between ψυχή and πνεῦμα analysed in the aforementioned texts, especially in 1 Cor 15:45. The terms πνεῦμα and ψυχή are not interchangeable in the Pauline corpus; even if Paul employs other anthropological terms ambiguously, in this case, at least, he draws a careful distinction between πνεῦμα and ψυχή.[57] The "psychic" person cannot understand spiritual things, because such person can draw only upon their natural abilities, whereas the spiritual person can discern everything, because such person has received the Spirit of God.

The person is "perfected" by participating in the Spirit of God and preserving the Spirit of God in themselves, as their own spirit, through persistent communion with

---

55 The expression πνευματικός ἄνθρωπος does not appear, but the "spiritual person" is understood from the context of 1 Cor 2:6–13, and especially in v. 15 (ὁ δὲ πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνει τὰ πάντα, αὐτὸς δὲ ὑπ᾽ οὐδενὸς ἀνακρίνεται), which speaks of the judgement of the spiritual person.

56 See J.M.G. Barclay, «Πνευματικός in the Social Dialect of Pauline Christianity», *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews* (ed. J.M.G. Barclay) (WUNT 275; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2011) 205–215, who states that the use of πνευματικός comes from neither the Greek nor the Jewish milieu, but belongs to Paul. For the meaning of the adjective πνευματικός, see G.D. *Fee, God's Empowering Presence. The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson 1994) 28–31.

57 With respect to the difference between πνεῦμα and ψυχή in 1 Cor 2:1–16 and its possible relation to the Gnostics, including the interpretation of the early Church Fathers, see M.M., Mitchell, «Anthropological Hermeneutics: Between Rhetoric and Philosophy», *Paul, the Corinthians and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics* (ed. M.M. Mitchell) (Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press 2010) 38–57.

Him (Rom 8:16). This perfect person is saved by faithfully maintaining the Spirit of God within themselves, and by keeping their soul and body irreproachable. The constant presence of the Holy Spirit in the body and the soul is accomplished insofar as persistent communion with Him increases through the person's docility to the Spirit.

St Irenaeus comments:

> For this reason does the apostle declare (1 Cor 2:6): *We speak wisdom among them that are perfect*, terming those persons perfect who have received the Spirit of God [...] whom also the apostle terms *spiritual* (cf. 1 Cor 2:15; 3:1...), they being spiritual because they partake of the Spirit, and not because their *flesh* has been stripped off and taken away, and because they have become purely spiritual. [...] But when the spirit here blended with the *soul* is united to [God's] handiwork, the man is rendered spiritual and perfect because of the outpouring of the Spirit, and this is he who was *made in the image and likeness of God* (cf. Gen 1:26). [...] Those, then, are the perfect who have had the Spirit of God remaining in them, and have preserved their souls and bodies blameless [...].[58]

The person made in the image and likeness of God is called to be spiritual, i.e. to perfect their nature in order to enter into that of God. This perfection is tied to the possession of the Spirit; the one who is perfect possesses, in addition to the soul and body, the Spirit of God as third element. This "spiritual/perfect" person participates qualitatively in the Spirit. Only by taking into account the "spiritual/perfect person" can we understand the tripartite Pauline anthropology of 1 Thess 5:23. Moreover, this perfection comes about when the order given by Paul in 1 Thess 5:23 is maintained: "spirit, soul, and body." Those who are "perfect," to whom the apostle refers, can be distinguished because the spirit guides and governs the soul, which, in turn, guides and governs the body. In this way, the spiritual person is fitted for actions with a double aspect, human and divine, actions guided by the Spirit of God, but carried out by the human being. The Spirit perfects the person, bringing them to take actions that are divine and, at the same time, human – done at the impulse of the Spirit of God, and carried out in the body and soul, or humanly.

It is surprising that 1 Cor 2:11 also speaks of the "spirit of the person," τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (v. 11a), which seems opposed to τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 11b).[59] However, v. 12 affirms that "We have not received the spirit of the world but the Spirit that is from God," ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. This means that the spirit of the person has received God's Spirit from God Himself. Moreover, v. 16 returns

---

58 Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, V.6.1. For a better understanding of Irenaeus' anthropology, see A. Orbe, «El hombre ideal en la teología de San Ireneo», *Greg* 43 (1962) 449–491.

59 See Desta Heliso, «Divine Spirit and Human Spirit in Paul in the Light of Stoic and Biblical-Jewish Perspectives», *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology. Essays in Honor of Max Turner* (eds. I.H. Marshall – V. Rabens – C. Bennema) (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans 2012) 156–176, who examines the relationship between the two. After analysing the Stoic background, texts from the Old Testament (like Gen 2:7), and texts from Second Temple Jewish literature, on the basis of 1 Cor 2:11 and Rom 8:16, Heliso concludes that these expressions are merely linguistic distinctions, and are ultimately the same reality, the same metaphysical entity: the divine Spirit, the Spirit of Jesus Christ. However, as we will see, I disagree with this thesis.

to this first-person plural and affirms that Christians have νοῦς Χριστοῦ, suggesting that, in eschatology, the Christian possesses the "mind of Christ," an expression similar to the "Spirit of Christ,"[60] and that the Christian therefore understands everything and can judge all of it. Now, in 1 Cor 2:11, Paul affirms that the person already had the human spirit when they received the divine Spirit: "who knows what pertains to a person except the spirit of the person that is within?," meaning that the human being was not created as an incomplete being, but naturally possesses a spirit, a capacity for God, and this spirit becomes reality, active, in eschatology when he receives the Spirit of God.

The Letter to the Romans contains a text that helps us to understand this better: αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ (Rom 8:16). It is a complex affirmation, since the noun πνεῦμα appears twice, and, as we have seen, it is a very polysemic term. In fact, it seems to refer to two different πνεύματα, since only two distinct subjects can bear concurring witness. The initial τὸ πνεῦμα is linked to the Spirit that Christians have received, i.e. the Spirit of the previous verse, to which the anaphoric determinant τό refers: "For you did not receive a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you received a Spirit of adoption" (Rom 8:15). Thus, the initial τὸ πνεῦμα refers to the Spirit of the Son, the Spirit of Christ (Rom 8:9), which is what allows one to cry "Father!" (Rom 8:15). The exegetical problem lies in the interpretation of the second πνεῦμα, which is determined not by the anaphoric τό, but by the possessive ἡμῶν. In this case, Paul clearly returns to speaking of a "spirit of ours," i.e. a human spirit, which bears witness on its own – concurring witness, but independent of the divine Spirit.

1 Cor 2:11	τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου	τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ	ἐλάβομεν
Rom 8:16	τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν	αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα	συμμαρτυρεῖ

Irenaeus interprets τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν in the sense of "a gift given by God to the person, not like a thing that belongs to him."[61] Thus, it would have to do with our most intimate depths, the inner person, inasmuch as it has already been transformed by the Holy Spirit. In this sense, the "spirit of the person" would be the capacity that the person has to receive the divine Spirit, shared and given to human beings.[62] The divine Spirit would dwell in "our spirit," received in the person's most intimate depths, in the "spirit of the person."[63] The "Spirit of God" can dwell in our most intimate depths, in our spirit, to the point of inwardly guiding our existence, as confirmed in Rom 8:14 (and 8:4). The spirit of the person is

60 Van Kooten («The Anthropological Trichotomy», 118–119) uses the philosophical background of the term νοῦς to state that Christians possess the νοῦς of Christ because they possess the πνεῦμα of Christ.

61 Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, III.22.1, says "But everyone will allow that we are [composed of] a body taken from the earth, and a soul receiving spirit from God."

62 See Schweizer, «πνεῦμα, πνευματικός», 434.

63 In fact, when Paul speaks of "our spirit," he applies the definite article τῷ in order to relate it directly to what precedes it, which is the Spirit of God (αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα).

a disposition, an interior capacity, that does not come from ourselves, but from outside of us, since 1 Cor 2:12 states "we have received," ἐλάβετε. The person does not have in themselves what they need for their own fulfilment – they receive it as a gift from God instead.

According to Saint Irenaeus, this gift from God inside the person, in their spirit, is dormant from the person's creation and is "awakened" with the gift of baptism; the Spirit of God, which is received in baptism, awakens the "spirit of the person," so to speak.[64] This spirit of the person is distinct from the Spirit of God, since both bear joint witness (Rom 8:16). However, the spirit of the person is necessary to be able to receive the quality that God gives to it, His Holy Spirit.

Manuel Aróztegui Esnaola analyses the ἀτονία of πνεῦμα, defended by Gnosticism, i.e. in the spiritual person, there was something divine, πνεῦμα, but it was imprisoned by σάρξ and ψυχή, and thus remained inactive.[65] Aróztegui states that the thinkers of that time believed there was πνεῦμα in all people, though in sinners it was weak and lacking vigour. Orthodox believers and Valentinians were in agreement on this issue. However, before original sin, the breath that dwelled in Adam and Eve retained its vigour. According to Irenaeus' anthropology, the flesh cannot be fashioned by God if not anointed by πνεῦμα. The reception of this divine πνεῦμα vitalises the lethargy of the human spirit, through the τόνος of the anointing, which prevents all torpidity or lethargy – ἄτονα. Subsequently, if the person obeys the counsel of the Spirit (*consilia Spiritus*), then their τόνος grows in intensity.[66] However, if the person disregards the *consilia*, then τόνος wanes to lethargy. It follows that the counsel of the Spirit acts as human acceptance. Thus, the preternatural person was given the gift of the spirit (*capax Dei*), gratuitously, but it was lethargic. When the divine Spirit is received, this human spirit is awakened.[67]

In this regard, without taking Saint Irenaeus' exegesis into account, Van Kooten affirms:

> Although theoretically the first human being had a tripartite structure, effectively humankind failed to keep its *pneuma*, so that it needs to be restored. [...] In the generalising passage of 1 Cor 2:11, Paul reveals his view about the standard composition of humankind in general, a constitution which also encompasses *pneuma*. Naturally, in Paul's view, whereas, technically speaking, every human being has *pneuma*, only the Christians can have their *pneuma* really and effectively restored. [...] although originally humankind was created with a trichotomous identity of πνεῦμα, ψυχή and σῶμα, effectively, after the degeneration and fall of humankind, human beings had no πνεῦμα till it was restored to them by means of their unification with Christ, the second human being from heaven. It is in this perspective of restoration that Paul quotes Gen 2:7 in 1 Cor 15:45. Paul does not mean that humankind was originally created as a dichotomic being, consisting only of ψυχή and σῶμα, but rather that, though humankind was created as a trichotomic being, made up of πνεῦμα, ψυχή and σῶμα, it is only Christ who restores the πνεῦμα which had effectively become lost. This gift of πνεῦμα is a fruit of

64 See Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, I.4–6.

65 Cf. M. Aróztegui Esnaola, *La amistad del Verbo con Abraham según san Ireneo de Lyon* (AnGr 294; Roma: Pontificia Università Gregoriana 2005) 35–40.

66 Cf. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, IV.37.1.

67 Cf. Aróztegui Esnaola, *La amistad del Verbo*, 94–96.

realised eschatology. The restoration of humankind's πνεῦμα is a result of the eschatological gift of the Spirit which is already operative.[68]

ἄτονα	τόνος
Lethargic	Awakened
Unkempt	Restored
Potential	Active

Based on the above, we can conclude that the risen Christ gives His Spirit within the person, who receives this Spirit in what is normally called their spirit. However, as Lemonon states "the divine *pneuma* is not added to a human *pneuma*, which would have consistency in itself,"[69] it is rather the gift of the divine Spirit that actualises the capacity that the person has, awakening the human spirit, which was lethargic. Along the same lines, Gordon Fee, after his thorough analysis of 1 Thess 5:23, argues that "Those who see this usage as denoting that part of human existence that serves as the place of intersection between the human and the divine by means of the Holy Spirit are most likely moving in the right direction."[70]

5. The "first instalment" or "firstfruits" of the Spirit

As can be seen in the previous section, the human spirit is awakened or restored by receiving the tone of the Spirit. Moreover, in the measure in which the person's freedom accepts the counsel of the Spirit (*consilia Spiritus*), its tone increases in intensity. This fact is supported by another expression that Paul frequently uses in connection with the Spirit: the "first instalment" or "firstfruits" of the Spirit. In this case, Paul clarifies how Christians can possess the Spirit of God, and to what extent It dwells in their spirit. Rom 8:11 affirms that "his Spirit [...] dwells in you," referring to a reality that the Christian already possesses. As already seen, in Rom 8:16, Paul states that "the Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit," thus showing this presence of the Spirit in our spirit. The believer's possession of the Spirit is further qualified in Rom 8:16, where, as in 1 Thess 5:23, "our spirit" forms part of the structure of the person saved by Christ, of the person in eschatology.[71]

68 G.H. van Kooten, «The Anthropological Trichotomy of Spirit, Soul and Body in Philo of Alexandria and Paul of Tarsus», *Anthropology in the New Testament and Its Ancient Context* (CBET 54; Leuven: Peeters 2010) 116–117, who claims that the same conception is also found in Plutarch, in his work *On the Sign of Socrates*, 591D, where he employs the noun νοῦς instead of the noun πνεῦμα. Van Kooten states that Plutarch presents the same ambiguity because for him – although, strictly speaking, all souls possess νοῦς – some do not in practice.

69 Lemonon, «L'Esprit Sant dans le corpus paulinien», 309.

70 Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 66.

71 Marie Joseph Lagrange (*Saint Paul. Épître aux Romains* [EBib; Paris: Gabalda 1931] 202) commenting on this same passage, claims that the spirit is a second nature in the person, a spiritual nature, because it has been poured out into the person by the Spirit.

However, this possession cannot be understood in the absolute sense. That is why Christians should keep "blameless their spirit for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thess 5:23). As a divine reality, the Spirit cannot be fully possessed by a human being. In fact, Paul defines this possession of the Spirit, which has already begun in this pilgrim life, using two expressions that are, in a certain sense, equivalent and complementary: "first-fruits" (Rom 8:23; 2 Thess 2:13; 1 Cor 15:20,23) and "first instalment" (2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; Eph 1:14).

The image of the firstfruits, ἀπαρχή, is taken from a rural context and represents the first fruit of the harvest, a foretaste of all the fruits that will come afterwards. Moreover, the word ἀπαρχή is a technical term in sacrificial language. It refers to the first fruits harvested, which are offered to God. In addition to the noun ἀπαρχή, Paul also uses the noun ἀρραβών, "first instalment," to refer to the ἔσχατον of the Spirit. This term indicates a sum of money paid in advance, which is part of the total sum that must ultimately be paid. The sum that is advanced makes the stipulated contract valid, because through it the buyer commits themselves to paying subsequent compensation to the seller.

Both of these images underline the fact that there is already a kind of possession, even if the present possession points to the full possession in the future. With regard to πνεῦμα, the use of these metaphors indicates the present reality of the Spirit in the person in the form of an advance/promise of the full reality that is to come. The genitive τοῦ πνεύματος is variously a genitive of apposition or epexegetical: the firstfruits or the first instalment, i.e. the Spirit, who offers Himself to us incipiently in eschatology as the first instalment or firstfruits. Thus, Paul can describe πνεῦμα as the ἀπαρχή of the awaited redemption of the body (Rom 8:23), or as the ἀρραβών of the new dwelling that awaits us (2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; Eph 1:14) – in short, as a foretaste of the fulfilment of our humanity, which will be gained once the gift of the Spirit at the coming of the Lord, Jesus Christ is fulfilled.

The passage from one order to the other – from natural life to spiritual life – begins in this life through the gift of the Spirit in the person, firstfruits or the first instalment of eternal life, which will only reach its fulfilment in the final resurrection. By grace, the Christian receives possession of the Spirit, which permits the believer to aspire – in the soul and body – to glorification beyond death, to full possession, to full humanity in the resurrection of the flesh, in the "spiritual body" (1 Cor 15:44). However, this aspiration is laden with reasons to be confident in full possession, because the person already participates in the actual foretaste of such firstfruits. The gift of the Spirit gives rise to a glorious hope, the waiting of the heirs who yearn confidently for the fulfilment of the possession of the celestial perfection of their humanity. This is a further implication of the well-known eschatological *adage* "yes, but not yet," "yes, but even more."

Why do we receive the Spirit as the first instalment in eschatology only to receive it in fullness in the *Parousia*? Is there, perhaps, an imperfection in God's gift? The Lord always gives Himself completely, but the Christian receives Him as they can and will. This means that the limit does not lie in the giver, but in the recipient of the gift. Since the person is temporal, God could not give them the Spirit all at once, completely, because they could

not receive it like this. The evolution of species is also present in the human being, who needs time to progress towards their fulfilment. The person needed time to become slowly accustomed to being guided and governed by the Spirit. The person's fulfilment depends on this relationship, which is always gradual, and in which such person is educated to be moved by the Spirit. Irenaeus affirms:

> But we do now receive a certain portion of His Spirit, tending towards perfection, and preparing us for incorruption, being little by little accustomed to receive and bear God; which also the apostle terms an *earnest* [instalment], that is, a part of the honour which has been promised us by God [...]. For if the earnest, gathering man into itself, does even now cause him to cry, *Abba, Father*, what shall the complete grace of the Spirit effect, which shall be given to men by God? It will render us like Him, and accomplish the will of the Father; for it shall make man after the image and likeness of God (cf. Gen 1:26).[72]

As Saint Basil aptly comments, the person receives the gift of God according to human nature rather than according to divine power:

> In essence simple, in powers various, wholly present in each and being wholly everywhere; impassively divided, shared without loss of ceasing to be entire, after the likeness of the sunbeam, whose kindly light falls on him who enjoys it as though it shone for him alone, yet illumines land and sea and mingles with the air. So, too, is the Spirit to everyone who receives it, as though given to him alone, and yet it sends forth grace sufficient and full for all mankind, and is enjoyed by all who share it, according to the capacity, not of its power, but of their nature.[73]

Because of this temporal character of the human being, the person receives the Spirit in eschatology as firstfruits; and through the poor exercise of their freedom, such human being can discard or tarnish the Spirit. If we had received Him in fullness, then we could not reject Him; if we had not received Him at all, then neither could we reject Him.

It must be said that the expression from 1 Thess 5:23 does not refer to the Holy Spirit, but to the human spirit, in which the Spirit dwells. Moreover, the Spirit has given Himself to us as the first instalment and, therefore, since the possession is not full, but gradual, the person can accept Him and allow Him to govern themselves to varying degrees. It can be blemished precisely because Christians possess the Spirit in the first instalment. The situation of the Christian, who is saved in expectation through the first instalment, helps us to interpret 1 Thess 5:23b-24 correctly. It is the human spirit, the capacity that

---

72 Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, V.8.1. The analogy of human eyes, which are born blind, but begin to perceive and to see slowly and gradually in order to prepare, little by little, to contemplate the sun (Novacian, *De Trinitate*, 18, § 101–102), together with the image of the infant who is brought up on milk until they can take in solid food, help us to understand this gradual progression. In fact, in 1 Cor 3:1–4, Paul compares fleshly people, who must be fed simply with milk, to spiritual people, who already receive solid food, because they can tolerate it. Another comparison is that of the embrace that is not consummated to the point of unity. It is an embrace that draws towards itself, without reaching complete possession inside and outside. The initiative always belongs to the Spirit, which, like the groom, draws the bride to himself and embraces her, without reaching the definitive consummation. There is still a distance between the initial embrace and the fleshly union.

73 Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, 9.22–23.

the person has, with their freedom, to accept the Spirit of God to varying degrees that must be preserved blameless so that neither their soul nor their body is tarnished. The believer is not the master of the Spirit, nor do they possess it as an irrevocable guarantee; rather, they can reduce the lordship of the Spirit in their life by exercising their freedom poorly.[74]

There is a similar text in the Pauline corpus, which can help us to understand this matter. In Gal 6:1, Paul speaks of people who are "spiritual," i.e. who possess the Spirit. However, even though they are spiritual, they can fall, they can be culpable. The apostle warns them "Brothers, even if a person is caught in some transgression, you [plural] who are spiritual should correct that one in a gentle spirit, looking to yourself [singular], so that you also may not be tempted" (Gal 6:1; cf. 1 Cor 10:12). The abrupt change from the plural "Brothers, [...] you who are spiritual should correct that one" to the singular "looking to yourself, so that you also may not be tempted" (σκοπῶν σεαυτὸν μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῇς) is remarkable. The apostle does not rule out the possibility that a spiritual person could succumb to the forces of evil. Paul warns the Galatians of the same danger that lurks for the Thessalonians – not preserving blameless the entirety of one's being for the Lord's coming. The Christian who does not take care of themselves could cease to be a spiritual person; between eschatology and the *Parousia*, this danger remains.

With that said, Paul does not rule out the possibility that a spiritual person could succumb to the forces of evil since even though this person is enlivened by the Spirit, they still remain subject to the forces opposed to the Spirit. Those who are sure of themselves, and consider themselves invulnerable to evil, must be especially vigilant. While their condition as pilgrims lasts, they must work with fear and trembling for their sanctification – or, in the words of 1 Thess 5:23, they must preserve themselves blameless in the Spirit until the day of the Lord. There is no contradiction between the fact that the person already possesses the Spirit of God in their spirit, and the possibility that such person might not arrive at the encounter with Christ with all of their being, including the spirit. On this pilgrimage, the relationship with πνεῦμα is gradual, and can even be lost. The person can participate in the Spirit to varying degrees, can suffer the weakness of the flesh and set aside the Spirit, or can accept it, allowing it to act.

Conclusion

Having studied the complex and relatively unknown verses of 1 Thess 5:23 and other Pauline texts, it can be concluded that Paul's anthropology depends directly on his Christology, which, in turn, is closely related to his pneumatology. His conception of the human being in eschatology is illuminated by the manifestation of the perfect human being in the risen Jesus Christ. Moreover, the risen Lord is characterised by the Spirit, which He can share with us. According to the proposed interpretation of 1 Thess 5:23, Paul understands

74 See Footnote 67 regarding indocility to the counsel of the Spirit (*consilia Spiritus*).

the human being, in the image of the risen Christ, according to a tripartite conception. In eschatology, the human being, after the gift of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, is not composed only of the soul and body, but also of the spirit, where the divine Spirit can dwell. Furthermore, when the divine Spirit dwells in the person, it actualises or awakens their spirit. The order of this tripartition, and the novel character of its first part, the spirit, shows us the primacy of the Spirit in Paul's doctrine. The human being is fulfilled insofar as they receive the Spirit in their spirit and it governs the soul, which, in turn, governs the body. The gift of the Spirit allows the person to actualise their spirit with the presence of the Spirit in them, making the Christian a new being, who participates in the life of the new Adam, Jesus Christ. The maturity and the progress of the Christian life consists in this spiritualisation. Thanks to the greater participation of the divine Spirit in the spirit of the person, the Christian is perfected, fulfilling, with their freedom, their original vocation to be transformed into the image and likeness of God, fully manifested in Jesus Christ. Then, Christians who have already received the firstfruits of the Spirit will receive it at the peak and their humanity will reach its fulfilment.

As is rightly affirmed in the recent Pontifical Biblical Commission's document entitled *What is Man?: A Journey through Biblical Anthropology*, "the human being is a mystery. In him is hidden God's admirable design, which each of us is personally called to scrutinize, in order to discover its meaning and live" (no. 347). However, this mystery "has its foundation in the obscure abyss of its origin" (no. 349). And this mystery is even greater in the end to which eschatology opens the person. With the reception of the gift of the Spirit, the person fulfils their original vocation and reaches the state to which they were called, completing their journey from protology to eschatology.

Translated by Jen Cottini

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Augustine, *De civitate Dei* (eds. B. Dombart – A. Kalb) (Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina 48; Turnhout: Brepols 1955).

Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto* (ed. B. Pruche) (Sources chrétiennes 17 bis; Paris: Cerf 2013).

Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* I (eds. A. Rousseau – L. Doutreleau) (Sources chrétiennes 264/2; Paris: Cerf 1979).

Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* III (eds. A. Rousseau – L. Doutreleau) (Sources chrétiennes 211/2; Paris: Cerf 2017).

Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* IV (eds. A. Rousseau *et al.*) (Sources chrétiennes 100/2; Paris: Cerf 2008).

Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* V (eds. A. Rousseau – L. Doutreleau – Ch. Mercier) (Sources chrétiennes 153/2; Paris: Cerf 2013).

Novacian, *De Trinitate*, in: Novatianus, *Opera quae supersunt* (ed. G.F. Diercks) (Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina 4, Turnhout: Brepols 1972) 11–78.

Tertullian, *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, in: Tertullianus, *Opera*. II. *Opera montanistica* (eds. J.G.Ph. Borleffs *et al.*) (Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina 2; Turnhout: Brepols 1954) 921–1012.

Secondary Sources

Aróztegui Esnaola, M., *La amistad del Verbo con Abraham según san Ireneo de Lyon* (Analecta Gregoriana 294; Roma: Pontificia Università Gregoriana 2005).

Barclay, J.M.G., «Stoic Physics and the Christ-Event: A Review of Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)», *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 33 (2011) 406–414.

Barclay, J.M.G., «Πνευματικός in the Social Dialect of Pauline Christianity», *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews* (ed. J.M.G. Barclay) (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 275; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2011) 205–215.

Cerfaux, L., *La Théologie de l'Église suivant Saint Paul* (Unam Sanctam 54; Paris: Cerf 1965).

Del Colle, R., «Christian Theology: the Spirit», *The Blackwell Companion to Paul* (ed. S. Westerholm) (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell 2011) 561–575.

Dillon, J., «Plutarch and the Separable Intellect», *Estudios sobre Plutarco. Misticismo y Religiones Mistéricas en la Obra de Plutarco* (eds. A. Pérez Jiménez – F. Casadésus) (Madrid – Málaga: Clásicas 2001) 35–44.

Dunn, J.D.G., «1 Corinthians 15:45 – Last Adam, Life-Giving Spirit», *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. In Honor of Charles Francis Digby Moule* (eds. B. Lindars – S.S. Smalley) (Cambridge: University Press 1973) 127–141.

Dunn, J.D.G., *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1998).

Dunn, J.D.G., «"The Lord, the Giver of Life": The Gift of the Spirit as Both Life-giving and Empowering», *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology. Essays In Honor of Max Turner* (eds. I.H. Marshall – V. Rabens – C. Bennema) (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans 2012) 1–17.

Engberg-Pedersen, T., *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul* (Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press 2010).

Fabris, R., *1–2 Tessalonicesi* (I libri Biblici. Nuovo Testamento 13; Milano: Paoline 2014).

Fadini, G., «Temporalità escatologica. San Paolo nella lettura di Heidegger», *Studia Patristica* 50 (2003) 357–375.

Fee, G.D., *God's Empowering Presence. The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson 1994).

Feldmeier, R., «Christ As Creator: Paul's Eschatological Reading of Gen 2:7 in 1 Cor 15:45», *Dust of the Ground and Breath of Life (Gen 2:7). The Problem of a Dualistic Anthropology in Early Judaism and Christianity* (eds. J. van Ruiten – G.H. van Kooten) (Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2016) 127–137.

Franco Martínez, C.A., «El hombre cristiano – "espíritu, alma y cuerpo" – en 1 Tes 5,23», *Concepto cristiano de hombre. 50º Aniversario de ordenación sacerdotal del Emm. Cardenal Primado* (Semana de Teología Espiritual 17; Toledo: Centro de Estudios de Teología 1992) 45–74.

Frey, J., «Paul's View of the Spirit in the Light of Qumran», *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature* (ed. J.-S. Rey) (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 102; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2014) 237–260.

García Serrano, A., «The Pauline Sense of the Expression "Now the Lord is the Spirit" (2 Cor. 3:17a)», *The Expository Times* 127 (2016) 479–487.

Gignac, A., «La mise en discours de l'humain chez saint Paul et ses interprétations anthropologiques en christianisme. Relecture de 1Co 6,12–20; 1Co 2,10–3,4 et 1Co 15,35–53», *Théologiques* 12 (2004) 95–124.

Harris, M.J., *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament. An Essential Reference Resource for Exegesis* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan 2012).

Hayward, R., «Adam, Dust, and the Breath of Life according to the Targumim of Gen 2:7», *Dust of the Ground and Breath of Life (Gen 2:7). The Problem of a Dualistic Anthropology in Early Judaism and Christianity* (eds. J. van Ruiten – G.H. van Kooten) (Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2016) 154–172.

Heliso, D., «Divine Spirit and Human Spirit in Paul in the Light of Stoic and Biblical-Jewish Perspectives», *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology. Essays in Honor of Max Turner* (eds. I.H. Marshall – V. Rabens – C. Bennema) (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans 2012) 156–176.

Hultgren, S., «The Origin of Paul's Doctrine of the Two Adams in 1 Corinthians 15:45–49», *Journal for the study of the New Testament* 25 (2003) 343–370.

Jewett, R., *Paul's Anthropological Terms. A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Späteren Judentums und des Urchristentums 10; Leiden: Brill 1971).

Ladaria, L. F., *Antropología teológica* (Serie I. Estudios 26. Teología I 13; Madrid – Roma: UPCM – Università Gregoriana 1983).

Lanzillotta, L.R., «Anthropological Views in Nag Hammadi: The Bipartite and Tripartite Conceptions of Human Being», *Dust of the Ground and Breath of Life (Gen 2:7): The Problem of a Dualistic Anthropology in Early Judaism and Christianity* (eds. J. van Ruiten – G.H. van Kooten) (Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2016) 136–153.

Legarreta-Castillo, F. de J., *The Figure of Adam in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15. The New Creation and Its Ethical and Social Reconfigurations* (Emerging Scholars; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2014).

Lemonon, J.-P., «L'Esprit Sant dans le corpus paulinien», *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplement* 60–61 (1986–1987) 240–320.

Levinson, J.R., *Filled with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge: Eerdmans 2009).

Miller, P.L., «Greek Philosophical Dualism», *Light Against Darkness. Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World* (eds. A. Lange *et al.)* (Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2011) 107–144.

Mitchell, M. M., «Anthropological Hermeneutics: Between Rhetoric and Philosophy», *Paul, the Corinthians and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics* (ed. M.M. Mitchell) (Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press 2010) 38–57.

Moule, C.F.D., «2 Cor. 3:18b, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος», *Essays in New Testament interpretation* (ed. C.F.D. Moule) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1982) 227–234.

Nayak, I., «The Meaning of καταπτριζόμενοι in 2 Cor 3:18», *Euntes Docete* 55 (2010) 33–44.

Orbe, A., «El hombre ideal en la teología de San Ireneo», *Gregorianum* 43 (1962) 449–491.

Pereira Delgado, Á., *Primera carta a los corintios* (Comprender la Palabra 31B; Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 2017).

Pikaza, X., «Antropología paulina», *Diccionario de san Pablo* (ed. F. Fernández Ramos) (Burgos: Monte Carmelo 1999) 74–105.

Pikaza, X., «Espíritu Santo», *Diccionario de san Pablo* (ed. F. Fernández Ramos) (Burgos: Monte Carmelo 1999) 461–491.

Rabens, V., «Reframing Paul's Anthropology in the Light of the Dichotomies of Pauline Research», *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 40 (2018) 503–515.

Rigaux, B., *Saint Paul. Les Épitres aux Thessaloniciens* (Paris – Gembloux: Gabalda – Duculot 1956).

Robinson, T.M., «The Defining Features of Mind-Body Dualism in the Writings of Plato», *Psyche and Soma. Psysicians and Metaphysicians on the Mind-Body Problem from Antiquity to Enlightenment* (eds. J.P. Wright – P. Potter) (Oxford: Clarendon 2002) 37–55.

Schrage, W., *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. IV. *1 Kor 15,1–16,24* (Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 7; Zürich – Braunschweig – Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 2000).

Schweizer, E., «πνεῦμα, πνευματικός», *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (eds. G. Kittel – G. Friedrich; trans. G.W. Bromiley) (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1971) VI, 332–455.

Still, T.D. – Wilhite, D.E. (eds.), *Irenaeus and Paul* (London: Bloomsbury 2020).

Stuckenbruck, L.T., «The Interiorization of Dualism within the Human Being in Second Temple Judaism: the Treatise of the Two Spiritus (1QS III: 13- IV:26) in its Tradition-Historical Context», *Light Against Darkness. Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World* (eds. A. Lange *et al.*) (Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2011), 145–168.

Thiselton, A.C., *1 & 2 Thessalonians Through the Centuries* (Blackwell Bible Commentaries; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell 2011).

Van Kooten, G.H., «The Anthropological Trichotomy of Spirit, Soul and Body in Philo of Alexandria and Paul of Tarsus», *Anthropology in the New Testament and Its Ancient Context* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 54; Leuven: Peeters 2010) 87–119.

Wedderburn, A.J.M., «Philo's "Heavenly Man"», *Novum Testamentum* 15 (1973) 301–326.

White, D.E., «The Personal/Substantial Spirit of Prophecy: Irenaeus's Use of Paul against the Heresies», *Irenaeus and Paul* (eds. T.D. Still – D.E. Wilhite) (London: Bloomsbury 2020) 89–112.

THE BIBLICAL ANNALS 12/4 (2022) 589–592

Francesco Filannino, *La fine di Satana. Gli esorcismi nel Vangelo di Marco* (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 67; Bologna: Edizione Dehoniane 2020). Pp. 285. € 34. ISBN 978-88-10-30257-6

Marcin Zieliński
The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
marcin.zielinski@kul.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9965-2196

The subject of exorcisms and Satanic activity is an important constituent of the Second Gospel, which in 30 per cent consists of descriptions of miracles performed by Jesus, and almost a quarter of those descriptions are accounts of exorcisms. The topic naturally aroused the interest among Biblical scholars and readers of the Bible. The question of Satan's existence and his activities finally resulted in numerous, and often contradictory, interpretations. It is, therefore, necessary to explore the topic further using the precise methodology to discover the authentic message of Mark about the exorcisms of Jesus. A book by Francesco Filannino is included in this area of research.

Francesco Filannino, born in 1988, is a presbyter of the Archdiocese of Trani-Barletta-Bisceglie-Nazareth. Upon the completion of philosophical and theological formation at the Pontifical Lateran University, he began his studies at the Pontifical Biblical Institute where he obtained a bachelor's degree (2016) and a doctoral degree (2019) based on his dissertation on the mission of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark (title of his doctoral thesis: *Tra il precursore e i discepoli: la missione di Gesù nel vangelo di Marco*), then published in Analecta Biblica. He is currently a lecturer of ancient languages at the Pontifical Lateran University.

The book is 285 pages long and consists of a preface, a general introduction and nine chapters divided into two parts. In the end, the author provides a bibliography, a biblical text index and an author index.

In the introduction, the author presents short status questions by referring to different authors dealing with this subject, especially in the last two decades. He then writes about research assumptions and the method. Being inspired by the works of Hauw, he prefers a syncretic and narrative approach to show various theological aspects of those stories in relation to Christology, eschatology, and discipleship. In his work, the author does not include a general introduction to the subject of exorcisms in The Old Testament, in Jewish writings from the Second Temple Period, and Greco-Roman literature. Thereby, he intends to favour Mark's text and provide all the references while examining the specific issues. In this way, the broad context allows a better understanding of Mark's theology to prevent

DOI: 10.31743/biban.14503 ISSN 2083-2222 e-ISSN 2451-2168

the reader from starting the reading of the study with the general knowledge that may overlap with the understanding of evangelical descriptions.

The author selects the analysed pericopes while in his analysis he omits *summaria* (Mark 1:32–34,39; 3:7–12), which do not contain new information in comparison with the analysed pericopes. However, he will refer to them, as well as to the story about the temptation of Jesus, which despite not being an exorcism, still contains interesting theological issues. Apart from classical elements of the historical-critical method (delimitation, context, etc.), the author wishes to concern himself with intratextual and intertextual reading. The aim is the semantic and rhetoric analysis of the pericope within the context of Mark's entire work as well as the extraction of significant references to the Old Testament. From the very beginning, the author underlines that every pericope, although it describes the moment of deliverance from the evil spirit, conveys at the same time an important theological message. In the 'programmatic' pericope, which describes the deliverance of the evil spirit in the synagogue of Capernaum (Mark 1:21–28), the key theme is the identity of Jesus. The exorcism of Gerasa (Mark 5:1–20) stresses the need to fight against evil powers and the definite character of their defeat, which falls within Mark's vision of apocalyptic eschatology. The deliverance of the Syrophoenician woman's daughter from the influence of the evil spirit (Mark 7:24–30) underlines the openness of Jesus to other nations while the expulsion of the mute spirit from the boy (Mark 9:14–29) raises the issue of faith as a key component in being a disciple of Jesus. Those observations, according to the author, suggest that exorcisms are deeply inscribed in the narrative of the Gospel of Mark because they convey a theological message consistent with the message of the section in which they were placed.

Having presented the objectives of the work and methodology, the author analyses selected texts. In the first part of the book (pp. 27–185) he provides an analysis of 4 pericopes, which contain a description of the exorcism. He begins with Mark 1:21–28, first addressing the issue of delimitation and general context, and then proceeding with a detailed analysis of the text. Examining inclusion, repetitions and other stylistic devices, he reveals the significant theological motifs of the text related to the teachings, the power (*eksousia)* and the novelty of Jesus's teaching. In a conclusion of a theological character, the author emphasises once again what results from the analysis of the text, namely the theme of the power and authority of Jesus, as elements inherent in the exorcism.

The second chapter (pp. 59–100) constitutes an analysis of the description of the liberation of the demon-possessed from Gerasa (Mark 5:1–20). The author elicits from it significant theological elements: the belonging of the possessed to the world of the dead, the power of the demon, etc. In the interpretation, he takes into account the context of macrosection Mark 1:16–8,26, where the identity of Jesus is an important topic. In his theological conclusions, he emphasises the absolute power of Jesus over evil spirits and the moment of revelation of his identity by demons. The event itself anticipates eschatological victory over evil, whose preacher becomes a man liberated from the demon's power.

In the third chapter (pp. 101–122), an extract describing the deliverance from the demon of a Syrophoenician woman's daughter is analysed (Mark 7:24–30). The author

examines the direct context of the pericope and analyses in detail the dialogue between Jesus and the Syrophoenician woman. In his theological conclusion, he stresses that exorcism as an event serves to show the desire of Jesus that the salvation message spread over all nations. This soteriological aspect seems to be the core message of the story.

Finally, the fourth chapter (pp. 123–156) describes the release of the epileptic from the mute spirit (9:14–29). As usual, the author devotes considerable attention to the context, in which the exorcism occurs, and analyses its respective elements. In conclusion, he shows the message of the pericope, which focuses on Christology and the idea of discipleship. In the author's opinion, the latter is the fundamental message that the organically inspired author combines with the context that touches upon that subject.

In the conclusion to the first part of the study, the author stresses the theological richness of the pericopes, which cannot be construed as a mere exorcism. He also emphasises the meaning of the context, which is the key to identifying the meaning of every pericope as in the evangelist's intention it forms with it an organic whole.

The second part of the book is devoted to the interpretative keys of exorcisms (pp. 160–224). The author selects extracts which relate to the theme of the demon's activity and at the same time shed light on the understanding of evangelical exorcisms.

The first chapter (pp. 163–185) examines the description of the temptation of Jesus in the desert (Mark 1:12–13). Presenting different interpretations of the extract, the author highlights the theological aspect: the presentation of Jesus as the Messiah (continuation of the presentation from Mark 1:1) and the eschatological message, which is connected with the desert theme, the Holy Spirit and peaceful communion with animals. It is also a harbinger of the final victory over evil at the end of time.

The second chapter (pp. 186–207) examines Mark 3:22–30, in which the words about the kingdom of Satan appear in the context of accusing Jesus of collusion with the forces of darkness. The elements of Christology and eschatology reappear: Jesus, anointed with the Holy Spirit, lives in constant communion with God and comes to defeat the kingdom of Satan through healings and exorcisms.

The third chapter (pp. 209–222) depicts the exorcism of a man who was not a disciple of Jesus (Mark 9:38–40). The author, starting from a careful analysis of the context and structure of the text, stresses that the mere emphasis on the power of Jesus and the importance of his name, which are indispensable elements in performing an exorcism, is not the most important from the theological perspective. The key thing here is the didactic element, i.e. the instruction that the effective action against demons is a sign of belonging to Christ. Although this unknown man was not a disciple of Jesus, he acted on His behalf and carried out the mission that was entrusted to the Twelve and, more broadly, to all believers of Jesus.

In the theological synthesis, the Italian exegete once again emphasises that exorcisms should be interpreted from their rich, theological perspective. In his opinion, they are the element (one of many), from which several aspects of the theological mission of Jesus can be extracted. First, the emphasis is put on their Christological dimension because they

reveal the identity of the Master of Nazareth. The analysis of Christological titles present in the descriptions of exorcisms shows their absolute convergence with Mark's theology extracted from the entire Gospel. The eschatological aspect is also crucial, showing the final victory of Jesus in the confrontation with the world of demons. In the soteriological perspective, the universality of salvation, which embraces all nations, is emphasised. Finally, exorcisms provide an opportunity to present the concept of being a disciple of Jesus and faith as a fundamental relation to the Master. This way, the events that are usually associated with the manifestation of power and are astonishing by their nature and raise numerous questions, are presented in a proper theological perspective. They are not only moments of struggle against the evil spirit, but they also are of revelatory nature, which perfectly fits into the theological image of the activity of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark. The study of these extracts alone leads to conclusions that flow from a comprehensive analysis of the Second Gospel.

The book by Francesco Filannino is a proposal of great theological value. Employing exegetical studies, the author systematically shows the theological message of exorcisms, which at first glance is merely a fight against evil forces. It is only the in-depth analysis which shows that each exorcism is perfectly suited to the wider context, and additionally confirms the teaching of the section in which it is placed. The theological conclusions proposed by the author are convincing as they arise from a precise analysis of the text, and they are supported by firm evidence included in the text. The book provides also a general idea of Mark's theology. It would be interesting to employ this methodology of work to other groups of events described in the Gospel of Mark to check whether they are also organically linked to the theological message of the whole Gospel as the description of exorcisms.