

Paul and the Soul: An Analysis of the Apostle's Anthropology

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (Ancient Greek)

Of

Rhodes University

By DYLAN HAY PLUKE

December 2023

Abstract:

It may be no exaggeration to say that every aspect of the Apostle Paul's thought is debated. This is certainly the case for his anthropology, which is to say his beliefs regarding the nature of the human person. There is intense debate concerning what Paul believed about the human person. This is especially so when arguing about whether or not Paul believed in a human soul. In the thesis that follows, I use a linguistic analysis of Paul's writings as well as those of two of his putative backgrounds, to determine what he believed regarding the nature of the human soul.

The results of this analysis are that, of the potential backgrounds that may have influenced the Apostle, the Jewish background into which he was born is the most pertinent, and that neither of the two words that Paul uses mean soul, in the sense of something which is immaterial and survives death. Rather, the psyche refers to one's life, and the pneuma to the part of the person that connects one with God and which will replace the psyche and animate the person in the new age to come.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, and most importantly, I must thank my supervisor, Mr Michael Lambert. His passion, patience, attention to detail, and kind help have all helped me immensely through the process. He has also taught me much about the nature of academic research and its rigours. My gratitude is immense.

Secondly, to my wife, who has been a consistent support through this process. Again, words cannot express the help she is to me.

Thirdly, to my family. Without their significant financial support, I could not have hoped to complete this degree. They have also been continuously encouraging and kind.

Fourthly, to the Rhodes University Classics department, who made every effort to support me financially, even during a difficult period. Again, without their support, I could not hope to be as far with this degree as I am.

Finally, I must thank my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The love and support of all the wonderful people mentioned above is simply the love and support of my Lord mediated to me. This is far from his greatest gift to me, but this experience is one for which I have enormous gratitude.

Table of Contents

Paul and the Soul: An Analysis of the Apostle's Anthropology	1
Abstract:	2
Acknowledgements	3
Introduction	7
Chapter One: Paul's Biography and Letters	12
Introduction	12
Methodology: The Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Epistles	12
Paul's Biography	24
Paul's Early Life	24
The Christophany	31
The Early Christian Years	34
The Missionary Journeys	36
Imprisonments and Death	39
Chapter 2: The Corpus Considered	40
Introduction	40
Ancient Pseudepigraphy	40
Amanuenses and Authorship	43
Ephesians and Colossians	48
2 Thessalonians	53
Chapter 3: The Soul in Paul	56
ψυχή - Introduction	56
Life	56
Individuation	61
Emotional/Internal Life	63
Adjectives and Verbs Based on ψυχή	69
Synthesis	73
πνεῦμα Introduction	75
πνεῦμα as Inner Person	76
The Inner Person Itself	76
The Attitude or Disposition of the Inner Person	88
As Metonymy for the Whole Person	94
Other Uses	94
Adjectival Uses	96
Synthesis	99

Chapter Four: Jewish Soul Texts	100
Introduction:.....	100
Paul’s Use of Scripture	100
The Text of Israel’s Scriptures.....	102
שׁוֹפָר.....	108
Law	108
Prophets.....	115
Writings.....	121
חַוָּה.....	126
Law	126
Prophets.....	129
Writings.....	130
Synthesis:	132
The Apocrypha – Setting and Theology	134
ψυχή in the Apocrypha	135
Soul	136
Life.....	138
Self.....	140
πνεῦμα in the Apocrypha	141
Spirit.....	142
Conclusion	143
Chapter Five: The Soul In Classical Greek.....	145
Archaic.....	145
Bremmer’s The Early Greek Concept of the Soul.....	146
The ψυχή as the Free Soul	148
The Soul in Classical Greek Texts.....	155
Introduction.....	155
Life.....	155
Departed Ghosts.....	156
Conscious Self or Personality	157
Philosophical Soul	160
Conclusion:	166
Hellenistic Texts on the Soul	166
Introduction.....	166
Epicureanism.....	167

Stoicism.....	169
Cynicism	171
Conclusion	172
Chapter Six: Final Conclusion	173
Introduction.....	173
Paul’s Use of Soul Words	173
Scriptures of Ancient Israel	174
Greek Writing on the Soul	176
Paul on the Soul	179
Bibliography	183
Primary Sources:	183
Secondary Sources	186

Introduction

For most of the Christian church's history, belief in the human soul, construed as an immortal, immaterial aspect of the human person, has been widespread. Although there may have been small pockets of disagreement, most Christians have believed and taught that the soul existed and survived death. Several scholars, however, have challenged this hegemony. There has been a resurgence of materialist philosophy.¹ This is shown in the work of Armstrong 1993, Papineau 1993, and Moser and Trout 1995, and has led scholars to doubt the existence of the soul on extra-biblical grounds. There has also been growing doubt among New Testament (NT) theologians since the 1960s that the NT ever refers to the existence of a soul.² As a result, many Christian scholars like Brown, Murphy and Malony 1998, Murphy 2006, and Green 2008 have challenged the belief that the soul exists. The debate occurs in NT anthropology.

NT anthropology is concerned with what the NT as a whole, or a particular author in the NT, believed about the human person.³ Starting with Bultmann in 1955, the trend has been to see the human being as an essential unity. Some, like Jewett,⁴ and Heckel⁵ argue that this unity is essentially physical.⁶ Others, like Gundry⁷ and Cooper⁸ argue that this is a functional unity, made up of body and soul working together, or an ontological unity made up of soul.

In the study that follows, I will be arguing that the Apostle Paul, one of the primary authors of the NT, did in fact believe in something that is roughly analogous to what we would call the human soul. I believe this study is important because, while there are defences of this view that already exist, like those cited above, these tend to be from a philosophical perspective. While not totally unique, my work will be conducted from a textual perspective, with the intention of showing from the texts *themselves*, and the putative background, that Paul believed in the concept of a human soul.

My theoretical approach to the Pauline letters will be informed by two important traditions in contemporary NT scholarship: *Sitz im Leben* and the consideration of the Pauline letters as literature. *Sitz im Leben* is a German term used by Form critics in New Testament

¹ Koons, Bealer 2010: ix.

² Green 2008: 10.

³ Capes, Reeves, Richards 2007: 367.

⁴ 1971.

⁵ 1993.

⁶ Green 2008: 8.

⁷ 1976.

⁸ 2000.

scholarship to refer to “the setting from which [the text] arose and the purpose for which [it] was used.”⁹ This is an especially relevant category to the study of Pauline epistles. Each of the epistles I will use is considered an occasional document, meaning that it was written to a particular group of people in response to something in their context that was troubling them.¹⁰ This means we nowhere have anything resembling a “systematic theology” of Paul, but rather a series of *ad hoc* statements that are shaped by the contexts for which they are written.¹¹ This is not to say that I believe Paul’s theology is *ad hoc*, rather that the presentation of it is. This means that an adequate understanding of the ‘life’ (*Leben*) situation of any of the letters is an important part of understanding what Paul is saying.

Ascertaining this life-situation is always a contentious process,¹² and with the Pauline letters it is no different. And yet, through a combination of internal clues, extra-biblical texts and archaeology, some rough reconstruction of the various situations for which Paul was writing, which may have influenced his presentation of his theology, is possible. Ascertaining this, by means of a historical-critical theory, or *Sitz im Leben*, will be a key feature of my research process.

In addition, as the Pauline epistles are letters, and the letter is an acknowledged literary genre in ancient literature in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek and Latin,¹³ I shall be using literary analysis where this is germane to the *meaning* of the text. Although some New Testament scholars have distinguished between ‘letters’ and ‘epistles’ - the latter being literary, the former not - and regard Paul’s writings as spontaneous ‘letters’ or ‘apostolic letters,’ dispatched to early Christian communities with problems, I shall regard Paul’s letters as literary works, which draw on Paul’s early acquaintance with Greek rhetoric. Apart from translation of the texts from ancient Greek and Hebrew, which is, in itself, an interpretative process, I shall pay close attention to the rhetorical characteristics of the Greek text where Paul deploys such devices to convey meaning.¹⁴ As Fitzmyer says, “Hence, though a Pauline composition is basically a ‘letter,’ careful scrutiny of its parts often discloses other homiletic, rhetorical, and literary formulations that are to be respected in interpretation.”¹⁵

There are three groups of questions governing my research. The first group can be

⁹ Travis, 1977: 154.

¹⁰ Carson, Moo 2005: 332.

¹¹ Sanders 2017: 433.

¹² Travis 1977: 161.

¹³ e.g. the letters of Aristeas, Epicurus, Cicero, Pliny and Seneca.

¹⁴ e.g. Paul’s use of literary devices such as alliteration, chiasmus, emphatic positioning, onomatopoeia etc.

¹⁵ 2020: 770.

organised under the question, “How did Paul use the words that are usually translated as ‘soul’?” Further sub-questions are: What are the relevant Greek words and how does he use them?¹⁶ Can we justifiably translate any of Paul’s uses as ‘soul?’ If we cannot, what do they mean? If we can, what does the context and the use itself suggest Paul believed about the soul?

The second group of questions arises from the main question, “What religious and intellectual background would have affected Paul’s beliefs concerning the soul?” Further questions are: What do the Hebrew words translated into the Greek of the Septuagint (LXX) as ‘soul’ mean?¹⁷ Given Paul’s strong disagreement with aspects of his Jewish upbringing, what relation would he have had to Jewish beliefs about the soul? What were the contemporary Hellenistic understandings of the soul? What relation would a Jew like Paul have had to these ideas that find their genesis outside of the Jewish tradition in which he would have been schooled? What education in Greek language and philosophy did he receive, and why?

The final major question I will ask is: “Based on how Paul uses the words usually translated as ‘soul’ and what the background reveals about this use, what does this show about how Paul thought about the soul?” This generates further questions like, What does the background reveal about Paul’s use of the words? What entity, if any, does Paul then believe in? Does this entity align with what a modern person would understand by the word ‘soul’?

Since the research focuses mainly on the analysis of ancient Greek, Latin and Hebrew texts, it will be a qualitative study conducted from an historical-critical perspective.

The first step in my research project will be either to translate the original texts or to ensure that the translations from which I will work are sufficiently faithful to the original Greek, Latin or Hebrew. Then I shall have to set the texts in their historical context (*Sitz im Leben*), consider the genre, addressee, style and influences on the texts to assess the contribution of the texts to the research questions I am attempting to answer.

To answer my specific research questions, my primary texts will be the Kurt-Aland *Greek New Testament*, as well as the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. I will also make use of the full range of ancient Greek texts pertinent to understanding the ancient Greek concept of the ‘soul,’ such as the Homeric epics, relevant Platonic dialogues, like Plato’s *Phaedo*, and a variety of texts, both Greek and Latin, like Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura*, pertinent to an understanding of Stoic and Epicurean concepts of the ‘soul’ which may have influenced Paul’s beliefs.

¹⁶ BDAG, s.v. ψυχή, c-f; s.v. πνεῦμα, 2-3. Cf. Suggit 2014: 49-55.

¹⁷ BDB, s.v. 4, רוּחַ and s.v. נְפֹשׁ, 1.

In addition to the Hebrew Old Testament, I will also be making use of the Apocrypha. This refers to a group of Jewish texts composed in Greek in the Second Temple Period. They provide a helpful understanding of how Jewish thinkers at the time were interpreting the texts of the Old Testament and other elements of their tradition.

As my research does not involve any animal or human subjects, I shall not require any clearance by the relevant University committee. One danger that is always present in studying aspects of a religion, however, is painting certain esteemed figures in a way that anachronistically affiliates them with, or distances them from, one's own denomination. In the work that follows I will make every effort to keep any of my own affiliations out of my analysis unless they are important to understanding a particular topic. I will also strive to keep it from those who would use its contents to oppress another's religious beliefs. It is also worth noting that I am a confessing and committed Christian, and as such will undertake this research from a Christian perspective. Where appropriate, however, I will be alert to the questions of prejudice and subjectivity and I shall endeavour not to distort the meaning of any text, ancient or modern I shall be analysing, or be intentionally derogatory about another person's interpretations or beliefs.

In Chapter One of this dissertation, I shall construct a biography of the Apostle Paul. I will do this to help give context to the letters which I will then discuss.

In Chapter Two I will argue that three of the disputed Pauline letters, Colossians, Ephesians and 2 Thessalonians, are genuinely Pauline and therefore suitable for inclusion in this study of what the Apostle believed.

In Chapter Three I will analyse the two words that Paul uses which are often translated as 'soul' or 'spirit.' To do this, I will look at every instance of both ψυχή and πνεῦμα in the Pauline letters, that I have argued are genuine, to see how he uses them and how we can reasonably translate them.

In Chapter Four I will examine Jewish texts. I will begin by looking at the Scriptures of Ancient Israel to see what נִפְשׁ and רוּחַ mean in these texts and how they are translated in the Septuagint versions of these texts. After this, I will examine the uses of ψυχή and πνεῦμα in the Apocrypha, to see what these words mean in their contexts.

In Chapter Five, I will analyse the uses of those same words in a representative collection of Greek Texts to see what they meant in the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic periods, thereby establishing how the soul was conceptualized in these texts and what the Hellenistic philosophers, for instance, taught about the soul.

In my final chapter, I shall return to questions posed in my thesis proposal and this

introduction in order to test the validity of my hypotheses about the Apostle Paul's concept of the human soul.

Chapter One: Paul's Biography and Letters

Introduction

The apostle Paul is one of the great figures of the early Christian movement. His body of letters was important to the development of what became Christian doctrine, and his missionary activities were a large part of what moved Christianity from Jerusalem to the furthest reaches of the Roman Empire. Before I discuss the central question of this thesis, I thought it would be useful to attempt to reconstruct an outline of the life of the apostle. The main reason I want to do this is that an understanding, however rudimentary, of Paul's life and deeds is helpful in establishing the *Sitz im Leben* of the texts I will analyse. While I am aware that attempting to write a biography of any figure from ancient history, and perhaps especially for Paul, is fraught, I nevertheless feel that it provides important background for what will follow.

Methodology: The Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Epistles

Before we discuss the actual life of Paul, however, it is worth spending some time on the sources available to scholars to reconstruct this life. Obviously, the best sources available are Paul's own letters. But since these letters are all occasional documents, written to particular audiences to deal with particular questions, they leave out many of the details historians would need to construct Paul's actual life. To make up for this, scholars have traditionally appealed to the account of Paul's life given in the Acts of the Apostles.¹⁸

More recently, however, scholars have begun to doubt this approach. This is in large part due to increasing doubts about the value of Acts as a historical source and the increasing suspicion that the Paul it portrays is nothing more than a fiction designed to encourage the faithful.¹⁹ So I will begin my discussion of Paul's life by arguing that although the Pauline letters should be given primacy in an attempted reconstruction of Paul's life, Acts is a useful account for anybody who wants to understand the life of Paul. So in this section, I will provide a short introduction to the book of Acts, in which I will discuss the authorship, genre, sources and purpose of the book, with the intention of showing that, when all of these factors are taken into consideration, and with the constraints of ancient historiography in mind, the book still has value for the Pauline scholar.

¹⁸ FF Bruce 1977; Carson, Moo, 2005; Blomberg 2016.

¹⁹ Carson, Moo 2005: 360.

Authorship

The authorship of Acts, as is the case for many New Testament works, is controversial to say the least. Traditionally, authorship has been ascribed to Luke, the travelling companion of Paul, who is also said to have written the Gospel that has come to bear his name. This authorship, however, has been challenged on many grounds. In what follows, I will analyse various relevant data in the debate over who wrote the book of Acts.

The first thing to note is that the book is technically anonymous, which is to say that nowhere are we given an explicit claim to authorship. There is, however, an explicit link between Acts and the Gospel of Luke. Both Luke,²⁰ and Acts,²¹ contain prologues that dedicate the books to somebody called Theophilus. For this reason, these books have consistently been connected to one another. Another reason for linking these books is that their Greek is remarkably similar. Both of these works are written in good Koine Greek, sharing 90 percent of its vocabulary with the Septuagint and 85 percent with Plutarch. Bock thinks that “this usage suggests a well-educated writer.”²² He also points out that this probably means that the author had a “desire to give a ‘biblical’ feel to his account.”²³ For these reasons, it seems likely that both Luke and Acts have shared authorship, and indeed, “[virtually] all modern scholars agree that Luke and Acts were written by the same person.”²⁴ This is important because it means that, if the link holds, the conversation about the authorship of Luke has bearing on Acts, and vice-versa. That being said, however, our discussion will be largely limited to Acts, with reference being made to Luke only when it is pertinent.

Aside from these brief dedications at the start of either work, the author of Acts is hardly present in the narrative. This means that, aside from his language, there are very few internal clues to his identity. A remarkable exception is the so-called “we-sections” of the book of Acts.²⁵ These are times when the narrator of the book suddenly switches to use of the first-

²⁰ Luke 1:1-4: Ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, ἔδοξε κάμοι παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε, ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν. (Since many have attempted to compile an account about the things fulfilled among us, just as the first eyewitnesses and servants of the word handed them down to us, I also have decided, having followed all of these things from the beginning, to write an account for you, most excellent Theophilus, carefully and in order, so that you may know the certainty of the things you were taught.)

²¹ Acts 1:1-2: Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων, ὧ Θεόφιλε, ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὐς ἐξελέξατο ἀνελήμφθη. (In my first book, Theophilus, I wrote about the things which Jesus began to do and teach until the day he was taken to heaven, after instructing his disciples he had chosen through the Holy Spirit.)

²² 2007: 13.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Blomberg 2016: loc 3688.

²⁵ Acts 16:10-17; 20:5-15; 21:2-18; 27:1-28:16.

person plural, suggesting that he was there for the event.²⁶ These passages have long led to the belief that the author of the book of Acts was a travelling companion of Paul. More recently, however, on the basis of other difficulties which I will address later, scholars have challenged this identification. At this stage of the scholarly debate, there are a few live options. Firstly, that these events are what they seem to be, the moments when Paul's travelling companion joined him and recorded what they did together. Secondly, they could be a part of a maritime literary technique. Finally, they could be a part of a source that the author used and declined to alter.²⁷ I will deal with these in reverse order.

It is undeniable that the author of Acts used sources in the compilation of his account.²⁸ Does this mean, however, that the “we-sections” of Acts are themselves the result of sources? One good case for this is that Paul is presented slightly differently in the “we-sections” than he is in the rest of the book of Acts.²⁹ Paul is regularly described in a slightly less favourable way in these sections. Is this evidence strong enough to suggest that these sections belong to some different sources? It seems unlikely. If this is an independent source, it is tricky to explain why the author would include it so roughly.³⁰ This is especially the case when we look at the sources we can be sure the author used, like Mark, to see how carefully he handled them, and how willing he was to adjust them to make them fit his narrative.³¹ This means that even if we do concede that Paul is depicted differently in the “we-sections,” it is unlikely that these sections of the narrative come from external sources the author incorporated into his work.

Another way of explaining these “we-sections” of Acts is to say that they are a kind of literary device. This is the view taken by Richard Dillon in his contribution to the *New Jerome Bible Commentary*. He says that “the appearance of the first person, notably in Paul's sea-travels, could certify the authenticity of Luke's material in a special way...thus addressing a

²⁶ For example, note the change from Acts 16:9 to Acts 16:10-12: καὶ ὄραμα διὰ νυκτὸς τῷ Παύλῳ ὤφθη, ἀνὴρ Μακεδῶν τις ἦν ἐστῶς καὶ παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων· Διαβάς εἰς Μακεδονίαν βοήθησον ἡμῖν. ὡς δὲ τὸ ὄραμα εἶδεν, εὐθέως ἐζητήσαμεν ἐξελεῖν εἰς Μακεδονίαν, συμβιβάζοντες ὅτι προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς εὐαγγελισασθαι αὐτούς. Ἀναχθέντες οὖν ἀπὸ Τρωάδος εὐθυδρομήσαμεν εἰς Σαμοθράκην, τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ εἰς Νέαν Πόλιν, κάκειθεν εἰς Φιλίππους, ἥτις ἐστὶν πρώτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις, κολωνία. ἦμεν δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει διατριβόντες ἡμέρας τινάς. (And a vision appeared to Paul in the night: a man from Macedonia standing and calling out to him and saying “Come over to Macedonia and help us.” And when he saw the vision, at once we prepared to go out to Macedonia, deciding that God had called us to preach to them. So having gone up from Troas, we sailed to Samothrace, and the next day on to Neapolis, and from there to Philippi, which is a [Roman] colony and the leading city of Macedonia. We stayed there several days.) (emphasis mine).

²⁷ Dillon 2020: 722-723.

²⁸ Sanders 2015: 15.

²⁹ Bock 2007: 13.

³⁰ Dillon 2020: 723.

³¹ Sanders 2015: 15.

concern for eyewitness warranty that is shown by contemporary historians like Polybius and Lucian.”³² Indeed, this view is very plausible. It would make sense for the author who is, after all, writing for the reassurance of his patron,³³ to do what he needed to in order to make his account fit more neatly into what the patron would have wanted, and also to make the work more useful to those who would read it later.³⁴ This view does suffer from two weaknesses, however. The first is that there is no “literary precedent for a travel narrative that is a literary creation.”³⁵ There is simply nothing in the extant literature of the period that would match with Acts if it is to be understood as a fictional account of travel. Even the precedent for the eyewitness as a fictional device has been challenged by contemporary scholars.³⁶ The second objection to the view that the “we-sections” of Acts are literary devices is the fact that they are so haphazardly inserted. There is no thematic or narrative link that seems to join all of the “we-sections” of the book together. Indeed, even Dillon has acknowledged that the insertion of the first-person is “unpredictable.”³⁷ The lack of discernible purpose for these sections does seem to militate against the likelihood of their being included as a literary device. Nevertheless, despite these problems, this view remains plausible.

The final view on these sections is that they are included as the actual eyewitness testimony of the author who was himself a travelling companion of Paul. Indeed, this is the impression that they leave on the reader, and so the burden of proof would appear to be on the person seeking to provide another explanation. Another argument for these being the actual recordings of a travelling companion of Paul’s is the same argument that was used against the literary view, which is that the places at which these sections appear and the events that are shared with Paul are so haphazard. When discussing this issue Bock says that “[the] lack of significance for the locales of such sections speaks to their authenticity.”³⁸ The biggest objection to this view is that the depictions of Paul in Acts and the epistles are so different that the author of Acts cannot have been a travelling companion of Paul’s. I will deal with this objection properly below but suffice it to say that I think these differences are somewhat exaggerated.

³² 2020:723.

³³ Luke 1:1-4.

³⁴ And, as Dillon himself acknowledges, “[regarding] the hypothesis that the ‘we’ is Luke’s own certifying device does not compromise the historical value of the accounts given in that form.” (2020: 723).

³⁵ Bock 2007: 13.

³⁶ Fitzmyer 1998: 100-102, cited in Bock 2007: 13.

³⁷ 2020: 723.

³⁸ Bock 2007: 13.

After a consideration of the internal evidence, I think the care with which the author uses his sources in the instances we can trace makes the view that these are roughly inserted sources implausible. But it seems to me that the view that the “we-sections” are a literary device is about on par with the view that they actually come from a travelling companion of Paul’s. So, in order to break the tie, we must turn to the external evidence. And, when we look at this, we see that the tradition singles out a companion of Paul as the author of Acts, and that it is Luke in particular.³⁹

There are several ancient sources which place Luke as either the author of Luke or Acts, and the connection between them means that if he wrote one, he wrote the other. The list is quite extensive, including Tertullian,⁴⁰ Irenaeus,⁴¹ and Origen.⁴² Speaking about this tradition, Marshall says that that it “may date back to the first half of the second century ... and it is unequivocal in singling out Luke from among several possible candidates.”⁴³ Indeed, the peculiarity of Luke as a choice must not be overlooked. Although he was a companion of Paul’s, he was far from one of the most famous. And so for the tradition to pick out somebody so anonymous in the list of Paul’s companions with the intention to deceive, is very unlikely.⁴⁴ This external evidence, then, lends credence to the view that the author of both Luke and Acts was Luke, the travelling companion of Paul.

A major objection to this view holds that the Paul presented in the epistles differs so radically from the Paul of Acts that Acts simply cannot have been written by somebody who knew Paul personally. Philipp Vielhauer, in his essay on this topic,⁴⁵ raised four major areas of discrepancy between the two depictions of Paul. These include the difference in Paul’s use of natural theology in Acts 17 and Romans 1, Paul’s relationship to the law in Acts and the epistles, Paul’s lack of emphasis on Christ in Acts and the absence of Paul’s eschatological teaching.⁴⁶

³⁹ Marshall 1978: 33.

⁴⁰ *Against Marcion* 4.2: Denique nobis fidem ex apostolis Ioannes et Matthaues insinuant, ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant. (Of the apostles, John and Mark first instil faith into us, and of the apostolic men Luke and Mark renew it afterwards.) This is about the Gospel of Luke, but as mentioned above, the link between Luke and Acts is very strong.

⁴¹ *Ag. Her.* 3.1: Καὶ Λουκᾶς δέ, ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ’ ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλῳ κατέθετο. (And Luke, Paul’s attendant, set down what was proclaimed in a book of his own.)

⁴² Cited in Eusebius *Eccl. Hist.* 6.25: καὶ τρίτον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν, τὸ ὑπὸ Παύλου ἐπαινούμενον εὐαγγέλιον τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν πεποιηκότα (And third the gospel according to Luke, the one commended by Paul and composed for Gentiles.)

⁴³ Marshall 1978: 33.

⁴⁴ Bock 2007: 19.

⁴⁵ 1980: 33-50.

⁴⁶ Carson, Moo 2005: 293-5.

While this is a comprehensive list, the differences are less potent when one actually digs into them. For example, while there is a difference between what Paul says about natural theology in Acts 17:26-27⁴⁷ and Romans 1:20,⁴⁸ this can be easily explained by examining the context in which each was given. As Bock says, “the difference between Acts 17 and Romans 1 is the difference between the writing of someone reaching out ... while making an effort to find common ground and the more forthright critique of what pagan culture was in the eyes of a monotheist.”⁴⁹ The important point here is not the putative reader, but the audience for Paul’s speech, regardless of how historically accurate the speech itself actually is.⁵⁰ While Romans is written for Christians, Paul in Acts is speaking to a gathered group of Greek philosophers of various schools. So, it makes sense that the material would be presented differently, whether that material is strictly historical or not. Similar points can be made about Acts’ underrepresentation of Paul’s Christology and eschatology. Given that the majority of Paul’s recorded preaching in Acts is evangelistic, it is likely that the contents would be different to those written to an established, though struggling, Christian church, as is the nature of the writing of the epistles. So, while there are differences, these differences are contextual rather than theological. And even though it is not a focus, the theology of the cross in Acts is similar to that found in Paul.⁵¹ There are also sprinklings of an ‘end time’ eschatology throughout the book of Acts to show that while the author is not concerned to argue for it or bring it up

⁴⁷ ἐποίησέν τε ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντων ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ παντὸς προσώπου τῆς γῆς, ὀρίσας προστεταγμένους καιροὺς καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν, ζητεῖν τὸν θεὸν εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὕροιεν, καὶ γε οὐ μακρὰν ἀπὸ ἑνὸς ἐκάστου ἡμῶν ὑπάρχοντα. (From one man he made all people to live on the face of the earth, and he marked out their times in history and the boundaries of their lands, so that they might seek God and perhaps reach out to him and find him, and he is not far from any of us.)

⁴⁸ τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἢ τε αἰδῖος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους. (For his invisible attributes have been clearly seen from the creation of the world, both his eternal power and divine nature, so that they are without excuse.)

⁴⁹ 2007: 16.

⁵⁰ I am aware that the conventions around speeches in ancient historiography had the reader as the main audience (see Sources and Historiography below). I also think, however, that the purpose of Acts, which was to provide context to early Christians, makes it likely that Luke would have made the content of the speeches evangelistic to show by what means the church grew.

⁵¹ Bock 2007: 16. Acts 20:28: προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου. (Keep watch over yourselves and all the flock, over whom the Holy Spirit has made you overseers. Be shepherds of the church of God, which he bought with his own blood.) Cf. Romans 5:9-10: πολλῶ οὖν μᾶλλον δικαιοθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ σωθησόμεθα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς. εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολλῶ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ. (By how much more, having been justified in his blood, will we be saved through him from the wrath of God. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his son, how much more, having been reconciled, will we be saved in his life.)

regularly, he seems to have had a belief of the end times that was at least similar to Paul's.⁵² All of this suggests that the differences, though apparent on the surface, are rather exaggerated.

The issue of the law is somewhat more complicated. This is partially because Paul in Acts is remarkably observant of the Jewish law. For example, he has Timothy circumcised, even though his father was a Gentile,⁵³ and he takes part in the ritual washing required to enter the temple.⁵⁴ But it is also partially because, *pace* Vielhauer, establishing what Paul believed about the law is very tricky. There is a wide divergence among scholars on what Paul believed about the law. Some, like Martin Luther, argue that Paul's whole theology was about saving people from the law. Others, like EP Sanders, are far from clear that Paul had major issues with the law.⁵⁵ So, it seems that this problem with Acts and Paul depends on simplifying one of the most interesting and complex areas of the theology of the apostle: his relationship to the law.

Nevertheless, while plausible explanations exist for all of these difficulties, they are still difficulties. It is my opinion that the internal evidence for authorship of the book of Acts, which seems to hang on the "we-sections," leaves nothing to be decided on between its being written by a travelling companion of Paul and somebody later using these sections as a literary device. On the strength of the external evidence, it does seem more probable that the book was written by a companion of Paul, with all the likelihood being that it was Luke. Credible responses to this do exist, but on the strength of the argumentation above, that is the position I will use in this thesis.

Genre and Purpose

A question at least as vexed as the authorship of Acts is that of its literary genre. As noted above, this book is the second part of a short history of the beginning of Christianity.⁵⁶ But what help this gives for identifying the author, it takes away by confusing the question of genre. This is because, while the connection between the works is still the consensus of modern scholarship, the reason Luke would write two books that seem so markedly different in terms of genre has perplexed many. Below, I will survey a few options for genre, and discuss the merits of each.

The first option for a genre of the book of Acts is the genre from which the book derives

⁵² Acts 1:11; 3:18-22; 10:40-42; 17:30-31.

⁵³ Acts 16:3.

⁵⁴ Acts 21:26.

⁵⁵ 2017: 474-511.

⁵⁶ Sanders 2015: 13.

its name. This name is found in the Anti-Marcionite prologue to Luke, Irenaeus,⁵⁷ and in many of the manuscripts⁵⁸ and describes a genre of Greco-Roman writing which typically refers to the great deeds of one particular person.⁵⁹ The fact that these types of account are typically limited to one individual has led many to think Acts is not in this genre, since it has many main characters. Aside from this rather substantial weakness, there is also the fact that the book seems to sit more comfortably in other genres.

In recent times there has also been an increasingly critical attitude to the notion that Acts falls into the genre of Hellenistic historiography. This is highlighted by two different but popular sceptical approaches: that of the Tübingen school and of Richard Pervo⁶⁰ and others who follow his approach.

The Tübingen school was a German critical school which argued that the book of Acts is a second-century document written in the wake of a split between Jewish Christianity, led by Peter, and Gentile Christianity, led by Paul. The purpose of this document, according to the school, is to provide a more harmonious picture of the relationship than actually existed.⁶¹ Their arguments, however, are predicated on dating the book to sometime in the second century. Moreover, as argued by JB Lightfoot, their hypothesis about the nature of the early church finds very little support in the early church documents we do have.⁶²

A far more common view at this time is that of Richard Pervo, who argues that Acts belongs to the genre of the Ancient Novel. He defines this as “a relatively lengthy work of prose fiction depicting or deriving certain ideals through an entertaining presentation of the lives and experiences of a person or persons whose activity transcends the limits of ordinary living as known to its implied readers.”⁶³ This definition, however, seems problematic. Firstly, because it does not align with how the novel is typically defined in Classical Literary studies.⁶⁴ Secondly, and more importantly, it is also too broad. On this definition, we would be justified

⁵⁷ Carson, Moo 2005: 285. Irenaeus, *Adv. Her.* 3.1.1: Καὶ Λουκᾶς δέ, ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βίβλῳ κατέθετο. (And Luke, Paul's attendant, set down what was proclaimed in a book of his own.)

⁵⁸ Bock 2007: 1.

⁵⁹ Carson, Moo 2005: 285. Cf. Augustus' *Res Gestae* for a work that would fit into the traditional definition of Acts.

⁶⁰ 1987 cited in Blomberg 2016: loc 3808.

⁶¹ Bock 2007: 8.

⁶² Carson, Moo 2005: 298.

⁶³ Pervo, cited in Blomberg 2016: loc 3808.

⁶⁴ Cf. Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 1021 – “[Greek novels] ... vary a shared pattern. Boy and girl fall in love ... Either before marriage ... or soon after ... they are separated and survive storms, shipwreck, imprisonment, attempted seduction or rape, torture and even what the readers and characters believe to be death, before reunion at the book's end.”

in calling Herodotus' *Histories* a novel. Thus, while the definition provides some necessary conditions for the Ancient Novel, it does not provide the requisite sufficient conditions. Moreover, when we look at other Ancient Novels, we see that there are other aspects of the document that do not fit with the genre of Ancient Novel at all. The first of these is that novels⁶⁵ often tended to have deliberate factual errors that would indicate to the reader that the author made no attempt at being historical. Blomberg cites the books of Judith and Tobit from the intertestamental period as examples of this.⁶⁶ But even in cases where this is not true, there were many typical features of an Ancient Novel that are missing from Acts. These include, "romance, the reuniting of two parties long separated, a happy ending or closure at the conclusion, encounters with pirates or bandits, and a consistent focus on one or two main characters."⁶⁷ These key absences make it unlikely that the genre of Acts is the Ancient Novel. Another reason for discounting the novel as the genre for Acts is the plausibility and popularity of other options. While there have certainly been challenges to the historicity of Acts, the fact that its genre falls somewhere within the broad sweep of Greek historiography still seems to be a popular understanding. For example, Dillon, describing the prologues of both books, says that "Luke intended to write history and to do so with unexceptionable procedure."⁶⁸ Likewise, Sanders says of Acts that "the work ranks as a good piece of Hellenistic historiography."⁶⁹ But history was an infamously wide-ranging description.⁷⁰ And so, we will turn our attention now to what type of history Luke wanted to compose in particular. At this point our investigation into the purpose and genre of Acts becomes intertwined, and so I will examine two perspectives, put forward by the two scholars previously cited, and examine them briefly.

The first perspective, offered by Sanders, is that the book of Acts is a "Hellenistic apologetic history and biography."⁷¹ Essentially, his argument is that Luke-Acts was written with the intention of showing that Christianity was a positive force. Sanders emphasizes that "Luke takes pains to show that there is no conflict between Christianity and the Roman Empire."⁷² He also argues that Luke wants to show the "early Christian movement as almost

⁶⁵ Such as Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*, and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

⁶⁶ Blomberg 2016: loc 3821.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* loc 3844.

⁶⁸ 2020: 723.

⁶⁹ 2015: 14.

⁷⁰ Smith, Kostopoulos 2017: 398.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² Sanders 2015: 15.

free of friction.”⁷³ These two considerations, along with a defence of Paul, are the reasons Sanders gives for labelling this work as a piece of apologetic history.

Certainly, the fact that there are undertones of apologia to this work is undeniable. To say that this was the main concern, however, is to “risk inflating partial concerns of the author into his overall purpose.”⁷⁴ In contrast to this, Dillon offers another perspective, which is that the book of Acts is a “historical monograph” written with the purpose of clarifying Christian self-understanding.⁷⁵ In other words, rather than being an attempt to convince outsiders of the validity or safety of the Christian movement, Luke’s goal was to help Christians understand the origin of their faith and what it said about them. Bock agrees, saying that “Acts is a sociological, historical, and theological work explaining the roots of this new community, as a sequel to Luke’s story of Jesus portrayed in his Gospel.”⁷⁶ Of course, there may be sections devoted to the defence of the movement within a work of this description, as Sanders would argue, but this wider generic definition allows for those parts of the narrative which do not fit with the somewhat narrower perspective Sanders offers.

But if this is valid, then how should the reader understand the unity between Luke and Acts? For if this is a historical monograph, then what of Luke? Luke seems to fit far more neatly into the genre of biography. In response to this concern, Smith and Kostopoulos have argued convincingly, from sources like Diodorus Siculus and Flavius Josephus, that there is “evidence that ancient prose authors could combine biographical and historical content in a multi-volume work.”⁷⁷ So, on the strength of this argument, it is not at all unprecedented that Luke could have written book one of his two volume work to describe the life and deeds of Jesus, the founder of the movement, and then written book two to describe the proliferation of the movement after him.

So, in conclusion, the best understanding of the history of Acts seems to me to be a historical monograph written with the intention of explaining how the Christian movement saw itself and how it began. This is not to exclude apologetic motifs throughout the work, but rather to suggest that those only make up a small portion of the work.

⁷³ *Ibid.*: 17.

⁷⁴ Dillon 2020: 723.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ 2007: 2.

⁷⁷ 2017: 404.

Sources and Historiography

As noted above, the author of Acts clearly used sources in the composition of his works. In the Gospel, the first of his two-parts, the sources are clear. He clearly worked with the Gospel of Mark, as well as Q.⁷⁸ This makes it reasonable to suppose that he used sources in the composition of his second text as well. In this section I will examine the extent to which he used sources, and I will pay particular attention to the nature and use of speeches in Acts.

The sources that inform Acts, as with many aspects of this book's composition, are famously obscure. For Luke, we have one of the sources, Mark, and other documents which make use of Q, against which we can compare it. Acts, by contrast, is the only source for its story, so there is nothing to which we can compare it. Nevertheless, we can have some idea about the sources that were used.

As I argued above, the "we-sections" of the book of Acts are best understood as the author inserting his own eyewitness testimony into the text. As a result, the source for these sections is obviously the author himself.⁷⁹ Outside of this, things become more complicated. There is likely some Jerusalem based source for Acts 1-12, since the action there all takes place in Jerusalem. Likewise, Acts 6:8-8:40 seems to have come from a Hellenistic Jewish source⁸⁰ because it recounts the particular struggles of that sub-community within the Jerusalem church.

Assuming, as I argued earlier, that the author was a travelling companion of Paul's, then it makes sense that Acts 9 and 13-28 would get at least some of their content from Paul. There is also the famous Antiochene hypothesis, which says that there was a local tradition present in Antioch from which Luke drew some of his material.⁸¹ While this theory has been laid to rest, it is experiencing something of a resurgence in modern times as the search for Lukan sources becomes reinvigorated.⁸²

But, as far as sources go, that is almost the best that can be done. Partially because of Luke's desire to have his whole account spoken in his voice, and partially because of the lack of contemporary accounts, the search for Luke's sources is an ongoing one.

One area that is affected by this consideration is the speeches of Acts. And this is significant because, of the material in Acts, a total of one third is speeches.⁸³ For the historian of the early church, this presents something of a problem. The ancient historian's position on

⁷⁸ Dillon 2020: 725.

⁷⁹ Bock 2007: 19.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² Dillon 2020: 725.

⁸³ Bock 2007: 20.

speeches, famously laid out by Thucydides,⁸⁴ is not as precise as what modern historians would expect. Instead, the goal was to fit the content of the speech into the narrative of the work the author was trying to compose. Thus Dillon can say that, “the speeches are to be understood less from the historical situation than from the context of the book.”⁸⁵ He elaborates this point by saying that “[the] speeches of Acts all have Luke as their author and his readers as their audience.”⁸⁶ Indeed, it seems indisputable that the speeches in Acts are rhetorical constructs, rather than some kind of transcript recording of the preaching of Peter, Paul, or any of the other figures of the book.

Does this mean, however, that these speeches are to be counted as having no historical value? It seems unlikely. In the first place, while the actual text of the speeches is a construction of Luke’s, there is no reason to doubt that he, like Thucydides, sought to remain faithful to what was said, to the extent he could. If, as I argued above, the book of Acts was written by Luke the companion of Paul, then it is very likely that he would have been familiar with the Christian tradition and apostolic preaching of the period.⁸⁷ Thus he would have had a bank of knowledge on which to draw in order to construct speeches that were faithful to what was said, or at least to the spirit of what would likely have been said in those contexts. Secondly, there is great variation in the speeches, from the use of differing Christological titles to the varied use of the OT, depending on who is speaking and to whom they are preaching.⁸⁸ This suggests that the author wasn’t simply creating all of his speeches from scratch, but was relying on sources to create what we now read in the book of Acts. Thus the content of the speeches seems to have some basis in a tradition beyond Luke himself and can therefore be seen as being representative of the context in which those traditions originated. A third reason that can be given for being prepared to derive historical value from these speeches is to note the ways in which Luke uses his sources when we have access to that information. It is clear that the Gospel of Mark was a source on which Luke depended for his own gospel, and since we have that

⁸⁴ Thucydides 1.22.1: Καὶ ὅσα μὲν λόγῳ εἶπον ἕκαστοι ἢ μέλλοντες πολεμήσειν ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ ἤδη ὄντες, χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεχθέντων διαμνημονεῦσαι ἦν ἐμοὶ τε ὦν αὐτὸς ἤκουσα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοθεν ποθεν ἐμοὶ ἀπαγγέλλουσιν· ὡς δ’ ἂν ἐδόκουν ἐμοὶ ἕκαστοι περὶ τῶν αἰεὶ παρόντων τὰ δέοντα μάλιστ’ εἰπεῖν, ἐχομένῳ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων, οὕτως εἶρηται. (And about the speeches, some were given before the war, and others in the midst of it. It was difficult for me to remember exactly what was said, whether I heard it myself or had it reported to me by others. So it has seemed good for me to make the speakers say what was demanded of them by the various occasions, while still coming as close as possible to the sense of what was really said.)

⁸⁵ 2020: 724.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ Bock 2007: 21.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

gospel, we can see that while Luke was indeed happy to adapt aspects of Mark's gospel, his dedication to preserving the essence of the source was strong.

That Luke used sources is undeniable. That Luke adjusted those sources to create a text unified in his vision is also undeniable. This does not mean, however, that the texts of either Luke or Acts are of no value to the historian hoping to understand the activities of the early church.

Conclusion

The purpose of this preliminary section is to show that while there are certainly cautions the Pauline scholar must take, the book of Acts does provide a valuable record of Paul's life, especially after his call. To do this, I first argued that the book of Acts was written by Luke, the travelling companion of Paul. Secondly, I argued that the genre for this work is ancient history. That isn't to say that Acts is an unbiased, objective, recording of events. Rather, it is to say that Luke intended to present what actually happened, albeit in a way that strengthens his overall purpose, which was to provide an understanding for the early church of its own identity. After this, I briefly considered the sources of the book of Acts, and in particular the speeches. I argued that while the speeches are undoubtedly composed by Luke, they do nevertheless have some value insofar as they accurately represent the traditions from which they are drawn.

From these three strands of evidence, it should be clear that while the book of Acts is a work in its own right, needing to be interpreted and analysed on its own terms, nevertheless, it provides a picture of Paul that is of great help to the historian who would seek to reconstruct the life of Paul. Having established this, we can now turn to the task of creating an outline of Paul's life.

Paul's Biography

Paul's Early Life

As with many famous characters in antiquity, information about Paul's early life is hard to come by. As a result of this, this section of a biography of Paul is usually more thematic than chronological. That is to say, although it is almost impossible to know what Paul was actually doing in these years, through his later writings and those actions he is reported as doing, we can get some inkling as to what made up his early life. In particular, I am going to be focussing on Acts 22:3-5. This is a speech, written by Luke, which has Paul speaking in front of a group of Jews who are intent on persecuting him. While this speech is Luke's construction, as I argued above, his speeches often depend on other traditions for their content. In this case, the source

may well have been the apostle himself, or some other contemporary biographical accounts by eyewitnesses or travelling companions. So, while it must be treated with care, there is still some valuable material that helps us understand the earlier parts of the life of the Apostle.

The speech begins by telling us that Paul was born in the city of Tarsus (22:3),⁸⁹ which Luke has Paul describe as “no mean city,”⁹⁰ and with good reason. It was one of the more famous and important cities in the Ancient Near East. An early historical record we can find of Tarsus comes from the 9th Century BC. It is called “Tarzi” on an Obelisk dedicated to Shalmaneser III.⁹¹ It is also mentioned in Xenophon’s *Anabasis*, where it is described as a prosperous city.⁹² After the conquests of Alexander it fell under the control of the Seleucids, where it was renamed Antioch, a name that appears on coins issued during the rule of Antiochus IV.⁹³ Roman rule came into effect after Pompey captured it, and it was made into the capital of Cilicia.⁹⁴ It was home to a great and flourishing philosophical tradition. Strabo, for example, records that Tarsus was a place where learning thrived, so that it even rivalled the learning of Athens and Alexandria.⁹⁵ These schools seem to have been mainly schools of Stoic and Epicurean philosophers.⁹⁶ Indeed, Augustus is recorded as having given the rule of the city to a Stoic Philosopher named Athenodorus, who was tasked with reforming the administration after some mismanagement.⁹⁷ As well as the famous intellectual life, there was also a thriving textile industry, based largely on linen.⁹⁸ Indeed, as Bock says, “[with] Ephesus and Smyrna, it was one of the three great cities on the southern coast of Asia Minor.”⁹⁹ It was also a city that was privileged by Rome, meaning that it was exempt from the usual taxation.¹⁰⁰ This would

⁸⁹ Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἄνθρωπος Ἰουδαῖος, γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσοῦ τῆς Κιλικίας. (I am a Jewish man, born in Tarsus of Cilicia.)

⁹⁰ Acts 21:39: “οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως.”

⁹¹ Fitzmyer 2020: 1332.

⁹² 1.2.23: καταβάς δὲ διὰ τούτου τοῦ πεδίου ἤλασε σταθμούς τέτταρας παρασάγγας πέντε καὶ εἴκοσιν εἰς Ταρσοῦς, τῆς Κιλικίας πόλιν μεγάλην καὶ εὐδαίμονα, οὗ ἦν τὰ Συενέσιος βασιλεία τοῦ Κιλικίων βασιλέως· (After descending he went through this plain in four stages, twenty five parasangs to Tarsus of Cilicia, a great and blessed city, where the palace of Synnesius, king of the Cilicians, was.)

⁹³ Bruce 1977: 33.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ *Geography* 14.5.13: τοσαύτη δὲ τοῖς ἐνθάδε ἀνθρώποις σπουδὴ πρὸς τε φιλοσοφίαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην παιδείαν ἐγκύκλιον ἅπασαν γέγονεν ὥσθ' ὑπερβέβληνται καὶ Ἀθήνας καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ εἴ τινα ἄλλον τόπον δυνατὸν εἰπεῖν, ἐν ᾧ σχολαὶ καὶ διατριβαὶ φιλοσόφων γέγονασι. (The citizens of this city apply themselves to philosophy and the whole encyclopaedia of learning so whole-heartedly that they surpass Athens and Alexandria and every other place that can be named, where there are schools and lectures about philosophy.)

⁹⁶ Fitzmyer 2020: 1333.

⁹⁷ Pliny the Younger, *LXXXIII to Sura*. Bruce 1977: 34.

⁹⁸ Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 1433.

⁹⁹ 2007: 658.

¹⁰⁰ Carson, Moo 2005: 355.

help explain how Paul came to be a Roman citizen, and why he could claim to be one by birth.¹⁰¹ This privilege came about because of the decree of Mark Antony, as a result of the city's status as the capital of the region. As Fitzmyer says, "freedom, immunity and citizenship were granted to the town by Mark Antony, and Augustus confirmed these rights."¹⁰²

This, however, only half explains how Paul, a Jewish man, came to enjoy Roman citizenship, which was typically only conferred on "freeborn natives of Rome."¹⁰³ Ultimately, Paul's Roman citizenship is a mysterious part of the Lukan account. Paul never mentions it himself, and other parts of his personal history make it hard to see how the title of citizenship would have come to him. For example, being as proudly Jewish as he portrays himself, it is difficult to imagine him coming from a family who would have cooperated with Rome to the degree where citizenship was an appropriate reward.¹⁰⁴ There have been proposed solutions, such as the suggestion that one of Paul's ancestors could have been part of a "firm of tent-makers" who would have been "very useful to a fighting proconsul."¹⁰⁵ While by no means impossible, this suggestion has no evidence to support it. This leaves us with three options concerning Luke's claim that Paul was a Roman citizen. It is possible that Luke recorded some fact that is otherwise unattested, and of which Paul himself had no reason to speak. It is possible that Luke created Paul's Roman citizenship as a device to illustrate that Paul and the Christianity he preached were of no threat to the Roman Empire. And finally, Luke might have simply been wrong about Paul's status as a citizen. Of these three, the first is the one I take to be the most likely. If, as I have argued, the author of Acts travelled with Paul, then it seems likely that he would have known that he was a citizen, and possibly even had occasion to see Paul enjoy the benefits of his citizenship. And, if Paul fails to mention this detail about himself, it is because none of his letters demanded such a disclosure to make its point. So, although Paul's Roman citizenship is shrouded in mystery, it can still be accepted as a credible part of his history.

But while Acts is clear about where Paul was born, it has less to say about when he was

¹⁰¹ Acts 22:27-28 describes a conversation between Paul and a Roman centurion: προσελθὼν δὲ ὁ χιλιάρχος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Λέγε μοι, σὺ Ῥωμαῖος εἶ; ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Ναί. ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ χιλιάρχος· Ἐγὼ πολλοῦ κεφαλαίου τὴν πολιτείαν ταύτην ἔκτησάμην. ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἔφη· Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γεγέννημαι. (The commander came to Paul and said to him, 'Tell me, are you a Roman citizen?' Paul replied, 'Yes'. The centurion said, 'I paid a lot of money for this citizenship.' And Paul said, 'I was born a citizen'.)

¹⁰² Fitzmyer 2020: 1333. This is not, however, to suggest that it is only individuals born *in Rome* that get citizenship. For a fuller discussion, see Berthelot, Price 2019: 83.

¹⁰³ Bruce 1977: 37.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

born. In fact, this is a particularly challenging issue. In Philemon, Paul calls himself an “old man” at the time of his writing the letter.¹⁰⁶ This means that he was probably around 50 years old.¹⁰⁷ This does not give us much help, and scholars have consigned themselves to a certain amount of uncertainty on the matter, with Wright saying: “[the] best guess has him a little younger than Jesus of Nazareth; a birth date in the first decade of what we now call the first century is as good as we can get.”¹⁰⁸

The next section of the speech provides the scholar of Paul’s life two major problems. The first is whether Paul grew up in Jerusalem. Firstly, this section has two different options for translation,¹⁰⁹ depending on punctuation, each of which results in a different interpretation.¹¹⁰ Some would make the translation, “I was born in Tarsus of Cilicia, but brought up in this city. I studied under Gamaliel and was thoroughly trained...,”¹¹¹ while others would translate it as “I was born in Tarsus of Cilicia, but brought up in this city, educated at the feet of Gamaliel...”¹¹² The difference is essentially whether “this city” Paul speaks about being raised in is Jerusalem or Tarsus. As Carson and Moo explain, by putting a full stop where they do, the translators of the New International Version imply that Paul’s raising and his education by Gamaliel are two different stages, both of which take place in Jerusalem.¹¹³ The punctuation of the other translations “requires that ‘brought up’ refers to Paul’s rabbinic education, a process that would have begun in his early teens.”¹¹⁴ Although both are grammatically feasible the word ἀνατεθραμμένος usually refers to being raised since childhood.¹¹⁵ The δέ also suggests a strong contrast between Paul’s being born in Tarsus, and then his being raised somewhere else, in this case, Jerusalem. Given these two factors, it is more likely that the passage means that Paul “lived in Jerusalem at least from around the age of seven until he was about sixteen – the years when boys were educated.”¹¹⁶

The second problem is the credibility of this claim. There is no denying that he was a Jew. The words Luke gives him in this speech to the Jews in the temple identify him as a

¹⁰⁶ Philemon 9.

¹⁰⁷ Fitzmyer 2020: 1332.

¹⁰⁸ 2018: 34.

¹⁰⁹ Acts 22:3 reads: Ἐγώ εἰμι ἀνὴρ Ἰουδαῖος, γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας, ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ.

¹¹⁰ Carson, Moo 2005: 356.

¹¹¹ New International Version.

¹¹² English Standard Version, New American Standard Bible, Christian Standard Bible.

¹¹³ Carson, Moo 2005: 356.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁵ Sanders 2015: 18. BDAG s.v. ἀνατρέφω, 1-2.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

“Jewish man.”¹¹⁷ This is something that Paul himself repeatedly affirms in his letters. For example, in Romans 9:3-4, where he calls the Jews his brothers and countrymen, and shows his affinity to them by wishing that he could be cut off from Christ if it would mean they come to him.¹¹⁸ Likewise, in Philippians 3, Paul gives his Jewish credentials, calling himself a Hebrew of Hebrews, born into the tribe of Benjamin.¹¹⁹ In fact, he was so invested in his Judaism that he claims to have become a member of one of its most rigorous sects, the Pharisees. Acts alludes to this when Paul is reported to say that he studied under Gamaliel,¹²⁰ who was one of the leading Pharisees of his day.¹²¹ Paul himself confirms this status as a Pharisee in Philippians 3:5.¹²²

The problem with this is that, although both Acts and epistles say that Paul was a Pharisee, scholars such as EP Sanders have begun to doubt that Paul ever was one. He is very insistent on this point, arguing that “[to] understand Paul we must see that he was a Diaspora Jew and that he was not a Pharisaic scholar.”¹²³ He does not deny that Paul would have shared some ideas with Pharisees, since they both subscribed to Judaism,¹²⁴ but he does deny that the evidence of Paul’s letters leads us to believe that he was a Pharisee. The particular point that counts against Paul’s being a Pharisee, in Sanders’ view, is his lack of willingness or ability to apply the religious teaching that he gives in his letters precisely to the everyday lives of the people around him.¹²⁵ This, according to him, is the key hallmark of the Palestinian Pharisees of Paul’s day. In response to the passages that are quoted above, he says that the three key phrases are that Paul was a “Hebrew of Hebrews,” a “Pharisee” and “Traditions of the ancestors.”¹²⁶ And he argues that while Paul was happy to position himself as a Pharisee, and may have been similar to the Pharisees in many ways, the fact that Paul’s letters lack any

¹¹⁷ Acts 22:3: Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἀνὴρ Ἰουδαῖος.

¹¹⁸ ἠυχόμεν γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα, οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται.... (For I wish that I myself could be cut off from Christ for the sake of my brothers and my kin, who are the Israelites...)

¹¹⁹ 3:4-5: καίπερ ἐγὼ ἔχων πεποιθήσιν καὶ ἐν σαρκί. Εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἄλλος πεποιθέναι ἐν σαρκί, ἐγὼ μᾶλλον· περιτομῆ ὀκταήμερος, ἐκ γένους Ἰσραὴλ, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν, Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων... (Though I have reasons for confidence in flesh. For if anybody thinks they have confidence in the flesh, I have more. Circumcised on the eighth day, from the nation of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews...)

¹²⁰ 22:3: παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιήλ, πεπαιδευμένος κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν τοῦ πατρῶου νόμου. (I was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel and was thoroughly trained in the law of our ancestors.)

¹²¹ Wright 1992: 194.

¹²² κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος [I was] (a Pharisee with respect to the law.)

¹²³ Sanders 2015: 22.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*: 53.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*

¹²⁶ Sanders 2015: 24.

uniquely Pharisaic ideas mean that “readers may remain agnostic as to whether or not Paul received a Pharisaic education.”¹²⁷ As for Paul’s education, Sanders argues that it was a more traditional education given to a Diaspora Jew.¹²⁸ This either meant that he studied “the Septuagint, possibly along with some of the other great works of Greek authors,” or else possibly went to a normal Greek school.¹²⁹ Given the fact that Paul, despite ample opportunity, quotes the Old Testament rather than Greek thought that would be relevant to his point, such as in 2 Corinthians 4:18,¹³⁰ it seems more likely, according to Sanders, that Paul went to a school that focussed on the Jewish Scriptures.¹³¹

Is Sanders right in his conjecture that Paul was not a Pharisee, but instead received a typical Diaspora education? It seems unlikely. Firstly, despite his assertion that “the primary source for Paul must be his own letters,”¹³² his thesis requires discounting Paul’s explicit testimony regarding himself. And while Sanders has provided arguments as to why the terms Paul uses to describe himself as a Pharisee mean something other than what we attribute to them, these are not strong enough to lift the burden of proof that he faces. The more likely reading of Paul’s own statements about himself is that he is claiming to be a member of the sect called Pharisee. Likewise, in his explanation of what it means to be a Pharisee, Sanders focuses on the role of the Pharisees in providing precision to Jewish practice, something that Paul, according to him, fails to do. This is his key marker that leads him to doubt Paul’s role as a Pharisee. While the Pharisees do seem to have an extreme focus on ritual purity, as a means of coping with Gentile oppression,¹³³ this does not seem to be sufficient ground for discounting Paul’s own claim for being a Pharisee. Indeed, any attempt to find what marked the Pharisees out as unique is going to be problematic because of the difficulty we have with sources for their faith and practice. The sources for Pharisaism are Josephus, the New Testament writings, the later Rabbinical writings and the Qumran scrolls.¹³⁴ All of these have their problems.¹³⁵ Given this, for Sanders to go against the explicit testimony of Paul on the basis of shaky sources seems

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*: 53.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*: 71.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ μη σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα, τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα πρόσκαιρα, τὰ δὲ μὴ βλεπόμενα αἰώνια. (So we fix our eyes not on what is seen, but what is unseen. For what is seen is temporary, but what is unseen is eternal.)

¹³¹ 2015: 72.

¹³² Sanders 2015: 56.

¹³³ Wright 1992: 189.

¹³⁴ Wright 1992: 182.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

unwise.¹³⁶ As a result, it seems better to trust Paul's own words. After all, even if Sanders is right, Paul's whole Christian experience was in part a break from the traditions in which he had grown up. In his growing acceptance of the Gentiles into the people of God, it seems reasonable to assume that one of the things that Paul would be willing to jettison from his Pharisaic upbringing would be the need to define precise ways of living. In order to accommodate those to whom he felt called, it is fair to assume that he found himself prepared to focus less on ritual precision.¹³⁷

This status as a Pharisee helps lend clarity to the next few statements that Paul is recorded as making in Acts 22. At the end of verse 3 he tells the watching crowd that he was "as zealous for God as any of you are today."¹³⁸ This term (ζηλωτής) has a connection to the Old Testament story, which describes God as saving for himself a group of people, Israel, but that group of people went astray and were punished by God as a result.¹³⁹ This was the problem Israel had faced throughout its history, and it was how those of Paul's persuasion understood the situation Israel was in at his time. Zeal, then, was the proper reaction to this waywardness. It was exemplified by the stories of Phineas¹⁴⁰ and Elijah,¹⁴¹ and can be defined as a "firm resolve and forceful resistance against anyone who in any way acts to compromise Israel's relationship with God."¹⁴² For Paul to be depicted as describing himself this way gives us rare insight into both the kind of Judaism he followed and also his relationship with his teacher. Gamaliel was one of the great rabbis of his period, and followed in the school of Hillel, who was himself an earlier rabbi. Hillel advocated for an open approach to outsiders, or those who would follow Judaism differently to the traditional way.¹⁴³ This is why we see Gamaliel characterised the way he is in Acts 5:34-39. For Paul to be described as zealous by Luke, then,

¹³⁶ As an example, in his comments on the Pharisees in *War* 2.162-3 and *Ant.* 13.172 and 18.12-15, Josephus describes the Pharisees as operating more like a Greek philosophical school than a Jewish religious group. This suggests, at the very least, that such a description of the Pharisees has been moulded to suit the foreign hegemony to which Josephus was writing. While not totally eliminating his credibility, this does mean that any reading of Josephus' account of the Pharisees must be undertaken carefully, and cannot be taken as normative. Such an approach must be taken with all the sources, meaning that we cannot say anything too decisive regarding the Pharisees.

¹³⁷ An alternative view is presented by Mason 2016. Space forbids a fuller discussion of his perspective, but suffice it to say that I favour Wright's view over Mason's, and continue to think that his understanding of Paul as a Shammai Pharisee makes the best sense of the historical Data.

¹³⁸ ζηλωτής υπάρχων τοῦ θεοῦ καθὼς πάντες ὑμεῖς ἐστε σήμερον.

¹³⁹ Wright 2018: 29.

¹⁴⁰ Numbers 25.

¹⁴¹ 1 Kings 18.

¹⁴² Capes, Reeves, Richards 2007: 57.

¹⁴³ Josephus *Antiquities* 17.41; 13.297; 13.172; 18.12-15 and *Jewish War* 1.110; 2.162-3. Cf. Wright 2018: 35.

shows that while he may have received much of his instruction from Gamaliel, he may well have ended up in a rival school following the teaching of a rabbi called Shammai, who said that aberrant ways of practising Judaism were the reason why God was delaying the deliverance of his people, and thus needed to be stamped out.¹⁴⁴

The fact that Paul attached himself to this way of teaching also helps to explain Acts 22:4, where he is recorded as explaining that he manifested his zeal for God and traditional Judaism by “persecuting the followers of the way to death.”¹⁴⁵ This makes sense. From the perspective of Paul’s religious zeal, this new sect of Judaism claiming that God had acted through this man Jesus of Nazareth and raised him from the dead, was impugning the traditional practices of Israel. So of course, following the examples of Phineas and Elijah, it was his duty to stamp them out.¹⁴⁶ In his letters, we see that Paul’s former life as a persecutor of the church is both an enormous part of his identity, as well as a source of great pain for him.¹⁴⁷ And yet it was exactly this part of his former life that would bring him to his most decisive moment, one which would change his course forever.

The Christophany

That decisive moment was the Christophany, which is another name for what happened to Paul on his journey to Damascus. This is possibly the most important moment in Paul’s life, shown by the fact that it is mentioned three times in the book of Acts,¹⁴⁸ and many times by Paul himself throughout his letters.¹⁴⁹ So significant is this moment, and the man to whom it happened, that it has even become an expression in common parlance. In this section I am going to briefly look at what happened to Paul on the Damascus Road.

The actual events of the Christophany are straightforward, and although some differences in the three accounts from Acts do cause confusion, they are easily explained. According to the author of Acts, Paul is commissioned by the Jewish leaders to travel to Damascus so that he can put an end to the church movement that has sprung up there,¹⁵⁰ but

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁵ ὅς ταύτην τὴν ὁδὸν ἐδίωξα ἄχρι θανάτου, δεσμεύων καὶ παραδιδούς εἰς φυλακὰς ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας. (I persecuted the followers of this way to death, arresting and throwing in prison both men and women.)

¹⁴⁶ Wright 2018: 38.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. 1 Cor 15:9; Gal 1:13; Phil 3:6.

¹⁴⁸ Acts 9, 22 and 26.

¹⁴⁹ Galatians 1:11-16; Philippians 3:4-9; 1 Corinthians 9:1; 1 Corinthians 15:9-9.

¹⁵⁰ Acts 9:1-2: Ὁ δὲ Σαῦλος ἔτι ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνου εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς τοῦ κυρίου, προσελθὼν τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ ἠτήσατο παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολὰς εἰς Δαμασκὸν πρὸς τὰς συναγωγὰς, ὅπως ἐάν τις εὕρη τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας, ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας, δεδεμένους ἀγάγη εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ. (Saul, still breathing out threats of murder against the disciples of the Lord, went to the High Priest and asked for letters to send to the Synagogues in

on his way there he has “a light from heaven [flashing] around him” and he hears the voice of Jesus calling out to him.¹⁵¹ It is at this point that we have our first controversy. In Acts 9, it is recorded that the people around Paul “heard a voice but could not see anyone,”¹⁵² but in Acts 22:9 Paul says that his companions “saw the light but did not hear the voice speaking to [him].”¹⁵³ During this time, Paul hears the voice of Jesus calling to him, is struck blind, and led to Damascus.

On the face of it, there seem to be a few blatant contradictions in the accounts. The first has to do with what actually happened with the light. Did the men see a light or not? Did they hear a voice or not? It is, however, worth noting that while the accounts differ with respect to this detail, these details are not mutually exclusive. It is entirely possible for Paul’s companions to have seen a light, but nothing that was recognisably a person within that light. Similarly, we may take the verb ‘hear’ in each of these verses slightly differently.¹⁵⁴ It may well be that what Luke was saying was that while the companions heard the sound of Jesus’ voice, they were unable to acknowledge it as a voice because they did not understand it. When read this way, we see that these details actually cohere to provide the central message, which is that Paul had an experience that he understood as the risen Christ speaking to him, and that revelation at that moment was unique to him, and which his travelling companions experienced to a far smaller degree.¹⁵⁵

In the midst of this light, according to the author of Acts, Paul hears the voice of Jesus speaking to him. What Jesus says to him is the second source of controversy. In Acts 9 he simply tells Paul that he must go into Damascus and await further instruction.¹⁵⁶ In Acts 26 however, Paul includes his commission to preach to the Gentiles as a part of Jesus’ initial

Damascus, so that if he might find some members of the way there, men or women, and might bring them as prisoners to Jerusalem.) Cf. Acts 22:5; 26:12 for the other two accounts of the Christophany in Acts.

¹⁵¹ Acts 9:3-4: ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐγγίζειν τῇ Δαμασκῷ, ἐξαίφνης τε αὐτὸν περιήστραψεν φῶς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἤκουσεν φωνὴν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ Σαοὺλ Σαοὺλ, τί με διώκεις;

¹⁵² 9:7: οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ εἰστήκεισαν ἐνεοί, ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες. (The men travelling with him stood speechless, for they heard a voice but could not see anybody.)

¹⁵³ οἱ δὲ σὺν ἐμοὶ ὄντες τὸ μὲν φῶς ἐθεάσαντο τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι. (Those who were with me saw a light but they did not hear the voice speaking to me.)

¹⁵⁴ BDAG s.v. ἀκούω 1; 3.

¹⁵⁵ Bock 2007: 351.

¹⁵⁶ Acts 9:4-6: καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἤκουσεν φωνὴν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ Σαοὺλ Σαοὺλ, τί με διώκεις; εἶπεν δέ· Τίς εἶ, κύριε; ὁ δέ· Ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὃν σὺ διώκεις· ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι καὶ εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ λαληθήσεται σοι ὃ τί σε δεῖ ποιεῖν. (And falling to the ground he heard a voice saying to him “Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?” and he said “Who are you, Lord?” and he replied “I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting. But stand up and go into the city, and I will tell you what you must do.”)

statement to him.¹⁵⁷ The difficulty dissolves, however, when we consider that Paul's commission does form part of the initial Christophany account, but it is spoken to Ananias, rather than Paul.¹⁵⁸ This suggests that the account in Acts 9 has been streamlined by Luke removing the commission directly to Paul and giving it to Ananias.¹⁵⁹ This event, coming straight after the conversion of Cornelius in Acts 10, emphasises the fact that "the foremost Gentile missionary and the first Gentile convert can stand side by side at the pivotal centre of his composition."¹⁶⁰

In the same way, because Acts 26 is given in the context of a defence, it is likely that Paul gave a fuller account of what happened to him "for dramatic effect and [to] give details held back until [this point in the story]."¹⁶¹ It is also worth noting that in the two speech versions, the role of Ananias diminishes until he eventually fades from view altogether.¹⁶² This is probably a literary adaptation,¹⁶³ which strengthens Paul's position in his defence before Agrippa. He is no longer the man who was led blindly away from the site and restored by another. Instead, he is the commissioned servant, whose proclamation from his Lord is thus worth taking seriously. Similar claims can be made for the other differences. They can fairly be described as "literary variations, such as regularly accompany Lucan repetitions."¹⁶⁴

After this, as I said above, Paul is taken into Damascus, where he meets with a Christian called Ananias who restores his sight.¹⁶⁵ After this, as I will discuss below, the chronology becomes tougher to follow. But there is no escaping the fact that, from this moment, Paul's life was changed inexorably. As Paul himself records in Galatians, he had gone from a persecutor of the church to one who was dedicated to watching it grow.¹⁶⁶

¹⁵⁷ Acts 26:16-18: ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι καὶ στῆθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὤφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρετήν καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδές με ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι, ἐξαιρούμενός σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν, εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε ἀνοίξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκοτόους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κληρὸν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ. (But get up and stand on your feet. I have appeared for this reason: to appoint you as a servant and a witness of what you have seen and will see of me. I will rescue you from your people and the Gentiles, to whom I am sending you, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light and from the authority of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and a place among those made holy by faith in me.)

¹⁵⁸ Acts 9:15-16.

¹⁵⁹ Bock 2007: 351.

¹⁶⁰ Dillon 2020: 744.

¹⁶¹ Bock 2007: 717.

¹⁶² Dillon 2020: 743.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*: 744.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁵ Acts 9:10-19.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Galatians 1:11-16 where Paul speaks directly about his previous role as a persecutor of the church.

The Early Christian Years

Acts 13 records the beginning of Paul's missionary work, as he works and builds a base in Antioch, but as Carson and Moo point out, this "must have been about twelve or thirteen years after his conversion."¹⁶⁷ This is one of the areas of Paul's life that is the hardest to have any certainty about, but nevertheless, with the help of Galatians 1-2 and Acts 9-11, we can make some headway into understanding what Paul was doing.

In Galatians 1:10-2:10, Paul needs to defend his gospel against a series of accusations from people in the Galatian church who said that it was a gospel he had inherited from people, and that it was in contrast to what the heads of the church in Jerusalem were teaching.¹⁶⁸ Part of Paul's answer to this is to give a brief but useful account of his life before his missionary journey.

In Galatians 1:17, he explains that after he had stayed with the believers in Damascus for a bit, he left them to go into Arabia.¹⁶⁹ The question of what Paul was doing in Arabia is one that has vexed scholars for a while. Some have suggested that he was in Arabia preaching the gospel, and point to the difficulties he had with Aretas, king of Nabataea, as evidence that he was involved in preaching during this time.¹⁷⁰ Others argue that this was a time of retreat and reflection for Paul, a time when he considered what he had seen at the Christophany and tried to relate what he knew about the Jewish Scriptures and about how zeal worked with what he had just seen in the Christophany.¹⁷¹ I sympathise with the latter understanding for two reasons. Firstly, as Wright argues, there are many verbal parallels with the other stories of prophets being called in the Old Testament, especially with the account of Elijah in 1 Kings 18-19.¹⁷² If these parallels are accepted as being accurate, it lends a good unity to the whole account of Paul's travels. He started out with a zeal for the traditions of his fathers which led him to persecute anybody who went against them, and he now found out that his zeal needed to be used differently, and so, like his great forebear, he went to Sinai.¹⁷³ This would fit well

¹⁶⁷ 2005: 364.

¹⁶⁸ Moo 2021: 56.

¹⁶⁹ οὐδὲ ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους, ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβίαν, καὶ πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν. (I did not go up to Jerusalem, to those who were apostles before me, but I went to Arabia, and after that returned to Damascus.)

¹⁷⁰ Carson, Moo 2005: 363. Cf. 2 Corinthians 11:32 for Paul's reference to King Aretas of Nabataea.

¹⁷¹ Wright 2018: 63.

¹⁷² 2018: 64.

¹⁷³ Sanders argues that Paul did not actually go to Mount Sinai, citing difficulty of travel and the dubiousness of the idea that Paul worked out a complete theology prior to his ministry (2015: 89-90). The journey is tough, but not unmanageable, especially for somebody as motivated as Paul would have been given the life-changing nature of what he had just experienced. Likewise, Sander's argument that Paul lacked a developed theology is

with the purpose of Acts, which, as I argued above, was to help the new Christian movement with its self-understanding. Secondly, there is the issue of aligning this passage with Acts 9. After this, Acts 9 records that Paul immediately went about preaching the gospel in the city of Damascus, and then when he experienced life threatening danger, he escaped.¹⁷⁴ This seemingly leaves no space for Galatians 1:17, with its trip to Arabia. One, somewhat plausible, solution is that the author of Acts ignored the visit to Arabia because he was intent on writing a focussed treatise on helping Christians understand their nascent faith and how the church they have joined grew, not a biography of Paul. Thus, although he may well have known about the visit, but, because it was not germane to his current topic, he ignored it.¹⁷⁵ If this is the case, then it is hard to see how he could have ignored this period of Paul's life if he was busily preaching the gospel. So, for these reasons, I think it is best to take this period of time as a time of reflection, and of Paul seeking to understand all of his old preconceptions in light of the new revelation he had just experienced.

After this, Paul returns to Damascus and begins to preach, but his preaching stirs up trouble amongst the Jews, who try to kill him. Thanks to some quick thinking on the part of his friends, he is able to escape in a basket.¹⁷⁶ After this, he goes to Jerusalem. The time from his conversion to his first journey to Jerusalem would have been about three years, from c.AD 33-36.¹⁷⁷ The time that Paul spends in Jerusalem is short. Galatians 1:18 tells us that he was only

overstating both the case of the people against whom he is arguing and his own case. Clearly, during his time in Arabia, Paul would have spent time reflecting on what had happened to him as he tried to accommodate his new understanding to his old worldview. Furthermore, nobody holds that Paul left Arabia with a complete systematic version of what would become his theology. Rather, it seems that he had the major elements nailed down, with room for refinement if it was needed.

¹⁷⁴ Acts 9:20-25.

¹⁷⁵ Bock 2007: 363.

¹⁷⁶ Acts 9:23-25: Ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦντο ἡμέραι ἰκαναί, συνεβουλεύσαντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν· ἐγνώσθη δὲ τῷ Σαύλῳ ἡ ἐπιβουλὴ αὐτῶν. παρετηροῦντο δὲ καὶ τὰς πύλας ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτὸς ὅπως αὐτόν ἀνέλωσιν· λαβόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ νυκτὸς διὰ τοῦ τείχους καθῆκαν αὐτόν χαλάσαντες ἐν σφυρίδι. (When many days had passed, the Jews plotted to kill him. Their plan was known to Saul. They watched the gates day and night in order to do away with him. So his disciples took him by night and let him down through an opening in the wall, lowering him in a basket.)

¹⁷⁷ Wright 2018: 66. In terms of dating, both Wright and Carson and Moo are close together. The reasoning for the dates given starts with Paul's trial before Gallio in Corinth, which can confidently be dated to AD 49. From this, we can work backwards to start dating other events. Another date that has bearing on the system is the date of Jesus' crucifixion, which happened either in AD 30 or 33. This ambiguity leaves open the dates for Paul's conversion to be somewhere between AD 32-35 (Carson, Moo 2005: 367-369). It must be stressed, however, that dating the events in Paul's life is incredibly difficult, and so I accept Sanders' humility when he says that "there are too many uncertainties, and one has to make too many suppositions in order to offer a more or less workable chronology" (2015: 157).

there fifteen days.¹⁷⁸ Wright suggests that it was so short because Paul's preaching would have made an already wary Jerusalem church nervous about what kind of negative attention he might draw from the authorities,¹⁷⁹ but it is impossible to know. All we can say for sure is that after this brief period in Jerusalem, Paul returns to Tarsus.¹⁸⁰

After this, there is about a ten-year period of silence. Paul lives in Tarsus from AD 36-46,¹⁸¹ but we can know very little about what he did there. Drawing from Paul's letters, NT Wright suggests there are two things we can be sure he was doing at this time. The first is that he was probably earning a living doing his family trade, which was tent-making.¹⁸² The second was that he was continuing his theological reflection and prayer.¹⁸³ Whether these are accurate or not, it is difficult to say. They seem so mundane that they can hardly be false, but positive verification of either seems impossible. Whatever the case, in about AD 46, Paul would begin his mission which would, in a very real sense, change the world.

The Missionary Journeys

The years between Paul's quiet decade in Tarsus and his imprisonments were a flurry of activity. Since most of this is narrated reasonably fully in Acts, I will not describe these next sections in as much detail.

The first thing it seems that Paul does, as he tells us in Galatians 2:1, is travel to Jerusalem.¹⁸⁴ Scholars have long debated whether this trip to Jerusalem corresponds better with Paul's relief trip narrated in Acts 11:27-30,¹⁸⁵ or else the trip to the Jerusalem council in Acts 15. With the help of three subtle pieces of evidence, Blomberg argues that this trip is better understood as Paul's version of Acts 11. The first reason is that Paul says that he went down

¹⁷⁸ "Ἐπειτα μετὰ ἔτη τρία ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἰστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν, καὶ ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε. (Then, after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to inquire after Cephas, and I stayed with him fifteen days.)

¹⁷⁹ Wright 2018: 67.

¹⁸⁰ Galatians 1:21: ἔπειτα ἦλθον εἰς τὰ κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας" (then I went to Syria and Cilicia.)

¹⁸¹ Wright 2018: 67.

¹⁸² Ibid. Cf 2 Thessalonians 3:6-10. Here Paul talks about his trade as a tentmaker.

¹⁸³ Wright 2018: 76. Cf. 2 Corinthians 12:1-10, where Paul recounts a mystical experience he had while praying.

¹⁸⁴ "Ἐπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα μετὰ Βαρναβᾶ συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον. (Then after fourteen years I went again to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus.)

¹⁸⁵ Ἐν ταύταις δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις κατήλθον ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων προφῆται εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν· ἀναστὰς δὲ εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν ὀνόματι Ἄγαβος ἐσήμανεν διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος λιμὸν μεγάλην μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην· ἥτις ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου. τῶν δὲ μαθητῶν καθὼς εὐπορεῖτο τις ὥρισαν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν εἰς διακονίαν πέμψαι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς· ὃ καὶ ἐποίησαν ἀποστείλαντες πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους διὰ χειρὸς Βαρναβᾶ καὶ Σαύλου. (In those days prophets from Jerusalem went down to Antioch. And one of them, Agabus by name, stood up and said there would be a severe famine throughout the world. This was in the time of Claudius. Each of the disciples, according to his means, decided to send support to those brothers in Jerusalem. They did this, sending the gift to the elders by Barnabas and Paul.)

to Jerusalem in response to revelation,¹⁸⁶ which corresponds well with Acts 11, where Paul goes to Jerusalem after a prophet named Agabus gives a prophecy of a great famine.¹⁸⁷ The second reason is that in Galatians 2:10, Paul is encouraged by the elders to remember the poor. This fits perfectly with the context of the famine relief trip of Acts 11, but does not make sense if they were there to discuss the nature of the message they were preaching.¹⁸⁸ The final, and possibly strongest, piece of evidence suggesting that Galatians 2 corresponds to Acts 11 is the short story Paul tells in Galatians 2:11-14.¹⁸⁹ Here Paul tells of how he was forced to resist Peter (Cephas) because he refused to eat with the Gentiles, being intimidated by some people who had come from James, the leader of the church in Jerusalem. Such a reaction makes the best sense if we assume that the question of the applicability of Jewish law to Gentile converts had not yet been settled in an official capacity, which would seem to militate against these events taking place after the Jerusalem Council of Acts 15, and hint instead to its being after the relief visit in Acts 11. If, as Galatians 2 seems to suggest, the conversations between Paul and the leaders in Jerusalem were carried out in a private capacity, the fact that Peter reacts the way he does makes sense. Or, as Blomberg put it, “[it] is far easier to imagine all the Jewish Christians in Antioch capitulating under pressure of some they believed represented James if only informal conversations and ‘gentleman’s agreements’ had been previously reached.”¹⁹⁰ In this case, a gentleman’s agreement refers to an informal agreement reached between Paul and the Jerusalem church about his theology of Gentile inclusion. So, for these three reasons, it seems best to conclude that both Galatians and Acts begin Paul’s active years by describing his journey to Jerusalem to help provide relief in the face of a particularly bad famine. This can be dated to around AD 47.¹⁹¹

After this, Paul and Barnabas seem to have returned to Antioch, where they are called

¹⁸⁶ Galatians 2:2.

¹⁸⁷ Blomberg 2016: loc 4774.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁹ “Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν· πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθην· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον, ὑπέστειλλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν, φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς· καὶ συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, ὥστε καὶ Βαρναβᾶς συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει· ἀλλ’ ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾶ ἔμπροσθεν πάντων· Εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαῖζειν;” (Then Cephas came to Antioch, and I resisted him to his face, because he stood condemned. For before some men came from James, he ate with the Gentiles. But when they came, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing the circumcision party. And the rest of the Jews joined him in his hypocrisy. Even Barnabas was carried away in his hypocrisy. But when I saw that they were not walking in line with the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before all, “If you, being a Jew, live like a Gentile and not a Jew, how can you compel a Gentile to live like a Jew?”)

¹⁹⁰ 2016: loc 4827.

¹⁹¹ Tacitus *Annals* 12.43. cf. Blomberg 2016: loc 4868.

about a year later to go out to other locations and preach.¹⁹² This is the beginning of what is commonly called Paul's first missionary journey. In the book of Acts, it runs from 13:4 until 14:26, and covers Paul's journey through Galatia, particularly to Cyprus, Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe.¹⁹³ The best estimate is that this journey ran for about one and a half years, from AD 46-47 or AD 47-48.¹⁹⁴

After this, Paul and Barnabas seem to have returned for a long stay in Antioch.¹⁹⁵ Then they were called to Jerusalem to take part in what is normally called the Jerusalem council. This was a meeting of the leaders of the churches that had been established to determine how they were to think about Gentiles who had come to faith in Jesus.¹⁹⁶ Paul has a decisive hand in this, by giving his report of what had happened on his missionary journeys among the Gentiles. By the end, the council decide that Gentiles should be allowed to join Christianity with minimal Jewish interference.¹⁹⁷

After this Paul returns to Antioch, before being sent out again. This time, however, before he is to leave, he and Barnabas have a terrible argument about John Mark, and part ways.¹⁹⁸ This Second Missionary Journey, thought to have taken place between AD 48-49 or 51,¹⁹⁹ is recounted in Acts 16-18, and sees Paul travelling through Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens and Corinth, where he finally stays for 18 months.²⁰⁰ At the end of this Paul returns to Antioch, but this time seems to have stayed only very briefly, before going on his third missionary journey.²⁰¹

His Third Missionary Journey was mostly located around Ephesus, where he seems to have stayed for somewhere between two and a half and three years.²⁰² After this time in

¹⁹² Acts 13:1-3; Carson, Moo 2005: 364.

¹⁹³ Carson, Moo 2005: 364.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 369.

¹⁹⁵ Acts 14:26-28: κάκειθεν ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, ὅθεν ἦσαν παραδεδομένοι τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ ἐπλήρωσαν. παραγενόμενοι δὲ καὶ συναγαγόντες τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀνήγγελλον ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξεν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν θύραν πίστεως. διέτριβον δὲ χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς. (From Attalia they sailed to Antioch, where they were given over to the grace of God for the work they had fulfilled. When they arrived there, they gathered all the church and reported what God had done with them and that he had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles. And they stayed long with the disciples.)

¹⁹⁶ Carson, Moo 2005: 365.

¹⁹⁷ Acts 15:13-21.

¹⁹⁸ Acts 15:36-41.

¹⁹⁹ Carson, Moo 2005: 369.

²⁰⁰ Acts 18:11.

²⁰¹ Acts 18:19.

²⁰² Carson, Moo 2005: 365.

Ephesus he travels through Macedonia.²⁰³ He then also probably stays in Corinth²⁰⁴ before returning to Jerusalem for what will prove to be a fateful journey. This seems to have been the longest of his journeys, running from AD 52-57.²⁰⁵

Imprisonments and Death

From before Paul left Ephesus for Jerusalem, he seems to have known that their trip was not likely to go well.²⁰⁶ And yet he goes, and when he arrives in Jerusalem, he is imprisoned for breaching temple laws and starting a riot.²⁰⁷ This imprisonment begins in Jerusalem, where he presents his case to the religious leaders of the time²⁰⁸ before being transferred to Caesarea, where he stays for two years.²⁰⁹ After these two years he is put on a ship to Rome. During the course of his journey, he is caught in a storm and shipwrecked on the island of Malta.²¹⁰ But after that he is able to reach Rome, where he would have arrived in about February AD 60.²¹¹ The book of Acts ends with Paul living under house-arrest in Rome and preaching about Jesus.

This does not seem to have been the end of Paul's life, however. There are early accounts that say that Paul died under Nero's persecution in AD 64-65.²¹² So what was Paul doing between the end of Acts and the time that he died? It is impossible to know for sure. If the Pastoral Epistles²¹³ are genuine, then it seems that Paul did some more ministry in the eastern Roman Empire, but to argue the legitimacy of those documents is beyond the scope of this chapter. It does seem to be that Paul survived beyond the end of the book of Acts, but exactly what took up his time is uncertain.

²⁰³ Acts 20:1; 2 Corinthians 2:12-13.

²⁰⁴ Acts 20:2-3; 2 Corinthians 9:4; Carson, Moo 2005: 365.

²⁰⁵ Carson, Moo 2005: 369.

²⁰⁶ Acts 20:25.

²⁰⁷ Acts 21:27-36.

²⁰⁸ Acts 22:30-23:11.

²⁰⁹ Acts 23:23.

²¹⁰ Acts 27:27-28:10.

²¹¹ Wright 2018: 383.

²¹² Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 2.25.8: Ὡς δὲ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἄμφω καιρὸν ἐμαρτύρησαν, Κορινθίων ἐπίσκοπος Διονύσιος ἐγγράφως Ῥωμαίοις ὁμῶν, ὧδε παρίστησιν ἑαυτὰ καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς τοσαύτης νοουθεσίας τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτεῖαν γενηθεῖσαν Ῥωμαίων τε καὶ Κορινθίων συνεκεράσατε. καὶ γὰρ ἄμφω καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόρινθον φυτεύσαντες ἡμᾶς ὁμοίως ἐδίδαξαν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμόσε διδάξαντες ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν.' καὶ ταῦτα δέ, ὡς ἂν ἔτι μᾶλλον πιστωθεῖη τὰ τῆς ἱστορίας. (And that they both suffered martyrdom at the same time is stated by Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, in his epistle to the Romans, in the following words: You have thus by such an admonition bound together the planting of Peter and of Paul at Rome and Corinth. For both of them planted and likewise taught us in our Corinth. And they taught together in like manner in Italy, and suffered martyrdom at the same time. I have quoted these things in order that the truth of the history might be still more confirmed.)

²¹³ 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus.

Even though this biography of Paul is less comprehensive than it could be, it is nevertheless a useful point from which to venture into a study of the thought of the apostle. Naturally, there are difficulties involved in reconstructing the ideas of any person, but by making an attempt to understand the person's life, context and representation, in keeping with the methodologies of *Sitz im Leben*, we clear important ground on which we can begin to build some understanding of the context that produced the documents we will go on to study.

Chapter Two: The Corpus Considered

Introduction

Any meaningful discussion of the Apostle's thought must begin by examining the sources. Immediately this presents us with a problem. There are thirteen letters in the New Testament which claim to have been written by the Apostle Paul. Of these, seven are widely considered to be Pauline, the so-called undisputed Pauline epistles.²¹⁴ The other six have contested authorship. A few scholars consider them to be authored by Paul, but by far the majority think they were authored by another, using Paul's name either for prestige or to align his thought with the since-deceased leader of the mission to the Gentiles. This dispute in modern scholarship leaves the would-be Pauline scholar with a difficult decision to make: Which letters does one include in a discussion of Paul's thought and which does one exclude as not representing the apostle's thought?

In this section, before we move into a discussion of what Paul's letters say about the soul, I will be arguing that three of the disputed letters, Ephesians, Colossians and 2 Thessalonians, are genuinely Pauline. In order to do this, I will begin by discussing two sets of assumptions. Firstly, I will challenge the relatively common scholarly assumption that pseudepigraphy was not considered morally wrong in Paul's time. Secondly, I will discuss the assumption that Paul himself wrote his letters with his own hand, arguing instead for the extensive use of both co-authorship and an *amanuensis* in the composition of Paul's letters. I will then move on to discuss each of these disputed letters in turn to show that the balance of probability makes it more reasonable to assume Paul authored them than that they are forgeries, and thus that their contents are germane to this discussion.

Ancient Pseudepigraphy

The first assumption I wish to challenge is the belief that pseudepigraphy or writing something

²¹⁴ These are Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians and Philemon.

in the name or tradition of an older member of your sect, was a morally unproblematic practice in the ancient world. Moo, summarising the general tenor of this view, says that “the majority of interpreters think that these details are features of an ancient literary style that the author has adopted. This author is not being deceptive, since he is writing within the conventions of a known and recognized style that would have been recognized by the readers of the letter. The author would be claiming simply to be writing within the authoritative tradition initiated by Paul – and anybody who read the letter would have understood his claim in just this way.”²¹⁵ So this idea is that while Paul had no hand in composing the “Deutero-Pauline” epistles, the audience who were originally engaging with the texts would have been aware of that, and would have had no objection to it, because they would have seen it as simply contributing to the body of “Pauline” thought. Bart Ehrman similarly, though rather more acerbically, says that “It is often said—even by scholars who should know better—that this kind of “pseudonymous” (i.e., falsely named) writing in the ancient world was not thought to be lying and was not meant to be deceitful.”²¹⁶ If this is true, it would provide a way for scholars to reconcile the claim that these documents were not, in fact, authored by Paul himself, with the view that they are still important, authoritative, witness to early Christian tradition. In this section, I will argue that this is not a fair representation of the ancient view on pseudepigraphy, whether Christian or non-Christian, and that as a result, this view should be discarded.

One of the arguments offered in support of the view that pseudepigraphy was a legitimate ancient tradition is the idea that schools of thought would often congregate around a leader and would attribute their ideas to him either out of humility or as a way of crediting their ideas.²¹⁷ A key figure in this argument is Pythagoras. Commentators frequently cite the Pythagorean community as one in which pseudepigraphy was not only present, but also accepted. It is widely accepted that there isn’t much evidence for this, but scholars²¹⁸ do frequently cite Iamblichus’ *Life of Pythagoras*.²¹⁹ Here Iamblichus refers to the practice within

²¹⁵ Moo 2008: 37.

²¹⁶ Ehrman 2011: 9.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.* 129; Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 1233.

²¹⁸ Blomberg 2016: loc 5343; Murphy O’Connor, 1995: 6-36; Carson, Moo, 2005: 339.

²¹⁹ 31.198.3-11: ἴκτων δὲ καὶ δακρύων καὶ πάντων τῶν τοιούτων εἶργεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας, οὔτε δὲ κέρδος οὔτε ἐπιθυμίαν οὔτε ὀργὴν οὔτε φιλοτιμίαν οὔτε ἄλλο οὐδὲν τῶν τοιούτων αἴτιον γίνεσθαι διαφορᾶς, ἀλλὰ πάντα τοὺς Πυθαγορείους οὕτως ἔχειν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ὡς ἂν πατὴρ σπουδαῖος πρὸς τέκνα σχοίη. καλὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ πάντα Πυθαγόρᾳ ἀνατιθέειν τε καὶ ἀπονέμειν καὶ μηδεμίαν περιποιεῖσθαι δόξαν ἰδίαν ἀπὸ τῶν εὕρισκομένων, εἰ μὴ πού τι σπάνιον· πάνυ γὰρ δὴ τινές εἰσιν ὀλίγοι, ὧν ἴδια γνωρίζεται ὑπομνήματα. (But the men shut out all lamentation and tears and the like, letting neither gain nor desire nor anger nor love of honour nor any other such thing become a cause of difference. Rather, all the Pythagoreans have the same attitude toward each other as a diligent father would have toward his children. And they consider it a noble thing to attribute and allot all

Pythagorean communities of writing works and then attributing them to Pythagoras rather than themselves so that they can maintain their humility.

While this quotation does seem to cut in favour of those who would say pseudepigraphy was commonplace, there are some problems with it. Firstly, the text itself deals with the Pythagoreans and those aspects of their community that make it unique. After speaking about how they approach their emotions and sufferings, Iamblichus then goes on to discuss how they practice their own brand of humility with respect to their writings. This makes it a peculiar text to use to speak about ancient pseudepigraphy across the board. The reason, however, that the scholars who support this perspective make use of this particular quotation is because it is very difficult to find another that will support the notion that pseudepigraphy was a widespread practice in the ancient world. In fact, where it is referred to, the vast majority of texts seem to suggest that it was looked down on at best, and actively censured at worst. Herodotus, for example, writes about Onomacritus who was found to have written an oracle pseudepigraphically, and was banished.²²⁰ Attitudes within the early church were very similar, as both Eusebius,²²¹ and Tertullian²²² illustrate when talking about various pieces of writing that were found to be pseudepigraphical and were receiving widespread circulation in the church. Even in the New Testament itself, we find a strong censure against the writing of false epistles in the name of other people.²²³ Indeed, in just about every case, the ancient texts present an attitude that is outright hostile to the practice of pseudepigraphy, especially within Christian circles. This has led Moo to comment that “[the] notion of an innocent, ‘transparent’, literary device of epistolary pseudepigraphy ... appears to be largely a modern scholarly invention”.²²⁴ Ehrman agrees but is somewhat more incendiary in his comments.²²⁵ It is for these reasons that

of their investigations to Pythagoras, claiming none of the honour for themselves— unless perhaps rarely, for there are very few whose writings are known to be their own.)

²²⁰ *Histories* 7.6

²²¹ *Ecclesiastical History* 6.12.16

²²² *On Baptism* 17: “quod si quae Acta Pauli, quae perperam scripta sunt, exemplum Theclae ad licentiam mulierum docendi tinguendique defendant, sciant in Asia presbyterum qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum atque confessum id se amore Pauli fecisse loco decessisse.” (But if certain Acts of Paul, which are falsely so named, claim the example of Thecla for allowing women to teach and to baptize, let men know that in Asia the presbyter who compiled that document, thinking to add of his own to Paul's reputation, was found out, and though he professed he had done it for love of Paul, was deposed from his position.)

²²³ 2 Thessalonians 2:2: “εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦς μηδὲ θροεῖσθαι μήτε διὰ πνεύματος μήτε διὰ λόγου μήτε δι’ ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι’ ἡμῶν, ὡς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου.” (So that you are not easily shaken in your mind nor troubled either by a spirit or a word or through a letter, as if from us, saying that the day of the Lord has come).

²²⁴ Moo 2008: 37.

²²⁵ Ehrman 2011: 121-122: “All of the scholars I have just quoted have three things in common. All of them

I reject the hypothesis that the so-called deuterion-Pauline canon is a collection of harmless and acknowledged fakes. I rather argue that they must either be shown to be fully Pauline, or else are undeserving of their place in the canon. And it is for this reason, then, that I will go on to argue that Paul was the author of Ephesians, Colossians and Second Thessalonians.

Amanuenses and Authorship

One argument that is frequently employed to show that Ephesians, Colossians and 2 Thessalonians aren't original is the fact that they seem to display a very different style to the undisputed Paulines. This claim is not without its own challenges,²²⁶ but even granting it as an initial premise, it still lends no clarity in the question of authorship, because, as I am going to argue, Western conceptions of authorship leave off one crucial aspect of ancient letter writing: the use of the *amanuensis*, or scribe. In this section I am going to argue that Paul did in fact make use of a secretary and that this helps us get some way towards understanding how these letters can have what on the surface looks like a different style, while still coming from the same mind.

That scribes were used in the ancient world is unquestionable. Cicero, writing to Tiro, the scribe with whom he worked when he was recovering from malaria, made sure to illustrate how important the help he provided Cicero was.²²⁷ Likewise, Josephus records making use of a scribe as he was learning his Greek in Rome.²²⁸ Finally, Plutarch records Cato's frustration when the secretary (γραμματεύς) provided to him by Clodius was unskilled and in Clodius' employ.²²⁹ In this source, the use of a secretary is so accepted that his mention is somewhat glossed over. It seems that somebody like Cato would have been expected to make use of a secretary. What was frustrating to him was that he had been given one who was against him.

Of course, these examples are authored by members of the upper and wealthier classes. It seems natural that rich people, with both the need to communicate with others and the funds

maintain that what I'm calling forgery – the claim of an author to be someone other than who he really is – was not a deceptive practice. All of them base their views on statements to that effect by earlier scholars rather than on an examination of the ancient sources; and all of them choose not to provide a single stitch of evidence”.

²²⁶ Cf. Hoehner 2002: 55-60.

²²⁷ *Ad. Fam.* 16.4.3

²²⁸ *Ag. Ap.* 1.50. εἴτα σχολῆς ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ λαβόμενος, πάσης μοι τῆς πραγματείας ἐν παρασκευῇ γεγενημένης χρησάμενός τισι πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοῖς οὕτως ἐποίησάμην τῶν πράξεων τὴν παράδοσιν. (Afterward I got leisure at Rome; and when all my materials were prepared for that work, I made use of some persons to assist me in learning the Greek tongue. And by these means I composed the history of those transactions).

²²⁹ Plutarch *Cato Minor* 34.4. 6-7.

to accommodate the use of a secretary would make use of this facility.²³⁰ Is that to say, however, that all classes of people made use of secretaries? It seems likely that they did.²³¹ As Richards says, “[even] a cursory examination of the papyri reveals a widespread use of secretaries in the business sector ... [many] of these business letters contain the “illiteracy formula”; that is, a concluding sentence that reads, for example, ‘Eumelus, son of Herma, has written for him because he does not know letters.’”²³² The fact that Greco-Roman letters were so stylized, combined with the fact that so many of the people who would have needed to send letters for business, would have made secretaries a valuable commodity in the ancient marketplace. And beyond this, there is some evidence that even lower-class people would have used to send important personal letters too, if the occasion demanded it.²³³

This is relevant to our discussion because, contrary to the common picture of Paul the letter-writer, it is likely that Paul made use of secretaries in the writing of his letters. The common practice was for secretaries to draft a letter, and then for the person who had commissioned it to sign his name on the bottom as a sign of authenticity. Indeed, we actually find references to this process in the letters of Paul. In Galatians 6:11,²³⁴ 1 Corinthians 16:21,²³⁵ and Philemon 19²³⁶ we have Paul authorising a letter with his own handwriting, to show that the letter that is being sent was written by him. In the letter to the Romans, we even have the secretary himself peering out from behind the mask to greet the recipients and tell them his name.²³⁷ Thus, with Richards, the question should be “not whether Paul used a secretary, but how Paul used a secretary.”²³⁸ Of course, how people used their secretaries would have differed dramatically. As Richards describes it, the “the role of the secretary may be described as a

²³⁰ While some scribes may have been slaves, others would appear to have been trained professionals. Of course, these categories are not mutually exclusive, but it does seem that at least some scribes were not slaves. For arguments on this point, see Richards 2004: 91 cf. Hornblower, Spawforth Eidinow 2012: 843-844.

²³¹ Ancient literacy is a complicated topic. For a long time it was presumed that the majority of people were illiterate, but, as Richards claims, “literacy was more common than has been supposed” (2004: 61). He argues this on the basis of papyri found in Egypt that suggest writing was more common than has been supposed.

²³² Richards 2004: 60.

²³³ Cf Richards 2004: 63: “It is clear that the use of a secretary was prevalent among both the upper and lower classes, although perhaps for different reasons. Of course, both classes made widespread—almost exclusive—use of a secretary in the composition of business and official letters. Yet, both class members still used a secretary in the writing of private letters, although at times they would send private letters in their own hand as well.”

²³⁴ Ἴδετε πηλίκους ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα τῆ ἐμῆ χειρὶ. (Look how big the letters are which I am writing to you in my own hand).

²³⁵ Ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῆ ἐμῆ χειρὶ Παύλου. (I, Paul, write this greeting with my own hand).

²³⁶ ἐγὼ Παῦλος ἔγραψα τῆ ἐμῆ χειρὶ, ἐγὼ ἀποτίσω (I, Paul, write with my own hand that I will repay.)

²³⁷ Romans 16:22: ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν κυρίῳ. (I, Tertius, the one writing this letter, greet you in the Lord).

²³⁸ 2004: 81.

spectrum.”²³⁹ He goes on to elaborate that “[at] one extreme the secretary was a transcriber who had no input in the letter, taking strict dictation from the author. At the other extreme the secretary composed the letter for the author.”²⁴⁰ As is usual, however, “[most] letters fell somewhere in between.”²⁴¹ Following Richards, I would contend that this middle space – in other words, the space between the extreme of dictation on the one hand and the extreme of pure secretarial composition on the other - is where the majority of the Pauline letters landed. Rather than saying that all of the letters are Paul’s very words, I think it is more accurate to say that they are Paul’s ideas, expressed by another person in a way that did not cause him to take exception. Indeed, following his in-depth study of the use of secretaries in the ancient world, as well as of the mechanics of letter writing in general, Richards formulates this hypothesis: “Most likely Paul’s secretary fell in that middle area between the extremes of transcriber and composer. Paul (and his team) dictated the letter, compromising between a painfully slow, syllable-by-syllable rate of speech and the rapid rate of normal speech. The secretary, unable to take shorthand, also compromised. Unable to maintain the complete precision of verbatim transcription, the secretary took notes as complete and detailed as he could. He then prepared a rough draft, probably on washable papyrus sheets or stacks of wax tablets. Paul and his team heard the letter read and made corrections and additions. (The way these changes were inserted will be discussed in the next chapter.) The process of editing and revising continued until Paul and his team were completely satisfied, since they, and especially Paul, had ultimate responsibility for every word of the letter.”²⁴²

The reason I bring this up in a discussion of the validity of certain Pauline letters is because I believe this has bearing on the discussion of pseudepigraphical writing in the name of Paul. One of the major reasons given for rejecting the authenticity of certain letters attributed to Paul is that they are written in what seems to be a different style. For example, in Ephesians, the first half of the letter contains many sentences which are longer than those of the average Pauline letter. There are also differences in vocabulary between the contested Paulines and the undisputed Paulines.²⁴³ These differences are the sort we might expect if Paul was giving his general ideas to a secretary – or several secretaries throughout his career – and then allowing them freedom to express those ideas as they wish, certifying them at the end with his own

²³⁹ *Ibid.* 64.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*

²⁴² *Ibid.* 93.

²⁴³ Hoehner cites the use of ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (in the heavenlies) in Ephesians versus the more common οὐρανοί (the heavens) as an example of this (2002: 56).

signature. That these stylistic differences are substantial is, of course, a contested claim. But even if we are prepared to grant it, this theory about secretaries and stylistic difference does not prove that Paul is not the author of a particular letter. So the scribes he used would have been varied, and thus their writing would likely have varied to some degree too. There are, of course, many other arguments for discounting certain letters from the Pauline corpus, and they will be examined in due course below, but this goes some way to removing one of the larger obstacles, which is that of style.²⁴⁴

That is not to say, however, that the theory of Paul's use of secretaries is universally accepted. Some scholars have argued strenuously that Paul could not have used a secretary. Although nobody doubts that the elites, like Cicero and Josephus, were wealthy and privileged enough to make use of a scribe, it is doubted whether somebody of Paul's status would have been able to access a scribe, simply because people are unsure whether an itinerant missionary would have been able to afford a scribe's services. Of course, as I suggested above, there is evidence contrary to this, but, as Ehrman says, "The papyri—that is, the surviving private letters that were written by regular folk instead of the elite of society—do not give us any help in knowing about these other three categories."²⁴⁵ This is, of course, an argument from silence. The fact that there is no record of it is not to say that it did not happen. And especially in this case, where the secretaries' job is to neaten up the person's presentation of themselves, it is extraordinarily tough to say decisively that they did not perform these functions.

Ehrman also argues that the "New Testament 'letters' are really more like essays put in letter form."²⁴⁶ As a result, "evidence that derives from the brief, stereotyped letters typically found in Greek and Roman circles is not necessarily germane to the "letters" of the early Christians."²⁴⁷ The one thing Ehrman fails to explain is why this is the case, especially for the letters of Paul. Unlike 1 John and Hebrews, which are admittedly more amorphous, the letters

²⁴⁴ Ehrman states it like this: "[certain scholars] are claiming, on historical grounds, that some books that appear to be pseudonymous in fact are not. That is because the real author, who actually was who he claimed to be, used a secretary, and the secretary wrote in a different style from the author himself. Sometimes the real author may have dictated a letter word for word to a secretary. But other times he may have asked his secretary to rework his letter to improve the style. At still other times an author may have simply told a secretary to write a letter for him, so that both the contents and the style of the letter are the secretary's, even if the ultimate "authority" for the letter is the author who is named" (2011: 133-134).

²⁴⁵ 2011: 136. The categories to which he refers are different uses of the secretary. As mentioned above, these range from dictation by the sender to the secretary to total secretarial composition simply signed off by the sender, with a spectrum of secretarial involvement in between. He believes there is good evidence from papyri found in Egypt and other places, as well as what might be called 'textbooks' for scribal training, which indicate training to help in the composition of letters, for the use of secretaries to take dictation.

²⁴⁶ 2011: 136.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

of Paul follow the typical Greco-Roman letter formula.²⁴⁸ And if length and content are the major criteria with which Ehrman finds trouble, these fail to provide reason for why we should be unprepared to take the evidence of the Greco-Roman letters into account. It is unclear why, if he was being properly compensated, a secretary would be unwilling to put a particularly long, complicated string of thoughts like 1 Corinthians into the proper form to make it a letter.

Another argument Ehrman raises against the use of secretaries is that the majority of the evidence we have of secretaries being used to alter somebody's style comes from the landed elites of Greco-Roman society, and so it seems unlikely that Paul would be one of the people to use a secretary in this way.²⁴⁹ There are, however, a few problems with this argument as well. Firstly, it is also an argument from silence. It is unclear exactly what evidence Ehrman would want to convince him of this use of secretaries. Even the evidence we do have is better than the lack of evidence Ehrman provides for his position. Likewise, it must be acknowledged that the vast majority of the letters we have preserved are from the landed aristocracy, which undoubtedly biases our evidence in that direction. Moreover, it fails to consider the fact that Ehrman might have it completely backwards. Is it not just as likely that the lower elements of Roman society would need to make use of this function of secretaries *more* than the richer elements? For, if letter writing is an element of Roman education,²⁵⁰ but one that formed a part of the higher elements of Roman education, then one would expect the poorer members of society who had less access to such education and - may even have been illiterate - to be those who made use of the facility of secretaries to write and improve their style most, when they could afford it.

So, despite contrary arguments from some scholars, I am prepared to accept the thesis that Paul made use of secretaries in the composition of his letters. This means that changes in

²⁴⁸ Ancient Greek letters were highly stylised. Fitzmyer gives some of the key components of the formula as a greeting, in which the person announced themselves and greeted those to whom they were writing, the thanksgiving, where one mentioned how grateful they were for the health of the recipient, the body, in which the meat of the letter was addressed, and finally a series of greetings for those around the recipient (2020: 769-770).

²⁴⁹ 2011: 136-137: "There is some evidence, though it is very limited, that secretaries occasionally were asked to improve the author's style. The evidence is all from the very top echelons of the upper class of ancient Rome, a letter from the military commander Brutus and another from the emperor Marcus Aurelius, for example. It is difficult to know whether this procedure was used widely, or at all, outside of the circles of the ultra-rich landed aristocracy." While there are indications that Paul received a very thorough education, and would seem to have been wealthy, Paul appears to have voluntarily taken on a working-class background during the course of his missionary activity (cf. 1 Corinthians 9:6; 11-12).

²⁵⁰ Richards 2004: 86. "Since we have seen exercises from the early stage of secondary education and since it was assumed already learned by the third stage, we can safely conclude that those who had a secondary level of education were given training in letter writing. The majority of people, those with only an elementary level of education, had perhaps a little exposure to letter writing, enough probably to handle the rudimentary forms."

Paul's style can be simply explained in a way that does nothing to remove Pauline authorship. In what follows, I am going to argue that Ephesians, Colossians and 2 Thessalonians are genuine Pauline epistles and thus are useable in the study that follows.

Ephesians and Colossians

Although these are two separate letters, I am going to deal with them together. This is in part because a major aspect of the discussion is the perceived relationship between these two letters, and partially because the arguments raised against them are so similar that it would be repetitious to discuss one and then the other.

In both cases, it is worth mentioning that the witness of the letters themselves,²⁵¹ and the early church, are unanimously in favour of Pauline authorship.²⁵² Ignatius, in his early letter to the Ephesians seems to have quoted from the New Testament letter²⁵³ as well as in his letter to Polycarp.²⁵⁴ Irenaeus also records that the letter was Pauline.²⁵⁵ Of course, this early tradition does not mean that the letter was definitely Pauline, but it does raise the level of evidence that is required to challenge its validity. The first serious challenges to that authorship arose only in the 18th century.²⁵⁶ While not as enthusiastically attested by the early church, the letter of Colossians also finds testimony suggesting it was authored by Paul.²⁵⁷ This is far from decisive, but it does suggest that if we are going to overturn this consensus, we should do so with good reason.²⁵⁸

One of the arguments frequently given for rejecting Pauline authorship is that much of the language, in terms of both style and theme, seems to parallel that which we find in the undisputed Pauline letters.²⁵⁹ In fact, where there are variations, these can quite easily be explained. For example, although Ephesians does contain words that do not occur anywhere else in the Pauline corpus, it nevertheless has a lower count of unique words than other

²⁵¹ Ephesians 1:1 - Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν [ἐν Ἐφέσῳ] καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God, to the saints in Ephesus, the faithful in Christ Jesus). Colossians 1:1 - Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός (Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God, and Timothy his brother).

²⁵² O'Brien 1999: 4.

²⁵³ Ignatius *Ad Ephesios* 1.1-2.

²⁵⁴ Ignatius *Ad Polycarpum* 6.2.

²⁵⁵ Irenaeus *Ag. Her* 5.2.3.

²⁵⁶ O'Brien 1999: 4.

²⁵⁷ Irenaeus *Ag. Her.* 3.14.1.

²⁵⁸ Hoehner 2002: 52 "Although rejecting Pauline authorship of Ephesians, Mitton acknowledges the long history of Pauline authorship of this epistle and states that 'the burden of proof lies with those who seek to maintain a contrary opinion.'" Cf. Mitton 1951: 25.

²⁵⁹ Carson, Moo 2005: 482.

undisputed Pauline letters like 2 Corinthians.²⁶⁰ Similarly, although the style can be said to differ from that found in the undisputed letters, especially with respect to the length of the sentences he uses, this is only true for the first half of the epistle, and it is plausible that this is due to the highly theological nature of the subject matter with which he is dealing.²⁶¹ But, even if the language is shown to be decisively different to the undisputed Paulines, as argued above, this can be very easily attributed to a secretary who has decided how the ideas Paul gave him should be expressed.

Another reason scholars give for denying the authenticity of Ephesians is the fact that it is impersonal. This is in large part because, unlike Romans for example, Ephesians does not end with a long list of greetings, which seems unlikely given that Paul would have spent a long time in Ephesus, according to Acts.²⁶² This, and a few other difficulties, are ameliorated when we consider the fact that the codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, as well as the Chester Beatti Papyri, all lack the phrase “in Ephesus” in 1:1.²⁶³ One reason given for this is that Ephesians may well have been an encyclical letter, written in order to be passed around many churches in Asia Minor.²⁶⁴ Furthermore, there is evidence that other letters of Paul’s were used in this way, such as in Colossians 4:16,²⁶⁵ where Paul instructs the Colossian church to pass on their letter to the Laodiceans and read their letter in turn. If it was the case that Ephesians was an encyclical letter, then that would explain the apparent lack of familiarity, as well as the absence of Paul’s normal list of greetings. It is also worth pointing out that while there is at least less familiarity in this letter, the point must not be overstated. Paul does make oblique references to familiarity with the church when he speaks about how he prays for them,²⁶⁶ and when he asks that they pray for him.²⁶⁷ Finally, it is worth noting that, in two of the undisputed

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*

²⁶² Acts 18:18-21; 19:1-20:1; cf. also 20:17-38 where Paul speaks to the Ephesian elders, showing his familiarity with them.

²⁶³ Blomberg 2016: Loc 5671.

²⁶⁴ Kobelski 2020: 883: “The absence of ‘in Ephesus’ is best explained if Eph is understood as an encyclical, a circular letter destined for several churches in the Roman province of Asia. This theory was first proposed by Abp, J. Ussher in the 17th cent.”

²⁶⁵ καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνῶσθῃ παρ’ ὑμῶν ἢ ἐπιστολή, ποιήσατε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνῶσθῃ, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε. (And when this letter is read among you, make sure it is read in the church in Laodicea, and that you read the letter sent to the Laodiceans).

²⁶⁶ Ephesians 1:16: οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μνησθεὶς ἐν τοῖς προσευχαῖς μου (I do not stop giving thanks for you, remembering you in my prayers).

²⁶⁷ Ephesians 6:19-20: καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, ἵνα μοι δοθῇ λόγος ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματός μου, ἐν παρρησίᾳ γνωρίσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ὑπὲρ οὗ πρεσβεύω ἐν ἀλύσει, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ παρρησιάσωμαι ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι. (and for me, that words may be given to me in the opening of my mouth, in boldness to reveal the mystery of the gospel, of which I am an ambassador in chains. Pray that I may speak it fearlessly, as I should).

Paulines, Galatians and 2 Corinthians, there is almost nothing by way of greetings.²⁶⁸ So the fact that Ephesians is similarly lacking should not *ipso facto* be a mark against its authenticity.²⁶⁹ As a result, it seems that the impersonal character of Ephesians is far from decisive against Pauline authorship.

A further argument given for doubting the authenticity of Ephesians is its relationship to the letter to the Colossians. Some think that Paul wrote Colossians, and then a forger used it as a blueprint to produce his own forgery, which was Ephesians. Others think that both are forgeries, with Colossians being the earlier copy,²⁷⁰ and some hold the same view, but with Ephesians as the older document, and Colossians as a summarised version. Whichever configuration one settles on, however, the point remains the same, that either one or both of these letters is a forgery, based on its supposed relationship with the other.

It is important, however, to examine this claim that Ephesians and Colossians are as closely related as they are said to be. For a long time, this has simply been a tenet of Pauline scholarship, unexamined in its outworking. Recently, however, scholars have come to the conclusion that the parallels between these two letters are not as impressive as they were initially believed to be. The majority of the borrowing comes in the form of the ideas, which are similarly expressed but also make use of different words for different things. An example is the use of the word *μυστήριον* (mysterion). In Ephesians, this word is used to refer to the joining of the Jews and the Gentiles. In Colossians, however, it is used to refer to Christ as the head of the church.²⁷¹ Best suggests that this borrowing of vocabulary, with the change of meaning, implies that there has been forgery taking place, but that forgery was done while the forger did not have access to the text he was basing his work on.²⁷² There is, however, another way to take this evidence. For is it not more likely that a forger, with a façade to maintain, would be more slavishly devoted to his source material, than an original author who has a

²⁶⁸ Hoehner 2002: 53.

²⁶⁹ Hoehner, referring to Black 1981: 59-73, puts it this way: "In conclusion, the impersonal nature of this letter does not prove that it was not from Paul. In fact, Black thinks that the impersonal character of Ephesians is not out of character with the rest of Paul's epistles ... Furthermore, it seems that the better Paul knew the church, the fewer personal greetings were given. For example, Romans has the most extensive greetings, yet he had never been there. On the other hand, the Thessalonian epistles include no greetings and Paul had been there a few weeks earlier." (2002: 54)

²⁷⁰ Best 1997:73: "Most scholars, however, regard Colossians as the halfway house between Paul and Ephesians."

²⁷¹ BADG, s.v. κεφαλή 1.b; 2.b.

²⁷² Best 1997:76: "The random nature of the way A/Eph is supposed to have drawn on references from Colossians suggests that if he did depend on it he did not have a copy of it in front of him as he wrote but had its words in his mind, and the same would be true of the way A/Col would have used Ephesians."

relevant previous work in mind on which he was drawing to complete his current writing?²⁷³ The fact that a single mind producing both of these letters seems to be the best explanation for the two letters we have today does nothing to suggest that the author was Paul. But it also does nothing to argue that it was not Paul. Indeed, as Carson and Moo point out, “the relationship between Ephesians and Colossians does not seem to be determinative of very much in the domain of authenticity.”²⁷⁴

Another argument frequently brought against the authenticity of Ephesians, and indeed Colossians, is that they both display theology which appears to be post-Pauline. Rather, it is argued it originates from what some call the early Catholic period of the church.²⁷⁵ This manifests itself in many different ways, each of which I will briefly examine. It is worth stating, however, that there is currently a certain amount of scepticism regarding our ability to gauge accurately what the development of the apostle’s thought was. His active period was so long before our time, and so short, that to feel we can accurately determine the limits of where his mind may have taken him, seems to be somewhat beyond the bounds of ordinary historical scholarship. Wright, speaking on Colossians, makes this point well, if at length.²⁷⁶

The first major difference people argue for in Ephesians is a Christological one. It is claimed that while the undisputed Paulines put much emphasis on the death of Christ, this letter focusses mainly on his exaltation and victory of spiritual powers.²⁷⁷ It is not the case that

²⁷³ Thus Hoehner 2002: 68: “Also, it is much easier to understand the creative differences of an author than to expect them of an imitator or disciple. The differences arise due to differences of purpose, content, time, mood, and audience. This scenario explains the similarities and dissimilarities in wording on specific topics and concerns. It is easier to believe that Paul wrote these two epistles and that when he penned Ephesians he would have similar vocabulary and content on similar topics and would vary in vocabulary when addressing different issues. Is it not possible for an author to use the same words in different epistles or choose to use different vocabulary over some of the same issues? One must also allow for a development in Paul’s thought. Certainly the thrust of Colossians is different because he had to deal with heresy, whereas Ephesians offers no indication that he is combating doctrinal error.”

²⁷⁴ Carson and Moo 2005: 486.

²⁷⁵ Moo 2008: 32.

²⁷⁶ 1983: 35-36: “To begin with, a general point. The popular idea that the Captivity Epistles (our two letters, with Ephesians and Philippians) show a more developed, and hence later, theological position than do the (supposedly) earlier ones rests on a mistake. We are able to chart changes in (say) Calvin’s mind by studying the differences between successive editions of the *Institutes*, and it might appear easy to do the same with Paul and his letters. But this appearance is deceptive. The greater historical distance between us and him; the very small amount of relevant comparative material; the ‘occasional’ nature of the letters—all these warn us to be on our guard against over-hasty conclusions. Artists, writers and composers by no means always show a unilinear development in their work ... The simplest hypothesis by far is to see all these letters as proceeding from the same pen in the same period of six or eight years. They all reflect not only the needs and problems of the individual churches to which they were addressed, but also the same overall theological position, however many different expressions it may find.”

²⁷⁷ Hoehner 2002: 76.

Ephesians never mentions the cross. It does so in 2:16,²⁷⁸ and makes reference to his death in 1:7²⁷⁹ 5:2²⁸⁰ and 5:25.²⁸¹ And, in a document of Ephesians' length, four references is quite a substantial number. Moreover, there is no suggestion that Christ's exaltation is in any way separate from his death on the cross. Instead, these should be thought of as two sides of the same coin.²⁸²

In Colossians, the Christological challenge is slightly more substantial. The exaltation of Christ that runs from 1:15-1:21 does seem to present a higher Christology than some of the other Pauline letters. It must, however, be noted that Paul's Christology has hinted in this direction before, in Philippians 2:5-11, or 1 Corinthians 8:6 for example. The ultimate question is not whether or not the Christology of Colossians represents a development. It seems clear that it does. The question is rather, as Moo asks, "could Paul, as a response to the apparent denigration of Christ and cosmic speculations of the false teachers in Colossae, have developed the cosmic Christology of Colossians?"²⁸³ To put it differently, are these ideas so far advanced beyond Paul that we can, with confidence, say that he could not have come up with them? I feel that it is well within the capabilities of a theologian as creative as the Paul presented to us in the undisputed Paulines to discern such an idea in response to the problems of Colossae. The next theological argument, which again plagues both Colossians and Ephesians, is the nature of the presentation of the church. In both cases, when the author speaks about the church, he is clearly talking about the universal church. In Ephesians we find mention of the universal

²⁷⁸ καὶ ἀποκατάλλαξεν τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνοντας τὴν ἐχθρὰν ἐν αὐτῷ." (And he reconciled them both in one body to God through the cross, killing off their hostility in him).

²⁷⁹ "Ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων, κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ" (In whom we have forgiveness through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace).

²⁸⁰ "καὶ περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας (And walk in love, just as Christ loved you and gave himself on your behalf as an fragrant offering and a sacrifice to God).

²⁸¹ "Οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς" (Husbands, love your wives just as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her).

²⁸² Hoehner 2002: 77.

²⁸³ Moo 2008: 33.

church in both 3:10, 21²⁸⁴ and 5:23-25.²⁸⁵ In Colossians, the same point is made in 1:18, 24²⁸⁶ and in 2:19.²⁸⁷ Of course, the metaphor of the church as a body with Christ as its head is not new, having been established by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12. The question again seems to be whether it is feasible for Paul to have so developed in his thinking that he could make the jump from understanding the local church as the body of Christ to seeing all churches connected together into one great organisation, described by the metaphor of the body of Christ. As with the above issue, I think it would be well within the grasp of a theological mind like Paul's to have come up with this idea.

In summary, then, while this treatment of these arguments has been brief, I have attempted to show that there is no good reason to deny either of these letters the status of having been authored by the apostle Paul himself. They both enjoy the internal testimony of having been written by him, as well as attestation to that effect by the early church. And while later scholars have raised arguments to challenge this, I hope that I have shown that, at the very least, those arguments are not strong enough to overturn the bar they must clear, and at most, are unconvincing in themselves.

2 Thessalonians

The arguments around the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians are slightly different. With that being said, however, the main points of the positive case are the same. The letter claims to have been

²⁸⁴ “ἵνα γνωρισθῆ ἡ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ ... αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰῶνων, ἀμήν.” (That the manifold wisdom of God might be known now to the rulers and authorities in the heavenly realms ... now to him be the glory in the church and in Jesus Christ throughout all the generations, forever and ever, amen).

²⁸⁵ “ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναίκος ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος· ἀλλ’ ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτως καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντί. Οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς” (Because the man is the head of the woman as Christ is the head of the church, he is the saviour of the body. But as the church submits to Christ, so the wife should submit to their husbands in everything. Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and laid himself down for her).

²⁸⁶ “καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ὃς ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ ... Νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία” (And he is the head of the body, the church. He is the beginning ... Now I rejoice in my sufferings on your behalf that I fill up what was left of the sufferings of Christ in my body on behalf of his body, which is the church).

²⁸⁷ καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβασζόμενον αὔξει τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ. (And not holding fast to the head, from which the whole body, supported and knit together by ligaments and sinews, will grow the growth provided by God.)

written by the apostle Paul in both 1:1²⁸⁸ and in 3:17.²⁸⁹

This claim of Pauline authorship is also backed up by the witness of the early church. As Green points out, the witness of the early church is actually stronger in the case of 2 Thessalonians than it is in that of 1 Thessalonians.²⁹⁰ For example, Polycarp, in his own letter to the Philippians, quotes from Second Thessalonians, and expressly states that he is quoting from the Apostle Paul.²⁹¹ And Ignatius mentions 2 Thessalonians by name when he quotes it.²⁹² These references, alongside many others, give strong evidence for thinking that the early church fathers believed that the letter came from Paul, and was addressed to the Thessalonians.

In recent times, however, this notion has been questioned. Three arguments in particular are raised against the authenticity of this missive. Firstly, it is argued that the vocabulary and style are so similar to 1 Thessalonians that they can only have come from a copyist. This is, however, difficult to prove. This becomes even less likely when we bear in mind the traditional account of the sending of the letters, in which Paul sends what we now call 1 Thessalonians, and then finds out shortly afterwards that certain elements in the Thessalonian church have taken some aspects of that letter too far. In response, he sends 2 Thessalonians to correct some of those misconceptions.²⁹³

A slightly stronger version of this first argument is based on the different tone from the first letter to the second. First Thessalonians is a much more personal work than its successor. For example, in 1 Thessalonians, Paul is lavish in his thanking God for the church,²⁹⁴ whereas in 2 Thessalonians his thanksgiving is more formal and reserved.²⁹⁵ This, however, ignores the fact that the two letters come to the church in starkly different situations. As Green points out, “1 Thessalonians expresses the profound relief and joy of the apostle when Timothy returned with good news about the Thessalonian church. 2 Thessalonians, on the other hand, contains a

²⁸⁸“Παῦλος καὶ Σιλβανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ.” (Paul and Silvanus and Timothy, to the church of Thessalonica, in God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ).

²⁸⁹“Ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῆ ἐμῆ χειρὶ Παύλου, ὃ ἐστὶν σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ· οὕτως γράφω.” (This greeting comes from my own hand, Paul’s, which is the sign of all my letters. This is how I write). Nicholas King (2012: 462) translates: ‘The greeting in my handwriting: PAUL, which is the identifying mark in every letter---this is how I write’.

²⁹⁰ 2002: 59.

²⁹¹ 11:3.

²⁹² *Ag. Her.* 3.7.2.

²⁹³ Green 2002: 60.

²⁹⁴ 1:2 “Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν μνησθῆναι ποιούμενοι ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν” (We always give thanks to God for all of you, making mention of you in our prayers).

²⁹⁵ 1:3 “Εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν” (We ought always to give thanks to God for you).

more sustained reflection on the persecutions the church was enduring.”²⁹⁶ This is not to say the relationship that Paul has with the recipient of the letters has changed. Only to argue that, given the occasional nature of the document, we should not expect the whole relationship to be expressed on every occasion.

The second family of arguments against the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians comes from the form of the letter. Some argue that, since the headings of the first and second letters to the Thessalonians are identical, this betrays the hand of a copyist, since this phenomenon is not found in any other pair of Pauline letters. This, however, seems unlikely. It is important to remember that the letters are thought to have been sent in quick succession, and this helps us make sense of the similar headings.²⁹⁷ It is also argued that since the author of 2 Thessalonians uses traditional material in the eschatological section of 2:1-12, it cannot be Paul. This, however, completely overlooks Paul’s use of traditional material in 1 Corinthians 15:3-7 and Philippians 2:6-11.²⁹⁸

The final family of arguments comes from the theology of the two letters. Firstly, some argue that the use of the word “τὸ εὐαγγέλιον” (the Gospel), is less precise than in other Pauline letters like Romans or 1 Corinthians. The same, however, is true for 1 Thessalonians, which is almost never disputed as being truly Pauline.²⁹⁹ Along similar lines, it is argued that the eschatology presented in 1 and 2 Thessalonians is contradictory. In 1 Thessalonians, it is said that the coming of the Lord will be unexpected. In 2 Thessalonians, however, it is argued that there will be some signs of the event that will predate its coming. This tension, however, is similar to that found in Jewish eschatology and even to the eschatological teaching of Jesus himself.³⁰⁰ Thus, while it presents a problem to the scholar trying to harmonise all of Paul’s ideas, it is not, in itself, an argument against Pauline authorship, since this tension would have been a part of Paul’s intellectual background.³⁰¹

For these reasons, among others, I will be considering Ephesians, Colossians and 2 Thessalonians as Pauline epistles in the course of this thesis. The hypothesis I will be using their data to investigate is that Paul did in fact believe in a non-material component to the human being, which we would call the soul. This means that in the last days, his idea of

²⁹⁶ 2002: 60.

²⁹⁷ Green 2002: 61.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁹ Green 2002: 62.

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.* Cf. Jesus’ words in Mark 13.

³⁰¹ *Ibid.*

resurrection³⁰² is really the idea of the human soul being reunited with a renewed body. I will also be investigating the idea that Paul developed these ideas from a combination of ideas in the Hebrew Scriptures and in Greek philosophy, particularly the Platonic and Hellenistic philosophy of his intellectual and cultural milieu.

Chapter Three: The Soul in Paul

ψυχή - Introduction

I will now move on to an analysis of the words that Paul used in his letters which are usually translated as ‘soul.’ These two words are ψυχή and πνεῦμα. I will look at all the uses of the words in Paul’s letters, to develop an understanding of what each word meant to him. This will, of course, provide an incomplete picture. To get a fuller sense of Paul’s beliefs we will need some understanding of his cultural and intellectual background. This will be provided by the next chapters.

I will begin by looking at the word ψυχή, and then move on to πνεῦμα. The word ψυχή is used twelve times in the letters I am regarding as genuinely Pauline.³⁰³ Beyond this, there are six uses of an adjective deriving from ψυχή. There is also one use of the verb εὐψυχέω. Firstly, I will analyse each use of ψυχή as a noun, and then move on to studying its adjectival and verbal uses. After this, I will synthesise some kind of meaning from the many facets of Paul’s use of this word.

Life

The most common use of the word ψυχή is when it means ‘life,’ understood as that animating force by which the human being is able to be and act in the world and which is lost at death. This usage occurs five times, scattered throughout Paul’s letters. The fact that the word is used in this way so often and so widely suggests that this is one of the foundational

³⁰² 1 Corinthians 15.

³⁰³ For details about which letters I accept as genuinely Pauline, see chapter 2.

ways Paul understood the word.

The word is used in this way in Romans 11:1-3:

Λέγω οὖν, μὴ ἀπόσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; μὴ γένοιτο· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλίτης εἰμί, ἐκ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν. οὐκ ἀπόσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω. ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἡλίας τί λέγει ἡ γραφή, ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ; κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν, κἀγὼ ὑπελείφθην μόνος καὶ ζητοῦσιν τὴν ψυχὴν μου.

(So I say, surely God has not rejected his people? Perish the thought. I myself am an Israelite, from the seed of Abraham, and of the tribe of Benjamin. God has not rejected the people whom he foreknew. Or do you not know what Scripture said about Elijah, about how he appealed to God against Israel? “Lord, they have killed your prophets and torn down your altars, and I am left alone, and they seek my life.”)

This usage is complicated somewhat because these are not strictly Paul’s words, but a quotation he is using from 1 Kings 19:10; 14. But, the fact that Paul is prepared to include this quotation with seemingly no problem with how ψυχή is used, suggests that he at least tacitly agrees with what it means here.

This verse comes towards the climax of the section in Romans when Paul is defending his claims about the Gospel in light of the problem of the unbelief of Israel.³⁰⁴ In this passage, he makes the case that while some in Israel do not believe in Jesus. To this end, he reminds them of the example of Elijah, to whom God says that he still has a remnant he intends to save. Paul is suggesting that this situation is being mirrored in Israel’s current unbelief.³⁰⁵

But what about the use of ψυχή here? The BDAG,³⁰⁶ the *Pocket Lexicon of the New Testament*,³⁰⁷ the DBL,³⁰⁸ TDNT³⁰⁹ and the *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*³¹⁰ all agree that the best way to take this word is simply as ‘life’. This is also how all the translations of the Bible into English I surveyed took it.³¹¹ The KJV, ESV, NASB and the CSB kept the word in by translating it as ‘life,’ whereas the NIV and *the*

³⁰⁴ Moo 1996: 547.

³⁰⁵ The passage continues: ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; κατέλιπον ἑμαυτῷ ἑπτακισχιλίους ἄνδρας, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ (But what was the oracular response to him? “I still have seven thousand people who have not bowed the knee to Baal.”)

³⁰⁶ s.v. ψυχή 1. B : Earthly life itself. 2. By metonymy, that which possesses life or a soul.

³⁰⁷ s.v. ψυχή (a): life, without any psychological content.

³⁰⁸ s.v. ψυχή 2: Life.

³⁰⁹ s.v. ψυχή II.1: Natural life and true life.

³¹⁰ s.v. ψυχή 20.66 : Life.

³¹¹ I consulted the New International Version (NIV), the King James Version (KJV), the English Standard Version (ESV), the New American Standard Bible (NASB), the Christian Standard Bible, (CSB) and *The Bible for Everyone*.

Bible for Everyone assumed this translation by simply rendering it “they are trying to kill me.” The conclusion seems to be that the best way to take ψυχή in this verse is simply as ‘life,’ as in that which is lost when a person is killed.

A further use of the word that seems to carry this meaning is found right at the end of Romans, in 16:4-5. In this section, Paul thanks Priscilla and Aquila for their work and for the fact that:

οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν, οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν, καὶ τὴν κατ’ οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν. ἀσπάσασθε Ἐπαίνετον τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου, ὅς ἐστιν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς Χριστόν.

(They risked their own neck on behalf of my life, it is not only I who give thanks to them but the whole church of the Gentiles, and the whole rest of the church that meets in their house. Greet Epaphroditus, who is the first fruits of Christ in Asia.)

Here, right in the midst of his greetings to the whole church, Paul makes sure to applaud the work of two of the early church’s most famous figures, Priscilla and Aquila, because of the work they did to save his life, at risk of their own. In this case, Paul referring to his ψυχή clearly refers to life simply understood. The BDAG,³¹² the *Pocket Lexicon of the New Testament*³¹³ and TDNT,³¹⁴ as well as the *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*³¹⁵ take it this way, as do the translations I surveyed. All but two included the word ‘life’ explicitly translating ψυχή. Those two were the NIV and *the Bible for Everyone*. Instead of explicitly mentioning life, they both translate τῆς ψυχῆς μου as ‘me.’ In this context, there is no difference between saying that they risked themselves on behalf of ‘my life’ and on behalf of ‘me.’ This is not always the case, but in this context, the equivalence seems clear.

The same can be said for 1 Corinthians 15:44-46:

σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν. Εἰ ἔστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἔστιν καὶ πνευματικόν. οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται· ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν. ἀλλ’ οὐ πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικόν ἀλλὰ τὸ ψυχικόν, ἔπειτα τὸ πνευματικόν.

(A human body is sown, and a spiritual body is raised. If there is a human body, there is also a spiritual body. For as it is also written, “The first man Adam came into existence as a living being,” the last Adam as a life-giving spirit. But not spiritual first,

³¹² s.v. ψυχή 1. β: Earthly Life Itself.

³¹³ s.v. ψυχή (a): Life, without any psychological content.

³¹⁴ s.v. ψυχή II. 1: Natural life and true life.

³¹⁵ s.v. ψυχή 23.88.2: Life.

then human, but human first, and then spiritual)

As one might guess, this is an important passage to which we will return when we discuss the adjective ψυχικός. Again, in this setting, the use of the noun ψυχή, is not strictly Paul's, but comes from a Greek quotation from Genesis 2:7, speaking about Adam. In this case, Paul uses this quotation in his lengthy discourse on the resurrection of the body, intended to combat the Corinthian belief that there could be no such resurrection, since the body is evil.³¹⁶

Again, in reference to this word, the dictionaries³¹⁷ and translations are more or less unanimous in translating this as 'being'. The NIV, ESV, NASB, and CSB all use this word. *The Bible for Everyone*, being somewhat looser in its translation practice,³¹⁸ adds more interpretation to their translation when it says 'living, natural being'. On the other hand, the KJV and the *Lexham Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament* (further, LALG)³¹⁹ both render this word as 'soul.' This seems unlikely for a few reasons. Firstly, this goes against the weight of opinion. Of course, opinion is not decisive, but when the majority of it is against the reading, it makes it less likely. Secondly, the idea behind the English word 'soul' makes this verse more complicated than it needs to be. The translation 'being' makes sense and provides a simpler reading, which makes it more likely. Finally, in this section, Paul is comparing the natural human body as we all experience it to the spiritual body he believes will come at the last resurrection. As a part of this comparison, he uses the analogy between Adam, the first man, who was the first instance of the normal, natural human body, and Christ, who was the first instance of the spiritual body that comes with resurrection. In this context, it makes much more sense to follow all the other translations, as well as the dictionaries, in translating this as simply 'living being' rather than introducing the confusing idea of 'living soul' into the mix.³²⁰

We find ψυχή used in a similar, though somewhat less grand way in 2 Corinthians 1:23:

Ἐγὼ δὲ μάρτυρα τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν, ὅτι φειδόμενος ὑμῶν οὐκέτι ἦλθον εἰς Κόρινθον.

(I call God as my witness on my life, that it was to spare you that I did not come again to Corinth.)

³¹⁶ Fee 1987: 713.

³¹⁷ BDAG: s.v. ψυχή 2: By metonymy that which possesses life or a soul. *The Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*: s.v. ψυχή: Life, without any psychological content.

³¹⁸ Goldingay, Wright 2018: xi-xiii.

³¹⁹ s.v. ψυχή 26.4.

³²⁰ Thus Thiselton (2000: 1283): "The first Adam was merely a living human being (Gen. 2.7)."

In this case, there is some variance in the dictionary readings. The *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament* translates this simply as ‘life.’³²¹ The BDAG, however, has a somewhat more complicated reading which detects some form of Semitism in this expression, arguing that this is a reflexive use that parallels the use of *nephesh* in many Semitic languages.³²² Similarly, TDNT and the LALG³²³ argue that this usage refers to the individual person as responsible to God.³²⁴ Harris agrees with the BDAG reading, saying in his commentary on the passage that this expression is “a Hebraism (*‘al-nap̄šî*) meaning ‘against my soul’ (= ‘against me,’ RSV, NRSV) or ‘on my own life’ (= ‘with my life as the forfeit,’ or ‘I stake my life on it,’ NEB).”³²⁵ The basic meaning, conveyed well in this passage and the translations thereof, is that Paul is so confident of the truth of the statement to follow, that he is prepared to allow God to take his ψυχή or נַפְשׁוֹ should he be proved false.³²⁶ This, again, describes the ψυχή as something that can, and indeed is, lost at the point when life ends. Thus, the simplest way to translate it,³²⁷ is simply as ‘life’ – that which is gone at the moment of death.³²⁸

Another passage in which Paul’s usage of ψυχή seems best translated by the idea of ‘life’ is Philippians 2:30:

ὅτι διὰ τὸ ἔργον Χριστοῦ μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισεν παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ, ἵνα ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα τῆς πρὸς με λειτουργίας.

(Since, because of the work of Christ, he drew near to the point of death, risking his life, that he might fill up what you lack in your ministry to me.)

This passage describes the work of Epaphroditus, the person Paul sends to the Philippians instead of Timothy. The passage seems to be something of an apologetic on Epaphroditus’ behalf, arguing that on account of his love for the Philippians, he deserves to be considered a worthy minister to them. This love motivated work which caused him to fall ill, and indeed

³²¹ s.v. ψυχή: Life, without any psychological content.

³²² s.v. ψυχή 1.f: In var. Semitic languages the reflexive relationship is paraphrased with *nephesh*; the corresponding use of ψυχή in our lit. may be detected in certain passages in our lit. esp. in quotes from the OT and in places where OT modes of expression have considerable influence.

³²³ s.v. ψυχή 26.4. 1.

³²⁴ s.v. ψυχή II. 2.

³²⁵ 2005: 212.

³²⁶ Barnett 1997: 114.

³²⁷ *Contra* KJV and NASB.

³²⁸ Of course, one could argue that the soul departs the body at the moment of death. This is, however, a more complicated solution than simply translating the word as ‘life’ because it assumes more entities. So, for now, the best translation seems to be ‘life.’

nearly die.³²⁹ Again, ψυχή seems to be understood as life, which is assumed to be lost at death, because Epaphroditus risked his ψυχή by falling ill. This understanding is unanimously reflected in the translations surveyed³³⁰ and the dictionaries consulted indicate that this is the best translation of ψυχή.³³¹

Based on these five widespread uses of the word ψυχή, we can conclude that at least one use of the word is to mean ‘life,’ as in, that animating force by which the human being is able to be and act in the world and which is lost at death. There are, however, several other uses of the word which have a different meaning than this one.

Individuation

The next common usage of ψυχή has an essentially individuating force. Most commonly, this takes the form of a strong personal pronoun, but occasionally its meaning is more complex. The word with this meaning appears twice, both of them in Paul’s letter to the Romans. In what follows, I will look at each of these instances to justify this understanding of them.

The first instance of this use of ψυχή is in Romans 2:9-11:

θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνου· δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν προσωπολημψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.

(There will be trouble and distress on every person who works evil, to the Jew first and then the Greek. Glory and honour and peace to all doing good, first to the Jew and then to the Greek. For there is no partiality with God.)

The point in the argument in which this use of the word occurs is while Paul is emphasising the fact that every person, whether Jewish or Greek, is in need of God’s redemption. In this particular section, Paul focusses primarily on the Greeks.³³² Our particular verse describes the outcome of sin in this person’s life, contrasted with the outcome of good works. Both BDAG³³³ and the *Pocket Lexicon for the New Testament*³³⁴ describe this usage as something other than soul. BDAG links it to the emotions, and *Pocket Lexicon for the New Testament* takes it as a

³²⁹ Silva 1988: 138.

³³⁰ NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, *The Bible for Everyone*: “Risking his life”; KJV: “Not regarding his life.”

³³¹ BDAG: s.v. ψυχή 1. B: earthly life itself; *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*: s.v. ψυχή (a): life, without any psychological content. TDNT: s.v. ψυχή II. 1: Natural life and true life. LALG: s.v. ψυχή 21.7: Life.

³³² Moo 1996: 126.

³³³ s.v. ψυχή 1.γ: feelings or emotions.

³³⁴ s.v. ψυχή: A strong personal pronoun.

kind of intensive pronoun. Likewise, TDNT takes this usage as having “the individual person in mind.”³³⁵ The LALG, KJV and NASB are the three sources I consulted that come to different conclusions. They all recommend translating it as 'soul.' Again, however, this contradicts the vast majority of the evidence, and introduces an unnecessary complication into the reading. By Ockham's Razor, however, we can explain the verse just as well by postulating ‘person’ rather than including another entity called a ‘soul.’

While the connection of soul language with judgement makes it tempting to think of the use of this word as pointing to an individuating non-physical immortal aspect of a person, this seems to be reading too much into the text. It is, after all, just as correct to speak of a person being judged as it is to speak of their soul being judged. Nevertheless, there is an individuating aspect of the word on display here.

The next verse in which ψυχή appears with this force is Romans 13:1:

Πᾶσα ψυχή ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ θεοῦ, αἱ δὲ οὗσαι ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν.

(Each person should submit themselves to the authorities ruling over them. For there is no authority except from God, and those who are appointed by God.)

The complication in this instance is a slight variance in readings from the dictionaries. The BDAG reads this as an example of metonymy, suggesting a whole person by only referring to that part of them that gives them life.³³⁶ By contrast, the *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament* reads this as an individual or as a strong personal pronoun,³³⁷ and TDNT says that Paul “has the individual in mind” in this usage.³³⁸ The LALG translates it as ‘soul.’³³⁹ As above, in the translations surveyed, ‘person’ is definitely the preferred reading, with only the KJV preferring ‘soul.’ In his comments on the verse, Moo says that in “typical OT and Jewish fashion, Paul uses ‘soul’ (*psyche*) to denote not one ‘part’ of a human being (soul in distinction from body or spirit) but the whole person. The translation ‘every person’ (NRSV; NASB; REB) or ‘everyone’ (NIV; TEV; NJB) is therefore entirely justified.”³⁴⁰ I will explore this “typical Jewish fashion” later in this dissertation, but for now, all that is significant to note is that translating ψυχή as ‘person’ is totally adequate for the context in which it is used here.

³³⁵ s.v. ψυχή II. 2.

³³⁶ s.v. ψυχή 2: By metonymy, that which possesses life or a soul.

³³⁷ s.v. ψυχή (b): an individual or as a strong personal pronoun.

³³⁸ s.v. ψυχή II. 2.

³³⁹ s.v. ψυχή 9.20.2.

³⁴⁰ Moo 1996: 794.

On the back of both these verses we can ascertain that the word also had a pronominal force for Paul. In what follows, I will attempt a deeper analysis of how we are to understand Paul's use of this word in this context, but for now it is sufficient to conclude that this is indeed a use of the word in the Pauline literature as we have defined it.

Emotional/Internal Life

Another use of the word in the Pauline literature is to describe the internal life, or the emotional life of a person. This usage occurs in five places, each in a different letter. The first instance of this use of ψυχή is in 2 Corinthians 12:15:

ἐγὼ δὲ ἥδιστα δαπανήσω καὶ ἐκδαπανηθήσομαι ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν. εἰ
περισσότερως ὑμᾶς ἀγαπῶν, ἦσσον ἀγαπῶμαι;

(I will gladly spend and be spent on behalf of your lives. If I love you exceedingly, am I to be loved less?)

The translation of ψυχή in this setting is perhaps the most controversial of all the ones covered so far. The BDAG says that this verse is referring to the “[apostles] and overseers [being] concerned about the souls of the believers.”³⁴¹ Likewise, both the ESV and the NASB read ψυχή (psyche) as ‘soul.’ Harris, in his commentary on 2 Corinthians, explains the logic behind this translation when he says that “[we] could take ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν (hyper ton psychon hymon) to mean little more than ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (hyper hymon), but the use of ψυχή indicates that the benefit [implied by ὑπὲρ (hyper)] to be felt by the Corinthians lay in the spiritual realm rather than in the physical or financial.”³⁴² In other words, it is because the benefit Paul's work would bring for the Corinthians is spiritual in nature that he uses this word ψυχή as a means of indicating the area that would be most benefited.

On the other side, however, the *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*,³⁴³ TDNT,³⁴⁴ the LALG,³⁴⁵ as well as the NIV, KJV, CSB and *the Bible for Everyone* all gloss this word usage as simply a strong personal pronoun, or as Harris said, interchangeable with ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. Barnett, in his commentary, does not focus on the usage of the word directly, but says parenthetically “Paul's vicarious note should not be missed: ‘I will very gladly ... be spent for

³⁴¹ s.v. ψυχή 2.

³⁴² 2005: 886.

³⁴³ s.v. ψυχή (b): An individual or a strong personal pronoun.

³⁴⁴ s.v. ψυχή II. 2: “[Paul] is read to spend and be spent for the *psychai* of his readers, i.e., that they might know the authentic life that comes from God and is lived responsibly before him.”

³⁴⁵ s.v. ψυχή 26.4. 1: Life.

(*hyper*) your souls [i.e., ‘selves’].”³⁴⁶ This makes it very clear that he takes ψυχή in this instance to be equivalent to a kind of intensive pronoun.

In this case, I am going to argue that the reading advocated by the BDAG, as well as the ESV and NASB is more likely. They do go against the majority of opinion, but in this case, it seems that pronominal usage just does not supply everything we need to make sense of the word in context. Why, after all, would Paul not just say ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν? I agree with Harris and say that it is because Paul sees his ministry as benefitting the Corinthians particularly with respect to their inner persons.

Another instance of this usage appears in the related sections of Ephesians 6:5-8 and Colossians 3:23-25. These letters have some overlap that suggests that they were written around the same time,³⁴⁷ and thus have some overlap in terms of their form and content. Both of the usages of ψυχή in these letters come in the ‘household code’ sections of the letters, where Paul addresses the three major relationships in the family – husbands and wives,³⁴⁸ children and parents³⁴⁹ and finally slaves and masters.³⁵⁰ The usage occurs when Paul is addressing the slaves, which in Ephesians reads like this:

Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ, μὴ κατ’ ὀφθαλμοδουλίαν ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι ἀλλ’ ὡς δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς, μετ’ εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις, εἰδότες ὅτι ἕκαστος ἐάν τι ποιήσῃ ἀγαθόν, τοῦτο κομίζεται παρὰ κυρίου εἴτε δοῦλος εἴτε ἐλεύθερος.

(Slaves, obey your earthly masters with fear and trembling and with sincerity of your hearts as to Christ, not only serving when you’re being seen, as people pleasers, but as slaves of Christ doing the will of God from your heart, serving with a good attitude as to the Lord and not to human beings, knowing that every person who does good, will get it back from the Lord, whether slave or free.)

And in Colossians:

Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε κατὰ πάντα τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις, μὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλίᾳ ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ἀλλ’ ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον. ὃ ἐάν ποιῆτε, ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις, εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπὸ κυρίου ἀπολήψεσθε τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας. τῷ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε· ὁ γὰρ

³⁴⁶ 1997: 586.

³⁴⁷ See discussion in chapter 2.

³⁴⁸ Eph. 5:22-33; Col. 3:18-19.

³⁴⁹ Eph. 6:1-4; Col. 20-21.

³⁵⁰ Eph. 6:5-9; Col. 3:22-4:1.

ἀδικῶν κομίζεται ὁ ἠδίκησεν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν προσωποληψία.

(Slaves, obey your earthly masters in all things, not only when they're watching you, to gain favour, but in sincerity of heart and fear of the Lord. Whatever you do, work from your heart as to the Lord and not to people, knowing that from the Lord you will receive the gift of inheritance. You serve the Lord. Anybody who does wrong will receive the wrong he has done, and there is no partiality.)

Both fall under the same headings in both the BDAG³⁵¹ and the *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*.³⁵² In the *Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, Ephesians 6:6 is understood to be referring to the whole being, rather than some individual portion that could be described as the 'soul.'³⁵³ All translations consulted translate both passages as 'heart,' except for the KJV, ESV and NASB, who translate ψυχή adverbially, saying that the Colossians should work 'heartily.' *The Bible for Everyone* also translates it somewhat differently, saying that the slaves should "give it [their] very best," but this difference is merely formal, and does nothing to change the meaning. Commentators note that in both passages, Paul makes a similar point in the verse before, but using the expression ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας meaning 'in sincerity of heart.'³⁵⁴ Thus, they conclude that Paul is making the same point, one verse later, but this time using ψυχή. Therefore this usage refers to the inner being.³⁵⁵ The command is to work with the direction of all of one's inner being for the sake of the Lord. In the first line, this is symbolised by the word καρδία, and in the second, by the word ψυχή. Thus, the translation of 'heart' provides consistency through the passage as well as captures the idea that Paul intended to convey.

Another passage where Paul uses the word ψυχή in this way is Philippians 1:27-28. In this passage he writes:

Μόνον ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτεύεσθε, ἵνα εἴτε ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ὑμᾶς εἴτε ἀπὼν ἀκούω τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν, ὅτι στήκετε ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθροῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ μὴ πτυρόμενοι ἐν μηδενὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντικειμένων, ἧτις ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἔνδειξις ἀπωλείας, ὑμῶν δὲ σωτηρίας, καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ θεοῦ·

(Only, conduct yourselves in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ, so that if I come and see you, or if I am away, I hear news of you, that you stand firm in one spirit, in one mind fighting together for the faith of the gospel and not being intimidated in anything by those set against you, which faith is the evidence to them of their

³⁵¹ s.v. ψυχή 1: Of feelings and emotions.

³⁵² s.v. ψυχή (c): psychical desire.

³⁵³ s.v. ψυχή 26.4.

³⁵⁴ O'Brien 1999: 451; Moo 2008: 311.

³⁵⁵ Hoehner 2002: 748; Dunn 1996: 255.

destruction, but of your salvation, and this from God.)

This command comes in a section in which Paul is encouraging the Philippians to stand firm in living out their faith, despite the external pressures that may motivate them to stop.³⁵⁶ Again, as in the above passages, ψυχή appears in what is almost a parallelism, helping to strengthen and illuminate another exhortation. In this case the exhortation stresses the necessity for the believers to act as one, striving with one another in their endeavours to be faithful---στήκετε ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες. Silva sees them as a chiasm, which each half emphasising and illuminating the other. He structures the chiasm like this:

- A *stēkete* (you are standing firm)
- B *en heni pneumati* (in one spirit)
- B' *mia psychē* ([with] one soul)
- A' *synathlountes* (contending together)³⁵⁷

Thus, we cannot divorce the meaning of ψυχή in this context from the meaning of πνεῦμα. Unanimously, the translations I surveyed considered πνεῦμα to mean ‘spirit.’ They were content to believe that in this situation it did not refer to the Holy Spirit, but rather to a sense of unity which can be metaphorically described as the ‘spirit’ of the congregation. Thus, in emphasising this, Paul uses the word ψυχή to refer to the conformity of their respective volitions such that in operation they can be seen as one. This interpretation is borne out by the dictionary interpretations,³⁵⁸ and the fact that the translations either used the idea of unity directly,³⁵⁹ or else translated it as ‘one mind’³⁶⁰ reflecting the fact that it is the volition and feelings to which Paul is appealing. This is borne out by the reading offered in TDNT, which says that “this term lays more stress on the task that is to be achieved,”³⁶¹ and is thus about the intention, an idea best captured by reference to the inner person. Therefore, it seems best to translate this use of ψυχή (psyche) with respect to the internal feelings and functioning of a person or the community, which must act with one intention, ‘one mind;’ hence the prefix in

³⁵⁶ Silva 1988: 82.

³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁵⁸ BDAG: s.v. ψυχή 1: Of feelings and emotions. *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*: s.v. ψυχή (C), psychological desire. ψυχή: The essence of life in terms of thinking, willing and feeling – inner self, mind, thoughts, feelings, heart, being.

³⁵⁹ NIV: “striving together as one”; CSB: “in one accord contending ...”; *The Bible for Everyone*: “struggling side by side.”

³⁶⁰ KJV, ESV, NASB.

³⁶¹ s.v. ψυχή II. 3.

συναθλοῦντες.

Another example of the use of ψυχή in this sense occurs in Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians. In 2:5-8 he says:

Οὔτε γάρ ποτε ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας ἐγενήθημεν, καθὼς οἴδατε, οὔτε ἐν προφάσει πλεονεξίας, θεὸς μάρτυς, οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν οὔτε ἀφ' ὑμῶν οὔτε ἀπ' ἄλλων, δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι ὡς Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι, ἀλλ' ἐγενήθημεν νήπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν. ὡς ἐὰν τροφὸς θάλπη τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα, οὕτως ὁμειρόμενοι ὑμῶν εὐδοκοῦμεν μεταδοῦναι ὑμῖν οὐ μόνον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς, διότι ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῖν ἐγενήθητε.

(For we did not come in words of flattery, as you know, nor in a pretext of greediness, God is my witness, nor seeking glory from people, neither from you nor anybody else, though we are able in terms of importance, as apostles of Christ. But we came as babies in your midst. Just as a caring mother nurtures her children, so through longing for you we desired to give you this---not only the gospel of God, but our very lives as well, because you had become beloved to us.)

In this case, Paul refers to how positively he was received when he came to the Thessalonian church and attempts to defend the nature of his ministry as he presented it to them. In this context, Paul says that he gave to the Thessalonians not only the gospel, which he felt commanded to preach everywhere he went, but he and his co-workers also felt compelled to give them τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς. In *The Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*, it is given as simply 'life,'³⁶² as does TDNT³⁶³ which is also how it is taken in the translations, except for the KJV³⁶⁴ and the ESV, which translates it as 'selves.' Over against all these, the LALG translates it as 'soul.'³⁶⁵ In this case, I believe that the ESV translation comes closest to what Paul is talking about. Green, commenting on this passage, notes that the "*lives* they gave them are 'their own souls,' the 'soul' signifying not simply their inner life but rather the whole of their person."³⁶⁶ In this case, it clarifies Paul's meaning to understand sharing one's ψυχή in the same way as married couples promise to share each other's lives. To understand this as a transferral of animating force would be ludicrous. Rather it is a promise to share all of one's self, both present and future. This is surely what Paul and his co-workers felt moved to do when they visited the church in Thessalonica.

³⁶² s.v. ψυχή (a): life, without any psychological content.

³⁶³ s.v. ψυχή II. 1.

³⁶⁴ The KJV translates it "souls."

³⁶⁵ s.v. ψυχή 26.4.2.

³⁶⁶ 2002: 129.

The final instance of this usage of ψυχή is found in 1 Thessalonians 5:23-24. It is in the concluding section of the letter, and while wishing the Thessalonians well, Paul writes:

Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἀγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὀλοτελεῖς, καὶ ὀλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τηρηθεῖ. πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς, ὃς καὶ ποιήσει.

(May God himself, the God of peace make you holy and complete. May the whole of your spirit, your life and your body be kept blamelessly at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. The one who calls you is faithful, who will also do this.)

This is possibly the most troublesome use of the word ψυχή. Indeed, frequent interpretations of this passage as teaching a tripartite division of the human person, into soul (πνεῦμα), spirit (ψυχή) and body (σῶμα) do not help matters. I am convinced, however, that this reading is inaccurate.

All the dictionaries I surveyed take this passage to mean something like ‘self’ or ‘inner person.’³⁶⁷ In his commentary on the letter, Green says that while “these terms may describe different *aspects* of a human’s nature, in the present context the apostle’s appeal to God is simply that his sanctification may extend to the *entirety* of their being.”³⁶⁸ He also notes how this is almost identical to another prayer offered by Paul in this letter, which simply says ‘hearts.’³⁶⁹ So, it seems unlikely that Paul is making his grand statement on the nature of humanity at this point. This does nothing, however, to say how we should translate ψυχή in this passage. All of the translations I surveyed give the translation ‘spirit,’ which is a similar translation to Philippians 1:27. This translation is fine, provided it is understood as that capacity of a person to think and feel, as related to their being alive. One way of understanding this division is vocationally: their conduct in the world, σῶμα, their inner life, ψυχή, and their life before God, πνεῦμα. Given this understanding, perhaps ‘person,’ or ‘mind,’ would serve as better translations. As it stands, however, the idea seems best captured by the concept of the ‘self,’ as the *Pocket Lexicon* said.

³⁶⁷ *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*: s.v. ψυχή c: psychical desire. It also notes that “[the] general use of the word in the Bible is in the sense of whatever is felt to belong most essentially to man’s life, when his bodily life has come to be regarded as a secondary thing. It comes near the modern conception, self.” LN s.v. ψυχή 26.4 notes that it is “important to distinguish ψυχή, signifying a psychological faculty, from ψυχή, meaning ‘physical life, life principle.’”

³⁶⁸ 2002: 268.

³⁶⁹ 1 Thessalonians 3:13: εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἀγιωσύνῃ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ, ἀμήν. (May he strengthen your hearts so that you will be blameless in holiness in the presence of our God and Father at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his holy ones, amen.)

Thus, as with the above verses, this use of ψυχή is best understood as the inner life of the person.

Adjectives and Verbs Based on ψυχή

Alongside the uses of the noun ψυχή, Paul also makes use of several adjectives that are related to this word. Several of these are compounds, either coming from the combination of a preposition and ψυχή, or else combining it with another adjective. I will consider each of these uses and show that, these words align themselves with one of the three uses the noun ψυχή has.

The first adjective is ψυχικός. This adjective only appears in two passages in Paul's writings, both found in his first letter to the Corinthians. In 2:13-16 he writes:

ἂ καὶ λαλοῦμεν οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες. ψυχικός δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ· μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστὶν καὶ οὐ δύναται γινῶναι, ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται. ὁ δὲ πνευματικός ἀνακρίνει [τὰ] πάντα, αὐτὸς δὲ ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἀνακρίνεται. τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου, ὃς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν; ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν.

(We don't speak of such things in learned speech of human wisdom, but in the words taught by the Spirit, explaining spiritual realities with spiritual words. A *human* person does not receive the things of the Spirit of God. For they are foolishness to him and he is not able to know how to judge spiritually. But he who is spiritual judges everything, and he is judged by nobody. "For who is it who has known the mind of the Lord so as to teach him?" We have the mind of Christ.)

The other passage that contains this adjective in it is 1 Corinthians 15:44-46. We did look at this passage earlier, but for the sake of convenience, I'll include it here as well:

σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν. Εἰ ἔστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἔστιν καὶ πνευματικόν. οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται· ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. ἀλλ' οὐ πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικόν ἀλλὰ τὸ ψυχικόν, ἔπειτα τὸ πνευματικόν.

(A human body is sown, and a spiritual body is raised. If there is a human body, there is also a spiritual body. For as it is also written, "The first man Adam came into existence as a living being," the last Adam as a life-giving spirit. But not spiritual first, then human, but human first, and then spiritual.)

You will notice that in both of these passages, the word ψυχικός is given in contrast to πνευματικός. In the first passage, what is being contrasted is the ψυχικός man to the πνευματικός man. In the second passage, the same contrast is made except the difference is not

the people but bodies. Thus, the key to understanding how Paul is using these words is in understanding the contrast he is making. In general, it seems to be that ψυχικός means that which is unaffected by the Holy Spirit, whereas πνευματικός describes that which has been influenced. The dictionary evidence helps us to see this. The *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament* defines the word as dealing with the animated flesh, over against the higher life which is enabled by the Holy Spirit.³⁷⁰ The BDAG describes the use in the 2:13-16 as the “unspiritual man, who lives on the purely material plain, without being touched by the Spirit of God.”³⁷¹ Similarly, the GE translates this word with “natural, terrestrial man.”³⁷² When speaking about 1 Corinthians 15:44-46, the dictionaries gloss ψυχικός as a physical body,³⁷³ and an animal body.³⁷⁴

This distinction is borne out by the translations. Whether with respect to the body or the person as a whole, the point that translators make is that the entity involved is ‘natural’ or ‘without the Spirit.’ In both situations, this translation also makes the best sense of the context. In 2:13-16, Paul is arguing with the Corinthians about their approach to wisdom, which was the root of their divisions.³⁷⁵ Thus, he makes the distinction between those who are ψυχικός, those without the Spirit inside them to guide them, and those who have the Spirit, who are able to discern divine wisdom for what it truly is. In 15:44-46, as mentioned above, Paul deals with the Corinthian belief that there is no resurrection of the body. He thus distinguishes between the current, natural body, and the spiritual body that comes at the last resurrection.

By contrast, the next adjective is very helpful for understanding Paul’s use of the term. The word is ἄψυχος, and it is found in 1 Corinthians 14:7:

ὅμως τὰ ἄψυχα φωνὴν διδόντα, εἴτε αὐλὸς εἴτε κιθάρα, ἐὰν διαστολὴν τοῖς φθόγγοις μὴ δῶ, πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ ἀλλούμενον ἢ τὸ κιθαριζόμενον;

(Similarly, inanimate things make sound, whether the aulos or the kithara, and if they didn’t give some variation in the notes, how would we know what is being played on the aulos or the kithara?)

³⁷⁰ s.v. ψυχικός: Derived from ψυχή. The principle of life and the basis of its emotional aspect, animating the present body of flesh, in contrast to the higher life – emotional or sensuous.

³⁷¹ s.v. ψυχικός 1.

³⁷² s.v. ψυχικός 1.B.

³⁷³ BDAG: s.v. ψυχικός 1. A physical body.

³⁷⁴ GE: s.v. ψυχικός 1. B. Animal body.

³⁷⁵ Fee 1987: 116.

In this case, the adjective is made up of the privation of the word ψυχή. All the dictionaries consulted gave a similar gloss for this word, saying it meant something like ‘lifeless.’³⁷⁶ All the translations accept this. This makes sense in the context, because at this point Paul is arguing that the Corinthians should use the spiritual gifts they are experiencing to build up the church, and Paul compares them to instruments, which need different notes in order to produce a sound.³⁷⁷ So, just as variation in notes provides music from lifeless things, how much more should the living church in Corinth praise God by virtue of its diversity. In this case, the analogy with a Pauline use of ψυχή seems clear. Since we find its privation being used to mean ‘lifeless,’ this seems to provide evidence for one of the meanings of ψυχή being ‘life.’

Another adjective relating to ψυχή is σύμψυχος, which is used in Philippians 2:1-4:

Εἴ τις οὖν παράκλησις ἐν Χριστῷ, εἴ τι παραμύθιον ἀγάπης, εἴ τις κοινωνία πνεύματος, εἴ τις σπλάγγνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί, πληρώσατέ μου τὴν χαρὰν ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε, τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην ἔχοντες, σύμψυχοι, τὸ ἐν φρονοῦντες, μηδὲν κατ’ ἐριθείαν μηδὲ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν ἀλλὰ τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν, μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος σκοποῦντες ἀλλὰ [καὶ] τὰ ἐτέρων ἕκαστοι.

(If you have any comfort in Christ, if any consolation of love, if any communion of spirit, if some mercy or compassion, complete my grace by being of the same mind, having the same love, being of one accord, thinking as one, do nothing out of selfish ambition or vain conceit. But, in humility think of one another as greater than yourselves, not each of you looking after your own interests but each looking out for the interests of the other.)

This passage deals with encouraging unity amongst the members of the church in Philippi. Paul is asking them to unite themselves against the threat which is coming against them from the outside. In this case, the word almost certainly means something like ‘united’ or ‘in agreement.’ This is how the dictionaries take it,³⁷⁸ as well as the translations. As with Philippians 1:27-28, the word ‘spirit’ is used by the NIV, the NASB and the CSB, with the *Bible for Everyone* getting at the same idea when it says “bring your innermost lives into harmony.” The command has to do with arranging one’s interior life and attitude so that it is in concord with that expressed by the other members of the church. Thus, as Silva says, this expression “certainly does not focus on intellectual uniformity but on a whole frame of mind that we can perhaps

³⁷⁶ BDAG: s.v. ἄψυχος: Inanimate, lifeless, of musical instruments. *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*: s.v. ἄψυχος: Lifeless. GE: s.v. ἄψυχος: inanimate, lifeless. LALG: s.v. ἄψυχος: Inanimate.

³⁷⁷ Fee 1987: 663.

³⁷⁸ BDAG: s.v. σύμψυχος: Harmonious, united in spirit. *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*: s.v. σύμψυχος: One in feeling with others, sharing the feelings of others. LN: s.v. σύμψυχος – United in spirit. G.E: s.v. σύμψυχος : Of one mind, in agreement.

best describe as spiritual oneness.”³⁷⁹ So, in this use, we see more evidence for Paul’s understanding of the word ψυχή having something to do with the interior life of the believer, with their emotions or beliefs.

In Philippians 2:19-20 a derivative of ψυχή appears twice, once as a verb and once as an adjective:

Ἐλπίζω δὲ ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Τιμόθεον ταχέως πέμψαι ὑμῖν, ἵνα καὶ ἐν ψυχῶν γνοῦς τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν. οὐδένα γὰρ ἔχω ἰσόψυχον, ὅστις γνησίως τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν μεριμνήσει·

(I hope in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy to you very soon, so that I may be encouraged knowing your news. I have nobody like him, who is genuinely concerned about your welfare.)

Firstly, I will consider the verb εὐψυχέω. Paul uses it here in his description of his plan to send Timothy, his most trusted assistant. He is hoping that, as a result of Timothy’s visit, he will learn things about the Philippian church that will encourage him.

The dictionary evidence is, once again, quite similar. In fact, the entries for the BDAG and the *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament* are completely identical.³⁸⁰ The *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* and the LN render it slightly differently, but the ideas don’t change.³⁸¹ In all cases, the idea is of somebody’s emotional life receiving a boost because outside information has given them something to feel good about. This definition suits the context, which is probably why it is the translation favoured by all the English versions I consulted. Thus, again, in this Pauline usage we can see that the word ψυχή and its derivatives have to do with the inner functioning of a person.

The other ψυχή derivative in this passage is ἰσόψυχος, an adjective used of Timothy. The translation of this word is somewhat more controversial than the first one. There is a subtle difference in the way the dictionaries translate this word. The BDAG³⁸² and the *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*³⁸³ both have similar translations, taking it to mean something like ‘likeminded.’ The LALG follows this pattern.³⁸⁴ The GE, on the other hand, translates ἰσόψυχος to mean ‘of equal feeling.’³⁸⁵ The debate is whether Timothy’s ἰσόψυχος refers to

³⁷⁹ 1988: 87.

³⁸⁰ BDAG: s.v. εὐψυχέω: Be glad, have courage. *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*: s.v. εὐψυχέω: Be glad, have courage.

³⁸¹ GE: s.v. εὐψυχέω: Be spirited, bold, courageous. LN: s.v. εὐψυχέω: To have courage.

³⁸² s.v. ἰσόψυχος: Of like soul or mind; possibly having much in common.

³⁸³ s.v. ἰσόψυχος: Likeminded.

³⁸⁴ s.v. ἰσόψυχος: Like-minded.

³⁸⁵ s.v. ἰσόψυχος.

his comparison with another, or whether it is his similarity to Paul, in his love for the Philippians.³⁸⁶ I tend to prefer the latter reading. But either way, the significance of this word for our understanding of ψυχή in Paul is clear. They both refer to the ψυχή as it relates to the mentality of the person who has it.

The final derivative of ψυχή in the letters of Paul which we are considering is found in 1 Thessalonians 5:14:

Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, νουθετεῖτε τοὺς ἀτάκτους, παραμυθεῖσθε τοὺς ὀλιγοψύχους, ἀντέχεσθε τῶν ἀσθενῶν, μακροθυμεῖτε πρὸς πάντας.

(We urge you, brothers, warn those who are idle, encourage the disheartened, help the weak, show patience to all.)

In this case, the meaning of the word is quite clear. Again, all the dictionaries I surveyed translate this word more or less similarly.³⁸⁷ Generally, it refers to a state where one's inner life and capacity to act have been diminished by distressing events in the outside world. In the translations, it is regularly translated as 'downcast' or 'disheartened,' except the KJV, which translates it as 'feeble-minded.' Again, as with the passages before, this suggests that the Pauline understanding of ψυχή includes some reference to the internal life.

Synthesis

With all the data I have gathered about the ψυχή word-group, I will now move to a preliminary analysis of what this word means in the letters of the Apostle Paul. Naturally, this analysis will be filled out by the studies into Paul's background that will follow, but this analysis based on word frequency and usage is an essential first step for what comes next.

Before I begin with that, however, I must acknowledge the difficulty that a synthesis of Pauline materials presents. After all, the majority of the information about the Apostle's beliefs comes from a series of letters written to disparate churches, in disparate places, often giving disparate information. Aside from the variety of the material, there is also the fact that each letter was written into a specific context, with a specific purpose. Thus, both the material and the presentation of that material will be different in one letter compared to another. Compare, for example, the lengthy, rhetorically sophisticated addresses to the Corinthians, to the short,

³⁸⁶ Silva 1988: 140.

³⁸⁷ BDAG: s.v. ὀλιγοψύχος: faint-hearted, discouraged. *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*: s.v. ὀλιγοψύχος: pusillanimous, of small courage. GE: s.v. ὀλιγοψύχος: mentally fragile, cowardly. TDNT: s.v. ὀλιγοψύχος: "[the] term suggests weakness of faith." This dictionary also suggests ἰσόψυχος, εὐψυχέω and σύμψυχος as references. LALG: s.v. ὀλιγοψύχος: Discouraged.

familiar missive sent to Philemon, and the nature of the problem will become apparent.³⁸⁸

While I am aware of these problems, I do still think there is genuine possibility for a reconstruction of Pauline thought. This possibility is rooted in the distinction between the writings themselves and the person behind the writings. In other words, Pauline theology needs to be sensitive to the writings themselves, and deal with them in a way that is responsible. But on another level, Pauline theology needs to attempt an understanding of the beliefs that produced those writings. While there is undoubtedly some trepidation required as one takes this step, there is, nevertheless, the real chance to come to some authentic conclusions about Pauline theology.³⁸⁹

Regarding ψυχή, there are really three ways Paul seems to use this noun. The first is to mean ‘life,’ as in that by which the body is animated and that which is lost at the moment of death. Of the uses surveyed above, three of them have relations to Paul’s Jewish background. In Romans 11:3, Paul cites from 1 Kings, and in 1 Corinthians 15:44-46 he cites Genesis 2:7. In both cases, his use of ψυχή, and all the meaning it carries, comes from his use and memory of the Israelite Scriptures mediated through LXX. In 2 Corinthians 1:23 Paul does not directly cite from the Scriptures of Israel, but he does use an expression which, following BDAG, reflects his Jewish roots.³⁹⁰ The two other uses of this word in the passage both refer to other people. In Romans 16:4-5 Paul refers to Priscilla and Aquila, who had risked their lives on his behalf, and in Philippians 2:30, to Epaphroditus. In both cases there, the emphasis is on how the ψυχή is risked when one puts oneself in danger. This is the same emphasis as the usage in Romans 11:3, and, implicitly, 2 Corinthians 1:23. In 1 Corinthians 15:44-46, the emphasis is rather on how Adam, the first man, became a living being, with the word ψυχή being used to describe his nature as an entity that has life. Putting together these two emphases, we end up with at least the fact that ψυχή refers to ‘life.’

Another way Paul uses it is to describe the inner life of the person. The passages in Ephesians and Colossians, dealing with the conduct of slaves, use this word in apposition to καρδιά, which is translated as ‘heart.’ In the context, it refers to the slaves directing their whole inner beings to the service of their masters. This usage is also found repeatedly in Philippians, where Paul regularly calls them to unity by appealing to the ψυχή. This is also the sense that

³⁸⁸ This can be understood as an example of the problem with Biblical Theology as a discipline. For discussion on this topic, see Moo 2021: 3-7; Carson 2010: 111-126.

³⁸⁹ In this, I follow Moo in 2021: 8. Carson 2010: 138-141.

³⁹⁰ s.v. ψυχή 1.f: “In var. Semitic languages the reflexive relationship is paraphrased with *nepshesh*; the corresponding use of ψυχή in our lit. may be detected in certain passages in our lit. esp. in quotes from the OT and in places where OT modes of expression have considerable influence.”

the word frequently has when it appears as a verb and an adjective. The ψυχή is something that can be encouraged, such as in Philippians 2:19-20,³⁹¹ or it can be discouraged, such as in 1 Thessalonians 5:14.³⁹² This suggests that Paul's use of this word goes deeper than simply meaning 'life.' 'Life' does seem to be the most basic meaning, but another layer on top of that appears to be that the ψυχή incorporates all that inner working and feeling that is present when life is present.

The final use that Paul has of this word, and possibly the most confusing, is the use of it as some kind of strong pronoun. This usage is somewhat rare – it is used this way only twice, and in each case, the setting is solemn. In Romans 2:9-11, Paul describes how no person who has done wrong will escape the judgement of God, a most solemn topic indeed. In Romans 13:1 Paul refers to the need for each person to submit themselves willingly to the government and its rulings. In each of these cases, Paul wants to address his readers, but wants to add some extra layer of seriousness to his address.

As a result, based on the analysis of the word as it is found in the Pauline texts, it refers to 'life,' as in that which animates and is lost at death, and by extension those capacities that belong to somebody when they are alive, such as will and emotion. Now, this is a very broad analysis, and in what follows, it will be developed. But first, we must give the same treatment to the other 'soul' word in the Pauline epistles: πνεῦμα.

πνεῦμα Introduction

We now turn to an analysis of Paul's use of the word πνεῦμα. This word is more common than ψυχή, appearing 145 times in Paul's letters.³⁹³ The vast majority of these instances, however, are in reference to the Holy Spirit, not the human spirit. Thus, they are not relevant to the topic at hand. The focus of this analysis, therefore, will be on the 32 times where Paul uses πνεῦμα in reference to humans.

Although there are more occurrences of πνεῦμα than ψυχή in our literature, the range of meaning it has is somewhat smaller. In this section I will lay out all 32 of the instances of this word and its related adjective πνευματικός in Paul's letters. I will argue that the uses of the noun can fall into three categories. I will show that πνεῦμα, when referring to people, most often refers to the inner person. Paul speaks about it when he defines the inner person, when

³⁹¹ εὐψυχέω.

³⁹² ὀλιγοψύχος.

³⁹³ Fee 1994: 14.

he talks about the disposition or action of the inner person, and when he uses it as metonymy for the whole person. After this, I will look at some unusual uses of the word, and finally I will describe the adjectival uses of the word, and show that they describe areas in which God's Spirit is at work.

πνεῦμα as Inner Person

As I mentioned above, this category contains the vast majority of Paul's uses of this word in reference to a human being. That is not to say, however, that it is uniform. There are certainly nuances within this group that deserve to be acknowledged. With this in mind, I am going to divide this category into three further subcategories. Firstly, I will look at uses that describe the inner person itself. Secondly, I will look at instances where this word describes an action or direction of the inner person into a disposition, and finally I am going to look at the rare occasions when Paul makes use of πνεῦμα as metonymy for the whole person.

The Inner Person Itself

Of the 32 instances in which Paul speaks about the human πνεῦμα, half of them end up in this category. The first is found in Romans 1:9-10:

μάρτυς γάρ μου ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, ᾧ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως μνησθῆναι ὑμῶν ποιῶμαι πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου δεόμενος εἴ πως ἤδη ποτὲ εὐδοθήσομαι ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

(For God is my witness, whom I serve in my spirit and in the gospel of his son, that I constantly remember you in my prayers all the time, asking that at last by God's will I will succeed in coming to you.)

This occurs right at the start of the letter, as Paul gives thanks for the safety of the members of the Roman church to whom he was writing, as it is traditional for those writing letters to do.³⁹⁴ Almost incidentally Paul mentions that when he serves God, he serves him in his πνεῦμα. Among the dictionaries I consulted, there is some conflict as to the meaning of πνεῦμα in this setting. The BDAG says that it means "the source and seat of insight, feeling and will, gener. as the representative part of the inner life of man."³⁹⁵ The *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament* agrees, but adds the idea that it is the "higher nature of man."³⁹⁶ TDNT agrees, arguing that this is the spirit as under the influence of the Holy Spirit, thereby experiencing

³⁹⁴ Moo 1996: 56.

³⁹⁵ s.v. πνεῦμα 3.b.

³⁹⁶ s.v. πνεῦμα.

some upliftment that is alien to the ordinary person.³⁹⁷

While this makes some sense, especially because it is connected with the word λατρεύω, which means to serve, used particularly in cultic settings,³⁹⁸ I nevertheless feel that there is a simpler explanation that helps understand what Paul is trying to express. As Moo says, “[what] fits Pauline usage and makes sense in the context is an emphasis on the engagement of Paul's ‘deepest’ person in the ministry to which he has been called. As this inward part of Paul's person is the instrument of his service, the gospel of God's Son is the sphere of that ministry.”³⁹⁹ This is echoed by Fitzmyer, who says that Paul's use of πνεῦμα in this context “most likely means that Paul put his whole self into evangelisation.”⁴⁰⁰ As both of them argue, Paul is here telling the Roman church about the extent of his service to God, and, to emphasize that, he mentions that this service comes from the depths of his inner person. So, it is most likely that this use of πνεῦμα is about Paul's own ‘inner person.’

Another passage in which Paul uses πνεῦμα in this way is Romans 8:16:

αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ.

(The Spirit himself witnesses with our spirits that we are children of God.)

This verse has two of the typical Pauline uses of πνεῦμα. It speaks about God's Spirit, who speaks to the πνεῦμα inside people. Again, the BDAG cites this as the inner part of a person,⁴⁰¹ and the *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament* agrees.⁴⁰² In commenting on this verse, Moo says that Paul “wants to stress that the witness of ‘the Spirit himself’ about our adoption as sons affects the deepest and innermost part of our beings.”⁴⁰³ In a footnote, he elaborates by saying that “[when] Paul speaks about the human πνεῦμα ... he focuses on the inner dimension of the person.”⁴⁰⁴ Thus, as in the above passage, we can say with some confidence that Paul envisions the Holy Spirit witnessing to the deepest part of a person.

Another passage where Paul has this in mind is in Romans 12:9-13:

³⁹⁷ s.v. πνεῦμα.

³⁹⁸ BDAG: s.v. λατρεύω: “serve, in our lit. only of the carrying out of relig. duties, esp. of a cultic nature, by human beings.”

³⁹⁹ Moo 1996: 58.

⁴⁰⁰ Fitzmyer 2020: 834.

⁴⁰¹ s.v. πνεῦμα 3.b: “as the source and seat of insight, feeling and will, gener. as the representative part of the inner life of man.”

⁴⁰² s.v. πνεῦμα: “Sometimes ... it denotes a normal element in human nature.”

⁴⁰³ Moo 1996: 504.

⁴⁰⁴ 1996: 503.

Ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος. ἀποστυγοῦντες τὸ πονηρόν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ, τῆ φιλadelphία εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι, τῆ τιμῆ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι, τῆ σπουδῆ μὴ ὀκνηροί, τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες, τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες, τῆ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες, τῆ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες, τῆ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες, ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἀγίων κοιωνοῦντες, τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες.

(Let your love be sincere. Abhor evil, and cling to what is good, in brotherly affection be devoted to one another. With honour consider each another better than yourself. With eagerness and not hesitation, be enthusiastic in your spirit, serve the Lord, rejoice in hope, endure in tribulation and persist in prayer. Hold the needs of the saints in common, pursue hospitality.)

The interpretation of this passage is somewhat more complicated than the first two. The BDAG,⁴⁰⁵ CSB,⁴⁰⁶ and *The Bible for Everyone*⁴⁰⁷ all take πνεῦμα in this passage as referring to the Holy Spirit, and understand Paul to be saying something like “you should be fervent by the empowering of the Spirit and the work it has called you to do.”

On the other hand, the LN,⁴⁰⁸ as well as the NIV,⁴⁰⁹ KJV,⁴¹⁰ ESV,⁴¹¹ and NASB⁴¹² all take it as human spirit. They understand Paul as instructing the Romans to remain faithful in

⁴⁰⁵ s.v. πνεῦμα 5.d: “The spirit as that which differentiates God fr. everything that is not God, as the divine power that produces all divine existence, as the divine element in which all divine life is carried on, as the bearer of every application of the divine will...”

⁴⁰⁶ “Let love be without hypocrisy. Detest evil; cling to what is good. Love one another deeply as brothers and sisters. Take the lead in honoring one another. Do not lack diligence in zeal; be fervent in the Spirit; serve the Lord. Rejoice in hope; be patient in affliction; be persistent in prayer. Share with the saints in their needs; pursue hospitality.”

⁴⁰⁷ “Love must be real. Hate what is evil, stick fast to what is good. Be truly affectionate in showing love for one another; compete with each other in giving mutual respect. Don’t get tired of working hard. Be on fire with the spirit. Work as slaves for the Lord. Celebrate your hope; be patient in suffering; give constant energy to prayer; contribute to the needs of God’s people; make sure you are hospitable to strangers.”

⁴⁰⁸ s.v. πνεῦμα 25.73: “to show great eagerness toward something – to show enthusiasm, to commit oneself completely to.”

⁴⁰⁹ “Love must be sincere. Hate what is evil; cling to what is good. Be devoted to one another in love. Honor one another above yourselves. Never be lacking in zeal, but keep your spiritual fervor, serving the Lord. Be joyful in hope, patient in affliction, faithful in prayer. Share with the Lord’s people who are in need. Practice hospitality.”

⁴¹⁰ “Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another; Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord; Rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer; Distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospitality.”

⁴¹¹ “Let love be genuine. Abhor what is evil; hold fast to what is good. Love one another with brotherly affection. Outdo one another in showing honor. Do not be slothful in zeal, be fervent in spirit, serve the Lord. Rejoice in hope, be patient in tribulation, be constant in prayer. Contribute to the needs of the saints and seek to show hospitality.”

⁴¹² “Love must be free of hypocrisy. Detest what is evil; cling to what is good. Be devoted to one another in brotherly love; give preference to one another in honor, not lagging behind in diligence, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord; rejoicing in hope, persevering in tribulation, devoted to prayer, contributing to the needs of the saints, practicing hospitality.”

their worship of God.

Moo agrees with the former group, arguing that there is a parallel with the Lord in v11c.⁴¹³ Since Paul mentions the Lord in v11c, he argues, we are justified in taking this instance of πνεῦμα as the Holy Spirit. I don't think this parallel, however, is strong enough to justify this reading. There is another kind of parallel present in this passage in v9, where Paul tells the Romans to "hate what is evil" but to "cling to what is good."⁴¹⁴ It seems just as likely that Paul is using a similar kind of parallel here, where they should tend to their own spirits, and then focus on God's work. Given also that the thrust of the whole passage is ethical instruction to the Roman church, the instruction to be set on fire by the Spirit would seem anomalous. Surely, given the nature of the commands surrounding it, it is better to take this as something Paul conceived of the Romans as being able to do for themselves? Thus, I take this as a reference to the human πνεῦμα, referring to the inner person that is able to feel zealous for God.

Another passage that shows this is 1 Corinthians 2:11. In this passage, Paul argues that the Corinthians are not as wise as they think they are, because they need the Spirit of God to help them understand God. To this end Paul says,

τίς γὰρ οἶδεν ἀνθρώπων τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ;
οὕτως καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκεν εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ.

(For who among people knows the deep things of a person except the spirit within him?
Likewise, nobody knows the deep things of God except the Spirit of God.)

Here Paul makes an argument from analogy. Just as a person's spirit is the only one who is able to say what the person is thinking, so too God's Spirit is prepared to reveal what is true about God internally. Both the BDAG⁴¹⁵ and the LN⁴¹⁶ agree that this is in reference to the person's spirit as the natural inner part of a human being.

Both Thiselton and Fee are quick to point out that despite appearances Paul is only making an argument, he is not making a definitive anthropological statement.⁴¹⁷ I agree with this. This point, however, does nothing to demonstrate that Paul did not understand the πνεῦμα to be the inner part of the person. In fact, although that is certainly not the main point of this

⁴¹³ 1996: 778.

⁴¹⁴ Cf. v15: χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. (To rejoice with those who rejoice, and weep with those who weep.)

⁴¹⁵ s.v. πνεῦμα 3.b. See n. 9.

⁴¹⁶ s.v. πνεῦμα 26.9: "the non-material, psychological faculty which is potentially sensitive and responsive to God, spirit, spiritual, spiritual nature, inner being."

⁴¹⁷ Fee 1987: 112-113; Thiselton 2000: 262-263.

section of 1 Corinthians, the fact that Paul sees this analogy as appropriate certainly suggests that he believed in something called the πνεῦμα which was the inner part of a person and in which a person did their deepest thinking.

A trickier instance of this word in 1 Corinthians is in 5:3-5. In this case, Paul refers to a sexually immoral man and proposes that the best way to deal with this situation is to cast such a man out of the assembly:

ἐγὼ μὲν γάρ, ἀπὸν τῷ σώματι παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, ἤδη κέκρικα ὡς παρὼν τὸν οὕτως τοῦτο κατεργασάμενον· ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] Ἰησοῦ ἰσχυρόντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου.

(For myself, although in my body I am absent, I am with you in spirit, and I've already passed judgement on the person who did these things, as if I was present. When you are gathered in the name of the Lord, and my spirit is with you in the power of our Lord Jesus, you must hand this person over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, so that his spirit might be saved on the day of the Lord.)

There are two instances in this passage. The first one has to do with Paul saying that he is somehow present in the gathering of the Corinthians believers, while being physically distant, and the second has to do with the man's expulsion, and what Paul hopes will result from this situation.

Firstly, in Paul's case, he makes the strange claim that although he is not with them in body, he is with them in spirit. There are two ways to take this. The first is to assume that Paul means that he is aware of the problem and it has not left his mind.⁴¹⁸ This, however, seems insufficient. If this is all Paul means, then it is hard to understand how he could assume to exercise authority over the church. Fee offers an intriguing understanding of it in his commentary on the passage, saying, "Paul does not mean that in some vague way they are to think about him as though he were actually among them, but is not really so. Rather, when the Corinthians are assembled, the Spirit is understood to be present among them (see on 3:16); and for Paul that means that he, too, is present among them by that same Spirit."⁴¹⁹ In other words, Fee argues that Paul really believed that he was there among them, in virtue of their shared connection to the Spirit of God, under whom they would meet. This can only be understood if Paul is understood as positing some aspect of his own personality, the πνεῦμα,

⁴¹⁸ Fee 1987: 204.

⁴¹⁹ *Ibid.* 205.

which is capable of being joined to the Holy Spirit, and is clearly separate somehow from the physical aspect of himself which would remain apart from them. In this case, we can see that the πνεῦμα is the inner person, and that part that is especially connected to the Holy Spirit.

The other instance in this passage describes the πνεῦμα of the man who was caught in the affair, and which Paul hopes will be saved by the punishment he is asking the church to exercise over this man. In this case, the dictionary readings are unanimous that this refers to the inner person.⁴²⁰ This reading adds a layer of nuance to the picture that has been established so far. The πνεῦμα is not just the inner part of the person. It is also that which is saved by God and, it is implied, can survive death.

Later on in his first letter to the Corinthians, in 6:17, Paul says that

ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν πνευμά ἐστιν

(The one united with the Lord is one spirit with him.)

The witness regarding this verse is completely split. On the one hand, all the dictionaries I surveyed defined this use as the Holy Spirit.⁴²¹ The only dictionary that differed slightly is the TDNT, but it is included in a section on the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, the translations I surveyed⁴²² and the commentaries take this to be a reference to the person's spirit being joined to the Holy Spirit when one becomes a Christian. It is this latter reading that I am going to favour, because it makes more sense of the context of the passage. In the passage Paul says that when somebody has sex with a prostitute, they unite themselves with the prostitute, but since the believer is united with Christ in their spirit, they shouldn't then unite their body to a prostitute. In view of this, the best understanding is that Paul is talking about a human spirit, and this would suggest that humans had such things and, their spirits are that part of the person

⁴²⁰ BDAG: s.v. πνεῦμα 3.a: "The spirit as a part of the human personality - when used with σάρξ, the flesh, it denotes the immaterial part." GE: s.v. πνεῦμα: "Spirit, spiritual element (of man)." TDNT: s.v. πνεῦμα 4: "In 1 Cor. 5:3ff. the pneúma seems to be the new I of faith which will be saved if purifying judgment is exercised on the flesh. Paul's pneúma, however, is his divinely given authority." LN: s.v. πνεῦμα 26.9: "the non-material, psychological faculty which is potentially sensitive and responsive to God (πνεῦμα contrasts with σάρξ, 26.7, as an expression of the divine in contrast with the purely human)— 'spirit, spiritual, spiritual nature, inner being.'"

⁴²¹ BDAG: s.v. πνεῦμα 5.d.β: The Holy Spirit, without the article. TDNT: s.v. πνεῦμα 1.b: "The term "Spirit of the Lord" denotes Christ's mode of existence and the power with which he encounters the community. In his powerful action he is equated with the Spirit, in his lordship over it he is differentiated from the Spirit. The union of believers with Christ in his spiritual body comes out plainly in 1 Cor. 6:17." LN: s.v. πνεῦμα 12.18: "Spirit, Spirit of God, Holy Spirit."

⁴²² NIV: "But whoever is united with the Lord is one with him in spirit." KJV: "But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit." ESV: "But he who is joined to the Lord becomes one spirit with him." NASB: "But the one who joins himself to the Lord is one spirit with Him." CSB: "But anyone joined to the Lord is one spirit with him." *The Bible for Everyone*: "But the one who joins himself to the Lord becomes one spirit with him."

which can be united with the Holy Spirit.

On a similar topic, Paul starts addressing the issue of husbands and wives later on in 1 Corinthians 7:33-34:

ὁ δὲ γαμήσας μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῇ γυναικί, καὶ μεμέρισται. καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἢ ἄγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ᾗ ἁγία καὶ τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι· ἡ δὲ γαμήσασα μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῷ ἀνδρὶ.

(The married man is anxious about the things of the world, how he can please his wife, and so is divided. The unmarried woman and the virgin are concerned about the things of the Lord, that they may be holy both in body and in spirit; whereas she who is married is worried about the things of the world, how she can please her husband.)

Again, in this passage, the dictionaries are reasonably clear that this refers to the human inner person.⁴²³ Some of the difficulty arises in understanding the precise nuance of the use of the word in this section of the letter. Thiselton, for example, considers Barrett's idea that this instance of πνεῦμα is not strictly a Pauline use, and that Paul is rather quoting a Corinthian understanding of holiness in order to disagree with it.⁴²⁴ This is not necessary however. It is simpler to take it as referring to holiness both in the bodily realm as well as in one's relationship to God, as in fact Thiselton does.⁴²⁵ So, here again πνεῦμα is best understood as an aspect of the human person, particularly that aspect by which a person relates to God.

A somewhat more controversial instance of this word is found in 1 Corinthians 12:8-11:

ᾧ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος δίδεται λόγος σοφίας, ἄλλω δὲ λόγος γνώσεως κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, ἑτέρω πίστις ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι, ἄλλω δὲ χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ πνεύματι, ἄλλω δὲ ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων, ἄλλω [δὲ] προφητεία, ἄλλω [δὲ] διακρίσεις πνευμάτων, ἑτέρω γένη γλωσσῶν, ἄλλω δὲ ἐρμηνεῖα γλωσσῶν· πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται.

(For to one is given a word of wisdom through the Spirit, and to another a word of knowledge by the same Spirit. To another faith in the same Spirit, and to another the gifts of healing in the same Spirit, and to another the working of power, and to another prophecy, and to another the discernment of spirits, and to another kinds of tongues,

⁴²³ BDAG: s.v. πνεῦμα 3: "The spirit as part of the human personality." TDNT: s.v. πνεῦμα 4: "Since the Holy Spirit affects the whole person and cannot be explained psychologically, Paul adopts popular anthropological ideas quite freely. He uses pneuma for psychological functions in 1 Cor. 7:34; 2 Cor 7:1." LN: s.v. πνεῦμα 26.9: "the non-material, psychological faculty which is potentially sensitive and responsive to God (πνεῦμα contrasts with σὰρξ, 26.7, as an expression of the divine in contrast with the purely human)—'spirit, spiritual, spiritual nature, inner being.'"

⁴²⁴ 2000: 591.

⁴²⁵ *Ibid.*

and to another the interpretation of tongues. All these things are the work of one and the same Spirit giving them to each as he wishes.)

There are several uses of πνεῦμα in this passage, with the majority of them referring to the Holy Spirit, and so falling outside the scope of our discussion. The second to last, however, is a controversial instance. Paul is listing different spiritual gifts that could be present among the Corinthians in the church, and one of these is what is called the διακρίσεις πνευμάτων, or the ‘discernment of spirits.’ The use of the plural here suggests that the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit of God, is not what is in view. But that is where agreement in the scholarship ends. BDAG⁴²⁶ and the LN⁴²⁷ understand this to be a reference to spirits – non-material powers that have influence over the body of the church. This is certainly a possibility, but there is some internal evidence that this is not in fact what Paul had in mind. In 1 Corinthians 14:29, Paul uses a very similar phrase to describe the process of judging whether or not prophecy was true or not. In this case, what is being judged is the nature of the connection between the spirit of the prophet and the Holy Spirit to determine whether a supernatural utterance is actually that or if it is some other form of self-deception.⁴²⁸ This would again suggest what we have been seeing repeatedly – that πνεῦμα describes an internal part of the human being which is particularly sensitive towards the Holy Spirit.

Another two uses of the word are found in 1 Corinthians 14:12-16:

οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἐπεὶ ζηλωταὶ ἐστε πνευμάτων, πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ζητεῖτε ἵνα περισσεύητε. Διὸ ὁ λαλῶν γλώσση προσευχέσθω ἵνα διερμηνεύῃ. ἐὰν [γὰρ] προσεύχωμαι γλώσση, τὸ πνεῦμά μου προσεύχεται, ὁ δὲ νοῦς μου ἄκαρπός ἐστιν. τί οὖν ἐστιν; προσεύξομαι τῷ πνεύματι, προσεύξομαι δὲ καὶ τῷ νοῖ· ψαλῶ τῷ πνεύματι, ψαλῶ δὲ καὶ τῷ νοῖ. ἐπεὶ ἐὰν εὐλογῆς ἐν πνεύματι, ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ιδιώτου πῶς ἐρεῖ τὸ ἀμὴν ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ; ἐπειδὴ τί λέγεις οὐκ οἶδεν·

(Thus, since you are zealous for spirits, look for many of them in order to build up the church. Thus the one who prays in tongues, let him pray that he might interpret. For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays, but my mind is unfruitful. So what is it? I will pray with my spirit and I will pray with my mind. I will praise in my spirit and in my mind. Since if you praise in the spirit, how can an outsider say amen to your thanksgiving, since he does not know what you mean?)

⁴²⁶ s.v. πνεῦμα 7: “Only rarely do we read in our lit. of persons who are possessed by a spirit that is not fr. God ... [because] there are persons activated by such spirits, it is necessary to test the various kinds of spirits.”

⁴²⁷ s.v. πνεῦμα 12.33: “a supernatural non- material being—‘spirit.’”

⁴²⁸ Fee 1987: 596-597.

The first usage is initially unclear. For which spirits are the Corinthians zealous? The use of the plural in this case makes it seem as if the Corinthians are zealous for other powers to influence them. The BDAG, however, classifies this usage as a reference to the Holy Spirit,⁴²⁹ and Fee elaborates in his commentary by suggesting that this was an instance where the Corinthians were zealous for different ‘manifestations’ of the one Holy Spirit. In other words, “[the plural] is Paul’s way of speaking about the Spirit manifesting himself through their individual ‘spirits.’”⁴³⁰ This interpretation would be consistent with the context of the passage, where Paul is urging the Corinthians to make their worship services more inclusive by making them intelligible, rather than having every Corinthian desiring the more ostentatious, but opaque, gift of tongues. In this context, Fee’s interpretation of the word as the Spirit influencing many “spirits” makes sense.

The second use of this word, however, occurs when Paul turns the focus on himself. He says that when he prays in tongues, his πνεῦμα is active, but his mind is silent. He then urges that they should rather seek those practices that lead to the flourishing of both spirit and mind. But how do we understand πνεῦμα in this context? The BDAG and TDNT take it to be a reference to the working of the Holy Spirit in a person, particularly towards the manifestation of the gift of praying in tongues.⁴³¹ Thiselton translates this usage as “deepest spiritual being.”⁴³² This is particularly compelling because of the contrast that is drawn between the νοῦς and the πνεῦμα. It seems, in this instance, that Paul is making a distinction between the fully rational human nature, and that part of the person with which the Spirit can have communion, and which can fall under the influence of the Spirit. Thus, again, it makes sense to understand πνεῦμα in this case as the inner person, especially that part of the inner person that is sensitive to the working of the Spirit.⁴³³

Later in the same chapter of 1 Corinthians, Paul refers to the πνεῦμα again in vv32-33:

καὶ πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται, οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεὸς ἀλλ’ εἰρήνης.

⁴²⁹ s.v. πνεῦμα 6.d: “The Spirit of God, being one, shows the variety and richness of his life in the different kinds of spiritual gifts which are granted to certain Christians.”

⁴³⁰ 1987: 666.

⁴³¹ BDAG: s.v. πνεῦμα 6.d: “The Spirit of God, being one, shows the variety and richness of his life in the different kinds of spiritual gifts which are granted to certain Christians.” TDNT: s.v. πνεῦμα 4: “In the last resort, however, the pneuma is for Paul the God-given pneuma that is alien to us.”

⁴³² 2000: 1111.

⁴³³ Cf. LN: s.v. πνεῦμα 26.9: “the non-material, psychological faculty which is potentially sensitive and responsive to God (πνεῦμα contrasts with σὰρξ, 26.7, as an expression of the divine in contrast with the purely human)—‘spirit, spiritual, spiritual nature, inner being.’”

(And the spirits of the prophets are subject to prophets, for he is not a God of disorder but of peace.)

Thiselton argues that Paul is speaking against an anticipated Corinthian objection that it would be somehow ‘unspiritual’ to restrain the speaking of the Spirit through his own spirit.⁴³⁴ The precise meaning of the πνεῦμα in this section is unclear, but what is clear is similar to what was said above – it seems to be that aspect of the person by which the prophet communicates with God and through which the Holy Spirit enables human communication with God, as we concluded above.

The last instance of this word in 1 Corinthians is found in 16:18:

ἀνέπαυσαν γὰρ τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν. ἐπιγινώσκετε οὖν τοιοῦτους.

(For they refreshed my spirit and yours. So recognise such persons.)

In this situation, Paul refers to some people from Corinth who went to see him regarding the state of the church. He says that they provided much encouragement for him, and so the Corinthian believers should treat them well. In this case it is clear, as LN says,⁴³⁵ that Paul is talking about his inner person – that aspect of himself by which he is able to feel the encouragement of other believers meeting with him.

A similar instance of the word, though with an opposite emotion, is found in 2 Corinthians 2:12-13:

Ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θύρας μοι ἀνεωγμένης ἐν κυρίῳ, οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν με Τίτον τὸν ἀδελφόν μου, ἀλλ’ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς ἐξῆλθον εἰς Μακεδονίαν.

(Coming into Troas to preach the gospel of Christ and although a door was opened for me in the Lord, I did not have rest in my spirit because I did not find my brother Titus, so saying farewell to them I set out for Macedonia.)

As above, Paul is relating the effect that the absence of a ministry colleague had on his sense of wellbeing. It forms a part of Paul’s travel narrative which runs sporadically through the Second Letter to the Corinthians. Harris sees a parallel between this passage and 2 Corinthians 7:5:

⁴³⁴ 2000: 1144.

⁴³⁵ s.v. πνεῦμα 26.9: “the non-material, psychological faculty which is potentially sensitive and responsive to God (πνεῦμα contrasts with σὰρξ, 26.7, as an expression of the divine in contrast with the purely human)—‘spirit, spiritual, spiritual nature, inner being.’”

...οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἢ σὰρξ ἡμῶν...

(our bodies had no rest).

From this parallel, he deduces that there is an aspectual distinction being made between the inner, spiritual dimension of the unrest and the outer dimension.⁴³⁶ This analysis seems fair, and emphasises the point that πνεῦμα often refers to this inner aspect of a person.

The next use of πνεῦμα in 2 Corinthians occurs in chapter 7, where we have two further occurrences of this word. The first is in 2 Corinthians 7:1:

Ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀγαπητοί, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἀγιωσύνην ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ.

(So, having this promise, beloved, let us purify ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, completing our holiness in fear of God.)

In this case, the dictionary interpretations of πνεῦμα are clear. In all the cases I surveyed, it is said to mean the ‘inner person’ or ‘spirit.’⁴³⁷ Again, Harris argues that in this combination of πνεῦμα and σὰρξ, there is a complimentary description of the inner and outer aspects of a human being.⁴³⁸ The point, it seems, is that the promises God has bestowed on his people require a righteousness that permeates the whole person, and in describing the whole person Paul uses σὰρξ to refer to the external person, and πνεῦμα to demarcate the internal person. Thus, again, we have another usage which testifies that one of Paul’s meanings for πνεῦμα is the ‘inner person’ of a human being.

The next instance of this word in chapter 7 is similar to 1 Corinthians 16:18 and 2 Corinthians 2:13 above. Paul has resumed his travel narrative, and again refers to Titus, his co-worker in 2 Corinthians 7.13:

διὰ τοῦτο παρακεκλήμεθα. Ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ παρακλήσει ἡμῶν περισσοτέρως μᾶλλον ἐχάρημεν ἐπὶ τῇ χαρᾷ Τίτου, ὅτι ἀναπέπαιται τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πάντων ὑμῶν.

(Because of this we have been comforted. In addition to our comfort, we rejoiced even

⁴³⁶ 2005: 238.

⁴³⁷ BDAG: s.v. πνεῦμα 3.a: “The Spirit as a part of the human personality ... when used with σὰρξ, the flesh, it denotes the immaterial part.” A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament: s.v. πνεῦμα: “Sometimes ... it denotes a normal element in human nature.” TDNT: s.v. πνεῦμα 4: “Since the Holy Spirit affects the whole person and cannot be explained psychologically, Paul adopts popular anthropological ideas quite freely. He uses πνεῦμα for psychological functions in 1 Cor. 7:34; 2 Cor. 7:1.” LN: s.v. πνεῦμα 26.9: “the non-material, psychological faculty which is potentially sensitive and responsive to God (πνεῦμα contrasts with σὰρξ, 26.7, as an expression of the divine in contrast with the purely human)—‘spirit, spiritual, spiritual nature, inner being.’”

⁴³⁸ 2005: 512.

more over the joy of Titus, because his spirit was revived by all of you.)

Again, we have a situation where somebody's πνεῦμα is reacting to outward situations. Like Paul's spirit in 1 Corinthians 16:18, Titus' spirit is comforted by the behaviour of the believers around him. Therefore, since there are no relevant differences in usage or context, we are justified in assuming that this also refers to a person's inner being.

Similarly, the next instance of πνεῦμα has a parallel in another passage we looked at earlier. In Colossians 2:5 Paul says,

εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι, χαίρων καὶ βλέπων ὑμῶν τὴν τάξιν καὶ τὸ στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως ὑμῶν.

(For if I am absent in the body but in spirit am present with you, rejoicing and seeing the discipline and firmness of your faith in Christ.)

This is very similar to 1 Corinthians 5:3-5, in which Paul tells the Corinthian church to expel the immoral man from their midst. In order to add weight to this, Paul reminds them that, by some fusion of his spirit with the Holy Spirit, he was truly present at their gatherings. Indeed, this is also what is going on in this situation in Colossae. Both the BDAG and the LN take it to refer to the human person.⁴³⁹ By way of further explanation, Moo, following Fee, says “[Paul’s] ‘presence’ with the Colossians, then, is not a simple “you will be in my thoughts and prayers,” but involves a profound corporate sense of identity, based on and mediated by the Spirit of God. It is on the basis of this union, effected in and by Christ and mediated by the Spirit, that Paul can address the Colossian Christians.”⁴⁴⁰

Thus, just as is the case in the Corinthians passage, the best understanding of πνεῦμα here is as that internal aspect of the human person, especially that part which is close to the Spirit of God.

The final use of πνεῦμα in Paul where it carries this particular force is found in 1 Thessalonians 5:23:

Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἀγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὀλοτελεῖς, καὶ ὀλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τηρηθεῖν.

⁴³⁹ BDAG: s.v. πνεῦμα 3.a: “The spirit as part of the human personality. When used with σὰρξ, the flesh, it denotes the immaterial part.” LN: s.v. πνεῦμα 26.9: “the non-material, psychological faculty which is potentially sensitive and responsive to God (πνεῦμα contrasts with σὰρξ, 26.7, as an expression of the divine in contrast with the purely human)—‘spirit, spiritual, spiritual nature, inner being.’”

⁴⁴⁰ 2008: 173.

(May the God of peace himself make you holy and complete, and keep all of you, your soul, spirit and body, blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.)

This verse occurs just as Paul is closing the letter, and in a kind of benediction he makes the Thessalonians aware of how comprehensive their salvation will be. This is again similar to what Paul said in 1 Corinthians 7:34. There, the contrast was simply between the σῶμα and the πνεῦμα. Now, Paul adds another layer to this statement by including another psychological word (ἡ ψυχή). This seems to raise a complication by making it sound as if Paul believed in a tripartite division of the human person. Green, however, argues that it is better to read this as hyperbole. Paul mentions as many different anthropological terms as he can find, with the hope of communicating the depth to which God wants to purify the Thessalonians.⁴⁴¹ Thus, as in 1 Corinthians 7, it is best to regard this usage of πνεῦμα as another reference to the inner person.

So, on the basis of these 16 passages, it is logical to conclude that the meaning of πνεῦμα in Paul is to describe an actually existent part of the human person, which is sometimes said to be related to God, and sometimes said to be the site of feelings such as comfort or distress. But the main point is that Paul seems to have believed in this internal aspect of the human being.

The Attitude or Disposition of the Inner Person

Another, related, use of πνεῦμα is to describe the attitude or the disposition of the inner person. Paul still affirms the existence of some kind of inner person in these passages, but instead of describing the thing itself, Paul describes it as directed towards some particular way of being, such as gentleness (Galatians 6:1) or the ways of the world (1 Corinthians 2:13). This usage of the word will generally, though not always, take a genitive of the attitude or disposition that Paul wants to imply.

Paul uses πνεῦμα in this sense nine times throughout his letters, spread fairly evenly over the entire corpus. The first of these occurs in Romans 11:8:

καθὼς γέγραπται·

ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως,

ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ ὄτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν,

ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.

(Just as it is written: “God gave to them a spirit of stupor, so that their eyes may

⁴⁴¹ 2002: 269.

not see, nor their ears hear, until our day.”)

In this section Paul addresses the fact that the Jews have failed to believe in the work of God revealed in Jesus, despite the fact that God still wants the Jews as his people to come to him in faith. In light of this, Paul says that God gave them a πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, or a spirit of stupor. The BDAG takes this to be some kind of actual spiritual force that God sends on the Jews, deliberately keeping them from seeing what he did in Jesus.⁴⁴² It is more likely, however, that instead of sending on the Jews an external πνεῦμα to influence them, he interfered with the πνεῦμα of each of the Jews so that, by virtue of their own altered disposition, they would remain unable to see what Christ means for the unfolding of God’s plan.⁴⁴³ Indeed, this is also how the LN takes this usage of the word.⁴⁴⁴ Thus, we can understand that this use of πνεῦμα refers to the disposition of the inner person.

We see a similar, and similarly controversial, use in 1 Corinthians 2:12. In this part of the letter, as discussed above, Paul questions the Corinthians’ attachment to earthly wisdom. In the course of the discussion, he reminds them that,

ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα εἰδῶμεν τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν·

(We have not received the spirit of the world, but the spirit from God, so that we may know the things God has freely given to us.)

In this case, the spirit in question is that of the world. Again, it is debatable whether this should be taken as a being in control of the parts of the world not aligned with God, or if it describes an internal disposition of the person, who has refused to follow.⁴⁴⁵ In the end, however, it is better in my mind to read this as descriptive of the Holy Spirit, and to say that Paul is reminding them that the spirit that has changed them is not one that has come from the world, and is thus not susceptible to its wisdom, but instead one that comes from God, and is thus over and above the wisdom of people.⁴⁴⁶

The next instance of the word in this usage is somewhat clearer. In 1 Corinthians 4:21, Paul has just finished reasserting his authority over the Corinthian church and lets them know

⁴⁴² s.v. πνεῦμα 7: “Only rarely do we read in our lit. of persons who are possessed by a spirit that is not fr. God ... Even more rarely, God gives a spirit that is not his own.”

⁴⁴³ Fitzmyer 2020: 860.

⁴⁴⁴ s.v. πνεῦμα 30.6: “an attitude or disposition reflecting the way in which a person thinks about or deals with some matter— ‘disposition, attitude, way of thinking.’ ”

⁴⁴⁵ Fee 1987: 113; Thiselton 2000: 263.

⁴⁴⁶ Fee 1987: 113.

that he plans to come to them soon. He hopes that what he finds there will be encouraging to him, and offers them a choice:

τί θέλετε; ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐν ἀγάπῃ πνεύματί τε πραΰτητος;

(What would you prefer? That I come to you with the rod or in love and a spirit of gentleness?)

Both the BDAG and the LN define this usage of πνεῦμα as expressing the disposition or attitude of the inner person.⁴⁴⁷ Thiselton also says that, although this is not a common use of πνεῦμα for Paul, to use it to describe a stance or a frame of mind is “not exceptional.”⁴⁴⁸

Thus, it seems best to take this usage of πνεῦμα as referring to Paul’s internal disposition – the ordering of his internal person towards some particular way of thinking or feeling.

Another instance of the word being used in this way occurs in 2 Corinthians 4:13-14:

Ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα, καὶ ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν, εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ ἐγείρας τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἡμᾶς σὺν Ἰησοῦ ἐγερεῖ καὶ παραστήσει σὺν ὑμῖν.

(Having the same spirit of faith according to what is written. “I believed, therefore I spoke.” And we believe, therefore we also speak, knowing that the one who raised the Lord Jesus will raise us also with Jesus and will present us together with you.)

Regarding this verse, the dictionaries are somewhat split. The BDAG,⁴⁴⁹ TDNT,⁴⁵⁰ and LN⁴⁵¹ all take this as a reference to the Holy Spirit. Thus, in their reading, the spirit of faith is the Holy Spirit, the same Spirit that Paul believed inspired the Psalmist to write what he did by providing him the faith he needed.⁴⁵² The key to understanding πνεῦμα in these verses is in the

⁴⁴⁷ BDAG: s.v. πνεῦμα 3.c: “spiritual state of mind, disposition”. LN: s.v. πνεῦμα 30.6: “an attitude or disposition reflecting the way in which a person thinks about or deals with some matter—‘disposition, attitude, way of thinking.’”

⁴⁴⁸ 2000: 378.

⁴⁴⁹ s.v. πνεῦμα 5.e: “The Spirit is more closely defined by a gen/ of the thing.”

⁴⁵⁰ s.v. πνεῦμα 2.b: “The cross divides the old world and the new. If the Spirit is the power that takes us out of the old age, union with the Lord is given, not in pneumatic materiality, but with the knowledge that the Spirit gives of the crucified Lord. The significance of the spiritual body, then, is that of entry into the saving event of the crucifixion and resurrection. Bearers of the Spirit do not live by a new substance but wholly by God’s work. The Spirit gives the new life, but not as supplementary miraculous power nor as substantial possession. The new knowledge is supernatural, yet not because it is taught or received ecstatically. The knowledge relates to the act of divine love at the cross, and the miracle is believing that God is for us in Jesus Christ. Hence the Spirit is the Spirit of faith (2 Cor. 4:13).”

⁴⁵¹ s.v. πνεῦμα 12.18: “Spirit, Spirit of God, Holy Spirit.”

⁴⁵² Harris 2005: 351.

phrase τό αὐτό πνεῦμα. The addition of the word αὐτό makes it quite clear that Paul is identifying this spirit with something else – a shared spirit or experience, because for things to be the same, there need to be two of them. This then makes it more likely that Paul is talking about his own spirit. Harris argues, and I agree, that this is a reference to the shared spirit Paul has with the Psalmist who wrote what Paul goes on to cite.⁴⁵³ And so we are best off taking this verse as referring to the human spirit within Paul, particularly as it is ordered towards faith in God.

Another similar usage in 2 Corinthians is found in 12:18:

παρεκάλεσα Τίτον καὶ συναπέστειλα τὸν ἀδελφόν· μήτι ἐπλεονέκτησεν ὑμᾶς Τίτος;
οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι περιπατήσαμεν; οὐ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἴχνεσιν;

(I urged Titus and I sent with him the brother. Did Titus take advantage of you? Did we not walk in the same spirit; on the same track?)

In this case, Paul is talking about a proposed trip to Corinth, and asking rhetorically whether Titus, the person whom he sent in his stead did a good enough job. When trying to understand this use of πνεῦμα, it helps to consider the parallel between τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι and τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἴχνεσιν. As Harris says, “the parallelism suggests that πνεύματι is being used anthropologically in reference to a ‘disposition of mind.’”⁴⁵⁴ This reading is supported by the LN.⁴⁵⁵ Thus, we should take this use of the word as a reference to Titus’ attitude.

Another use of πνεῦμα in this sense is found in Galatians 6:1:

Ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προλημφθῆ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τινι παραπτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ
καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος, σκοπῶν σεαυτὸν μὴ καὶ σὺ
πειρασθῆς.

(Brothers, if somebody is overtaken in some sin, you who are spiritual should restore him in a spirit of gentleness, keeping an eye on yourself lest you should be tempted too.)

This is a reference to the way Paul feels the Galatians should conduct themselves with respect to those who have fallen away in sin. As the dictionaries I surveyed suggest,⁴⁵⁶ by far the

⁴⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁴ Harris 2005: 892.

⁴⁵⁵ s.v. πνεῦμα 30.6: “an attitude or disposition reflecting the way in which a person thinks about or deals with some matter—‘disposition, attitude, way of thinking.’”

⁴⁵⁶ BDAG: s.v. πνεῦμα 3.c: “Spiritual state, state of mind, disposition.” DBL: s.v. πνεῦμα 4460.6: “Way of thinking, attitude, disposition.” LN: s.v. πνεῦμα 30.6: “an attitude or disposition reflecting the way in which a person thinks about or deals with some matter—‘disposition, attitude, way of thinking.’”

clearest way to read this is to understand it as a description of a person's disposition – they must cultivate a gentle disposition towards the person who has committed sin.

Ephesians 2:1-2 is somewhat similar to 1 Corinthians 2:13 discussed above, in that it could either be taken to refer to some kind of external spirit, or else it could be the internal spirit of a person directed towards a particular way of acting or thinking. The passage in Ephesians reads:

Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν αἷς ποτε περιπατήσατε κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας...

(And you were dead because of your trespasses and sins, in which you used to walk according to the age of this world, according to the ruler of the power of the air, the spirit which is now at work among the sons of disobedience...)

The LN takes this as a reference to an actual spirit who has some power to work evil in the world.⁴⁵⁷ This takes the clause that starts with πνεῦμα as an explanatory clause defining what was meant by the “ruler of the power of the air.” On this reading, he is the spirit who is at work among the sons of disobedience. Hoehner, in his commentary, argues differently, saying that this is probably best taken as a reference to the ordinary spirit of a human being, at work against God.⁴⁵⁸ In my view, the analogy with what Paul had to say in 1 Corinthians 2 means that this is best taken as a reference to the internal disposition he saw in people as yet untouched by the Holy Spirit. Thus, we can take this as again a reference to the human πνεῦμα as it is ordered to create a specific disposition in somebody.

Later on in Ephesians 4:20-23, Paul makes use of πνεῦμα in the same way:

Ἦμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν, εἴ γε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε, καθὼς ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης, ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.

(But you did not learn Christ in this way, if indeed you heard him and were taught in him, as the truth is in Jesus, that you put off your old person, regarding your old way of life, a person being ruined according to your deceitful desires, and rather be renewed in the spirit of your mind and put on the new person, the one shaped in accordance with God in the righteousness and holiness of the truth.)

⁴⁵⁷ s.v. πνεῦμα 12.33: “a supernatural non- material being—‘spirit.’”

⁴⁵⁸ 2002: 315.

In this case, Paul is talking about the Ephesians' previous state, and the effect that their conversion had on them. The dictionaries⁴⁵⁹ as well as Hoehner in his commentary⁴⁶⁰ agree that the best way to understand this verse is to take it to refer to the human spirit. And, as above, it refers to the renewing of the person in terms of an adjustment of their focus from being connected to the order of the world as opposed to God, and changing the πνεῦμα so that it now conforms with what God has done in Jesus. This is strengthened by the connection that is has with the word νοῦς. In this case, Paul talks about the spirits of their minds. The most natural way to take this is to understand Paul as speaking about that aspect of the inner person by which they connect with God.

The final use of this kind in Paul's letters occurs in Philippians 1:27-30.⁴⁶¹ As I discussed this passage above,⁴⁶² I will be briefer here. Paul is here exhorting the Philippians to conduct themselves in love and unity, over-against those people who would oppress them for being Christians. In his exhortation he uses a parallel phrase: ὅτι στήκετε ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες... (that you stand firm in one spirit, in one mind fighting together...). As we discussed above, the second half of this refers to an organisation of one's attitude towards unity. Therefore, it makes sense to take the first part as a reference to unity as well. In this case, it refers to Paul's desire that the inner person of each Philippian be directed toward the same goal of perseverance in the faith.⁴⁶³

On the basis of these nine passages, it is fair to conclude that Paul also used the word πνεῦμα to describe the activity of the inner person, particularly as ordered towards some particular goal or action.

⁴⁵⁹ BDAG: s.v. πνεῦμα 3.c: "Spiritual state, state of mind, disposition." LN: s.v. πνεῦμα 30.6: "an attitude or disposition reflecting the way in which a person thinks about or deals with some matter - 'disposition, attitude, way of thinking.'"

⁴⁶⁰ 2002: 575-576.

⁴⁶¹ "Μόνον ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτεύεσθε, ἵνα εἴτε ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ὑμᾶς εἴτε ἀπὼν ἀκούω τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν, ὅτι στήκετε ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ μὴ πτυρόμενοι ἐν μηδενὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντικειμένων, ἧτις ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἔνδειξις ἀπωλείας, ὑμῶν δὲ σωτηρίας, καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ θεοῦ." (Only, conduct yourselves in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ, so that whether I come and see you or am away and hear about you, I know that you stand firm in one spirit, in one mind fighting together for the faith of the gospel and not being intimidated in anything by those set against you, which is the evidence to them of their destruction, but of your salvation, and this through God.)

⁴⁶² p. 65.

⁴⁶³ LN: s.v. πνεῦμα 30.6: "an attitude or disposition reflecting the way in which a person thinks about or deals with some matter—'disposition, attitude, way of thinking.'"

As Metonymy for the Whole Person

Another use that Paul has for πνεῦμα is metonymy for the whole person. This usage is exclusively found in closing greetings, and so we see it in Galatians 6:18:

Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί· ἀμήν.
(The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brothers. Amen.)⁴⁶⁴

In all three cases, Paul wishes the recipients of his letter well, and he does so by wishing the grace of Jesus would be with them in their πνεῦμα. In this case, it is clear that Paul uses the word πνεῦμα as metonymy for the whole person. In wishing them well, Paul is wishing their spirits well.⁴⁶⁵ The fact that Paul can say farewell in this way indicates that he is aware that such a thing as the πνεῦμα exists and that it is a part of the human being, otherwise it would not make sense for him to wish people well in reference to it. Thus, although obliquely, this provides more evidence that Paul believed there was some inner person called the πνεῦμα, and that it was appropriate to use this in reference to the whole person.

Other Uses

There are three other places where Paul uses the word πνεῦμα in a way that does not seem to refer to the inner person in any way, but rather to some other entity. In 1 Corinthians 15:44-46 Paul refers to it when he is comparing Christ to Adam:

σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν. Εἰ ἔστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἔστιν καὶ πνευματικόν. οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται· ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν. ἀλλ' οὐ πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικόν ἀλλὰ τὸ ψυχικόν, ἔπειτα τὸ πνευματικόν.

(A human body is sown, and a spiritual body is raised. If there is a human body, there is also a spiritual body. For as it is also written, “The first man Adam came into existence as a living being,” the last Adam as a life-giving spirit. But not spiritual first, then human, but human first, and then spiritual.)

As mentioned above,⁴⁶⁶ this section of Paul’s letter to the Corinthians sees him arguing for the resurrection of physical bodies on the last day, as was prefigured, Paul would argue, by Christ’s resurrection. When he describes Adam, he says that Adam was made into a living creature, and

⁴⁶⁴ It is also in Philippians 4:23: Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν (The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit.) and finally in Philemon 25: Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν. (The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit)

⁴⁶⁵ TDNT: s.v. πνεῦμα 4: “[It is] equivalent to ‘you’ in closing greetings.”

⁴⁶⁶ p. 58.

the word for creature is ψυχή. By contrast, when he speaks about Christ, he says that he has been made alive in the Spirit. In this case, the word is πνεῦμα. The BDAG sees this as a reference to Christ himself.⁴⁶⁷ In that case, the best understanding would be to see Adam and Christ as representative of the old and new ages respectively. Adam had natural life, signified by the ψυχή, while Christ had new life, signified by πνεῦμα, that is, the life that comes by the working of the Spirit. Thus, in this situation, πνεῦμα is probably best understood as referring to the eschatological reality of the new life that Paul believed Christ inaugurated through his death and resurrection.

Another of these unusual uses of πνεῦμα is found in 2 Thessalonians 2:1-2:

Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ’ αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦς μηδὲ θροεῖσθαι, μήτε διὰ πνεύματος μήτε διὰ λόγου μήτε δι’ ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι’ ἡμῶν, ὡς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου·

(So we ask you, brothers, concerning the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, and our being gathered up to him, not to be quickly shaken from your way of thinking nor troubled, neither through spirit, nor through word, nor through a letter as if from us saying that the day of the Lord has come.)

In this section of his letter, Paul is concerned to correct some of the Thessalonians’ misapprehensions regarding the nature of Christ’s second coming, and warns them not to be deceived by any communication that seems to contradict what they are saying. He seems to be worried about forged letters, different preaching and then finally a spirit that might betray them. The BDAG and the LN see this use of πνεῦμα as a reference to a spirit that is not connected to either a person or to God.⁴⁶⁸ Similarly, Green in his commentary on the passage says that this speaks about prophecy – but prophecy that comes from a spirit not sent by God.⁴⁶⁹ In my opinion, on the basis of the balance of evidence above, the best understanding of this passage is that Paul is referring to a spirit that is unconnected to either God or human beings, and that has the power to sway people’s emotions.

The final unusual use of πνεῦμα occurs a few verses later, in 2 Thessalonians 2:8-10:

καὶ τότε ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ὁ ἄνομος, ὃν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἀνελεῖ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ καὶ καταργήσει τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, οὗ ἔστιν ἡ παρουσία κατ’ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν

⁴⁶⁷ s.v. πνεῦμα 5.f: “Of Christ.”

⁴⁶⁸ BDAG: s.v. πνεῦμα 7: “Only rarely do we read in our lit. of persons who are possessed by a spirit that is not fr. God.” LN: s.v. πνεῦμα 12.33: “a supernatural non- material being—‘spirit.’”

⁴⁶⁹ 2002: 303.

ψεύδους καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ ἀδικίας τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, ἀνθ' ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέξαντο εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι αὐτούς.

(And then the lawless one will be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus will destroy by the breath of his mouth, and will wipe him out at the revelation of his coming, whose coming is according to the working of Satan in all power and signs and omens of falsehood and in all deception of unrighteousness for those who are perishing, because they did not receive the love of truth to be saved.)

This passage refers to the apocalyptic coming of the power of evil and the defeat of an evil being by God. But the manner by which he is defeated is described as God breathing on him. πνεῦμα in this case refers to the breath, as glossed in the dictionaries.⁴⁷⁰ It also makes the most sense of the immediate context, given Paul's Hebrew roots, since the cognate Hebrew word נַחַח describes both 'breath' and the 'human spirit.'

Adjectival Uses

Aside from πνεῦμα operating as a noun, Paul also makes use of the adjectival form πνευματικός. This has a few meanings, which we will briefly discuss below. In general, however, it refers to something that has come from God, particularly that which has come from the working of his Spirit.

In Romans 7:14 the law of God is described as πνευματικός:

Οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστίν, ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινός εἰμι πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν.

(For we know that the law is spiritual, and I am fleshly having been sold to sin.)

In this case, the law is being described as πνευματικός because, in Paul's mind, it has come from God, and it is working to reveal to him the fact that he is not of God in the same way. He is instead under the power of sin. πνευματικός is defined in this way by all the dictionaries I surveyed.⁴⁷¹ Moo elaborates by saying that Paul probably included this aside as a way of "defending his orthodoxy" on the topic to opponents who did not believe that Paul believed

⁴⁷⁰ BDAG: s.v. πνεῦμα 1.b: "The breathing out of air, blowing, breath." A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament: s.v. πνεῦμα (b): "breath, what distinguishes a living from a dead body, (anima) the life principle." DBL Greek: s.v. πνεῦμα 8: Breath. LN: s.v. πνεῦμα – 23.186: "a breath of air coming from the lungs—"breath."

⁴⁷¹ BDAG: s.v. πνευματικός 2.a. β: "Used of impersonal things such as the law given by God." A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament: s.v. πνευματικός: "having the characteristics of πνεῦμα, spiritual, with general reference to the higher nature of man as directly in touch with and influenced by the divine." TDNT: s.v. πνευματικός: "The law, too, is pneumatikos. It is the law of God deriving from the divine world, not the human." LN: "pertaining to being derived from or being about the Spirit—"spiritual, from the Spirit" (in reference to such matters as gifts, benefits, teachings, blessings, and religious songs.)"

that the law of Moses had divine origin.⁴⁷² But in this use the word describes something that has come about by God's work through his Spirit.

πνευματικός is also used in Romans 15:27:

εὐδόκησαν γὰρ καὶ ὀφειλέται εἰσὶν αὐτῶν· εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινώνησαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς.

(They have decided and indeed they are in debt to them. For if the Gentiles have shared in their spiritual gifts, they ought to serve them with their material ones.)

In this case, Paul is arguing that the Roman Christians ought to be willing to offer collection to their Jewish brothers, because they have had the privilege of sharing in their spiritual blessings, and so ought to be happy to share their own material blessings. Again, the dictionaries are fairly unanimous, all agreeing that the meaning refers to matters that are spiritual, or influenced by the working of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁷³ In this case, it seems best to understand that what Paul is talking about is the inclusion of the Roman Gentile Christians into the promises God made for his own Jewish people.⁴⁷⁴ Thus, the best understanding of πνευματικός in this context is as referring to the spiritual legacy that God has left for the Jews and which, Paul is convinced, has been extended to the Gentiles.

In 1 Corinthians 2:13-15⁴⁷⁵ and in 15:44-46. Paul makes use of the Corinthian idea of ordinary people (ψυχικοί) and spiritual people (πνευματικοί). Paul's use of πνευματικός in 1

⁴⁷² 1996: 453.

⁴⁷³ BDAG: s.v. πνευματικός b.: "as a subst. neuter – spiritual things or matters". GE: s.v. πνευματικός: "of pure spirit, spiritual, supernatural, divine." TDNT: s.v. πνευματικός: "Spiritual things in contrast to earthly things i.e. those pertaining to natural life." LN: s.v. πνευματικός 26.10: "In Ro. 15:27... πνευματικός stands in contrast to σαρκικός 'material' and may therefore focus upon non-material or spiritual aspects of human personality or life in contrast with the physical aspects. Accordingly, one may translate Ro. 15:27 as 'if the Gentiles shared in their spiritual benefits, they ought to help them with material things.' It is also possible, however, to understand πνευματικός in Ro 15:27 as referring to those blessings which come from the Holy Spirit (see 12.21) rather than those blessings which are for the human spirit."

⁴⁷⁴ Moo 1996: 905.

⁴⁷⁵ τίς γὰρ οἶδεν ἀνθρώπων τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ; οὕτως καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκεν εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα εἰδῶμεν τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν· ἃ καὶ λαλοῦμεν οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες. ψυχικός δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ· μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστὶν καὶ οὐ δύναται γνῶναι, ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται. ὁ δὲ πνευματικός ἀνακρίνει [τὰ] πάντα, αὐτὸς δὲ ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἀνακρίνεται. (For who among people knows the deep things of a person except the spirit within him? Likewise, nobody knows the deep things of God except the Spirit of God. We have not received the spirit of the world, but the spirit from God, so that we may know the things God has freely given to us. For what we say we do not say in words taught by human wisdom, but in those taught by the spirit - spiritual people discerning spiritual things. The natural person cannot receive the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him and he is not able to understand them, because they are spiritually understood. But the spiritual person discerns all things, and he is not judged by anybody.)

Corinthians is certainly eschatological. He describes the πνευματικοί as the people who are a part of God's kingdom through their belief in Jesus. The ψυχικοί by contrast, are people who have not become a part of God's kingdom yet, and are, as a result, not joined to Christ.⁴⁷⁶

In 15:44-46 Paul changes the topic slightly, but the usage is the same.⁴⁷⁷ In this section, he argues that there are two kinds of bodies. Again, one is ψυχικός and one is πνευματικός. The ψυχικός body is simply the ordinary human being, without the influence of God. The πνευματικός body, on the other hand, is the body as it would be when, under Paul's schema, the person was resurrected.⁴⁷⁸ That is to say, it is under the influence and power of the Holy Spirit and has been changed accordingly. Thus, once again, the best way to understand Paul's use of πνευματικός in this passage is to see it as something that has been affected by the working of God through his Spirit. In this case, the body.

The final passage in which πνευματικός is used in Paul's letters is in Galatians 6:1:

Ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προλημθῆ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τινι παραπτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος, σκοπῶν σεαυτὸν μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῆς

(Brothers, if somebody is overtaken in some sin, you who are spiritual should restore him in a spirit of gentleness, keeping an eye on yourself lest you should be tempted too.)

In this case, the πνευματικοί are people who are marked by the Spirit, in that they are capable of living the conduct the Holy Spirit requires of them as part of God's new kingdom. The dictionaries define this instance as describing somebody who has been affected by the Spirit.⁴⁷⁹

⁴⁷⁶ Fee 1987: 112-113.

⁴⁷⁷ σπεύρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν. Εἰ ἔστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἔστιν καὶ πνευματικόν. οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται· ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν. ἀλλ' οὐ πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικόν ἀλλὰ τὸ ψυχικόν, ἔπειτα τὸ πνευματικόν. (A human body is sown, and a spiritual body is raised. If there is a human body, there is also a spiritual body. For as it is also written, "The first man Adam came into existence as a living being," the last Adam as a life-giving spirit. But not spiritual first, then human, but human first, and then spiritual.)

⁴⁷⁸ Cf. s.v. πνευματικός 2.β: "That which belongs to the supernatural order of being is described as πν.: Accordingly, the resurrection body is a σῶμα πν." TDNT: s.v. πνευματικός: "The Pneumatikoi are for Paul those who know God's saving work by the Spirit ... A distinction is made between pneumatic and psychical bodies in 1 Corinthians 15:44-46." DBL Greek: s.v. πνευματικός 4461.4 "Not physical, not material." s.v. πνευματικός 12.20: "one who has received God's Spirit and presumably lives in accordance with this relationship—'one who is spiritual, one who has received the Spirit.'"

⁴⁷⁹ BDAG: s.v. πνευματικός 2.b.β: "possessing the Spirit, the one who possesses the Spirit." LN: s.v. πνευματικός 12.20: "one who has received God's Spirit and presumably lives in accordance with this relationship—'one who is spiritual, one who has received the Spirit.'"

So, it seems most reasonable to conclude that, just as all of the above uses, this instance of πνευματικός describes somebody who has been affected by God's working through his Spirit.

Synthesis

In the majority of cases where Paul uses πνεῦμα, it is clear that he refers to the immaterial aspect of the human being. This is, however, not all we can glean from Paul's usage. We see, especially in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, that this part of the person is specially designated towards connecting with God. For example, in 1 Corinthians 5:4, Paul speaks about how he can be with the Corinthians by virtue of his πνεῦμα and its connection to the Spirit of God. Furthermore, in 1 Corinthians 6:17 he relates how somebody who is united to God is connected with him by virtue of his πνεῦμα. On the basis of these verses and others, we are justified in understanding Paul's usage of πνεῦμα as referring to the part of the person that has a special ability to relate to God.

Furthermore, it seems that this πνεῦμα can survive death. In 1 Corinthians 5:5, for instance, Paul writes about delivering a person over to Satan so that, even though his body perishes, his πνεῦμα will survive to be saved by God. Although this is only one example, and thus should not bear too much of the weight of systematisation, it provides an interesting line of inquiry going forward.

Finally, it seems that Paul understood the πνεῦμα as distinct from the mind. This distinction occurs in 1 Corinthians 14:12-16 where Paul refers to the need for intelligibility in worship, and makes a distinction between the operations of the πνεῦμα and the operations of the νοῦς. It seems clear here that what Paul is advocating for is a unification of these two faculties in the worship of the Corinthians. Again, this is only one passage in only one letter, but nevertheless, it is still enough to be intriguing.

On the basis of Paul's use of the soul words ψυχή and πνεῦμα it does seem that he believed in something like the modern concept of the soul as defined by substance dualists. This is not so evident from his use of ψυχή. In Paul, that word seems to refer most often to natural human life. On other occasions it can refer to the internal attitudes or dispositions of the person who is living. And, especially in adjectival form it can refer to the natural human life in contrast to the life brought about by the Spirit of God. Finally, it can be used as a strong pronoun for a person. Clearly, then, the word ψυχή does not, in Paul at least, refer to the soul as we understand it. It is something more like the life-force.

On the contrary, πνεῦμα does seem to refer to what we would understand as the soul. It is a part of the person that seems to be understood as enduring death, as well as the part of the

person that seems to be especially concerned with connecting to God. It is also distinct from other internal faculties such as the mind.

What I will proceed to do from here is to examine Paul's influences, both Jewish and Greek, to attempt to round out this understanding of what he believed the soul to be. In the next chapter, I will examine how the Old Testament used these words, ψυχή and πνεῦμα, and their Hebrew equivalents. I will then briefly examine the Jewish literature of Paul's contemporaries, and finally examine the literature of the contemporary Greek culture.

Chapter Four: Jewish Soul Texts

Introduction:

From a discussion about Paul's use of the words relating to the soul, we now turn to a discussion about what might have influenced Paul to use these words. As I argued in my biography, Paul was a Jewish man. As a Jewish man, a Pharisee no less,⁴⁸⁰ his main influence would have been the contemporary Jewish ideas he encountered from the Scriptures of Israel, and from the current literature. In this chapter, I will analyse both bodies of literature to see what information I can gather that will help us understand why Paul may have used ψυχή and πνεῦμα in the manner that he did. To do this, I will start by looking at Israel's Scriptures, and I will then move on to a brief examination of Paul's relationship to the Jewish literature that was produced around his time, which is called the Second Temple literature.

In terms of the scriptures of Ancient Israel I will be using the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.⁴⁸¹ As with Paul, my main means of analysis regarding the beliefs of the Jews in terms of the soul will be the words that they use, which are usually translated as 'soul.' These are נַפְשׁוֹ and רִיבּוֹ. I will outline the uses of each word, in order to draw some conclusions about the most likely meanings of these words in their own context, and then what that might have meant in light of what we have discovered about Paul.

Paul's Use of Scripture

Before I begin looking at the texts, however, I must begin by addressing two assumptions about how Paul used the Scriptures of Ancient Israel, and two further assumptions about the nature of these.

⁴⁸⁰ See my chapter on Paul's biography, especially pp. 28-30.

⁴⁸¹ 1967.

Of the two assumptions regarding Paul’s use of the Scriptures I want to acknowledge and defend, the first is that Jewish beliefs, as found in the Scriptures of Israel, were not just relics of Paul’s past to which he referred and with which he foundationally disagreed, but were important parts of his worldview. Although this seems obvious, Paul’s use and understanding of the Scriptures he would have read as a Jew is a complicated field in modern scholarship. As N.T. Wright puts it, “[h]ardly anyone will doubt that Paul knew Israel’s scriptures well, and that he used them freely and frequently in some (though not all) of his letters. But there the ways divide.”⁴⁸² As Wright suggests, Paul’s usage of Israel’s Scriptures is too frequent and too clear to doubt. He often alludes to them, as he does, for instance, in 1 Corinthians 10:6-10.⁴⁸³ Not only did he allude to them, but Paul also quoted freely from them, as we find in Romans 3:10-18.⁴⁸⁴ But, as Wright argues, that Paul used Israel’s Scriptures is different to understanding why Paul used them. Indeed, the poles of belief are as far apart as Douglas Moo, who argues that “Paul’s theological reasoning could almost be characterised as a dialogue with Scripture,”⁴⁸⁵ and Christopher Stanley, who argues that Paul used Scripture for rhetorical effect, to add weight to his arguments, and was essentially unconcerned with how close his meaning was to the meaning of the text that he was citing.⁴⁸⁶ I find myself closer to Moo than to Stanley, and believe that Paul was a devoted reader of Israel’s Scriptures, whose whole

⁴⁸² 2013: 1450.

⁴⁸³ Ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς κάκεῖνοι ἐπεθύμησαν. μηδὲ εἰδωλολάτραι γίνεσθε καθὼς τινες αὐτῶν, ὡσπερ γέγραπται· ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πίνειν καὶ ἀνέστησαν παίζειν. μηδὲ πορνεύωμεν, καθὼς τινες αὐτῶν ἐπόρνευσαν καὶ ἔπεσαν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ εἴκοσι τρεῖς χιλιάδες, μηδὲ ἐκπειράζωμεν τὸν Χριστόν, καθὼς τινες αὐτῶν ἐπέειρασαν καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ὄφεων ἀπώλλυντο. μηδὲ γογγύζετε, καθάπερ τινὲς αὐτῶν ἐγόγγυσαν καὶ ἀπώλοντο ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀλοθρευτοῦ. (These things happened as examples for us, so that we might not set our desires on wrong things, just as they did. Do not be idolaters, as some of them were, just as it is written, “the people sat to eat and to drink and stood up to play.” Let us not commit sexual immorality, just as some of them did and twenty-three thousand of them fell on one day. And let us not test Christ, just as some of them did, and were killed by snakes. Do not grumble, just as some of them grumbled, and were then killed by the destroyer.)

⁴⁸⁴ καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν. πάντες ἐξέκλιναν ἅμα ἠχρεώθησαν οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ποιῶν χρηστότητα, [οὐκ ἔστιν] ἕως ἑνός. Τάφος ἀνεωγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιοῦσαν, ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν· ὧν τὸ στόμα ἀρᾶς καὶ πικρίας γέμει, ὄξεῖς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα, σύντριμμα καὶ τάλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν. οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. (Just as it is written, that nobody is righteous, not even one. There is nobody who understands, nobody who seeks God. All have turned away, and as one have become worthless. There is nobody who does what is good, not even one. Their throat is an open grave, and their tongues are deceitful. The poison of vipers is under their lips. Their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness. Their feet are swift to shed blood. Ruin and misery mark their ways. They have not known the way of peace; there is no fear of God before their eyes.)

⁴⁸⁵ 2021: 16.

⁴⁸⁶ Cited in Wright 2013: 1451-1452. This is not to presume that Paul had a text in front of him, nor to presume which of the various texts of Israel’s Scriptures was familiar to him. Stanley’s point rather is that, whichever text Paul was using and in whatever manner he was using it, he was simply using it as a show of rhetorical force, rather than implying that it had any personal significance for him.

thought was dedicated to trying to fit what he believed he had seen on the Damascus road into the narrative that he found in the Scriptures of Ancient Israel. With this understanding of Paul's relationship to the Scriptures of Israel, it makes sense that what they have to say about the human soul will have an impact on Paul's understanding of it.

The final assumption that I am making is borne out of this belief. I am assuming that, to the extent that Paul's use of the words is continuous with the way in which Ancient Israel's Scriptures use that word, Paul's understanding of that word is continuous too. Where there are discrepancies, I will understand them as either an incomplete picture of Paul's thoughts, as is the nature of dealing with them in the letter format, or else as an innovation in Paul's thinking because of the influence of the Greco-Roman world around him, or his new Christian perspective.

The Text of Israel's Scriptures

Having discussed Paul's use of the text, I must now discuss my assumptions regarding the nature of the text. To discuss this issue, I will now turn to look at the texts which I will include in this study, and which versions of those texts I will focus on.

According to Gottwald, most of the sections of text which came together to form the Hebrew Bible were in pieces of tradition, usually oral, but sometimes written, which were not imagined to be a part of a larger whole when created. Indeed, he goes on to argue that only the final redactors, who wrote very little themselves, imagined it all fitting together as a unity.⁴⁸⁷ Gottwald also describes a few ways that many of these different sources may have come to be included in the text. At times an author may quote from a source. In other cases, an essentially oral unity may be written down later (he gives Ruth as an example.)⁴⁸⁸

Of course, what we have in the Hebrew Bible is not a collection of oral traditions, but a group of written texts. It seems that, for some reason, during Israel's history the scriptural needs of the people demanded that the traditions be written down, as opposed to preserved orally as they had been. As Gottwald himself describes the process of writing, he says "[the] transition from the tribal period of Israel's life to the monarchy witnessed the rise of a literary court culture alongside the old oral forms of tribal life. There was a sudden burst of literary activity as the earlier oral forms were taken up into writing and often arranged in larger compositions that had a distinctly literary character."⁴⁸⁹

⁴⁸⁷ 1985: 93. Cf. Walton, Sandy 2013: 18.

⁴⁸⁸ Gottwald 1985: 93.

⁴⁸⁹ 1985: 96.

Traditionally, these written texts are grouped into three different collections: the Torah, or law, the Nevi'im, or Prophets, and the Ketuvim, or the writings. Of these, the text of the Torah is in a different state to the rest of the documents that make up the Hebrew Bible. Part of the reason for this is that it was so central to Israelite faith and practise that it needed to be well preserved and understood, while other books were less important by comparison. This is also probably due to the fact that there was a change in power-balance at this time, with the Pharisees seeming to become more dominant. Since they treasured the Torah, they may well have had the best documents.⁴⁹⁰

In contrast to the Torah, the Writings was the last collection of the Hebrew Scriptures to be compiled together and clearly demarcated. There are other contemporary books, but as far as it seems, there is no reason to think these were ever seriously considered to be part of the tradition of these scriptures. Indeed, there is some evidence that where there were sufficient doctrinal grounds, the text was open to alteration, especially in the Writings, which seem to have been considered less significant than the Prophets.⁴⁹¹

A summary of one way of thinking about the formation of the Hebrew Bible is provided by Gottwald. He describes this happening in three stages. These are, as he puts it, firstly "[the] stage of the formation of the separate literary units, oral and written, that eventually became a part of the Hebrew Bible, from about 1200 BCE to 100 BCE. Secondly, [the] stage of the final formation of the Hebrew Bible as an authoritative collection of writing in three parts (Law, Prophets, Writings), beginning ca. 400 BCE with the Law as the kernel, later supplemented by the Prophets, and culminating ca. 90 CE with the delimitation of the boundaries of the writings. Finally, the stage of the preservation and transmission of the Hebrew Bible, both in the original tongue and in translation into other languages, which involved two phases: 1. The period when the finalisation of the contents of the Hebrew Bible was still in progress, ca 400 BCE to 90 CE 2. The period when the Hebrew Bible had reached definitive form, from 90 CE to the present."⁴⁹²

The reason I discuss the formation of the Scriptures of Ancient Israel in this detail is because this tripartite structure will form the foundation of my analysis of my chosen words (נְפִלָּה and חֵרֶם). I will look at each one in turn, looking at its typical uses in the Law, the Prophets and then in the Writings. Before I proceed to this, however, there is one more thing to determine, which is the version of the text I will be using. The two most important versions of

⁴⁹⁰ Wurthwein 1988: 13-14.

⁴⁹¹ Sandy, Walton 2013: 30-38; Gottwald 1985: 109.

⁴⁹² 1985: 93.

the Scriptures of Ancient Israel are the Masoretic text and the Septuagint (LXX).

The name for the Masoretic text, which is the text which forms the basis of most of the editions of the Hebrew Bible, comes from the word Masora, which is a word for the textual tradition of a group of Jewish scholars called the Masoretes.⁴⁹³ The oldest full Hebrew manuscripts of the Scriptures of Ancient Israel come from the tenth century, and the oldest codex of these is from AD 895 and contains only the prophets.⁴⁹⁴ There are many early Hebrew manuscripts, including a few from the pre-Christian era, which came from Qumran, where a sect of Essenes hid their scrolls.⁴⁹⁵ Fragments of every biblical book, except Esther, were discovered there, as well as a full copy of the scroll of Isaiah, and the first two chapters of Habbakuk.⁴⁹⁶ The consonantal text, as was preserved by mediaeval manuscripts and with which scholars today are familiar, seems to have been somewhat secure by A.D. 100. After the war lost to the Romans in A.D. 70, the Jews sought to regain some national pride, and part of that was the Council of Jamnia (end of first century A.D.), which established an authoritative text and canon of the Hebrew Bible. The standard consonantal text, which became the basis for the Masoretic text, was confirmed by some of the findings at Qumran, especially the book of Isaiah, which only differed in minor ways from the consonantal, Masoretic version. What Qumran did show, however, is that there were several different textual traditions around prior to the Jewish revival at the end of the first century.⁴⁹⁷ Scholars have divergent interpretations of how these different texts may have related to one another. Frank M. Cross argues that they were spread out by geography (Palestinian, Egyptian and Babylonian types).⁴⁹⁸ Others like Shemaryahu Talmon argue that the diversity of textual traditions is the result of different social and religious groups. There is little consensus, and little hope that there will be any consensus until further data are retrieved.⁴⁹⁹

With the creation of the consonantal text, which was just about as we have it now, there was no longer space for other textual traditions to exist, such as those we find at Qumran. Instead, the Masora existed to make sure the authoritative version of the text was transmitted exactly as they decided it should be. To this end, the scribes laboured under incredible pains to

⁴⁹³ Wurthwein 1988: 10.

⁴⁹⁴ 1988: 11.

⁴⁹⁵ It is debatable that the people whose writings we find at Qumran were Essenes, but as defending this view takes us to fields outside the scope of this thesis, I rest on the arguments found in Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 417 and Wright 1992: 201-209 (with his own reservations in mind).

⁴⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹⁷ *Ibid.* 14.

⁴⁹⁸ Cited in Wurthwein 1988: 11.

⁴⁹⁹ *Ibid.* 15.

make sure the text remained in that form.⁵⁰⁰ Despite its continuity with the older traditions, the new consonantal Masoretic text was a novelty, in the sense that it was an established, definitive tradition. This is not to say that it was the only tradition, or that it immediately suppressed all others, as some manuscripts bear close resemblance to the Samaritan text for Deuteronomy, but by the time of our best manuscripts, it seems that the work of the Masoretes, in establishing the consonantal Masoretic text as the authoritative one, had succeeded.⁵⁰¹

The other form of the text of the Hebrew Bible is the Septuagint. The early church regarded the Septuagint as the standard form of the Old Testament. When Jerome was translating his Vulgate, Augustine argued that he should use the Septuagint rather than the Hebrew original. This is so significant that Wurthwein argues that it "could well be said that the influences of the Old Testament upon the Christian world through the centuries, almost up to the present day, has been mediated linguistically and conceptually by the hellenistic [sic] forms it received in [the Septuagint]."⁵⁰² The Letter of Aristeas is an ancient apologetic for the Septuagint, describing the translation of the Torah. It claims that Demetrius of Phaleron wanted to put the Law of the Jews in the library of Alexandria, but only once it had been translated into Greek. King Eleazar sent seventy two of the best scribes to Alexandria who translated the text in seventy two days. This account is still influential in how people approach the LXX.⁵⁰³ The Letter of Aristeas claims further that the Torah was translated into Greek in the first half of the third century B.C., and this does seem to be correct, according to Wurthwein. It was, however, probably a long time after this that the rest was translated into Greek.⁵⁰⁴

The fact that there is a long period between the translation of the Torah and the rest "precludes the possibility that [the LXX] was the work of a single translator or group of translators."⁵⁰⁵ A better way of looking at it is the way Wurthwein summarises it when he says that "what we find in [the LXX] is not a single version but a collection of versions made by various writers who differed greatly in their translation methods, their knowledge of Hebrew, their styles and in other ways. This diversity which makes it necessary to consider each book of the Bible individually is a large part of the problem posed by [the LXX], making it impossible to formulate the value of the version as a whole for textual criticism in any uniform

⁵⁰⁰ *Ibid.* 19.

⁵⁰¹ *Ibid.* 19-20.

⁵⁰² Wurthwein 1988: 50.

⁵⁰³ Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 1352.

⁵⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰⁵ Wurthwein 1988: 53.

way."⁵⁰⁶

Indeed, it seems that from an early stage of the Greek translation of the Scriptures of Ancient Israel there were attempts to revise it, especially because the first version was undertaken without sufficient tools and was not close enough to the Hebrew. One of these is called the *kaige* recension found in 1963. Others include that of Aquila, whose philosophy was to keep incredibly close to the Hebrew, and as a result produced a version that did not sound very Greek. Another revision is that of Symmachus, which was undertaken in around AD 170 and tried to balance accuracy with good Greek expression. The last one was by Theodotion, who revised an extant Greek edition with a Hebrew version.⁵⁰⁷

Origen was a Christian scholar who produced a major version of the Hebrew and Greek versions of the Scriptures of Ancient Israel called the Hexapla, because it had six columns. The first was a Hebrew text, the second was a transliteration, the third was Aquila, the fourth was Symmachus, the fifth was the Septuagint, and the sixth was Theodotion. He wanted to link the LXX with the Hebrew "with the help of other more literal versions." To this end, he made several changes to the text of the LXX, some indicated and some not, which had an impact on the manuscripts. There was also the Tetrapla, which was likely a shorter version of the same work. None of the originals survive, but the Codex Colberto-Sarravianus seems to approximate Origen's text.⁵⁰⁸ Jerome mentions three further recensions to the LXX. The first is by Lucian, which was commonly read by Jews in regions from Constantinople to Antioch according to Jerome. This one was not edited with reference to the Hebrew, but instead focussed on Greek style. After these recensions, the text continued to develop, and some manuscripts followed different exemplars for different parts of their text.⁵⁰⁹

The reason I am discussing all this background is to help explain the versions of the text I am going to use. The history of the versions suggests that the LXX is the older version. The age of the manuscripts, however, is not the primary criterion that guarantees its worth. Rather, what Wurthein argues one should focus on, is the quality of the textual tradition.⁵¹⁰ The LXX was highly valued in antiquity, and in the 19th century people often valued it over the Masoretic text. The problem with this is that LXX was never intended to be a scholarly translation, but to meet the needs of various Jewish communities. The philosophies of

⁵⁰⁶ *Ibid.* 53-54.

⁵⁰⁷ Wurthein 1988 54-56. Cf. Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 1352.

⁵⁰⁸ Wurthein 1988: 57-59.

⁵⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 60-61.

⁵¹⁰ *Ibid.* 12.

translation and presuppositions that the translators brought to the LXX are important for assessing it as a source for textual criticism. There are a few of these features that limit its usefulness. The first is the nature of Koine Greek. There are certain Hebrew words whose nuances can only be captured by many different Greek words. There are also differences in constructions. The translators also had varying knowledge of Hebrew and lived in Hellenistic settings, which seem to have affected the ways they thought and thus the way they translated. They also seem to have translated in ways that made their text more understandable to those around them in non-Jewish settings.⁵¹¹ Some argue that it points to an older version of the Hebrew text, but again what is important is not the age of the version but its textual tradition. The tradition of the Masoretic text is very secure, especially the consonantal text, whereas the textual tradition that undergirds any particular rendering of the LXX is often weaker, as shown by the finds at Qumran. This is not to claim the Masoretic text is uniformly better, but that each variant should be assessed on its own merits.

Wurthwein summarises it well when he says, "the language and content of [the LXX] must be understood against the background of the particular doctrinal and religious situation which produced it and which it was intended to serve. This complicates its usefulness for textual criticism. Undoubtedly it is a most important and even indispensable witness to the text, assisting in the emendation of many corrupted passages. But it can be useful for textual criticism only after a careful appreciation of its nature, its various translation techniques, and its history. We must beware of attempting to reach the underlying Hebrew text through a simple and direct back-translation of the Greek text into Hebrew."⁵¹²

For this reason, I shall be including both the Hebrew and the Greek texts in my analysis in this chapter. Although the Septuagint's tradition is weaker than that of the Masoretic text, and although it includes books which are not relevant to this study specifically, it is important because this thesis is undertaking an analysis of Greek words, and because this is almost certainly the version of the text Paul cited. The Masoretic text, however, is important for understanding the use of these words in their Jewish context, which is important for understanding Paul's background. Therefore, I shall include both the Masoretic Hebrew text and the Septuagint Greek text.

With those clarifications made, I will now begin looking at the words that are relevant to our study. In the first place, I will look at the Hebrew word שָׁנָה which corresponds to the

⁵¹¹ *Ibid.* 66-67.

⁵¹² Wurthwein 1988: 70.

Greek ψυχή in many of its usages.

נֶפֶשׁ

נֶפֶשׁ is a very common word in Biblical Hebrew. It appears 694 times through the course of the 39 books that make up the *Biblia Hebraica*.⁵¹³ It is clearly beyond the scope of this dissertation to survey each use of this word; however, an overview of the various uses and meanings of this word will be useful in understanding how Paul interpreted it. Therefore, I will be surveying representative uses of this word in the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings, to see what each body of literature contributes to the history of the use of this word.

Law

We start by looking at the uses of the word in the Torah. The word appears 172 times in this section of the Scriptures.⁵¹⁴ There are many meanings represented within these 172 instances of the word. The most common are using it to denote a person, one's inner self, life itself, and finally the dead. I will now examine each of these in turn.

Person

The word נֶפֶשׁ often means person, in the sense of being a being which possesses the life which the נֶפֶשׁ gives. The first use of this word which helps us understand this meaning is found in Genesis 2:7, where God creates the first person and gives him the breath of life:

וַיִּצְרֶה יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם עָפָר מִן־הָאֲדָמָה וַיִּפַּח בְּאָזְנוֹ נְשָׁמַת חַיִּים וַיְהִי

הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה:⁵¹⁵

καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς· καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχήν ζῶσαν.

(And the Lord God made the person from the dust of the earth, and he breathed into his mouth the breath of life and the person became a living creature.)

This is an instance where the word is used not to describe life itself, but rather that thing which is living, in this case, Adam. The KJV translates נֶפֶשׁ as a 'soul,' but every other

⁵¹³ Logos Bible Software.

⁵¹⁴ Logos Bible Software.

⁵¹⁵ I have magnified the Hebrew to make the pointing visible.

translation I have surveyed either uses the word ‘creature,’⁵¹⁶ or ‘being,’⁵¹⁷ or ‘person.’⁵¹⁸ The BDB has a special description for this verse, but still glosses it as a “living being.”⁵¹⁹ Here then we see a use of נִפְשׁ where it does not mean life as a state but rather as the person which is in that state.

Another example of this use is found in Genesis 12:5, where an account is given of the property that Abram takes with him when he leaves Charran for the land of Canaan:

וַיִּקַּח אַבְרָם אֶת־שָׂרָי אִשְׁתּוֹ וְאֶת־לוֹט בֶּן־אָחִיו וְאֶת־כָּל־רְכוּשָׁם אֲשֶׁר
 רָכָשׁוּ וְאֶת־הַנְּפֹשׁ אֲשֶׁר־עָשׂוּ בַּחֲרָן וַיֵּצְאוּ לְלֶכֶת אֶרְצָה כְּנָעַן וַיָּבֹאוּ אֶרְצָה
 כְּנָעַן

καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἀβράμ τὴν Σαρὰ γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν Λὼτ υἱὸν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῶν ὅσα ἐκτήσαντο καὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἣν ἐκτήσαντο ἐκ Χαρράν, καὶ ἐξήλθοσαν πορευθῆναι εἰς γῆν Χανάαν· καὶ ἦλθον εἰς γῆν Χανάαν.

(And Abram took Sarah his wife, and Lot his brother’s son, and all his possessions which he had gained, and all the people whom he had gained in Charran, and went out to journey to the land of Canaan, and they arrived in the land of Canaan.)

In this case, the use of נִפְשׁ refers to the people that Abram took along with him into the land of Canaan. The translations I have consulted are all unanimous in translating this use of נִפְשׁ as ‘people.’⁵²⁰ The BDB agrees, saying that the “essential man stands for *the man himself*.”⁵²¹ Here again we have נִפְשׁ referring not to life, but rather to that which possesses life.

We find another example of this same usage later, in Exodus 1:5:

וַיְהִי כָּל־נַפְשׁ יִצְחָק יִרְדֵּי־עֵקֶב שִׁבְעִים נַפְשׁ וַיֹּסֶף הִנֵּה בְּמִצְרַיִם:

Ἰωσήφ δὲ ἦν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ· ἦσαν δὲ πᾶσαι ψυχαὶ ἐξ Ἰακώβ πέντε καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα.

(All the descendants of Jacob were 70. Joseph was in Egypt.)⁵²²

⁵¹⁶ NIV.

⁵¹⁷ ESV.

⁵¹⁸ NASB.

⁵¹⁹ s.v. נִפְשׁ (nephesh) - 2. The נִפְשׁ (nephesh) becomes a living being by God’s breathing.

⁵²⁰ These are the same translations I consulted for the previous section: the NIV, the KJV, ESV, NASB, CSB and *The Bible for Everyone*.

⁵²¹ s.v. נִפְשׁ (nephesh) - 4.b.

⁵²² In this case, my translation follows the Hebrew text.

This instance occurs at the beginning of the book, where the author seeks to establish how the fledgling tribe of Israel came to be in Egypt. The use of נַפְשׁ or ψυχή here refers to the people who come with Jacob into Egypt. The two dictionaries I consulted, as well as all the translations apart from the KJV⁵²³ all translate it as ‘people.’ In this case, I think the clearest reading is that the נַפְשׁ here refers to that which bears life, which is to say, a person.

The final instance of this usage we will consider in the Torah is found in Numbers 15:27:

וְאִם-נִפְשׁ אִשָּׁת תִּחַטָּא בְשִׁגְגָה וְהִקְרִיבָה עֹז בַּת-שְׁנָתָהּ לְחַטָּאת:

ἐὰν δὲ ψυχή μία ἀμάρτη ἀκουσίως, προσάξει αἷγα μίαν ἐνιαυσίαν περὶ ἀμαρτίας·

(If some person sins unintentionally, the person must bring a female goat for a sin offering.)

Again, in this case, the word refers to that thing which has life, in this case, a person. This is attested in all the sources I consulted except the KJV, which again translates this word as ‘soul.’ Along with the translations, both the BDB and the LAL interpret this word as meaning ‘person.’⁵²⁴ Given all this, it seems best to understand this as referring to a person who sins unintentionally and is in need of penitential sacrifice.

These are, of course, representative citations, but from these we can be reasonably confident that in the Torah, נַפְשׁ often refers to a person.

Inner Self

Another way that נַפְשׁ is used in the Torah is to speak about the inner self. Of course, this meaning has many facets. For example, נַפְשׁ can occasionally be used to refer to the internal will of a person. This is shown in Genesis 23:8:

וַיְדַבֵּר אֲתָם לְאָמֵר אִם-יֵשׁ אֶת-נַפְשְׁכֶם לְקַבֵּר אֶת-מִתִּי מִלְּפָנַי שְׂמַעֲלוּנִי וּפְגַעוּ-לִי בְעֶפְרוֹן בֶּן-צָחָר

καὶ ἐλάλησε πρὸς αὐτοὺς Ἀβραὰμ, λέγων, Εἰ ἔχετε τῆ ψυχῆ ὑμῶν ὥστε θάψαι τὸν νεκρὸν μου ἀπὸ προσώπου μου, ἀκούσατέ μου καὶ λαλήσατε περὶ ἐμοῦ Ἐφρών τῷ τοῦ Σάαρ·

(And Abraham spoke to them saying, “If you are willing that I bury my dead out of my sight, listen to me and intercede with Ephron the son of Saar for me.”)

⁵²³ The KJV renders this as ‘souls.’

⁵²⁴ BDB: s.v. נַפְשׁ no. 4 - נַפְשׁ. The נַפְשׁ as the essential of man stands for *the man himself*; LALH: s.v. נַפְשׁ - Person: a human being; sometimes referred to collectively as people.

In this case, Abraham is asking the Hittites if they will allow him to bury his wife Sarah in their lands. The use of the word *שָׁפַח* is masked in most English translations which translate it with some version of “if you are willing.” The KJV includes a psychological word that helps us understand what this word means, translating “if it be in your mind.” Although the BDB is reluctant to attribute this to will, it seems to be the best understanding of it. Abraham is asking his interlocutors if their internal disposition is so ordered as to allow him to bury his dead in their land. The best understanding of this idea is what we normally call the ‘will,’ which is the ordering of our internal feelings towards something. So, in this way at least, it seems likely that *שָׁפַח* here refers to some aspect of our internal life.

That, however, is not the only way it refers to aspects of our internal life. It can also refer to how it feels to have some experience. This, indeed, is what is in the law, which Moses mediates to the people of Israel in Exodus 23:9:

וְגֵר לֹא תִלְחָץ וְאַתֶּם יְדַעְתֶּם אֶת־נַפְשׁ הַגֵּר כִּי־גֵרִים הֵייתֶם בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם

καὶ προσήλυτον οὐ θλίψετε· ὑμεῖς γὰρ οἴδατε τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ προσηλύτου· αὐτοὶ γὰρ προσήλυτοι ἦτε ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ.

(Do not trouble the foreigner, for you yourselves know the feeling of being a foreigner. For you yourselves were foreigners in the land of Egypt.)

In this case the sentiment is that the people of Israel should be unwilling to act in a prejudiced manner towards foreigners in their own land, and the reason given is because they know what it feels like to be foreigners after their Egyptian experience. In this case, *שָׁפַח* is translated as ‘feeling.’ Both the KJV and the ESV translate this word as “heart,” which is a fair enough translation, although it does somewhat miss the point. It trades clarity for anatomical language. The BDB is better, calling it the “seat of emotions and passions,” especially “alienation, hatred and revenge.”⁵²⁵ This is probably the best understanding of this use of the word. The *שָׁפַח* is that part of a living thing which feels emotions. As Eichrott puts it, “[as] an expression for this fact of being alive, for vitality, *שָׁפַח* covers every *type of wish, desire or vital urge*.”⁵²⁶

The final use of this word I will consider is found in Leviticus 26:16:

אֲרֹאֲנִי אֶעֱשֶׂה־אֶת־לְבָבְךָ וְהִפְקַדְתִּי עַל־יָדְךָ בְּהִלָּה אֶת־הַשְׁחָפֶת וְאֶת־

⁵²⁵ s.v. 6 - *שָׁפַח*.

⁵²⁶ Eichrott 1967: 139. Italics original.

הַקְּחָת מְכֻלֹּת עֵינַיִם וּמְדִיבַת גַּפְּיָם לְרִיק זְרַעְכֶּם וְאֶכְלָהוּ אִיבֵיכֶם:

καὶ ἐγὼ ποιήσω οὕτως ὑμῖν, καὶ ἐπισυστήσω ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς τὴν ἀπορίαν τὴν τε ψώραν καὶ τὸν ἴκτερα καὶ σφακελίζοντας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑμῶν ἐκθήκουσαν· καὶ σπερεῖτε διὰ κενῆς τὰ σπέρματα ὑμῶν καὶ ἔδονται οἱ ὑπεναντίοι ὑμῶν.

(Then I will do thus to you, and I will bring upon you sudden confusion and disease and fever and will infect your eyes and take away your strength. And you will sow your seed in vain, because your enemy will eat it.)

This usage is another way of understanding the inner person. It also seems to be an extension of the life. Translations vary, but all refer to some aspect of the inner person. Some (KJV, ESV) say it means ‘heart.’ Others, (CSB, *The Bible for Everyone*), render it as ‘life,’ where the life falls away. The NIV offers ‘strength.’ The LALH is similarly broad, defining it as “the inner self” and elaborating that this is “that part of a person or animal that thinks, feels, wills, desires.”⁵²⁷ The BDB is somewhat more specific in describing this usage particularly as the inner person experiencing abhorrence or loathing.⁵²⁸ But in all cases, the word refers to a person’s inner vitality. It does not seem to be directly referring to one’s life, because a person’s death is not necessarily implied. Instead, it conveys the vitality of a person, which results from us having life.

Thus, not only does נַפְּשׁ refer to people, but it also refers to the part of people that governs their inner life, in terms of feeling and thinking. The root meaning for these two uses of the word, as ‘people’ and as ‘inner life’, debatably comes from the next use of the word we will be discussing, which is where נַפְּשׁ means ‘life.’

Life

The word נַפְּשׁ very often means ‘life’ when it is used in the Torah. When it is used in this way, it means that animating aspect of a person which is lost at death. The first passage we will consider, which illustrates this use of the word, is Deuteronomy 12:23-24:

רַק חֶזֶק לְבַלְתִּי אֶכֶל הַזֶּם כִּי הַזֶּם הוּא הַנֶּפֶשׁ וְלֹא־תֹאכַל הַנֶּפֶשׁ עִם־
הַבָּשָׂר:

לֹא תֹאכְלֶנּוּ עַל־הָאָרֶץ תִּשְׁפָּכֶנּוּ כַּמַּיִם:

⁵²⁷ נַפְּשׁ s.v.

⁵²⁸ נַפְּשׁ - 6 s.v.

πρόσεχε ἰσχυρῶς τοῦ μὴ φαγεῖν αἷμα, ὅτι αἷμα αὐτοῦ ψυχή· οὐ βρωθήσεται ἡ ψυχή μετὰ τῶν κρεῶν· οὐ φάγεσθε, ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐκχεεῖτε αὐτὸ ὡς ὕδωρ·

(Keep yourself strongly from eating the blood, because the blood is the life, and you must not eat the life with the meat. Do not eat it, but pour it on the ground like water.)

This text comes from the part of the law where God is telling the Israelites about the place of worship he will institute, and how the Israelites are to perform this worship. Amid this, he tells them that, although it is permissible for them to eat the flesh of the victim, they may not eat its blood, for in the blood is the *נֶפֶשׁ*. In this case, all the translations, as well as the BDB⁵²⁹ and the LALH⁵³⁰ are unanimous in agreeing that this use of the word means ‘life.’ Eichrott emphasises this point by saying that “[it] is easily understandable that the blood should be preeminently the vehicle of the *נֶפֶשׁ*, so that it can be stated quite categorically that the blood is the *נֶפֶשׁ*. Whoever loses his blood also loses his life.”⁵³¹

The use of this word to mean ‘life’ is also found in reference to human beings. In Genesis 12:13, Abraham is nervous about meeting the Egyptian Pharaoh with his wife, because he is aware that she is an attractive woman and he may well be killed for her hand in marriage, and so he says to her,

אֶמְרִי-נָא אֶתְּךָ לְמַעַן יִיטַב-לִי בְעַבְדְּךָ וְחַיִּתָּה נַפְשִׁי בְגַלְלֶךָ:

εἶπὸν οὖν ὅτι Ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ εἰμί, ὅπως ἂν εὖ μοι γένηται διὰ σέ, καὶ ζήσεται ἡ ψυχή μου ἕνεκεν σοῦ.

(So say, “I am his sister”, so that things may be well with me on your account, and that my life will be spared for your sake.)

Here as well, the clearest meaning of the word is ‘life.’ Abraham is worried that his *נֶפֶשׁ* is in danger because of the way his wife looks, and so he asks her to take steps to ensure that he is not at risk of losing it. This suggests also that *נֶפֶשׁ* is not understood as something that is permanent, but rather as something that is at risk of being lost. This also helps substantiate reading this word as ‘life.’

Thus, it seems that a fair rendering of *נֶפֶשׁ* is life. Moreover, it seems to be a life that is tightly bound up with the body, since the affiliation with the blood is so strong that the *נֶפֶשׁ* can actually be said to be the blood. This is further confirmed by the worry that Abraham has that it may be lost. As a result, we may best understand this word here as ‘life.’

⁵²⁹ s.v. 1 *נֶפֶשׁ*. That which breathes, the breathing substance or being, the soul, the inner being of man.

⁵³⁰ s.v. *נֶפֶשׁ*. A living person, for example, in phrases like “a life may be spared” or “my life may be spared.”

⁵³¹ Eichrott 1967: 136.

The Dead and A Corpse

This meaning, however, can also extend to include that which previously possessed life, in other words, a corpse. To illustrate this, we turn to two passages from Leviticus, both of which seem to teach almost identical things. The first is Leviticus 22:4:

אִישׁ אִישׁ מִזֶּרַע אַהֲרֹן וְהוּא צָרוּעַ אֹדֹב בְּקִרְשֵׁים לֹא יֵאָכֵל עַד אֲשֶׁר
יִטְהַר וְהִגִּיעַ בְּכָל־טְמֵא־נֶפֶשׁ אֹדֹב אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־תֵּצֵא מִמֶּנּוּ שְׂכַבְתָּ־זָרַע

καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Ἀαρὼν τοῦ ἱερέως, καὶ οὗτος λεπρᾶ ἢ γονορρυΐας, τῶν ἁγίων οὐκ ἔδεται ἕως ἂν καθαρισθῇ· καὶ ὁ ἀπτόμενος πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας ψυχῆς, ἢ ἄνθρωπος ᾧ ἂν ἐξέλθῃ ἐξ αὐτοῦ κοίτη σπέρματος...

(If there is a man of the seed of Aaron the priest, and he has leprosy or some skin disease, he may not eat of the sacred food until he is cleansed. He will also be unclean if he touches any uncleanness of a corpse, or anybody who emerges from an emission of semen...)

And the second one comes from Leviticus 19:28:

וְשָׂרֵט לְנֶפֶשׁ לֹא תִתְּנוּ בְּבָשָׂרְכֶם וְכִתְּבֹת קַעֲקֹעַ לֹא תִתְּנוּ בְּכַם אָנֹכִי יְהוָה.

καὶ ἐντομίδας οὐ ποιήσετε ἐπὶ ψυχῆ ἔν τῳ σώματι ὑμῶν, καὶ γράμματα στικτὰ οὐ ποιήσετε ἐν ὑμῖν. ἐγὼ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν.

(And do not make cuts on your body for the dead, nor give yourself tattoos. I am the Lord your God.)

In both cases, the verses refer to Israel's purity laws. The first is directed to the tribe of Levi, called the sons of Aaron in this case, and the second is directed towards the people of Israel as a whole. But in both cases, the prohibition relates to dealing with dead people. The Levites are told they may not touch a dead person, since they are considered unclean, and the people of Israel are told that they should not cut or scarify their bodies for the sake of dead people. In both cases, the translations and the dictionary are unanimous in saying that this use of the word נֶפֶשׁ refers to persons themselves, and in this case, it refers to an entity that previously possessed this נֶפֶשׁ.⁵³²

Conclusion:

This is a fair representation of the 172 uses of נֶפֶשׁ in the Torah. Of course, there are some minor uses which I did not discuss here, given the scope and the aims of this thesis. The major uses are where it refers to a person, or living thing, the inner life of that thing, especially a

⁵³² BDB: s.v. 4 נֶפֶשׁ.c.5. *The man himself ... the deceased person.*

person, the essence of life itself, and those things that previously had life, such as the dead as a collective or a corpse. This helps us to see that the root meaning for נָפֶשׁ in this group of texts is ‘life.’

I will now discuss the uses of נָפֶשׁ in the second grouping of the Israelite scriptures, the Prophets.

Prophets

נָפֶשׁ appears 259 times across the collection of works called the Prophets.⁵³³ Again, it is used in a wide variety of ways. Interestingly, though, as we consider this collection which was finished somewhat later than the Torah (although much of the material was probably contemporary or maybe even earlier)⁵³⁴ we will see that the nuances of the word have changed somewhat, so that now the most common use is to describe the inner person. In general, however, the change in meaning is small.

Inner Self

The first family of meaning we will consider is that of the inner person. This is, as I said above, the most common understanding of נָפֶשׁ in this section of the Scriptures. The first example is in Joshua 22:5:

רְקוּ שְׁמֵרוּ מְאֹד לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת־הַמִּצְוֹת וְאֶת־הַתּוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֶתְכֶם מֹשֶׁה
עַבְד־יְהוָה לְאַהֲבָה אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְלִלְכֹת בְּכָל־דְּרָכָיו וְלִשְׁמֹר
מִצְוֹתָיו וְלִדְבָקָה־בּוֹ וְלַעֲבֹדוֹ בְּכָל־לִבְבְּכֶם וּבְכָל־נַפְשְׁכֶם:

ἀλλὰ φυλάξασθε ποιεῖν σφόδρα τὰς ἐντολὰς καὶ τὸν νόμον ὃν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν ποιεῖν Μωσῆς ὁ παῖς Κυρίου, ἀγαπᾶν Κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν, πορεύεσθαι πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ, φυλάξασθαι τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ προσκεῖσθαι αὐτῷ, καὶ λατρεύειν αὐτῷ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς ὑμῶν.

(But be careful to do carefully the commands and the law which Moses, the servant of the Lord, gave you. Love the Lord your God, walk in all his ways, and keep his commands. Hold fast to him and serve him in all your heart and all your inner self.)

In this passage, Joshua addresses the people of God before they go out to live by themselves in the land which they have just captured. Before they go, Joshua gives them one last speech urging them to dedicate themselves to God. In doing this, he asks them to follow

⁵³³ Logos Bible Software.

⁵³⁴ See my discussion in the introduction to this chapter on p. 103.

God with all of their נַפְשׁוֹ. In this case, it seems to refer to the part of the person which is directed towards the worship of God. The LALH translates this as the ‘Inner self,’⁵³⁵ and all the translations translate this as ‘soul’ except *The Bible for Everyone*, which says “being.” In this case, the best understanding of this word is a part of the inner person, especially the moral centre of the person, which is involved in the decisions about whether a person ought to follow God.

The next use of this word I will discuss is found in 1 Samuel 1:10:

וְהָיָה מִרַת נַפְשׁוֹ וְתַתְּפִלָּה עַל־יְהוָה וּבְכָה תְּבַכֶּה:

καὶ αὐτὴ κατώδυνος ψυχῆ, καὶ προσηύξατο πρὸς Κύριον λέγουσα καὶ ἔκλαυσεν·

(And in the deep anguish in her inner self, she prayed to the Lord speaking and weeping bitterly.)

This comes from the start of the story in 1 Samuel, where Hannah, who is barren, prays to God for a son. In this case, the referent is the deep emotional pain that Hannah is feeling. In this case, the word appears to refer to something within people that feels emotions. The translations, apart from the KJV and *The Bible for Everyone*,⁵³⁶ do not refer to an entity at all, but rather refer to the anguish itself. The LALH and the BDB both take this as referring to the inner person, especially as it relates to emotions,⁵³⁷ and it does seem that there is a reference to some kind of entity in which a human being feels their emotions.

The final use of this word I will look at in this section is in Isaiah 38:15:

מִה־אֲדַבֵּר וְאֶמְרֶה לִי וְהוּא עָשָׂה אֲדַבֵּר כָּל־שְׁנוֹתַי עַל־מֶרַח נַפְשִׁי:

ὡς χελιδὼν, οὕτως φωνήσω, καὶ ὡς περιστερά, οὕτως μελετῶ· ἐξέλιπον γάρ μου οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τοῦ βλέπειν εἰς τὸ ὕψος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς τὸν κύριον, ὃς ἐξείλατό με καὶ ἀφείλατό μου τὴν ὀδύνην τῆς ψυχῆς.

(Like a swallow, so shall I cry out, and as a dove, thus will I moan. My eyes grew too weak as I looked into the heights of heaven, to the Lord, who rescued me and took away the pain of my soul.)⁵³⁸

Isaiah refers to the pain he suffers on account of what the Lord has done to him. Here, all

⁵³⁵ s.v. נַפְשׁוֹ

⁵³⁶ KJV: ‘soul’; *The Bible for Everyone*: ‘spirit.’

⁵³⁷ BDB: s.v. 6 נַפְשׁוֹ.c. Seat of emotions and passions ... sorrow and distress; LALH: s.v. נַפְשׁוֹ - Inner self: that part of a person (or animal) that thinks, feels, wills and desires; perhaps an extension of the literal meaning throat.

⁵³⁸ I have translated this from the Greek, rather than the Hebrew.

the translations except *The Bible for Everyone* use the word ‘soul,’ and even *The Bible for Everyone* uses ‘heart.’ The use of נַפְשׁ here seems to refer to an inner part of the human person, which can feel emotions, or is possibly even the seat of the emotions.

Therefore, נַפְשׁ can be used in the Prophets to refer to the inner person, which is to say the seat of one’s moral reasoning, as in Joshua, and the seat of one’s emotions, and in particular negative emotions, as we see in 1 Samuel and Isaiah.

Life or Person

Along with referring to the inner person, נַפְשׁ also means ‘life,’ as in the state which is opposite to death, and that which has life, which is to say a person or an animal. This way of using the word can be found in Joshua 2:14:

וַיֹּאמְרוּ לָהּ הֲאֵנָּשִׁים נִפְשֵׁינוּ תִּחְתִּיכֶם לְמֹות אִם לֹא תִגִּידוּ אֶת־דְּבָרֵנוּ זֶה וְהָיָה בְּתַת־יְהוָה לָנוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְעָשִׂינוּ עִמָּךְ חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת:

καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῇ οἱ ἄνδρες Ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν ἀνθ’ ὑμῶν εἰς θάνατον. καὶ αὐτὴ εἶπεν Ὡς ἂν παραδοῖ Κύριος ὑμῖν τὴν πόλιν, ποιήσετε εἰς ἐμὲ ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθειαν.

(The men said to her, “Our life for your life even to death” and she replied, “whenever the Lord gives the city to you, you will show me mercy and truth.”)

This use of נַפְשׁ is in the story of the spies who are being sheltered at the house of the prostitute Rahab. The spies tell Rahab that if she spares their lives, they will spare hers. All the translations I consulted, as well as the dictionaries,⁵³⁹ say that this use of נַפְשׁ refers to ‘life,’ in this case referring to the animating principle of a person, which is lost at death.

We encounter this use again in Joshua, slightly later, in chapter 11:11:

וַיָּכּוּ אֶת־כָּל־הַנְּפֹשׁ אֲשֶׁר־בָּהּ לְפִי־חֶרֶב הַחֶרֶב לֹא נוֹתַר כָּל־נְשָׁמָה וְאֶת־חָצוֹר שָׂרָף בְּאֵשׁ:

καὶ ἀπέκτειναν πᾶν ἐνπνέον ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν ζίφει καὶ ἐξωλέθρευσαν πάντα, καὶ οὐ κατελείφθη ἐν αὐτῇ ἐνπνέον· καὶ τὴν Ἀσὼρ ἐνέπρησαν ἐν πυρὶ.

(And they killed all who breathed in it with the sword and destroyed all, and not one was left in her that drew breath. And he burned Hazor with fire.)

This describes the Israelite’s conquest of Hazor. Interestingly, this is an occasion where

⁵³⁹ BDB: s.v. נַפְשׁ.b. The living being whose life resides in the blood ... serious attack upon the life is an attack upon this inner living being; LALG: s.v. נַפְשׁ A living person, for example, in phrases like “a life may be spared” or “my life may be spared.”

נְפֹשׁ is not translated by ψυχή. Instead, we have the more periphrastic translation, “anything that breathes.” In any case, all the translations take this to mean ‘person,’ as do the dictionaries,⁵⁴⁰ except the KJV, which takes it to mean ‘soul,’ but even with the KJV, the meaning appears to be that which has a soul, which is to say, ‘a person.’

We see a similar use to Joshua 2 later in this body of literature, in 2 Samuel 18:13:

אֲרוּעַשְׂתִּי בְּנַפְשׁוֹ וְשָׁקַר וְכָל־דְּבָרַי לֹא־יִכָּחַד מִן־הַמֶּלֶךְ וְאַתָּה תִּתְיַצֵּב
מִנְגִּד:

Φυλάξατέ μοι τὸ παιδάριον τὸν Ἀβεσσαλώμ, μὴ ποιῆσαι ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ ἄδικον· καὶ πᾶς ὁ λόγος οὐ λήσεται ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ σὺ στήση ἐξ ἐναντίας.

(Guard the child Absalom for me, do not do anything against his life. Since all the words will not be hidden from the king, even if you oppose me.)

David is speaking to his servant regarding the treatment of Absalom, his rebel son. He asks that he may not kill his son, even though he has rebelled against the king. This use of נְפֹשׁ seems to mean ‘life,’ as in the animating principle of a person which is lost at the moment of death.

The final instance of this use of the word is found in Jeremiah 4:31:

כִּי קוֹל כְּחוֹלֵה שְׂמֹעֲתִי צָרָה כְּמִבְכִּיָּה קוֹל בַּת־צִיּוֹן תִּתְיַצֵּחַ תִּפְרָשׁ כַּפְיָהּ
אִוִּינָא לִי כִי־עִיפָה נַפְשִׁי לְהַרְגִּים:

ὅτι φωνὴν ὡς ὠδινούσης ἤκουσα τοῦ στεναγμοῦ σου, ὡς πρωτοτοκούσης· φωνὴ θυγατρὸς Σειῶν· ἐκλυθήσεται, καὶ παρήσει τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς Οἴμοι ἐγώ, ὅτι ἐκλείπει ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνηρημένοις.

(I hear your voice of distress as of somebody giving birth for the first time, the voice of the daughter of Zion. She will be crying for breath and will raise her hands. “Alas, I am fainting, and my life is wearied because of the murderers.”)

Both the dictionaries translate this in the same way, saying that it means ‘life.’⁵⁴¹ In terms of the translations, there is some variation. The NIV, CSB and *The Bible for Everyone*, all translate the word as ‘life.’ By this they mean something like the life of the speaker is fading away before the danger they are experiencing. The ESV and the NASB translate this as ‘I,’ taking it as a pronominal use. The KJV, as is perhaps usual, translates it as ‘soul.’ Overall,

⁵⁴⁰ BDB: s.v. 4 נְפֹשׁ. the נְפֹשׁ as the essential of man stands for the man himself; LALH: s.v. נְפֹשׁ - Person; a human being; sometimes referred to collectively as people.

⁵⁴¹ BSB: s.v. 3 נְפֹשׁ.b. A serious attack upon the life is an attack upon the inner living being; LALH: s.v. נְפֹשׁ - A living person, for example, in phrases like “a life may be spared” or “my life may be spared”.

there is not much to choose between these two, but the translation ‘life’ appears to be slightly more favourable because it fits the context better to say that one’s life is wearied, as in one’s life force feels weakened, by the injustice in the society of Jerusalem, rather than to say that one faints before it. Thus we shall take this use of the word to mean ‘life.’

Throat or Craving

A further meaning of שָׁפָה is that of the ‘throat.’ Indeed, some argue that this is the basic meaning of the word, from which all other more metaphorical meanings later derive.⁵⁴² Whether or not this is the case, שָׁפָה as ‘throat’ is a clearly testified usage of the word, as is a related metaphorical meaning found, for instance, in Isaiah 32:6:

כִּי נִבְלָה נִבְלָה יִדְבָּר וְלִבּוֹ יַעֲשֶׂה-אָוֶן לַעֲשׂוֹת חָפָז וּלְדַבֵּר אֶל-יְהוָה תוֹעֵה
לְהַרְיֵק גִּפְשׁ רָעָב וּמִשְׁבֶּקֶה צָמְאָ יִחְסִיר:

ὁ γὰρ μωρὸς μωρὰ λαλήσει, καὶ ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ μάταια νοήσει, τοῦ συντελεῖν ἄνομα καὶ λαλεῖν πρὸς Κύριον πλάνησιν, τοῦ διασπεῖραι ψυχὰς πεινώσας, καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς τὰς διψώσας κενὰς ποιήσει.

(For the fool will say foolish things, and his heart will think wicked thoughts, to do lawless deeds, to spread evil concerning the Lord, to scatter abroad hungry persons, and he will make the thirsty persons empty.)

In this case, שָׁפָה is used to describe hungry persons. The translations vary, sometimes referring to the hungry persons and sometimes leaving the “person” understood. The LALH understands the word as a ‘craving’ expressed through a metaphorical use of שָׁפָה as ‘throat.’⁵⁴³ Given this definition, I think the best way of understanding this verse is by taking שָׁפָה to refer to the craving itself, not the person. In understanding cravings, given the physiological nature of much of the thinking of Ancient Israel, it seems that they conceived of cravings as something that happened in somebody’s throat.

A more literal use of שָׁפָה meaning ‘throat’ is found in Jeremiah 4:10:

וְאָמַר אֲהָהוּ אֲדַנִּי יְהוָה אֲכַן הֲשֵׂא הַשָּׂאתָ לְעַם הַזֶּה וְלִירוּשָׁלַם לְאֹמֶר
שָׁלוֹם יְהִי לָכֶם וְנִגְעָה תִּרְבַּע עַד-הַנֶּפֶשׁ:

καὶ εἶπα Ὡ δέσποτα Κύριε, ἄρα γε ἀπατῶν ἠπάτησας τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ, λέγων Εἰρήνη ἔσται, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἤφατο ἡ μάχαιρα ἕως τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν;

⁵⁴² Eichrott 1967: 134.

⁵⁴³ s.v. שָׁפָה.

(And I said, O Sovereign Lord, you have completely deceived this people and Jerusalem, saying that there will be peace, and behold, a sword is at their throat.)

Jeremiah speaks to God about the state of Jerusalem at his time. There were prophets claiming that peace was at hand, speaking as if from the Lord, but in reality they were in grave danger. In making this point, Jeremiah uses the image of having a sword at one's *שֶׁפֶט*. In every source I consulted bar the KJV, which translated *שֶׁפֶט* as 'soul,' as, debatably, does the LXX, and the BDB, which did not include this use of *שֶׁפֶט*, the word is considered to mean 'throat.' This seems clear, since what Jeremiah intends to portray is that the city and her people are under threat, and what image makes this point more clearly than that of having a sword against one's throat?

Corpse/ Death

The final use of *שֶׁפֶט* I will survey in the Prophets is where it refers to either a corpse or death itself. This is a rare use of *שֶׁפֶט* in this body of literature, but an instance can be found in Haggai 2:13:

וַיֹּאמֶר חֲגִי אִם-יִגַע טְמֵא-נֶפֶשׁ בְּכָל-אַלֶּה הֲיִטְמָא וַיַּעֲנוּ הַכֹּהֲנִים וַיֹּאמְרוּ
יִטְמָא:

καὶ εἶπεν Ἀγγαῖος Ἐὰν ἄψηται μεμιαμμένος ἀκάθαρτος ἐπὶ ψυχῇ ἐπὶ παντὸς τούτων, εἰ μιανθήσεται; καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ εἶπαν Μιανθήσεται.

(And Haggai said, "If a defiled person who is unclean because of touching a dead body touches any of these things, will it become defiled?" And the priests said, "it will be defiled.")

This one is clear. Haggai is involved in a discussion with the priests of his time, and he asks them if they can make something else unclean having been in contact with a *שֶׁפֶט*. In reference to the law, this is clearly a reference to contact with a dead body, which communicates the spiritual contamination from the dead to the living.

Conclusion:

What the reader will notice is that the meanings for *שֶׁפֶט* that are present in the Prophets are very similar to those found in the Law. The difference is the order and the emphasis. While in the Law, the most frequent uses were found in the more concrete meaning of 'person,' in this case the more common use is when it refers to the inner person. This is the case once again when we consider the final collection in the Scriptures of Ancient Israel, the Writings.

Writings

The final collection of the Scriptures of Ancient Israel is the Writings. The word נַפֶּשׁ appears in this collection most of all, at 293 times. The meaning of many of these instances is ‘inner self’ (179 times out of 293),⁵⁴⁴ with ‘life’ or ‘person’ and ‘craving or throat’ being the other meanings.

Inner Self:

As noted above, נַפֶּשׁ is most often used in the Writings to refer to some aspect of the inner person. A clear example of this is found in 1 Chronicles 22:19:

עֲתָה תִּזְנוּ לְבַבְכֶם וְנַפְשֵׁיכֶם לְדַרְוֹשׁ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְקוּמוּ וּבְנוּ אֶת־מִקְדָּשׁ יְהוָה הָאֱלֹהִים לְהַבְרִיא אֶת־אֲרוֹן בְּרִית־יְהוָה וְכָל־יְקֻדְשׁ הָאֱלֹהִים לְבַיִת הַנִּבְנֶה לְשֵׁם־יְהוָה:

vñv dote kardias úmwn kai psyxas úmwn tou zhtēσαι tō kyriō theō úmwn, kai eγέρθητε kai oikodomēσατε αγίασμα tō theō úmwn, tou eiseenégkai tēn kibwōtōn diathēkēs Kyriou kai skeuyē tā āgia tou theou eis oīkon tōn oikodomoumenon tō onómati Kyriou.

(Now give your hearts and souls to seeking the Lord your God, and be raised up and build a sanctuary to your God, so that you may bring in the ark of the covenant of the Lord and all the sacred vessels of God into the house which is to be built for the name of the Lord.)

The people are being urged to call on the Lord to learn what he wants them to do. They are being urged to build a temple. When this is happening, they are told to do so by dedicating your hearts and your נַפֶּשׁ. In this case, there is some diversity among the translations with respect to exactly to which part of the body or person these two terms are referring, but the most common is the heart and soul. What is most important is that the author uses this term to urge people to bring their inner being to God,⁵⁴⁵ and as a result, this seems to be a clear reference to the inner part of a person.

Another example of this use is found in Job 3:20:

לָמָּה יָתַו לְעַמְּלֵי אֹרֶךְ יָתִים לְמַרִּי נַפְשִׁי:

ἵνα τί γὰρ δέδοται τοῖς ἐν πικρίᾳ φῶς, ζῶη δὲ ταῖς ἐν ὀδύναϊς ψυχαῖς;

⁵⁴⁴ Logos Bible Software.

⁵⁴⁵ So the BDB and the LALH: BDB: s.v. 7; 10 - נַפֶּשׁ: Used occasionally for mental acts; LAL: s.v. נַפֶּשׁ - Inner self: the part of a person (or animal) that thinks, feels, wills, and desires; perhaps an extension of the literal meaning throat.

(Why is light given to those in misery, and life to those bitter of soul?)

This also seems to be a straightforward instance of the word *נֶפֶשׁ* referring to the inner person. In this case, it is the same as the passage with Hannah discussed above.⁵⁴⁶ The *נֶפֶשׁ* in both scenarios is the part of the person where emotional pain is felt.⁵⁴⁷

A very similar use is found in Psalm 119:28, which reads as follows:

דְּלִפְּהַ גַּפְשִׁי מִתּוֹגָה קִיְּמָנִי כְּדַבְּרֶךָ:

ἐνύσταξεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἀπὸ ἀκηδίας, βεβαίωσόν με ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου·

(My soul is weary from sorrow, strengthen me with your word)

This word is similar to the usage above in that the *נֶפֶשׁ* is the place in which a person feels sorrow, which wearies them, and in which a person can feel the reassurance of God by means of his interaction with them.⁵⁴⁸ Thus, it seems best to take *נֶפֶשׁ* in this instance to be a reference to the inner person.

The final instance of this use of the word I will discuss is found in Proverbs 13:19:

תַּאֲוָה גִּהְיָה תַעֲרָב לְנַפְשׁ וְתוֹעֵבָת כְּסִילִים טוֹר מִרְעַע:

ἐπιθυμῖαι εὐσεβῶν ἠδύνουσιν ψυχὴν, ἔργα δὲ ἀσεβῶν μακρὰν ἀπὸ γνώσεως.

(The desires of the pious gladden the soul, but the deeds of the impious are far from knowledge.)

נֶפֶשׁ here seems quite clearly to be a reference to the inner person. It is the place where one has one's desires, and the place which is gladdened when those desires are met.⁵⁴⁹ Thus, although it refers to a different part of the inner person (the desires), or the same part operating in a different way, it nevertheless refers to the inner person.

Life:

Although the inner person is by far the most common use of the word in this body of literature, it is not the only one. *נֶפֶשׁ* is also used to mean 'life,' as in the senses discussed before. This is the case in 1 Chronicles 11:19:

⁵⁴⁶ Cf. p. 117.

⁵⁴⁷ LALH: s.v. *נֶפֶשׁ* - Inner self: the part of a person (or animal) that thinks, feels, wills, and desires; perhaps an extension of the literal meaning throat.

⁵⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

וַיֹּאמֶר קְלִילָהּ לִי מֵאֲלֹהֵי מַעֲשׂוֹת זֹאת הַדָּם הַאֲנִשִּׁים הַאֲלֵה אֶשְׁתָּה
 בְּנַפְשׁוֹתֵם כִּי בְנַפְשׁוֹתֵם הִבִּיאֹם וְלֹא אָבִיחָה לְשִׁתּוֹתָם אֲלֵה עֲשׂוּ וְשִׁלַּשְׁתֶּם
 הַגְּבוּרִים:

καὶ εἶπεν Ἰλεώς μοι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο· εἰ αἷμα ἀνδρῶν τούτων πίομαι ἐν ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν; ὅτι ἐν ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν ἤνεγκαν· καὶ οὐκ ἐβούλετο πιεῖν αὐτό. ταῦτα ἐποίησαν οἱ τρεῖς δυνατοί.

(And he said, “God forbid me to do these things. Should I drink the blood of these men who went to risk their lives? For with their lives, they brought it.” So he did not want to drink it. The three mighty warriors did these things.)

This is the story of David’s mighty men, his most famous soldiers. They break through enemy lines to get David a drink of water, which he refuses to drink because they fetched this water at the risk of their נַפְשׁ. The dictionaries and the translations I consulted all translate נַפְשׁ in this passage as ‘life,’⁵⁵⁰ which is to say the animating part of a person which is threatened or disappears when a person is killed.

This use is again mentioned in Job 2:4:

וַיַּעַן הַשָּׂטָן אֶת־יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר עֹר בְּעַד־עֹר וְכֹל־אֲשֶׁר לְאִישׁ יִתֵּן בְּעַד
 נַפְשׁוֹ:

ὑπολαβὼν δὲ ὁ διάβολος εἶπεν τῷ κυρίῳ Δέρμα ὑπὲρ δέρματος· ὅσα ὑπάρχει ἀνθρώπῳ ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκτίσει.

(Satan replied to the Lord and said, “Skin for skin. A man will give all he has in return for his life.”)

This passage takes place in the divine court section of the book of Job. Satan has taken all that Job possesses, and yet Job remained faithful to God. Now Satan wants to attack Job’s נַפְשׁ. In this case, it seems clear that the best translation of this word in this context is ‘life.’⁵⁵¹

The last example of נַפְשׁ I will consider is found in the book of Psalms, in chapter 25:20:

שְׁמְרָה נַפְשִׁי וְהַצִּילְנִי אֶל־אֲבוֹשׁ כִּי־תִסְתִּי בְךָ

φύλαξον τὴν ψυχὴν μου καὶ ῥῦσαί με· μὴ καταισχυνθείην, ὅτι ἤλπισα ἐπὶ σέ.

⁵⁵⁰ BDB: s.v. 3 - נַפְשׁ.b. a serious attack upon the life is an attack upon this inner living being; LALH: s.v. נַפְשׁ - Life: a living person, for example, in phrases like “a life may be spared” or “my life may be spared”.

⁵⁵¹ LALH: s.v. נַפְשׁ - *Ibid.*

(Guard my life and rescue me, do not let me be put to shame, for I have put my trust in you.)

This Psalm records somebody in distress calling out to God for help. He wants God to guard his נַפְשׁוֹ and rescue him. Again, the best translation here seems to be ‘life,’ as all the translations and dictionaries I consulted define it.⁵⁵² As the BDB says, this is defined as an attack on the life which animates a person but which is lost at the moment of death.⁵⁵³

Person:

A translation that is much rarer, but still occurs, is נַפְשׁוֹ as ‘person’. An example of this is found in Proverbs 11:25:

נַפְשׁוֹ-בְּרַכָּה תְּדַשֵּׁן וְיִמְרָהּ גַם-הוּא יִרְאֵה:

ψυχὴ εὐλογουμένη πᾶσα ἀπλῆ, ἀνὴρ δὲ θυμώδης οὐκ εὐσχήμων.

(Every generous person is rewarded, but the passionate man is not seemly.)⁵⁵⁴

Here the author of Proverbs is speaking about the behaviour of a type of נַפְשׁוֹ. In this case, the best translation, supported by all the sources I consulted except the KJV, is ‘a person.’ This would have the passage meaning that a generous person benefits from his generosity.

Another example of נַפְשׁוֹ used in this way is in Lamentations 3:25:

טוֹב יְהוָה לְקַוֵּי לְנַפְשׁוֹ תְּדַרְשֵׁנוּ:

Ἀγαθὸς Κύριος τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν, ψυχὴ ἣ ζητήσει αὐτὸν ἀγαθόν·

(The Lord is good to those who wait for him, to the person who will seek him he is good.)

There is some dispute among the sources I consulted regarding the translation of נַפְשׁוֹ in this verse. The KJV and the ESV both translate this use of נַפְשׁוֹ as ‘soul,’ and this is certainly credible, because the נַפְשׁוֹ is described as seeking God. But in this case, the use of Hebrew parallelism makes it clear that the use of נַפְשׁוֹ here is meant to parallel those who are waiting for God. Thus, it seems better to take נַפְשׁוֹ to mean ‘person,’ as the LALH and the BDB interpret it.⁵⁵⁵

⁵⁵² LALH: s.v. נַפְשׁוֹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵³ s.v. 3 - נַפְשׁוֹ.b.

⁵⁵⁴ For the sake of clarity, I have translated from the Greek. While important, the Hebrew is somewhat garbled.

⁵⁵⁵ BDB: s.v. 4 - נַפְשׁוֹ.a. The נַפְשׁוֹ as the essential of man stands for *the man himself* ... a paraphrase for the

Throat:

The final meaning of שָׁנַף that I will discuss is ‘throat’ or ‘neck.’ We see the word used this way in Psalm 69:2:

הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי אֱלֹהִים כִּי בָאוּ מַיִם עַד-נֶפְשִׁי

Σῶσόν με, ὁ θεός, ὅτι εἰσήλθοσαν ὕδατα ἕως ψυχῆς μου.

(Save me, God, for the water comes up to my throat.)

In this case, the Psalmist is talking about troubling times he is facing, and to communicate this idea he uses the metaphor of water rising over him, threatening to drown him. The trouble is so severe, that it has risen to the point of his שָׁנַף. Although translation as ‘throat’ is the majority reading in this case, it is not universal. Both the KJV and the NASB read it as ‘life.’ Similarly, the BDB interprets this use of the word as referring to life, saying that “a serious attack upon the life is an attack upon this inner living being.”⁵⁵⁶ This is a fair reading, but I think that it is simply derived from the Psalmist’s metaphor. He is indeed talking about his life being under threat, but conveys this meaning through the metaphor of water rising up to his throat. Allied to this, it is easier to understand the Hebrew preposition עַד meaning ‘up to’ as opposed to ‘against.’ Finally, this is consonant with the use of drowning imagery found later in the Psalm, for example in verses 3 and 14-15. Thus, although this is not a point beyond debate, I nevertheless believe this use of the word is best understood as an instance where שָׁנַף means ‘throat.’

As with the section on the Prophets, there are metaphorical uses of שָׁנַף, where literally translated it would probably mean ‘throat,’ but where it actually refers to something like a craving or a need. This is the case in Proverbs 6:30:

לֹא-יִבְוִזוּ לַגָּנוֹב כִּי יִגְנוֹב לְמַלְא נֶפְשׁוֹ כִּי יִרְעֵב:

οὐ θαυμαστὸν ἐὰν ἀλώ τις κλέπτων, κλέπτει γὰρ ἵνα ἐμπλήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν πεινῶν·

(People do not despise the person who is caught stealing, if he steals to satisfy his craving because he is starving.)

Here the word is being used to describe the craving of the thief. The שָׁנַף here is not the person who is hungry but seems to be describing the actual need itself. Indeed, as the LALH

personal pron. Especially in poetry and ornate discourse; LALH: s.v. שָׁנַף - Person: a human being, sometimes referred to collectively as people.

⁵⁵⁶ s.v. 3 - שָׁנַף.b.

suggests, this may well be the outworking of the basic definition of נֶפֶשׁ, which is ‘throat.’⁵⁵⁷

Conclusion:

In the case of the Writings, debatably the latest of the collections of the Hebrew Scriptures, most of the uses refer to the inner person. These usages are more psychological, as we would understand the use of the word, but that isn’t to say that these are totally different. Indeed, they occupy a remarkably similar lexical place to the rest of the usages of נֶפֶשׁ in the Scriptures of Ancient Israel. Indeed, throughout this study, we have seen that while the emphasis of the use of the word does change on occasion, the main lexical range of the word has remained constant. נֶפֶשׁ always refers to life, which by extension makes it refer to people, as those who have life, as well as to the internal functioning of a person, which they have as a result of being alive. The word also refers to the dead and corpses, as those who were previously alive, and finally, though possibly most basically, it can also refer to one’s throat, and all the metaphorical cravings belonging there.

I shall now turn to a discussion of the next significant Hebrew word which is רוּחַ.

רוּחַ

The first thing to notice is that רוּחַ is a far rarer word than נֶפֶשׁ, especially anthropologically. It only occurs 371 times in the Israelite Scriptures.⁵⁵⁸ The other thing to note is that these few uses are also far less varied than the uses of the word נֶפֶשׁ. It tends to mean ‘breath,’ or it can refer to a person’s spirit. As before, I am going to look at some representative uses of רוּחַ in the Scriptures of Ancient Israel in the three sections identified earlier, the Law, the Prophets and the Writings, as I did with נֶפֶשׁ.

Law

When used anthropologically in the Torah, this word almost exclusively refers to the immaterial aspect of a person. As Eichrott argues, using the word in this way is “undoubtedly connected with the derivation of all earthly life from that supra-individual divine vital force which, as the breath of God, pervades the whole creation.”⁵⁵⁹ In essence, Eichrott means that the רוּחַ in a person is that person’s connection to God, from whom all divine energy comes. I will show that, unlike נֶפֶשׁ, which is primarily physical, the רוּחַ is the internal aspect of the person, which controls their emotions and morals. It is also the seat of their talents, as well as

⁵⁵⁷ LALH: s.v. נֶפֶשׁ - A craving understood in terms of the throat.

⁵⁵⁸ Logos Bible Software.

⁵⁵⁹ Eichrott 1967: 131.

their disposition, or beliefs.

The first passage of relevance we will discuss is Genesis 45:27. In this passage, Joseph's brothers, having just had their last audience with him, come to fetch their father Jacob and take him with them to Egypt. Jacob was, of course, deeply hurt by the loss that he experienced when the brothers sold Joseph into slavery.

וַיְדַבְּרוּ אֵלָיו אֶת כָּל־דְּבָרָיו יוֹסֵף אֲשֶׁר דָּבַר אֲלֵהֶם וַיֵּרָא אֶת־הַעֲגָלוֹת
אֲשֶׁר־שָׁלַח יוֹסֵף לְשָׂאת אֹתוֹ וְתַחִי רִיחַ יַעֲקֹב אָבִיהֶם

ἐλάλησαν δὲ αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ ῥηθέντα ὑπὸ Ἰωσήφ ὅσα εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἰδὼν δὲ τὰς ἀμάξας ἃς ἀπέστειλεν Ἰωσήφ ὥστε ἀναλαβεῖν αὐτόν, ἀνεζωπύρησεν τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰακώβ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν.

(And they told him all the words of Joseph, whatever he said to them. And when he had seen the wagons which Joseph sent to carry him, the spirit of Jacob, their father, revived.)

This translation of ריח as 'spirit' is the same in all the translations I surveyed. The BDB defines it as the seat of emotions, but the Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew defines this word as 'vigour' or 'vitality.'⁵⁶⁰ Now, of course, it does refer to Jacob's vitality, since that is exactly what is restored to him by his knowledge that he may see the son he lost, but it is not simply vitality. This refers to a vitality inspired in Jacob because of his own emotional situation. The joy he experiences at the thought of possibly seeing a son, he thought to be lost, once again revives his spirit. Thus, unlike נפש, which tends to include corporeal to less corporeal meanings, ריח seems to be solely concerned with the inner man, rather than involving his natural corporeal self. This would make sense if, as Eichrott suggested, this is the part of man which is somehow gifted to him by the divine person.

ריח can also refer to somebody's talents or inclinations, for example, in Numbers 27:18, when the Lord describes Joshua to Moses:

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה קַח־לְךָ אֶת־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן־נֹון אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־רִיחַ בּוֹ
וְסָמַכְתָּ אֹת־יָדְךָ עָלָיו:

καὶ ἐλάλησεν Κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν, λέγων, Λάβε πρὸς σεαυτὸν τὸν Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν Ναυή, ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἔχει πνεῦμα ἐν ἑαυτῷ, καὶ ἐπιθήσεις τὰς χεῖράς σου ἐπ' αὐτόν·

(And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, "Take with you Joshua, son of Nun, who has a

⁵⁶⁰ s.v. 3 ריח. B.2 - Vigour, vitality.

spirit in him, and you will lay your hands upon him.”)

As the Lord describes Joshua to Moses, and explains why he should be the person to take over from Moses after he dies, he gives as his reason the fact that Joshua has a particular spirit within him. The BDB understands this as a kind of prophetic spirit.⁵⁶¹ Although this language may be somewhat more loaded than we need, it does seem that the Lord is pointing to some aspect of Joshua’s person that makes him suitable to lead Israel. Thus it is not so far-fetched to assume that the רוּחַ is understood to be the place where Joshua’s gift for leadership lies. This either means that God’s spirit influenced Joshua to prepare him to take over, or it refers to those traits of mind and personality which make Joshua a likely successor. I favour the latter interpretation, since it is unlikely that ‘the Lord’ would so influence Joshua without mentioning it to Moses. This suggests that the רוּחַ was understood to be the place in which the person’s inclination or talent lay.

A similar conclusion can be reached when we read Numbers 14:24. In this text, God refers to Caleb because he alone of all the Israelites did not refuse to go into the promised land after he had spied it out:

וְעַבְדִּי כָלֵב עֵקֵב הָיְתָה רוּחַ אַחֲרָת עִמּוֹ וַיִּמְלֵא אַחֲרָי וְהִבִּיאֵתִיו אֶל-
הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר-בָּא שָׁמָּה וְזָרְעוּ יוֹרְשֶׁנָּה

ὁ δὲ παῖς μου Χαλέβ, ὅτι ἐγενήθη πνεῦμα ἕτερον ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐπηκολούθησέν μοι, εἰσάξω αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν εἰς ἣν εἰσῆλθεν ἐκεῖ, καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ κληρονομήσει αὐτήν.

(But my servant Caleb, because there was a different spirit within him, and he followed me, I will lead him into the land into which he came and his descendants will inherit it.)

This is attributed to Caleb’s having ‘a different spirit within him.’ Unlike the previous example, this neither describes gifting nor traits of mind. Rather, it describes something like a belief or an attitude. Indeed, this is how the BDB interprets it. This, again, refers to something about the inner person. Thus, once again we see a refining of the word רוּחַ to include a person’s beliefs and dispositions.

Thus, it seems that, in the Torah, רוּחַ, when used anthropologically, is primarily used to describe one’s inner person. It refers to one’s emotions, as we saw in Genesis when discussing Jacob, as well as their talents and dispositions, as we saw while discussing Joshua and Caleb.

⁵⁶¹ s.v. 3 - רוּחַ.

We shall now discuss the use of this word in the Prophets.

Prophets

In contrast רוח is not typically used anthropologically in the Prophets. In fact, when it is used to mean ‘spirit,’ it either refers to the spirit of God or spirits that work among people, which are often sent by God. There are, however, a few references to the spirit of a person, and so I will discuss them below.

The first of these is in Isaiah 26:9:

נִפְשֵׁי אוֹיְתֵיךָ בְלִילָה אֶפְרוּחֵי בְקִרְבֵי אֲשַׁחֲרֶךָ כִּי כֹאֲשֶׁר מִשְׁפֹּטֶיךָ
לְאַרְץ צָדִק לְמַעַד יִשְׁבֵי תִבְלִ:

ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ, ὁ θεός, διότι φῶς τὰ προστάγματα σου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. δικαιοσύνην μάθετε, οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

(from night my soul awakens early for you, God, because your commands are light upon the world, learn righteousness, you who inhabit the earth.)⁵⁶²

This text shows the author speaking about God and saying that he desires God. In the passage, the רוח clearly seems to be the spirit of the person. The LALH takes it to be the spirit of a person, but does not say more than that.⁵⁶³ The BDB, however, proves more helpful, by saying that this refers not just to the spirit of a person, but to the spirit of the person as the seat of desire.⁵⁶⁴ Since the רוח here refers to the spirit of a person, and understands that spirit to be the origin of the person’s desire, it seems justified to understand רוח, as denoting the seat of a person’s emotions.

One can draw a similar conclusion from Ezekiel 3:14:

וַרוּחַ נִשְׂאָתָנִי וַתִּקְחָנִי וַאֲלַךְ מִלְּבַחַת רוּחֵי יְיָ וַיְהִינֵה עָלַי תִּנְקָה:

καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐξῆρπέν με καὶ ἀνέλαβέν με, καὶ ἐπορεύθην ἐν ὄρμῃ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, καὶ χεὶρ Κυρίου ἐγένετο ἐπ’ ἐμὲ κραταιά.

(And the spirit of the Lord lifted me and carried me up, and I went in the bitterness/impulse of my spirit, and the hand of the Lord was heavy upon me.)

There are two important uses of the word רוח here. The first refers to the spirit of God,

⁵⁶² Once again, there is a marked difference between the Greek and the Hebrew texts. Again, I have followed the Greek text for my translation.

⁵⁶³ s.v. רוח

⁵⁶⁴ s.v. 5 - רוח.a. Spirit as seat of emotion ... desire.

which is moving Ezekiel into an ecstatic state. The second use, however, is the important one for our purposes. This is the state of bitterness of spirit that Ezekiel describes himself as feeling. The BDB describes this as resulting from the breath quickening during one's frustration or bitterness.⁵⁶⁵ Such a reading is also provided by many of the translations I consulted.

The רִיחַ, however, is not simply the seat of a person's desires and emotions. It is also the place where a person's moral judgements are made. We see an example of the word used in this way in Ezekiel 11:19:

וְנָתַתִּי לָהֶם לֵב אֲחָד וְרוּחַ חַדְשָׁה אֶתֶּן בְּקִרְבְּכֶם וְהִסְרֹתִי לֵב הָאֲבָן
מִבְּשָׂרָם וְנָתַתִּי לָהֶם לֵב בָּשָׂר:

καὶ δώσω αὐτοῖς καρδίαν ἑτέραν, καὶ πνεῦμα καινὸν δώσω ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐκσπάσω
τὴν καρδίαν τὴν λιθίνην ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτῶν καὶ δώσω αὐτοῖς καρδίαν σαρκίνην

(And I will give to them another heart, and I will give them a new spirit within them. I will take out their heart of stone from their flesh and give them a heart of flesh.)

In this case, the רִיחַ seems to be the seat of a person's moral character, as the BDB says.⁵⁶⁶ All the translations I surveyed render this word as 'spirit,' but it refers to the way that Israel lives in its relationship to God, which is governed by moral character. Thus, when God refers to putting a new spirit within them, he is speaking about a new moral way of being. Since this is the terminology used when trying to convey this idea, it seems fair to conclude that the רִיחַ was also thought of as the place where moral judgements were made.

On the strength of this, we can see that there are some new aspects of the רִיחַ revealed in the Prophets. As before, רִיחַ denotes the part of a person where emotions reside, but, in the Nevi'im, it also refers to the part where one makes moral judgements.

Writings

In the Writings, we see that the meanings given for רִיחַ are broadly the same as they were throughout the Scriptures of Ancient Israel. In this case, it refers to the emotions, as well as the seat of morality and the decision-making faculties, particularly when they are subject to the influence of God.

The first use of רִיחַ we will discuss here is when it refers to the moral aspect of the person, as in Psalm 32:2:

⁵⁶⁵ s.v. 3 - רִיחַ.e.

⁵⁶⁶ s.v. 8 - רִיחַ.

אַשְׁרֵי אֲדָם לֹא יִהְיֶה בְּיָדָיו עֲוֹן וְאֵין בְּרוּחֹו רְמִיָּה:

μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὗ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται Κύριος ἁμαρτίαν, οὐδέ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος.

(Blessed is the man against whom the Lord does not count sin, and in whose spirit is no deceit.)

In this case the Psalm begins by describing the kind of person who enjoys the Lord's favour. The LXX and the Hebrew text show some disparity in this case. The Hebrew uses רוח which means 'spirit,' as the translations demonstrate. In the LXX, the word is στόμα which means 'mouth.' In this case, although the LXX makes more sense, I am going to proceed based on the Hebrew text, since my goal is to develop an understanding of רוח. The use of the word here shows that there is some idea of the רוח as the seat of 'moral character.'⁵⁶⁷ It is the place from where somebody's deceit or honesty originates. Thus, on the strength of this verse, and others like it, רוח can be understood as the place in the human person where morality originates.

Another example of the use of רוח is in 1 Chronicles 5:26:

וַיַּעַר אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־רוּחוֹ פּוּל מֶלֶךְ־אַשּׁוּר וְאֶת־רוּחַ תִּלְגַּת פִּלְנֶסֶר
מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר וַיִּגְלֶם לְרֵאוּבֵנִי וְלִגְדֵי וְלִחֲצֵי שְׂבַט מְנַשֶּׁה וְיִבְיֵאֵם לְחָלָח
וְחָבוֹר וְהָרָא וְנָהָר גּוֹזָן עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה:

καὶ ἐπήγειρεν ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ τὸ πνεῦμα Φαλώχ βασιλέως Ἀσσοῦρ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα Θαгнаφάμασαρ βασιλέως Ἀσσοῦρ, καὶ μετώκισεν τὸν Ρουβὴν καὶ τὸν Γαδδὲι καὶ τὸ ἥμισυ φυλῆς Μανασσή, καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς Χαὰχ καὶ Χαβὼρ καὶ ἐπὶ ποταμὸν Χωζὰρ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης.

(So the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Phaloch (Pul) king of Assyria (Ashshur) and the spirit of Thagnapamasar (Tillegat Pilneser) king of Assyria, who took the Reubenites and the Gadites and the half-tribe of Manasseh, and he took them to Ha'ach (Halah) and Habor and to the river of Gozar (Gozan) until this day.)⁵⁶⁸

The text describes the attack of the Assyrians on the Israelites, and it describes how the decision to do this was made. What it says is that God stirred the רוח of the king of Assyria. The LALH does not help us shed much further light on the situation, describing this merely as the spirit of a person.⁵⁶⁹ The BDB, however, is more incisive, when it describes this use as

⁵⁶⁷ BDB s.v. 8 רוח.

⁵⁶⁸ I have included the Hebrew names in brackets for the sake of harmonising the Greek and Hebrew texts.

⁵⁶⁹ s.v. רוח

“spirit as breathing quickly in animation, agitation ... disposition of various kinds, often unaccountable and uncontrollable impulse.”⁵⁷⁰ In this case, the impulse is inspired by God. This means, however, that we can also say that the רִיחַ refers to that part of a person which is subject to impulses, or else makes a decision. In this case, the decision is not necessarily a moral one, but tactical, since God inspires the king to decide what he is going to do with prisoners. The point here is that as well as being the seat of moral decisions, the רִיחַ also provides the space for other kinds of decisions and is subject to the influence of God in the making of those decisions.

The final passage I will consider for this section Job 6:4:

כִּי חֲצִי שְׁלִי עִמָּדֵי אֲשֶׁר חִמָּתָם שָׂתָה רוּחֵי בְעוֹתֵי אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲרֹכּוּנִי:

βέλη γὰρ Κυρίου ἐν τῷ σώματί μου ἐστίν, ὧν ὁ θυμὸς αὐτῶν ἐκπίνει μου τὸ αἷμα,
ὅταν ἄρξωμαι λαλεῖν κεντοῦσί με.

(For the arrows of the Lord are in my body, my spirit drinks in their poison, and the terrors of God are arrayed against me.)

Here רִיחַ means something about the internal person which feels the pain of God’s affliction. Interestingly, the LXX does not use πνεῦμα, but θυμός to translate רִיחַ, which here quite clearly refers to the internal person, particularly in terms of emotion. This is a very similar use to the one we saw in Ezekiel, where it expressed the bitterness that somebody feels within their spirit. This again suggests that the רִיחַ, or spirit, is the seat of one’s emotions, including one’s negative emotions.

In conclusion, then, we can say that throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, one finds a relatively consistent understanding of what the רִיחַ is. It is the internal, immaterial part of the person. There is some variation, though arguably more consistency, in the understood functions of this immaterial part of the person. It seems to be the seat of talents and dispositions, as well as emotions, decisions and even one’s moral reasoning. These meanings remain relatively consistent throughout the sections of Scripture I have surveyed.

Synthesis:

I will now turn to surveying how what has been discussed above relates to what Paul has to say. To do this, I will provide a short recap of my findings of the use of these words in the

⁵⁷⁰ s.v. 3 - רִיחַ.g.

Scriptures of Ancient Israel, and I will then link that to what I found about Paul's use of the cognate words in the chapter before.⁵⁷¹

In the case of נַפְשׁ, the first thing to note is that in every case, the LXX translates this word as ψυχή, and so it seems justified to assume that if Paul did get his understanding of these words from the Hebrew Scriptures, his use will overlap with what we find in Israel's Scriptures. In what we saw above, the meaning of נַפְשׁ remained relatively consistent throughout the sections of Israel's Scriptures that I surveyed. There are a few very common meanings that appear throughout. These are when the word means a person's life, as in that which animates them and is lost at death, as well as when it is used to describe a person, and when it is used to describe their inner life. There are a couple of peripheral meanings which were not included in all three sections, but which are still significant. The first is that of death or the dead. The second is the meaning of 'throat,' or the cravings contained within the throat. This is a wide variety of meanings, but the most significant are the first three.

It is important to note that, in the Scriptures of Ancient Israel, נַפְשׁ is never construed as something that can survive death. Nor is it understood to be disembodied. It is rather thoroughly embodied, so that it is even contained in the blood.

With רוּחַ, the matter is more complicated. In the first place, the LXX does not uniformly translate רוּחַ as πνεῦμα. The translators instead use many other terms, such as στόμα in Psalm 32:2. Another translation of רוּחַ is θύμος. This means that it is more difficult to align Paul's use of πνεῦμα with the use of רוּחַ in the Scriptures of Ancient Israel.

This is somewhat perplexing because they actually line up quite well together. The Scriptures of Israel view the human רוּחַ as a non-physical part of a person, which contains the emotions, the morals, the gifts, the beliefs and dispositions. This is remarkably similar to the way in which we saw Paul using πνεῦμα in the previous chapter.⁵⁷² There are, however, some differences, and I will argue that these differences arise because, while the Scriptures of Ancient Israel saw the רוּחַ as God's influence in the world, Paul developed a different understanding of God's influence through his burgeoning thinking about the Holy Spirit.

In short, however, the conclusion of this section is that the Apostle Paul, when using words that have come to be translated as 'soul,' did so in Hebrew terms. He used these words in a fundamentally Jewish way, but that is not to say that he did not innovate at all through the course of his thinking.

⁵⁷¹ See pp. 75-100.

⁵⁷² Cf pp. 99-100 .

In what follows, I will analyse the Second-Temple literature to see what that has to say about the soul and whether any of that managed to find its way into the teaching of the Apostle.

The Apocrypha – Setting and Theology

From a discussion of the “canonical” writings of Judaism, we move to a discussion of the apocryphal, or deuterocanonical works.⁵⁷³ First, I will give a short explanation of what these works are and why they are significant. Then I will examine the use of ψυχή and πνεῦμα in these works, and I will conclude with a brief discussion of why these works are important to study, and what benefit they have for Pauline studies.

The Apocrypha are a collection of Jewish religious writings that were written in the period between 300 B.C. and A.D. 100.⁵⁷⁴ They were written in a variety of settings in the Middle East, such as Palestine, Antioch, Alexandria and possibly even Egypt.⁵⁷⁵ This period of history for the people of the region was fraught, especially for the Jews. In 587 B.C. Jerusalem fell to the Babylonian invasion led by Nebuchadnezzar and the Temple was destroyed. This marked the end of Jewish independence, and presented a real challenge to Jewish theology because it appeared that Gentiles had prevailed over the God of Israel.⁵⁷⁶ After Cyrus conquered Babylon and returned the Jews to their homeland in 538 B.C.,⁵⁷⁷ the Jews still did not enjoy any sovereignty because they were constantly ruled over by Persia, Greece, the Ptolemies, the Seleucids, and finally Rome.⁵⁷⁸ There was a brief period between the Seleucids and Roman rule when the Jews had sovereignty over their own land in the form of Hasmonean rule, but even this had hints of Hellenism so that, according to certain Jews, it was not true Jewish rule.⁵⁷⁹

This Hellenism was another challenge that the Jews faced in this period. When Alexander the Great conquered the land previously controlled by the Persian Empire, Greek culture and thought spread throughout that region. Naturally, this included Judea.⁵⁸⁰ Thus a

⁵⁷³ Depending on one’s tradition. Protestants refer to these books as Apocryphal and do not consider them a part of the canon of Scripture. Catholics and Eastern Orthodox, on the other hand, call these deuterocanonical and consider them a part of the canon.

⁵⁷⁴ deSilva 2005: 53.

⁵⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 2.

⁵⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 33.

⁵⁷⁷ Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 219, 407; cf. deSilva 2018: 34.

⁵⁷⁸ Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 1243-1235, 1341; cf. Wright 1992: 157

⁵⁷⁹ Wright 1992: 158-159.

⁵⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 153.

major emphasis of the Apocrypha is how one can live as a faithful Jew in an increasingly different, predominantly Greek, culture while also enjoying some of the good that such a culture brings.⁵⁸¹

Given the situation of the Jews and their nation at the time of writing, one of the main theological points that unites most of the Apocrypha is what it means to be faithful to God in difficult times, especially when Gentiles hold sway and Jewish ways of life are under threat.⁵⁸² Despite this, many of the Apocryphal writings focus on the God of Israel as the covenant God, and Israel as his covenant people. This covenant is especially mediated through the Torah, which is the source of God's wisdom and the way to a good life. There is also deeper thinking about the creation narratives in these books, as well as a development of the related doctrines of angelology and demonology.⁵⁸³

The books that comprise the Apocrypha are written in a variety of genres. One unifying feature, however, is that they share a relationship with the canonical Hebrew Scriptures, and often take literary forms from those writings.⁵⁸⁴ Like most of the Jewish writings we have studied, they do not focus on developing an understanding of what the human being is. This is not to say, however, that they are completely silent on these issues. On the contrary, they have much to say, and add some different thinking to what we have already seen in analysis of the canonical scriptures of Israel. I will continue my method of surveying various uses of the words *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα* and use that to determine what these varied texts think about the soul. I should say from the start that there is no unity of thought among those that wrote these texts, but nevertheless one can discern some generalised meanings as one studies the lexicography of each of these texts.

ψυχή in the Apocrypha

Use of the word *ψυχή* in the Apocrypha is somewhat different to the usage of this word in the canonical scriptures of Israel. I will discuss some possible reasons for this towards the end of this section. But for now, there are three meanings that I will be surveying. The first is that of 'soul,' the second is 'life,' and the third is the strong reflexive pronoun.

581 deSilva 2018: 2.

582 *Ibid.*

583 deSilva 2005: 54-55.

584 *Ibid.* 53.

Soul

There are several uses of ψυχή in the texts of the apocrypha that are translated as ‘soul.’ In general, the meaning of this word appears to be the part of the person which relates to God and contains the seat of moral reasoning. We see this, for example in the Wisdom of Solomon 4:10-11:

εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ γενόμενος ἠγαπήθη,
καὶ ζῶν μεταξὺ ἀμαρτωλῶν μετετέθη·
ἠρπάγη, μὴ κακία ἀλλάξη σύνεσιν αὐτοῦ,
ἢ δόλος ἀπατήση ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ·

(A man, on becoming pleasing to God, was loved by him and, living amongst sinners, was set apart; he was snatched away, lest evil change his thinking, or cunning trick his soul.)

The translations I consulted, as well as the Lexham Analytical Lexicon of the Septuagint,⁵⁸⁵ all translate this use of ψυχή as ‘soul.’ In Wisdom, the soul appears to be the seat of moral thinking, as opposed to the καρδία in which intellectual reasoning takes place. This is shown here, where the writer is speaking about people who love God despite living in a foreign land, and who were thus protected from compromise. It seems that in this passage the soul is the place from where one’s faithfulness to God originates. In other words, the seat of one’s moral and spiritual life.

Another text which has a similar nuance occurs slightly later in the Wisdom of Solomon (7:27):

μία δὲ οὗσα πάντα δύναται,
καὶ μένουσα ἐν αὐτῇ τὰ πάντα καινίζει,
καὶ κατὰ γενεὰς εἰς ψυχὰς ὁσίας μεταβαίνουσα
φίλους θεοῦ καὶ προφήτας κατασκευάζει·

(Although she is one, she can do all things, and remaining in herself, she makes all things new. In every generation she passes into holy souls, and she makes them

⁵⁸⁵ Further, LALS.

friends of God, and prophets.)

In the case of this verse too, all the sources I consulted translate this use of ψυχή as ‘soul.’ In this case, the verse is about Σοφία and some of the positive effects she has. One of the things she can do is turn the souls of people who are holy towards God. In this case, the soul appears to be the place in which relationship with God uniquely takes place.

Another example of the use of ψυχή in the Wisdom of Solomon occurs in chapter 17:15:

τὰ μὲν τέρασιν ἠλαύνοντο φαντασμάτων,

τὰ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς παρελύοντο προδοσίᾳ·

αἰφνίδιος γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπροσδόκητος φόβος ἐπῆλθεν.

(Some were driven by the signs/portents of ghosts, others were paralysed by their soul’s betrayal; for sudden and unexpected was the fear which came upon them.)

In this case, there are many different lines of evidence to consider. The LALS considers this to be an instance where ψυχή means ‘life.’⁵⁸⁶ The NRSV translates it as ‘soul.’ while the KJV translates it as ‘heart.’ By this, the author is saying is that their source of courage has failed them. So the meaning of the word in this case appears to be ‘soul,’ understood as the seat of moral functioning.

This meaning is not only found in the Wisdom of Solomon, however. In the second account written about the Maccabees, in chapter 6:30, we find this same nuance given to the word ψυχή:

μέλλων δὲ ταῖς πληγαῖς τελευτᾶν, ἀναστενάξας εἶπεν Τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ τὴν ἁγίαν γνῶσιν ἔχοντι φανερόν ἐστιν ὅτι δυνάμενος ἀπολυθῆναι τοῦ θανάτου, σκληρὰς ὑποφέρω κατὰ σῶμα ἀλγηδόνας μαστιγούμενος, κατὰ ψυχὴν δὲ ἠδέως διὰ τὸν αὐτοῦ φόβον ταῦτα πάσχω

(Being about to die under the blows, groaning deeply he said, “it is clear to the Lord in his holy knowledge that I might have been saved from death, but I am enduring terrible sufferings in my body under this beating, but in my soul I am glad to suffer these things because I fear him.”)

In this section of the text, Eleazar is being martyred for his faith. This is a fairly clear acknowledgement of a duality of being within the person. He recognises that while his body is suffering, another part of him, which has clearer connection with God, is enduring well,

⁵⁸⁶ s.v. ψυχή.

because of its privileged connection to God. Thus we see that the ψυχή in this section is described as that part of the person that relates to God, and processes moral issues and feelings (ἡδέως διὰ τὸν αὐτοῦ φόβον ταῦτα πάσχω).

Later in the book, in 2 Maccabees 15:17, we see this same word used with the same nuance:

Παρακληθέντες δὲ τοῖς Ἰούδου λόγοις πάνυ καλοῖς καὶ δυναμένοις ἐπ’ ἀρετὴν παρορμηῆσαι καὶ ψυχὰς νέων ἐπανδρῶσαι, διέγνωσαν μὴ στρατεύεσθαι, γενναίως δὲ ἐνφέρεσθαι, καὶ μετὰ πάσης εὐανδρείας ἐμπλακέντες κρῖναι τὰ πράγματα, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὰ ἅγια καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν κινδυνεύειν.

(Having been encouraged by the words of Judah, which were very well-spoken and able to arouse virtue and instil courage in the souls of the young, they decided not to engage in a campaign, but to endure the attack nobly and to decide the matter, inspired by/immersed in every kind of courage because the city and the holy things and the temple were in danger.)

Although the LALS translates this usage as ‘life.’⁵⁸⁷ This does not seem to be the case. Instead, a better understanding of this use of the word appears to be something more like ‘soul,’ (NRSV) or ‘heart’ (KJV). I prefer ‘soul,’ because this is consistent with what we have seen so far---that ‘soul’ refers to the moral seat of the individual, and in this case Judas’ words are able to encourage the young men to great deeds by inspiring them in this very aspect of their person.

So, from this small but representative collection of texts we can see that one of the meanings clearly attested in the Apocrypha is that of ‘soul,’ meaning the part of the person that relates to God and processes moral ‘truth’⁵⁸⁸ and the ‘right’ kind of emotion involved in expressing these ‘truths.’

Life

Another meaning of ψυχή which will be more familiar at this point is that of ‘life,’ which is to say, that force which animates a person while they are active and present in this world, but which is lost at death. We see our first example of this in the book of Sirach, chapter 16:30:

ψυχὴν παντὸς ζώου ἐκάλυψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς,

καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν ἡ ἀποστροφὴ αὐτῶν.

⁵⁸⁷ s.v. ψυχή - life.

⁵⁸⁸ Though, of course, the claim that the soul is thought in this writing to be the place wherein moral truths are processed need not commit one to the existence or lack thereof of such truths. All one needs to be saying is that the author believes that this is where moral truth is processed.

(The Lord covered the face of the earth with all sorts of living creatures, and they will return to it.)

In this case, the meaning is clear. It appears to be referencing Genesis 2:7 with its use of ψυχή and ζοή close together.⁵⁸⁹ This is exactly the kind of repetition one might expect to find in an text derived from an oral tradition. In this case, it does not just refer to the human male, but to every living creature. So, it seems fair to suggest that the meaning intended by the use of the word ψυχή here is ‘life.’

Another example of this usage is in Judith 8:24:

καὶ νῦν, ἀδελφοί, ἐπιδειξώμεθα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐξ ἡμῶν κρέματα ἡ ψυχή αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ ἅγια καὶ ὁ οἶκος καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐπεστήρισται ἐφ’ ἡμῖν.

(And now, my brothers, let us show our brothers an example, because their lives depend on us, and the sacred things, the house and the altar, are firmly based on us.)

Here again the meaning is fairly clearly ‘life’ as the KJV, NRSV and LALS all agree. We can see this in the fact that Judith is aware that both the lives of the Jewish people and their religion, exemplified by the Temple, depend on their actions.

Another instance of this use of the word from the same book occurs in chapter 10:15:

καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτήν Σέσωκας τὴν ψυχὴν σου σπεύσασα καταβῆναι εἰς πρόσωπον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν· καὶ νῦν πρόσελθε ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀφ’ ἡμῶν προπέμψουσίν σε ἕως παραδώσιν σε εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ.

(And they said to her, “you have saved your life, having hastened to go down to the presence of our lord. And now go to his tent, and some of us will lead you until they give you into his hands.”)

Here, again, ψυχή clearly refers to life in the sense of that which is lost at the moment of death. We can see this because the attendants who are addressing Judith at this moment were clearly worried that she had lost her ψυχή, and were glad to see that she had not. Now, if ψυχή means something other than life, it is unclear how one should take this word in the passage. Therefore, I propose that the best strategy is to consider this word, in this instance, to mean ‘life.’

This use of ψυχή is more widespread, however, than just Judith and Sirach. It is also found in the book of 1 Maccabees, especially in chapter 2:40-41:

⁵⁸⁹ The use of the word πρόσωπον does not refer to the living things, but the earth. As such, it is not relevant to this discussion of the way living things are discussed.

καὶ εἶπεν ἀνὴρ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ Ἐὰν πάντες ποιήσωμεν ὡς οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν ἐποίησαν, καὶ μὴ πολεμήσωμεν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν δικαιωμάτων ἡμῶν, νῦν τὰχιον ἡμᾶς ὀλεθρεύσουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐβουλεύσαντο τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, λέγοντες Πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἐὰν ἔλθῃ πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰς πόλεμον τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων, πολεμήσωμεν κατέναντι αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνωμεν πάντες καθὼς ἀπέθανον οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν ἐν τοῖς κρυφοῖς.

(And each man said to his neighbour, “if we do all which your brothers did, and do not make war against the Gentiles on behalf of our lives and ordinances, they will quickly destroy us from the earth.” So they planned on that day, saying, “let us fight against each man who will come against us on the Sabbath. Let us not die just as our brothers did in their hiding places.”)

Here again, the meaning ‘life’ is obvious. The Jews are planning to defend themselves from the attacks of the enemies who seek to kill them. They use the word ψυχή to denote that which will be lost should they be attacked and killed. Indeed, this is how both the NRSV and the KJV, as well as the LALS, take this use of the word.⁵⁹⁰

This use is more consistent with what we saw when we looked at the canonical writings of Israel, and it is therefore not all that surprising that it would occur in this collection of works that was in large part inspired by those writings.

Self

Another way of using the word ψυχή is as a strong reflexive pronoun. Again, this is a use that we should be familiar with, especially from the letters of the apostle Paul. We see this in the book of Sirach 6:26:

ἐν πάσῃ ψυχῇ σου πρόσελθε αὐτῇ,
καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ δυνάμει σου συντήρησον τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς.

(With all of your soul come to her, and with all of your power observe her ways.)

In this case, the NRSV, as well as the LALS translate ψυχή as ‘soul.’ The KJV by contrast translates it as ‘heart.’ This, along with the parallelism with power, suggests that what the author means by ψυχή in this instance is something more like ‘self.’ The thrust of the passage is that one should pursue wisdom with all one has. Thus, I would argue that this use of ψυχή refers not to a metaphysical entity called a ‘soul,’ at least not directly, but instead is being used metonymically for the whole person.

Another instance of this same usage occurs in Judith 4:9-10:

⁵⁹⁰ s.v. ψυχή - life.

Καὶ ἀνεβόησαν πᾶς ἀνὴρ Ἰσραὴλ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἐκτενεῖα μεγάλῃ, καὶ ἐταπεινοῦσαν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐν ἐκτενεῖα μεγάλῃ, αὐτοὶ καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ νήπια αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ κτήνη αὐτῶν· καὶ πᾶς πάροικος ἢ μισθωτὸς καὶ ἀργυρώνητος αὐτῶν ἐπέθεντο σάκκους ἐπὶ τὰς ὀσφύας αὐτῶν.

(And every Israelite man cried out to God with great zeal, and humbled their souls with great earnestness. They and their wives and their children and their flocks and every foreigner or hired servant or bought slave of theirs put sackcloth on their waists.)

This takes place when the campaign of the Assyrian general Holofernes threatens Judea. The people respond by humbling themselves before God. Again, this appears to be a metonymic use for ‘self.’ Although this does imply the belief in a soul, since one can scarcely use metonymy of something somebody does not believe in, this use appears to be highlighting the scale of the abasement, rather than the abasement of any particular part.

The final use of ψυχή in this manner that we will survey is found in Tobit 1:11-12, where the focalising voice of the narrative says this about his early days in a foreign land:

ἐγὼ δὲ συνετήρησα τὴν ψυχὴν μου μὴ φαγεῖν, καθότι ἐμεμνήμην τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ μου.

(I kept myself from eating, because I remembered the Lord my God with my whole spirit.)

There are two occurrences of ψυχή in Tobit 1:11-12. The first one simply seems to be an intense reflexive pronoun, and indeed this is how it is translated in both the NRSV and the KJV. The second usage is similar, but with a different focus. The point seems to be that Tobit remembers God with his whole person, and as a result he keeps himself from the impurity of the world around him. The KJV and the NRSV both try to keep this sense when they translate it as ‘heart.’

Again, as we would probably expect, the final major way of using the word ψυχή in the apocrypha is as a strong reflexive pronoun. These are the major ways that the writings termed the Apocrypha by Protestants and Jews use the word ψυχή. I will discuss what conclusions we can draw from this shortly, but first I must turn to the other word on which this dissertation is focussed, πνεῦμα.

πνεῦμα in the Apocrypha

As in every body of literature I have discussed so far, there are far fewer uses of πνεῦμα in the apocrypha than uses of ψυχή. Further, there are very few uses of πνεῦμα to refer to the person.

And some of them do not refer to anything psychological, but rather to the breath, or some other part of the person like that. The few uses of πνεῦμα there are, however, refer to the person's spirit, in the same way that the first usage of ψυχή does.

Spirit

The first use of this word in this way is found in the Wisdom of Solomon 16:14:

ἄνθρωπος δὲ ἀποκτείνει μὲν τῇ κακίᾳ αὐτοῦ,
ἐξελθὼν δὲ πνεῦμα οὐκ ἀναστρέφει,
οὐδὲ ἀναλύει ψυχὴν παραλημφθεῖσαν.

(One person in his wickedness kills another, but the spirit that is gone cannot return, nor the trapped spirit freed.)

The use of parallelism in this verse suggests that there is significant overlap, if not complete identity, between πνεῦμα and ψυχή. Parallelism is frequently used in Jewish poetry to connect ideas that are thought to be equivalent. This means that even if the phrasing is not identical, the concept each phrase or sentence is intended to communicate will be. In this case, the ideas that are being paralleled are the fact that the soul, once it leaves the body, is not able to return. Whether this spirit has 'departed' from the body, or is 'trapped' in death, the difference in words and phrasing here does not seem to suggest a difference in concept communicated, and thus, a difference in entity described. In this case, it seems to refer not only to the seat of morals, but actually that which survives death and goes on to experience some form of punishment or blessing. This is, of course, one of the new ideas that the Apocrypha added to the realm of Hebrew thought. Since prior to this Hebrew thought had not really included the idea of a soul which would survive death, and yet this work, as well as others in the Apocrypha like the books of the Maccabees, indicate a clear trend in this direction.⁵⁹¹

The second, and final use, we will be looking at is found in Susanna 44-45:

Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος Κυρίου, ἐκείνης ἐξαγομένης ἀπολέσθαι· καὶ ἔδωκεν ὁ ἄγγελος,
καθὼς προσετάγη, πνεῦμα συνέσεως νεωτέρῳ ὄντι Δανιήλ.

(And behold an angel of the Lord, as she was being led off to die, and the angel gave, just as he was commanded, spirit of understanding to a young man called Daniel.)

⁵⁹¹ This would, of course, be an interesting avenue for exploration. But since the Apostle Paul and not the Apocryphal literature is the subject of this dissertation, that must remain an interesting avenue left untraveled.

In this case, the meaning of πνεῦμα once again is once again very close to that of ψυχή. As Susanna is about to be killed, God speaks to Daniel in his πνεῦμα and shows him the problem with the situation. This suggests that the πνεῦμα is the place in which God has special access to the person, and that it is the place in which moral feelings and intuitions are housed.

So in total, the use of πνεῦμα in a psychological sense in the Apocrypha typically refers to that part of the person that relates to God and governs a person's morality. The other meaning that is hinted at, especially by Wisdom 16:14, is that it seems to survive death.

Conclusion

When the Apocrypha the word ψυχή, the meanings diverge. In the more "Jewish" works like Sirach, 1 Maccabees and Judith⁵⁹² it refers to what we might expect, namely to 'life' and the 'self.' This is unsurprising, as these these texts, as well as Tobit, are thought to have come from Semitic originals.⁵⁹³ But in the books that were written in Greek centres or with Greek thought in mind it refers to the soul,⁵⁹⁴ which is the seat of morals and the part of the person with which God relates.

πνεῦμα has a much narrower lexical range, and far fewer uses within that range. When it is used with a psychological bent, it typically means the same as ψυχή when ψυχή is used to mean 'soul.'

Finally, I must briefly discuss the value of including the Apocrypha in a study like this. The Apocrypha give a more reliable picture of Judaism in the Second Temple Period,⁵⁹⁵ which is the Judaism of Jesus and Paul.⁵⁹⁶ This is particularly useful because it provides a helpful understanding of how the theology of the canonical Hebrew Scriptures developed into the theology of the New Testament. For example, the figure of Wisdom in Wisdom of Solomon provides the raw materials for the Christology of Colossians, Hebrews and John.⁵⁹⁷ Likewise, the Apocrypha help provide the background that clarifies the movement from Isaiah's "Suffering Servant" to the full doctrine of penal substitution, as evidenced on the cross. Another important idea that comes from the Apocrypha is the development of the theology of life after death and the resurrection of the body, as well as divine justice in the hereafter.⁵⁹⁸ Although

⁵⁹² DeSilva 2018: 166-170; 89-92; 268-270.

⁵⁹³ For a discussion on this, see Dunn, Rogerson 2003: 736-738; 748; 779; 807.

⁵⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 136-138; 291-295.

⁵⁹⁵ Especially 300 B.C. to A.D. 100.

⁵⁹⁶ deSilva 2018: 6.

⁵⁹⁷ deSilva 2005: 54.

⁵⁹⁸ *Ibid.* 56.

the authors of the New Testament don't quote from it directly - a privilege which they reserve for the OT alone - they do nevertheless appear to use apocryphal phrases and arguments in their theological reasoning.⁵⁹⁹

My interest in this literature, therefore, is twofold. Firstly, it may well have had some direct influence on Paul and his thinking. But even if it did not, it still reveals people like Paul, Jewish thinkers, who were grappling with the same challenges that he was, namely, trying to accommodate a changing world into the Jewish story, and unpack it in a way that still made sense.⁶⁰⁰

The other reason these texts are so interesting to me is because they open the way for Greek thought to start influencing Jewish religious writing. In other words, they pave the way for the study of the next chapter, which will be on Greek psychological thinking and its influence on Paul.

⁵⁹⁹ 2018: 7-8.

⁶⁰⁰ Wright 2013: 121-138.

Chapter Five: The Soul In Classical Greek

From a discussion of how Paul’s Jewish upbringing may have contributed to his beliefs about the human soul we move to a discussion about how the Greek thought that surrounded him may have contributed to his thinking. As was discussed, Paul grew up in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia which was famous for its culture and philosophy.⁶⁰¹ Furthermore, this was after Alexander’s conquests and the Seleucid domination, so Greek thought, language and culture would have been widespread in the Eastern Mediterranean at the time. Thus it is necessary to investigate the possibility that Paul’s thought was influenced in some way by Greek ideas.

This, however, raises a few questions. The first is what the term ‘Greek’ means at this time. Of course, it cannot simply mean that which belongs to the mainland and islands of Greece. Rather, in this section I will use ‘Greek’ to refer to anything that finds its basis in the ideas or culture of people traditionally from Greek areas. By our period this had spread because of Alexander the Great, and the aftermath of his conquests.⁶⁰²

In what follows, I will consider two sources where the Apostle Paul may have been influenced in his thought by Greek ideas. These two sources are literature and philosophy.⁶⁰³ To see how these two potential streams of influence may have shaped the thinking of Paul, I will look at the use of the words ψυχή and, to a lesser extent πνεῦμα, in each of these two “fields”, starting with the Archaic period, and then moving on to the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

Archaic

We shall begin our discussion of the Greek concept of the soul by looking at the Archaic period. In this period, there were many different words that had psychological bearing. I will, however, focus my discussion largely on the use of ψυχή. This is because Paul’s words

⁶⁰¹ Wright 2018: 11; also see my discussion on pp. 24-25 of this dissertation.

⁶⁰² Wright 2013: 258.

⁶⁰³ The difference between philosophy and literature in this framework is that literature intends to construct a narrative that also communicates ideas about the big questions of life. Philosophy, by contrast, intends to communicate ideas about the nature of reality, and will communicate these in whatever manner is thought best.

for ‘soul’, as I have discussed earlier in this dissertation, are ψυχή and πνεῦμα. Words like θυμός do not feature very often in his corpus.⁶⁰⁴ Paul’s use of πνεῦμα has been examined earlier.⁶⁰⁵ In contrast, πνεῦμα in Homer does not feature in a psychological sense. In fact, in most of the Greek texts I will survey, πνεῦμα tends to refer to a person’s breath.

In *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*, Jan Bremmer aims to set forward “as complete a picture as possible of Greek soul belief before the soul became the subject of systematic reflection by Plato and other philosophers.”⁶⁰⁶ This study is important for a few reasons. Firstly, it helps us to look past the homogenising idea that one can look to Plato to understand the entirety of Greek thought. Secondly, it helps us to understand the cultural undercurrents that would have informed the views of the soul that came later, and which have proved so influential, even to the present day.

In interacting with this work, I hope to show the different ways that the word ψυχή is used in Homeric literature, and to try and develop something of a synthesised understanding from this analysis.

Bremmer’s The Early Greek Concept of the Soul

Bremmer’s first chapter serves three purposes: to draw attention to some methodological concerns, to situate the rest of the book in the current conversation about early Greek soul belief, and to describe the basic framework upon which the rest of the book seeks to build.

There are essentially two methodological issues that Bremmer addresses in his introduction. The first is to challenge the idea that to get an understanding of the early Greek concept of the soul, all one needs to do is find all the words usually translated ‘soul,’ along with their cognates, and synthesise them to create a picture. Opposing this, Bremmer opines that scholars have long since recognised that using “modern Western terminology to describe non-Western beliefs influences analysis since it assumes the existence among other peoples of the same semantic fields for modern words, and thus often implies a non-existent similarity.”⁶⁰⁷ Harrison makes the same point: “[a] common source of misunderstanding in Homeric interpretation is the assumption that Homeric language and modern languages are essentially parallel, and that, to understand Homer, all we have to do is match two corresponding sets of terms.”⁶⁰⁸ After some discussion, both Bremmer and Harrison agree that while it is tricky, the

⁶⁰⁴ Cf. BDAG s.v. θυμός – 1. Passion, passionate longing; 2. Anger, wrath, rage.

⁶⁰⁵ See my discussion on pp. 99-100.

⁶⁰⁶ Bremmer 1983: 10.

⁶⁰⁷ *Ibid.* 4.

⁶⁰⁸ Harrison 1960: 63.

use of the English word ‘soul’ is still the best, but only when people pay due respect to the intricacies involved. The second methodological concern that Bremmer raises is the fact that some people tend to analyse ancient people’s experiences through the lens of modern psychology.⁶⁰⁹ In contrast, Bremmer believes that we need to understand that all of our experiences take place in and are shaped by a particular context, and so to try and understand an experience by importing ideas from another context is essentially disingenuous.⁶¹⁰

Instead, the method which he advocates is a study of words and etymologies, which is informed by a knowledge of comparative anthropology.⁶¹¹ He advocates for this because classicists, unlike many others who study the ancient world, have the benefit of a wealth of texts which give a clearer insight into people’s customs and, more importantly, their actual understanding of those customs. While recognising this, Bremmer is also quick to point out that this wealth of information must not lull the classicist into a false sense of security. He says this because archaeology never gives as much information as we would like it to. There is also the fact that ancient authors are never themselves unbiased windows into their time period, but reveal their own prejudices and express their opinions.⁶¹² With these caveats in mind, however, there is still the possibility to gain real insight.

Bremmer then goes on to situate his work in a scholarly context. While he cites many scholars who have done important work in the field, the most important for Bremmer’s subsequent argument is the Swedish Sanskritist Ernst Arbman.⁶¹³ In his study of Indian soul belief, Arbman found that the concept of the soul was not unitary, but dual, i.e. the soul in India was understood to be made up of the ‘free soul,’ which was a representation of the individual in times of unconsciousness, such as sleep or death, and the conscious soul, which he deemed the ‘body soul.’⁶¹⁴ The body soul was further divided into two parts. The first was the ‘life soul,’ and was often identified with the breath. The second was the ‘ego soul,’ or the “inner self of the individual.”⁶¹⁵ Bremmer uses this model of the dual soul in the remainder of his book as the framework for understanding how the early Greeks conceptualized the soul:

⁶⁰⁹ Bremmer 1983: 5.

⁶¹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹¹ *Ibid.* 6.

⁶¹² *Ibid.*

⁶¹³ *Ibid.* 9.

⁶¹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶¹⁵ *Ibid.*

“...ψυχή will be identified ... as corresponding with the free soul and terms connected with man’s inner life such as θυμός, νοῦς and μένος as corresponding with the body souls.”⁶¹⁶

The ψυχή as the Free Soul

Bremmer summarises Arbman’s understanding of the free soul as the “individual’s nonphysical mode of existence not only after death but also in dreams, swoons and other types of unconsciousness.”⁶¹⁷ Unlike, for example, the μένος, the free soul has no particular place of residence in the body and, because it only ‘represents’ the individual, it “never has any physical or psychological attributes.”⁶¹⁸ This also implies that it cannot continue its worldly existence after death.

Bremmer then goes on to show how most of these beliefs are expressed in Homer’s concept of the ψυχή, essential for the survival of the Homeric man. We see this, for example, in *Iliad* 9. 321-322:

οὐδέ τί μοι περίκειται, ἐπεὶ πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῷ
αἰεὶ ἐμὴν ψυχὴν παραβαλλόμενος πολεμίζειν.

(Nor is there much gain for me, when I have suffered pain in my heart,
always risking my life to fight.)

This text occurs in the famous section where three of the Achaean heroes try to persuade Achilles to rejoin the fight. Having heard Odysseus’ plea, Achilles argues that there is nothing in battle for him, except that he may risk his ψυχή. The LSJ interprets this usage as ‘life,’⁶¹⁹ and indeed this seems the best way to understand this use of the word, since it is difficult to imagine what else Achilles could be risking in battle. In addition, the Homeric texts use ψυχή to refer to that which “leaves the body during swoons.”⁶²⁰ This use occurs in *Iliad* 5. 696-698:

τὸν δ’ ἔλιπε ψυχή, κατὰ δ’ ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ’ ἀχλύς:
αὐτίς δ’ ἐμπνύνη, περὶ δὲ πνοιὴ Βορέας
ζώγρει ἐπιπνείουσα κακῶς κεκαφηότα θυμόν.

(and his life left him (i.e., he fainted), and a mist fell over his eyes;

⁶¹⁶ *Ibid.* 11.

⁶¹⁷ Bremmer 1983: 17.

⁶¹⁸ *Ibid.* 18.

⁶¹⁹ s.v. ψυχή - A.

⁶²⁰ Bremmer 1983: 15; Homer *Il.* 5.696.

but he lived again, because a North wind blew on him.

and restored him to life as he badly panted for breath.)

This describes what happens to Pelagon when he tries to take the spear that has wounded him out of his leg. This is apparently deeply distressing to him, and we are told that his ψυχή left his body briefly. The LSJ describes what happens in this moment as spirit which departs the body during a swoon.⁶²¹ There is a similar interpretation given in the *Homeric Dictionary*, which regards ψυχή here as the spirit of “one falling in a faint.”⁶²² In both cases, the understanding appears to be that the ψυχή is the consciousness, which is lost when one faints. The ψυχή also leaves the body permanently at death and departs to live in Hades.⁶²³ This is found, for example, in Homer *Odyssey* 11.467-470.

ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχὴ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
καὶ Πατροκλῆος καὶ ἀμύμονος Ἀντιλόχοιο
Αἴαντός θ', ὃς ἄριστος ἔην εἶδός τε δέμας τε
τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα.

(Then came to him the spirit of Peliades Achilles, and Patroclus and peerless Antilochus and of Aias, who was the best in the beauty of his form, and of all the Danaans after peerless Peliades.)

This is the scene where Odysseus digs his trench at the furthest parts of Oceanus, pours libations, prays and pours the blood of sheep into the trench. There rise up from Erebus many spirits, including those of the great heroes of the *Iliad* referred to above. The LSJ, GE and the *Homeric Dictionary* all take this use of ψυχή as referring to the souls as shades in Hades.⁶²⁴ Based on later evidence of what the shades say, they live in greatly diminished conditions, which suggests that this post-mortem state is far from what Plato described, as I will discuss later on, but it does seem that the Homeric authors understood the ψυχή to be something that endured after death, even if in a somewhat diminished form.

As a result of his analysis of the Homeric material, Bremmer argues that he has been able to show a total of six similarities between Homer's description of the ψυχή and Arberman's

⁶²¹ s.v. ψυχή - A.II. In Hom. a departed spirit or ghost ... In swoons as it leaves the body.

⁶²² s.v. ψυχή - 1.

⁶²³ Bremmer 1983: 15; Homer // 22.362.

⁶²⁴ LSJ s.v. ψυχή - A.II. Departed Spirits; the GE s.v. ψυχή - 2. The soul distinguished from the body; in Hom. a soul or shade; The *Homeric Dictionary* s.v. ψυχή - 1.

definition of the ‘free soul.’ One notable area in which the Homeric ψυχή and Arbman’s free soul do not overlap is that of dreams. Bremmer accounts for this absence in Homer by arguing that the dreams in Homer are not so much descriptions of authentic dreams as they are literary dreams, designed to supply information that moves the plot along.⁶²⁵

Another challenge to regarding Homer’s ψυχή as Arbman’s free soul is the apparent connection between the noun ψυχή and the verb ψυχεῖν, which means ‘to breathe.’⁶²⁶ If this connection is legitimate, then surely it would be more fitting to connect the ψυχή with the breath soul, which is a part of the body, and not the free soul? Bremmer is not unaware of this challenge, and responds by suggesting that in Homer we have a halfway stage in the development toward a unitary soul.⁶²⁷ He speculates that in a time prior to Homer there was a different word for the free soul, but this was subsumed into the word for ‘breath soul’ (ψυχή), which then became the Homeric ψυχή or ‘free soul,’ a process which, he is quick to point out, seems to have happened in almost every culture that has been surveyed.

Having looked at the Homeric material, Bremmer then examines post-Homeric material for evidence of the free soul and discovers that “Archaic Age legends of persons whose souls were reputed to wander away during a trance indeed reflect the continuation of the belief in the free soul found in Homer.”⁶²⁸ He uses this section to discuss the accounts of both Aristeas of Proconnesus and Hermotimos of Clazomenae, both of whom had experiences where their souls left their bodies and wandered away.⁶²⁹ In the case of Aristeas, his soul returned to his body, and the man who was presumed dead simply left the place where his body was found. In the case of Hermotimos, however, his body was burned, so there was no place to which his soul could return. In both of these cases, we find an aspect of the free soul that was not delineated in Homer, which is the wandering of the free soul in a trance and being seen in other places (bilocation).⁶³⁰ Having analysed these stories, Bremmer suggests that it is “probable that ψυχή sufficiently corresponds with the notion of the free soul as defined by Arbman and his pupils to be accepted as the Greek version of the free soul,”⁶³¹ thus dismissing, on the basis of paucity of evidence, earlier scholars such as Dodds, who had argued, in his *The Greeks and the Irrational*, that these two stories are not evidence of a free soul, but rather of a shamanistic

⁶²⁵ Bremmer 1983: 19.

⁶²⁶ *Ibid.* 21. Burkert 1985: 195.

⁶²⁷ Bremmer 1983: 24.

⁶²⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶²⁹ *Ibid.* 25.

⁶³⁰ *Ibid.* 29-32.

⁶³¹ *Ibid.* 48.

influence on Greek concepts of the soul.⁶³²

Having discussed the free soul, Bremmer then moves on to discuss the body souls, which Arbman claims are made up of the breath and ego souls.⁶³³ Since he already discussed the breath soul as part of the development of the free soul, he moves on to discuss the ego soul, which Arbman “used ... to denote the individual living consciousness in contrast to the free soul and the life soul.”⁶³⁴ Bremmer, however, feels that this definition is not sufficient given the psychological richness of Greek concepts such as θυμός, νοῦς and μένος, the main parts of the ego soul. I will look at each in turn.

The θυμός is the most common word for the ego soul in epic. It is active only when the body is awake.⁶³⁵ It is a source of both action and emotion. It can also have an intellectual force, but only when emotions govern the intellect.⁶³⁶ The θυμός was thought to live in the chest, and occasionally in the limbs, and left these places when the person died.⁶³⁷ It also does not leave the body while swooning, but, even though it is present, it is not active until the person regains consciousness.⁶³⁸ The νοῦς, by contrast, is never “conceived of as something material.”⁶³⁹ It is rather thought of as the “mind or an act of mind, a thought or a purpose.”⁶⁴⁰ In contrast to the θυμός and its physical and emotional grounding, the νοῦς, while active and alive in the person, is not itself material and is directed more towards intellectual endeavour. μένος, like the νοῦς, is “not a physical organ. It is a momentary impulse of one, several or even all mental and physical organs largely directed toward a specific activity.”⁶⁴¹ It is usually tied to a warrior’s rage, and is located in either the chest, the θυμός or the φρένες.⁶⁴² In short, Bremmer believes that the ψυχή corresponds to Arbman’s free soul, and the θυμός, νοῦς, and μένος to the ego soul.

At the moment of death, Bremmer argues, it is only really the ψυχή that carried on existing: this “suggests that for the Greeks as for many other peoples the free soul of the living was the same as the soul of the dead.”⁶⁴³ These souls “lacked the psychological elements associated

⁶³² Dodds 1951: 141, 143-144.

⁶³³ Bremmer 1983: 53.

⁶³⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶³⁵ Bremmer 1983: 54; Homer *Il.* 20.174.

⁶³⁶ *Ibid.*; Homer *Il.* 13.163; 11.403.

⁶³⁷ Bremmer 1983: 55; Homer *Il.* 4.152; 8.202.

⁶³⁸ *Ibid.* Homer *Il.* 22.475.

⁶³⁹ Bremmer 1983: 57.

⁶⁴⁰ *Ibid.* Homer *Il.* 16.688.

⁶⁴¹ Bremmer 1983: 58; Homer *Od.* 24.520.

⁶⁴² Bremmer 1983: 59. Homer, *Il.* 19.202; 16.529; *Od.* 1.89.

⁶⁴³ Bremmer 1983: 74.

with the ego souls of the soul of the living,” and, consequently, the activities of the θυμός, νοῦς and the μένος after death are shrouded in mystery.⁶⁴⁴ As Bremmer says, “[it] is not surprising that after death nothing is said of the body souls. Their connection with the body is the cause of their disappearance.”⁶⁴⁵

In terms of representation, Bremmer argues that it is mostly the ψυχή which represents the dead in Hades.⁶⁴⁶ There are occasions where the dead person is said to be represented by the whole person, but this could be an instance of metonymy rather than any specific attempt by Homer to illustrate any kind of commonly held belief.⁶⁴⁷ Similarly, Homer compared the dead to shadows, mostly because of their greatly limited capabilities, rather than because he thought they were anything like shadows.⁶⁴⁸ The dead were also represented by an image of themselves---an εἶδωλον. The use of this word, Bremmer believes, underlines that “for the ancient Greeks the dead looked exactly like the living.”⁶⁴⁹ In terms of theriomorphic representations of the dead, the only one that Bremmer is prepared to lend credence to is the snake, but even in this regard he says that “we simply do not know what or even if the Greeks of the Archaic Age thought about the precise connection of the snake with the soul and body of the dead.”⁶⁵⁰

Adhering to Arbman’s distinction between free soul and body soul, Bremmer concludes by regarding the soul of the dead in the Archaic age as the continuation of the free soul, or ψυχή, with the body souls ceasing with the function of the body. Bremmer’s work reveals his skilful use of cross-cultural, anthropological material in order to understand early Greek concepts of the soul. Indeed, Fleming describes “Bremmer’s little book” as “the first work of classical scholarship to make an appropriate use of anthropological methods.”⁶⁵¹ Presumably, Fleming regards Dodds’ ground-breaking use of such methods, not to speak of Jane Harrison, as inappropriate. West opines that his book contains “many useful bibliographical notes and diverting bits of folklore,”⁶⁵² which provide a useful sourcebook for those who want to take their study of this issue further. Gill finds Bremmer’s reply to Dodds fascinating, who, following Meuli, wanted to attribute the wandering soul stories of Aristeas and Hermetimos to

⁶⁴⁴ Bremmer 1983: 74-75.

⁶⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 76.

⁶⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 77.

⁶⁴⁷ *Ibid.* 78.

⁶⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 79.

⁶⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 82.

⁶⁵¹ Fleming 1984: 168.

⁶⁵² West 1985: 58.

shamanistic influence from surrounding cultures.⁶⁵³

Despite these apparent strengths, there are still many weaknesses in Bremmer's work. In his review of the book, Martin West, said that the "discussion of Homer's psychological vocabulary is generally sketchy, and falls far short of what one expects in a book with this title."⁶⁵⁴ While I would not venture to be so pejorative, I would agree with the basic sentiment.

In the section where Bremmer attempts to show the similarities between Arbman's free soul and the Homeric ψυχή he includes only one citation for each characteristic. This seems thin. What is more, he offers no discussion of uses of ψυχή that disagree with his thesis.⁶⁵⁵ These include *Iliad* 9.322,⁶⁵⁶ which present aspects of the ψυχή which are not covered by Arbman's free soul, and *Iliad* 21. 568-570:

καὶ γὰρ θὴν τούτῳ τρωτὸς χρώς ὀξείῃ χαλκῷ,

ἐν δὲ ἴα ψυχή, θνητὸν δὲ ἔφασ' ἄνθρωποι

ἔμμεναι: αὐτὰρ οἱ Κρονίδης Ζεὺς κῦδος ὀπάζει.

(For his body might be torn by sharp bronze and he has only one life, and some say he's mortal...)

As Brenck points out, these uses of ψυχή clearly seem to align more with the life soul than the free soul.⁶⁵⁷ But Bremmer never mentions them, or makes an attempt to provide a coherent model into which they fit. A similar problem with the book is the lack of other Greek sources. He never mentions Hesiod, and he ignores the lyric poets apart from a few brief nods to Pindar. He also completely avoids any discussion of the Presocratic philosophers.⁶⁵⁸

He does mention one other source to help him establish his idea of the free soul, and that is the pair of tales of wandering souls. West has a different interpretation of these tales, and, I think, a more compelling one. He argues that these legends are recorded because they describe extraordinary individuals, who lived outside of the normal bounds of the Greek world. In West's words, "[they] astonish because they *introduce* the hearer to the idea of a travelling soul; they cannot be taken as expressions of a general Archaic (much less pre-Homeric) concept."⁶⁵⁹ The stories are recorded because they are remarkable, and not because they reflect

⁶⁵³ Gill 1985: 205.

⁶⁵⁴ West 1985: 57.

⁶⁵⁵ Brenck 1984: 2.

⁶⁵⁶ Which I discussed above.

⁶⁵⁷ Brenck 1984:2.

⁶⁵⁸ West 1985: 57.

⁶⁵⁹ West 1985: 56.

some commonly held cultural belief. This means that, even though Bremmer is cogent in arguing against Meuli's and Dodds' understanding of these stories as shamanistic, they do not provide evidence of general Greek soul belief, regardless of their origin.

A further problem with Bremmer's identification of the ψυχή as the free soul is the trouble he has with dreams. I have noted how Bremmer explains the absence of the travelling free soul in dreams by describing Homer's dreams as 'literary.' What he fails to mention is the fact that Homer's description of dreams is contrary to the model he attempts to develop. For example, when Penelope dreams in *Odyssey* 19.541⁶⁶⁰ she is able to cry while dreaming, "something she could hardly do if her ψυχή was absent."⁶⁶¹

While his discussion of the body souls is less problematic, because of the frailty of his association of ψυχή with the free soul, "[one] is left with the distinct impression that Arbman's schema is being imposed on material for which it is only partly appropriate."⁶⁶² A better understanding of the soul in Homeric times is given by Harrison. His contention is similar to Bremmer's, that the soul is not unitary in Homeric times, but is rather broken up into a variety of organs and processes. Or as he puts it, "several seats of mental life which can perhaps best be described as 'mental organs.'"⁶⁶³ Another key element of Harrison's understanding is that thinking for Homeric man was closely related to "man's physical reaction to his environment."⁶⁶⁴ What Harrison ends up with is a collection of "mental organs," each of which performs a different function, much like Bremmer. Unlike Bremmer however, he resists the urge to systematize it, and simply lets the somewhat chaotic state of Homeric psychology be.

While I think the older approach by Harrison is better, this is not to take away from the positive qualities of Bremmer's work, which include erudition and readability. Nevertheless, there are, in my view, too many issues with Bremmer's hypothesis for it to be accepted fully. Thus, in my analysis of Homer's ψυχή, I will understand it in Harrison's terms, which is to say as one of the "seats of mental life." I will discuss how I feel this relates to Paul in the conclusion. In this section, however, I believe that the soul, for Homer, is both that which signifies life, as well as the consciousness which is lost during a swoon and at death, and which survives the death of the body to exist as a 'shade' in Hades.

⁶⁶⁰ αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κλαῖον καὶ ἐκώκυον ἔν περ ὄνειρῳ (Then I began crying and wailing in my dream.)

⁶⁶¹ West 1985: 56.

⁶⁶² Gill 1985: 205.

⁶⁶³ Harrison 1960: 64.

⁶⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 65.

The Soul in Classical Greek Texts

Introduction

From discussing the soul as it was understood in the Archaic period, for which I used Bremmer's work as a lens, I now turn to the soul as it was understood in the Classical period, which I understand as the period in which Athens flourished, from the middle of the fifth towards the middle of the fourth century B.C. This was a time when the idea of the soul was developed, both in literary and philosophical texts. In this section I will analyse the use of the word ψυχή, which is again the dominant psychological word of this period, and see what meanings it carried. As we shall see, some of these meanings have been inherited from Homeric Greek, and some are entirely new, which is especially the case as we examine the word as it is used by Plato and Aristotle.

Life

The first of the uses of ψυχή I will discuss is where it means 'life.' This is one of the two meanings that the word has in the Classical period which carry over from the Homeric period. The first instance of the word that I will consider is found in Sophocles *Electra* 1492-1493:

χωροῖς ἄν εἴσω σὺν τάχει: λόγων γὰρ οὐ
νῦν ἐστὶν ἀγών, ἀλλὰ σῆς ψυχῆς πέρι.

(Go quickly and bring him in, for what is at stake is not words, but your life.)

Both the LSJ and the GE translate ψυχή here as 'life,'⁶⁶⁵ and this does seem the best way to take this word, since at this point in the narrative, Orestes is addressing Aegisthus, the man who conspired with his mother to murder his father. Having found this man, he now wants to kill him. To understand this use of ψυχή as referring to Aegisthus' life seems the most natural reading. The same can be said for the next instance which I shall consider, found in Euripides' *Phoenissae* 1329-1331:

ἀλλ' οἴχεται μὲν σὴ κασιγνήτη πάλαι:
δοκῶ δ' ἀγῶνα τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς, Κρέον,
ἤδη πεπράχθαι παισὶ τοῖσιν Οἰδίπου.

(It has been some time since your daughter's departure, and I expect the struggle for

⁶⁶⁵ LSJ: s.v. ψυχή - A.I. Life. GE: s.v. ψυχή - 1. Life.

my life, Creon, and it is already decided by the sons of Oedipus.)

In this case, it is the chorus referring to the battle between the two sons of Oedipus for control over the city of Thebes. They realise that, should they lose the battle, they will struggle for their lives. Again, the LSJ takes this use of ψυχή to mean ‘life’⁶⁶⁶ and it is difficult to imagine any other translation here.⁶⁶⁷

The last of these fifth century uses of ψυχή I will consider is found in Herodotus’ *Histories* 1.24.2-3, where he describes the unfortunate adventures of the rich poet Arion, who was travelling at sea and then robbed by people he thought he could trust:

ὀρμᾶσθαι μὲν νῦν ἐκ Τάραντος, πιστεύοντα δὲ οὐδαμοῖσι μᾶλλον ἢ Κορινθίοισι μισθώσασθαι πλοῖον ἀνδρῶν Κορινθίων. τοὺς δὲ ἐν τῷ πελάγει ἐπιβουλεύειν τὸν Ἀρίονα ἐκβαλόντας ἔχειν τὰ χρήματα. τὸν δὲ συνέντα τοῦτο λίσσεσθαι, χρήματα μὲν σφι προϊέντα, ψυχὴν δὲ παραιτεόμενον.

(Since he trusted nobody more than the Corinthians, he hired a boat with a Corinthian crew to sail from Tarentum. While they were sailing, the crew decided to throw Arion out of the boat to have his money. When he discovered this, he earnestly entreated them, asking for his life in exchange for his money.)

Again, both the GE and the LSJ take this use of ψυχή to mean ‘life,’⁶⁶⁸ and it is difficult to disagree with this reading. The threat is clearly to Arion’s life, and so it makes sense that this is what he is bargaining for.

As in the Homeric literature discussed above, it makes sense to read these uses of the word ψυχή, found in Classical texts of the fifth century B.C., as ‘life.’

Departed Ghosts

Another Homeric use of ψυχή, which has been inherited by the Classical period, is reference to a dead person, who lives in a different state in Hades. The first use of the word in this way that I will discuss is found in Aeschylus’ *Persae* 629-630:

Γῆ τε καὶ Ἑρμῆ, βασιλεῦ τ’ ἐνέρον,
πέμψατ’ ἔνερθεν ψυχὴν ἐς φῶς:

(Earth and Hermes, and you, Lord of the dead, send to the light the spirit from below.)

⁶⁶⁶ s.v. ψυχή - A.I. Life.

⁶⁶⁷ For further examples of ψυχή meaning ‘life’ in fifth century Greek tragedy, see Euripides’ *Medea* (431 B.C.) 968, 1219; cf. lines 230, 403, 1162, earlier than the *Phoenissae* (409 BC).

⁶⁶⁸ LSJ: s.v. ψυχή - A.I. Life GE: s.v. ψυχή - 1. Life.

At first glance, there appears to be some conflict between the two dictionaries that I used for this section. The LSJ simply defines this as a “departed spirit [or] ghost.”⁶⁶⁹ The GE, on the other hand, defines this as an instance where the soul is being referred to in contrast with the body, and then cites this as a Homeric use.⁶⁷⁰ Reconciliation between these two meanings is, of course, possible. For to understand ψυχή as a disembodied departed spirit, one must also think of it in terms of a non-physical entity, which exists outside the body, here in Hades.

A similar use is recorded in Plato’s *Laws* 927b . Here, he is referring to those who are due special treatment as a part of a person’s holy duty. In his list he includes:

μὲν τοὺς ἄνω θεοὺς φοβείσθων, οἱ τῶν ὀρφανῶν τῆς ἐρημίας αἰσθήσεις ἔχουσιν, εἶτα τὰς τῶν κεκμηκότων ψυχάς, αἷς ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ φύσει τῶν αὐτῶν ἐκγόνων κήδεσθαι

(Let them (the guardians) fear the gods above, who realize how deprived orphans are, and then the souls of the dead, whose nature it is to take care of their own offspring.)

Plato refers to the annual duties of the three guardians concerning orphans and the departed, who have left them behind. For these, Plato uses ψυχαί. Again, the LSJ takes this use of ψυχή to be a ‘departed spirit,’ or ‘ghost,’ in the same way as this word is often used in the Homeric epics.⁶⁷¹

These are only two examples, and admittedly this is a very rare use of the word in this period, but these two uses are sufficient to show that, even if it was by this time a somewhat archaic usage, it was nevertheless a ‘live’ use of ψυχή.

Conscious Self or Personality

A more common use of ψυχή is when it is used to mean one’s conscious self or mind, or even certain aspects of one’s personality. This usage is particularly common in fifth-century tragedy. A clear example of this is found in Sophocles’ *Antigone* 225-228, where a guard enters, addresses Creon, and then reports on a conversation he had with himself:

πολλὰς γὰρ ἔσχον φροντίδων ἐπιστάσεις,

ὁδοῖς κυκλῶν ἐμαυτὸν εἰς ἀναστροφήν:

ψυχή γὰρ ἠὔδα πολλά μοι μυθουμένη:

τάλας, τί χωρεῖς οἷ μολῶν δώσεις δίκην;

⁶⁶⁹ s.v. ψυχή - A. II.

⁶⁷⁰ s.v. ψυχή - 2.A. Soul, distinguished from the body, Hom. of dead people, soul, shade.

⁶⁷¹ s.v. ψυχή - A.II. Departed spirit, ghost.

(For often my thoughts made me stop often and wheel around in my path, to return, for my mind said many things to me, ‘ Poor fool, why do you go where your arrival will result in punishment?’)

In this case, the LSJ gives a somewhat vague definition of what this word means. All it says is “conscious self or personality.”⁶⁷² It seems clear that what Sophocles refers to, when the guard uses ψυχή, is the actual site in his body where this reflection took place. In modern English, we might call this ‘the mind.’ It thus seems to refer to his conscious self.

Another use of ψυχή, like this, but not totally identical, is found in Euripides’ *Hippolytus*. In describing the distress of the chorus at seeing Phaedra so greatly affected, when she appears with the nurse for the first time, Euripides has them sing as follows (173-175):

τί ποτ’ ἔστι μαθεῖν ἔραται ψυχῆ,

τί δεδήληται

δέμας ἀλλόχροον βασιλείας.

(My heart longs to know what has afflicted her bodily frame, and changed the complexion of the queen.)

In this case, there is some conflict between the dictionaries I consulted. The LSJ, as above, takes this to be a reference to the ‘conscious self.’⁶⁷³ The GE, on the other hand, takes this to be a reference to the ‘life’ of the queen.⁶⁷⁴ In this case, I think it is better to understand this as a reference to the conscious self of the chorus (or chorus leader), as opposed to the ‘life’ of the queen. Ψυχή is surely the subject of ἔραται and must refer to the chorus leader, not Phaedra; the lines after this refer to the reason for this longing---the ill health of the queen and how this has affected her appearance, which takes the chorus by surprise. To me this seems a more plausible reading of the flow of thought (and emotion) in this section.

In both examples discussed above, ψυχή has denoted the conscious self, rather than any description of it. In the following two examples, ψυχή describes some aspect of this conscious self. The first example is also in Euripides’ *Hippolytus*, lines 503-506:

ἄ μή σε πρὸς θεῶν — εὖ λέγεις γάρ, αἰσχρὰ δέ —

πέρα προβῆς τῶνδ’ : ὡς ὑπείρασμαι μὲν εὖ

⁶⁷² s.v. ψυχή - IV.

⁶⁷³ s.v. ψυχή - IV. Conscious self or personality.

⁶⁷⁴ s.v. ψυχή - 1. Life.

ψυχὴν ἔρωτι, τὰσχαρὰ δ' ἦν λέγῃς καλῶς,

ἐς τοῦθ' ὃ φεύγω νῦν ἀναλωθήσομαι.

(Ah no! Do not by the gods - for you speak well, but shamefully - do not go beyond these bounds: my soul is made ready by desire, and if you urge shameful things by speaking well, I will be entirely spent on what I am currently fleeing.)

In this case, the nurse is urging Phaedra to succumb to her desire for Hippolytus, her stepson, and Phaedra implores her to desist, as she believes that the nurse's skilful and persuasive rhetoric is driving her towards an end that she does not think is good, precisely because her desire for him is already rooted in her ψυχή. In this case, it seems clear that ψυχή refers to the place where her ἔρως has been experienced and stored. Indeed, the LSJ suggests this when they define it as a part of the emotional self.⁶⁷⁵ So we have something of a refinement of the idea described above, where the ψυχή simply describes the inner person; now it specifically describes the inner person with relation to a powerful desire like ἔρως.

The last example of this use of ψυχή is from Sophocles' *Antigone* 175-177, where Creon, addressing the chorus, refers to Theban loyalty to Laius, then Oedipus and then, because of the death of Oedipus' sons, to himself, the new ruler, who still must undergo the ultimate test:

ἀμήχανον δὲ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐκμαθεῖν

ψυχὴν τε καὶ φρόνημα καὶ γνώμην, πρὶν ἂν

ἀρχαῖς τε καὶ νόμοισιν ἐντριβῆς φανῆ.

(It is impossible to know each man fully, his character, his will and his judgement, until he is seen to be tested in rule and in making laws.)

Here ψυχή, grouped with φρόνημα and γνώμη, clearly refers to some inner part of a person. The LSJ takes this use of the word to mean the “moral or intellectual self.”⁶⁷⁶ In his commentary on the play, R.C. Jebb considers ψυχή to be “soul, the man's moral nature generally,” φρόνημα “the ‘spirit’ of his dealings in public affairs” and γνώμη “the intellectual aspect of the man, his ability and judgment”.⁶⁷⁷ Jebb clearly conceives of φρόνημα and γνώμη as being aspects of the ψυχή, as Plato does in his *Laws*.⁶⁷⁸

⁶⁷⁵ s.v. ψυχή - IV.3. Conscious self or personality ... Emotional self.

⁶⁷⁶ s.v. ψυχή -IV.4 Conscious self or personality ... moral or intellectual self.

⁶⁷⁷ 1891: 43.

⁶⁷⁸ 672 b.

Thus ψυχή, especially in Greek tragedy, occasionally refers to the inner person. It both testifies that the inner person exists and helps to explain what the tragedians attributed to this inner self, such as thinking, emotions, judgment, and moral reasoning.

Philosophical Soul

Arguably the most innovative use of the word ψυχή is evident in the philosophical texts of the fourth century B.C. I will look at how Plato and Aristotle used the word ψυχή, and what this can tell us about how these profoundly influential philosophers seem to have understood this entity.

As Plato wrote most of his philosophy in dialogue form, he is able to explore his ideas from many perspectives, but this also means that it is not clear which perspective was his and which he gave to his interlocutor for the purposes of disproving or further exploring it. In addition, there are many places in his dialogues where his exact meaning is open to interpretation or seemingly contradictory. This makes it challenging to build a systematic understanding of exactly what Plato thought about a particular topic. The ψυχή is no exception.⁶⁷⁹ There are, however, three important assumptions Plato makes about the ψυχή. Firstly, he says that it is immortal. Secondly, he argues that it is tripartite, and, thirdly, that the ultimate goal of the philosopher is to get in touch with the highest part of his soul.⁶⁸⁰

In the *Apology* 40c, Plato's Socrates does not appear to have any fixed idea of the fate of the soul after death:

ἐννοήσωμεν δὲ καὶ τῆδε ὡς πολλὴ ἐλπίς ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸν αὐτὸ εἶναι. δυοῖν γὰρ θάτερόν ἐστιν τὸ τεθνάναι: ἢ γὰρ οἷον μηδὲν εἶναι μηδὲ αἴσθησιν μηδεμίαν μηδενὸς ἔχειν τὸν τεθνεῶτα, ἢ κατὰ τὰ λεγόμενα μεταβολὴ τις τυγχάνει οὓσα καὶ μετοίκησις τῇ ψυχῇ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἐνθένδε εἰς ἄλλον τόπον.

(We should reflect that there is much hope that it will be a good outcome. For death is one of two things. It might be like nothing, and the dead have no perception of anything, or as it is said it might be a kind of change, and a transfer for the soul from one place to another.)

From this passage it seems clear that Socrates, facing his own death at the hands of his fellow Athenians, is unsure of what to expect immediately after death. In later dialogues, however, Plato gives Socrates a very different perspective.

In these dialogues, Plato uses Socrates to argue that the soul *is* immortal. He does this

⁶⁷⁹ Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 1155.

⁶⁸⁰ Throughout, when Plato refers to the soul, he calls it the ψυχή.

especially in the *Phaedo* 71 e1-5.⁶⁸¹ The most famous argument he offers to make this point is the argument of opposites. This argument starts with Socrates wanting to establish a general principle in *Phaedo* 70 e5:

τοῦτο οὖν σκεψώμεθα, ἄρα ἀναγκαῖον ὅσοις ἔστι τι ἐναντίον, μηδαμῶθεν ἄλλοθεν αὐτὸ γίνεσθαι ἢ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτῷ ἐναντίου.

(Let us examine, then, whether it is necessary that everything which has an opposite, comes to be from nothing except its opposite.)

In his typical fashion, Socrates carries on testing his principle. For example, he tests it in terms of size, to see whether the bigger comes from the smaller, in the sense of growth, or whether the weaker comes from the stronger and especially whether waking comes from sleeping. Finally, he begins to apply it to the question at hand. He does this by establishing that life and death are opposites. After this, he says that just as sleep comes from wakefulness and wakefulness from sleep, life must beget its opposite, which is death. If this is the case, then it must also follow that life comes from death, since opposites beget one another.⁶⁸² This means that the person must persist in some form, which is what Socrates calls the ψυχή. This leads Socrates to conclude in *Phaedo* 72 d6-e2 that:

ἔστιν γάρ, ἔφη, ὃ Κέβης, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, παντὸς μᾶλλον οὕτω, καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτὰ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐξαπατάμενοι ὁμολογοῦμεν, ἀλλ' ἔστι τῷ ὄντι καὶ τὸ ἀναβιώσκεσθαι καὶ ἐκ τῶν τεθνεώτων τοὺς ζῶντας γίνεσθαι καὶ τὰς τῶν τεθνεώτων ψυχὰς εἶναι καὶ ταῖς μὲν γε ἀγαθαῖς ἄμεινον εἶναι, ταῖς δὲ κακαῖς κάκιον.

(“It is so, Cebes,” he said, “as it seems more than anything else, and that in these things we are not deceived when we agree; but the returning to life from the dead is a fact, living people are born from the dead and the souls of the dead exist, and for the good this is better and for the bad worse.”)

In this argument, which is but an example of many other arguments in Plato’s corpus,⁶⁸³ we see Socrates arguing for the fact that the soul is immortal.

Furthermore, the immortality of the soul for Plato did not only mean that it continued to exist after one died, but also that the soul existed before it became embodied. One of the most famous expositions of this belief is found in Plato’s *Meno*, where Socrates teaches

⁶⁸¹ Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 1157.

⁶⁸² Plato *Phaedo* 71a-72b.

⁶⁸³ E.g. *Republic* Book 9; Kenny 2012: 190.

mathematics to a slave to show that his soul remembers its life prior to being embodied. At the conclusion of this experiment Socrates says in *Meno* 84 a3-b1:

ἐννοεῖς αὖ, ὦ Μένων, οὗ ἔστιν ἤδη βαδίζων ὅδε τοῦ ἀναμνησέσθαι; ὅτι τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἤδει μὲν οὐ, ἥτις ἔστιν ἡ τοῦ ὀκτώποδος χωρίου γραμμῆ, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ νῦν πω οἶδεν, ἀλλ' οὖν ὤρετό γ' αὐτὴν τότε εἰδέναι, καὶ θαρραλέως ἀπεκρίνετο ὡς εἰδώς, καὶ οὐχ ἠγεῖτο ἀπορεῖν: νῦν δὲ ἠγεῖται ἀπορεῖν ἤδη, καὶ ὥσπερ οὐκ οἶδεν, οὐδ' οἶεται εἰδέναι.

(Do you see, Meno, that he is already making progress in his recollection? At first he did not know which of the square line makes eight feet, and he still does not know. But he thought that he knew it then, and answered confidently as though he knew, and did not believe that he was confused: but now he believes that he is confused, and even though he does not know, he does not think that he knows.)

Although this passage makes no explicit mention of the soul or its pre-existence, it does mention the faculty of recollection (ἀνάμνησις), which Cebes describes in the *Phaedo* later as a function of the pre-existent soul.⁶⁸⁴

In addition, Plato also suggests that the soul is tripartite. He gives a very basic description of his conception of the tripartite soul in the *Phaedrus*, where he compares the soul to a charioteer with a good and a bad horse.⁶⁸⁵ This is a concept to which he returns in the *Republic*, book four, where he divides the soul into three parts: τὸ λογιστικόν, which is the rational part, τὸ ἐπιθύμητικόν which is the appetitive part and, finally, τὸ θυμοειδές, which could be called the emotional part.⁶⁸⁶ The goal of the philosopher, according to Plato, is to harmonize these parts of the soul, the rational, the emotional and the appetitive, to bring about a balanced internal life. He later develops this idea in book nine of the *Republic*, saying that each part of the soul aspires to something different, and justice in the individual, reflecting justice between social classes, requires that each part be permitted to perform and fulfill its essential function, thus creating a balanced and fulfilled individual.⁶⁸⁷

Plato once again mentions the tripartite soul in the *Timaeus* 69e-70a. But this time Plato uses Socrates to assign each part of the soul to a part of the body:

καὶ διὰ ταῦτα δὴ σεβόμενοι μαινέειν τὸ θεῖον, ὅτι μὴ πᾶσα ἦν ἀνάγκη, χωρὶς ἐκείνου κατοικίζουσιν εἰς ἄλλην τοῦ σώματος οἴκησιν τὸ θνητόν, ἰσθμόν καὶ ὄρον διοικοδομήσαντες τῆς τε κεφαλῆς καὶ τοῦ στήθους, ἀγένηνα μεταξὺ τιθέντες, ἴν' εἴη χωρὶς. ἐν δὲ τοῖς στήθεσιν καὶ τῷ καλουμένῳ θώρακι τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς θνητόν γένος

⁶⁸⁴ Plato *Phaedo* 73b.

⁶⁸⁵ Plato *Phaedrus* 246b; cf. Kenny 2012: 189.

⁶⁸⁶ Kenny 2012: 189.

⁶⁸⁷ Kenny 2012: 189.

ἐνέδουν. καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸ μὲν ἄμεινον αὐτῆς, τὸ δὲ χεῖρον ἐπεφύκει, διοικοδομοῦσι τοῦ θώρακος αὐτὸ κύτος, διορίζοντες οἷον γυναικῶν, τὴν δὲ ἀνδρῶν χωρὶς οἴκησιν, τὰς φρένας διάφραγμα εἰς τὸ μέσον αὐτῶν τιθέντες.

(And because they wanted to avoid polluting the divine element more than was completely necessary, they put the mortal element in a different room in the body, and built an isthmus and boundary for the head and the chest by putting the neck between them, so that they might be apart. And in the chest, or so-called thorax, they bound the mortal element of the soul. And since this mortal element by nature has a better and a worse part, they built a division within the thorax as if to fence off two separate parts, like the quarters for men and women, by placing the diaphragm between them.)

In addition to this refinement of the nature of the soul, Plato believes that the philosophers' priority is to be in touch with it, because this is what makes them wise and, more importantly, ready for death.⁶⁸⁸ He makes this point in his *Phaedo* 67d 7-10:

λύειν δέ γε αὐτήν, ὡς φαμεν, προθυμοῦνται ἀεὶ μάλιστα καὶ μόνοι οἱ φιλοσοφοῦντες ὀρθῶς, καὶ τὸ μελέτημα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐστὶν τῶν φιλοσόφων, λύσις καὶ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος: ἢ οὐ;

(But only true philosophers, who practice philosophy in the right way, are always exceedingly eager to release the soul, as we say, and this specific desire is the study of philosophers---the release and separation of the soul from the body. Or is it not so?)

Throughout his discussion in the *Phaedo*, which is dramatically set in the moments before and after Socrates drinks his hemlock, Socrates insists that death, which he understands as the freedom of the soul, is and ought to be the highest goal of the philosopher.

Throughout his teachings, then, Plato argues repeatedly that the soul is immortal, both in the sense that it pre-existed the body in which it lives and that it will live beyond it. In addition, Plato's division of the soul into three parts, the rational, emotional and appetitive, and his actual location of these in parts of the body, indicates how complex his model of the ψυχή became in between early works such as the *Apology* and later works such as the *Timaeus*. Finally, Plato underlines the soul's importance to the philosopher by arguing that it is the true goal of the philosopher to concentrate on reason, the higher part of the ψυχή.

Although Plato's views on the soul were important and continued to be influential, they were challenged by his most famous pupil, Aristotle.

To understand Aristotle's views on the ψυχή, one must first understand his theory of matter and form, and the relationship between them. He developed this theory because of his

⁶⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 186.

disagreement with Plato's view of the Forms or Ideas.⁶⁸⁹ For Aristotle, the form is that which makes something what it is, and the matter is that from which it is made. An example that Aristotle gives is a bronze sphere, where the sphere is the form, but the bronze is the matter.⁶⁹⁰

It is important to understand this distinction because Aristotle argues, in *De Anima* 412a 19-22, that the ψυχή is the form of the body:

ἀναγκαῖον ἄρα τὴν ψυχὴν οὐσίαν εἶναι ὡς εἶδος σώματος φυσικοῦ δυνάμει ζωὴν ἔχοντος.

(The soul must be as the form of the natural body having potential life within it.)

This is probably a view that originated through his study of biology, because he regards the soul as the actuality of a body that has life, where life is the capacity for self-sustenance.⁶⁹¹ What this means is that the soul is the animating principle which holds the matter of the body together to make it one organism which is arranged by unity of purpose.⁶⁹²

The soul for Aristotle was also the impetus to change. The most important of these changes, he argues, being the need that organisms have to reproduce.⁶⁹³ To this end Aristotle says in *de Anima* 415a26-29

ὥστε πρῶτον περὶ τροφῆς καὶ γεννήσεως λεκτέον· ἡ γὰρ θρεπτικὴ ψυχὴ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὑπάρχει, καὶ πρώτη καὶ κοινοτάτη δυνάμις ἐστὶ ψυχῆς, καθ' ἣν ὑπάρχει τὸ ζῆν ἅπασιν. ἥς ἐστὶν ἔργα γεννῆσαι καὶ τροφῆ χρῆσθαι· φυσικώτατον γὰρ τῶν ἔργων τοῖς ζῶσιν, ὅσα τέλεια καὶ μὴ πηρώματα ἢ τὴν γένεσιν αὐτομάτην ἔχει, τὸ ποιῆσαι ἕτερον οἶον αὐτό, ζῶον μὲν ζῶον, φυτὸν δὲ φυτόν, ἵνα τοῦ ἀεὶ καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ μετέχωσιν ἢ δύνανται·

(Thus first one must speak about nutrition and reproduction. For the vegetative soul exists alongside all the others, and it is the first and the most common power of the soul, according to which all have life. The deeds by which life happens are to reproduce and to nourish. For these are the most natural deeds of all living things, which are mature and which are unharmed and which do not generate automatically, to produce another like itself, an animal produces another animal, a plant produces another plant, so that they might always exist, and have a part of the divine, should they be able.)

⁶⁸⁹ Kenny 2012: 173.

⁶⁹⁰ Russell 2010: 161-162.

⁶⁹¹ Kenny 2012: 192; Aristotle, *de Anima* 412 a27-b1: διὸ ἡ ψυχὴ ἐστὶν ἐντελέχεια ἢ πρώτη σώματος φυσικοῦ δυνάμει ζωὴν ἔχοντος. τοιοῦτον δὲ ὁ ἄν ἢ ὀργανικόν. (This is why the soul is the first type of actuality of the natural body which potentially has life within it. Such a body is one which is organized.)

⁶⁹² Russell 2010: 162.

⁶⁹³ Kenny 2012: 192.

Unlike Plato, Aristotle does not understand the ψυχή as a tripartite entity. Instead, he argues that it has many faculties or capabilities. These capabilities are distinguished by operation and by outcome, as he reasons in *De Anima* 413b 27-29: ⁶⁹⁴

τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς φανερόν ἐκ τούτων ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι χωριστά, καθάπερ τινὲς φασιν· τῷ δὲ λόγῳ ὅτι ἕτερα, φανερόν·

(The rest of the portions of the soul, it is clear from what we have said, are not separable, as some others claim. They can, of course, be separated by definition.)

His idea that the ψυχή is the form of a living body means that all living things have souls. Plants have vegetative souls; animals have sensitive souls and humans have rational souls. ⁶⁹⁵

Like Sophocles, however, Aristotle also appears to have distinguished between νοῦς and ψυχή in *De Anima* 413b 24-27:

περὶ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τῆς θεωρητικῆς δυνάμεως οὐδὲν πω φανερόν, ἀλλ' εἰοικε ψυχῆς γένος ἕτερον εἶναι, καὶ τοῦτο μόνον ἐνδέχασθαι χωρίζεσθαι, καθάπερ τὸ αἶδιον τοῦ φθαρτοῦ.

(Concerning the mind and the power to think, nothing is clear yet, but it appears to be a completely different genus of soul, and this alone is given to be separate, just as the immortal from the perishable.)

He seems to have believed that the soul was the part involved in sense-perception, while the mind dealt with universals, such as mathematics. ⁶⁹⁶ He develops this idea in his *Nicomachean Ethics* 1139a 4-10:

πρότερον μὲν οὖν ἐλέχθη δὴ εἶναι μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς, τό τε λόγον ἔχον καὶ τὸ ἄλογον· νῦν δὲ περὶ τοῦ λόγον ἔχοντος τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον διαιρετέον. καὶ ὑποκείσθω δύο τὰ λόγον ἔχοντα, ἐν μὲν ᾧ θεωροῦμεν τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ὄντων ὅσων αἱ ἀρχαὶ μὴ ἐνδέχονται ἄλλως ἔχειν, ἐν δὲ ᾧ τὰ ἐνδεχόμενα:

(It has been said before that there are two parts of the soul, the rational part and the irrational part. But now let us divide the rational part in the same way. And let us assume

⁶⁹⁴ Kenny 2012: 193

⁶⁹⁵ *Ibid.* *De Anima* 414a 29-32: Τῶν δὲ δυνάμεων τῆς ψυχῆς αἱ λεχθεῖσαι τοῖς μὲν ὑπάρχουσι πᾶσαι, καθάπερ εἵπομεν, τοῖς δὲ τινὲς αὐτῶν, ἐνίοις δὲ μία μόνη. δυνάμεις δ' εἵπομεν θρεπτικόν, αἰσθητικόν, ὀρεκτικόν, κινητικόν κατὰ τόπον, διανοητικόν. (Of the powers of the soul we have discussed, some living things have all, as we have said, and some less than all, and some only have one. The powers we spoke about are nutritive, appetitive, sensory, locomotive and rational.)

⁶⁹⁶ Russell 2010: 167.

we have two rational parts, one in which we think about things with first principles that are not able to be otherwise, and one in which we contemplate things that can change.)

The ψυχή is completely bound to the human body, and so dies when it does,⁶⁹⁷ but the νοῦς is a part of the divine which has been put into us. It too leaves us when we die,⁶⁹⁸ but it does not cease to exist. Thus it seems that Aristotle does not believe in personal immortality, but only that of the divine part of a person.⁶⁹⁹

Conclusion:

Aristotle then, differed greatly from his teacher Plato. His view, on the whole, seems less idealistic than Plato's and more grounded in what he observed in nature. The pair of them, however, are similar in the sense that they both developed the concept of the soul, embodied in the word ψυχή, in ways very different from earlier uses. In Greek Tragedy, for example, ψυχή came to refer to the interior part of a person, which could be a person's mind or heart, and the way that people thought, a clear advance on the Homeric meanings of the word. Then, under the influence of important philosophers like Plato and Aristotle, ψυχή came to denote the immaterial aspect of persons, which signified their unique personalities, and either lives on forever (Plato), or dies when the person dies (Aristotle). The late Classical period thus saw important developments in the conception of ψυχή, which have greatly influenced, even if only by disagreement, how subsequent thinkers engaged with the word.

Hellenistic Texts on the Soul

Introduction

Having discussed the uses of ψυχή in both the Archaic and Classical periods, we now move to a discussion of the soul in the Hellenistic period. This is particularly important for our study because the philosophies that were developed during the Hellenistic Age were the philosophies that were current and still very popular during the lifetime of the Apostle Paul. Therefore, if we want to gain an understanding of what Paul thought, and especially what he thought about the human soul, it is important that we gain a good understanding of what each of these important Hellenistic philosophies believed about the soul, even if only to see that Paul was not heavily influenced by them. To do this, I will look at the Epicureans, the Stoics and the Cynics.

⁶⁹⁷ *Nicomachean Ethics* 1102b; Russell 2010: 167.

⁶⁹⁸ *On the Generation of Animals* 736b27. Kenny 2012: 195.

⁶⁹⁹ Russell 2010: 167.

Epicureanism

Epicurus (the founder for whom the philosophy was named), born in Samos in 341 B.C., studied under Nausiphones, who taught him the atomism of Democritus, and founded schools in Mytilene and Lampsachus, before moving to Athens, in 307/306 BC, where he established his famous 'garden.'⁷⁰⁰

The goal of Epicurus' philosophy, devised as a practical guide for those attempting to cope with the stress of life in the Hellenistic world, was to help people be happy and avoid the fear of death.⁷⁰¹ The Roman poet, Lucretius, one of our important sources for Epicurean philosophy, introduces us to Epicurus in his *De Rerum Natura* 1. 62-71:

Humana ante oculos foede cum vita iaceret/
in terris oppressa gravi sub religione/,
quae caput a caeli regionibus ostendebat/
horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans/,
primum Graius homo mortalis tollere contra/
est oculos ausus primusque obsistere contra;/
quem neque fama deum nec fulmina nec minitanti/
murmure compressit caelum, sed eo magis
acrem/ inritat animi virtutem, effringere ut arta/
naturae primus portarum claustra cupiret.

(When human life, before our eyes, lay on the earth, foully crushed by religion, who showed her head to mortals from the quarters of the sky, hovering over them with her hideous appearance, a man from Greece dared for the first time to raise his eyes in defiance, and to be the first to stand up against her; neither the talk about the gods nor the lightning nor the murmuring thunder in the sky crushed him, but quickened the sharp virtue of his mind so that he, first of all men, longed to smash the locks on the doors of nature.)

Here Lucretius presents humanity as cowering before the gods because they had been convinced by their religion that their lives were lived at the mercy of these gods and their deeds in this life would be punished by them. He then presents Epicurus as the brave man who saw through that superstition and helped people to face their fear of death. In this way, Lucretius summarises the goal and the effect of Epicurus' philosophy.

Epicureanism was profoundly influenced by the Atomic theory of the pre-Socratic thinkers, Democritus and Leucippus, who posited the existence of atoms and void (Lucretian *inane*), in order to account for the materiality of the universe.⁷⁰² Lucretius gives his Latin account of the essence of this atomism early on in the *De Rerum Natura* 1. 484-488:

Corpora sunt porro partim primordia rerum/,
partim concilio quae constant principiorum/.
sed quae sunt rerum primordia, nulla potest vis/
stinguere; nam solido

⁷⁰⁰ For Epicurus' biography, see Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 513; cf. Russell 2010: 231.

⁷⁰¹ Long 1974: 21.

⁷⁰² Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 513.

vincunt ea corpore demum/. etsi difficile esse videtur credere quicquam/ in rebus solido reperiri corpore posse.

(Bodies are partly primordial beginnings of things (i.e. atoms), and partly the bringing together of things (i.e. compounds) which are constituted by those primordial beginnings. But the primordial beginning of things, no power can destroy. For they endure indefinitely by their solidity, even if it is difficult to believe that anything completely solid can exist.)

Lucretius' *primordia rerum* is his translation into Latin of the Greek word ἄτομος, meaning these smallest units of being, of which everything consists, derived from the fact that they cannot be cut into smaller units.⁷⁰³ These atoms come in different kinds, which helps explain the diversity of matter, and also move through the void, which affects the outcome of what should happen, which is how atomists, and by extension Epicureans, marrying physics and ethics, explained free will and choice.⁷⁰⁴

These atoms also helped Epicurus provide a materialistic explanation of the existence and perception of sensations which he claims originate outside us.⁷⁰⁵ We have these sense-perceptions, says Epicurus, because everything is made of atoms, and some atoms emanated by the object interact with the atoms that make up our mind. It is this interaction that results in knowledge.⁷⁰⁶

Despite the goal of Epicurus and the Epicureans to set people free from the fears instilled by religion, they nevertheless believed in the gods who existed far away in a state of total atomic beatitude, while humans, here on this earthly plane, could be inspired by contemplating their eternal tranquility, and thus live as blessed a life.⁷⁰⁷

Even though the gods existed, Epicurus still managed to make sure they had no power over a human's fate. He did this by teaching that a person's ψυχή neither preceded birth nor survived death.⁷⁰⁸ Epicurus believed that the soul was made up of very fine atoms which dissolve at death and so the person ceased to exist.⁷⁰⁹

Lucretius further explained Epicurus' perspective on the soul. He said that there is a distinction between *animus*, which is the mind, and a part of the *anima* (soul) spread throughout the body.⁷¹⁰ More important than the soul, the mind, which is inextricably linked to the soul,

⁷⁰³ Long 1974: 33; cf. LSJ, s.v. ἄτομος.

⁷⁰⁴ Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 514.

⁷⁰⁵ Long 1974: 21.

⁷⁰⁶ Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 513.

⁷⁰⁷ Wright 2013: 211.

⁷⁰⁸ Long 1974: 49.

⁷⁰⁹ Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 514.

⁷¹⁰ Kenny 2012: 196. For Lucretius' introduction of *animus* and *anima*, see *De Rerum Natura* 3.31-40.

can survive damage to the soul.⁷¹¹ As Lucretius memorably says in his *De Rerum Natura* 3. 402-405:

at manet in vita cui mens animusque remansit/, quamvis est circum caesis lacer
undique membris/; truncus adempta anima circum membrisque remota/ vivit et
aetherias vitalis suscipit auras;

(But the one who remains alive is the one whose mind and spirit have remained in him, no matter how his trunk is damaged with the limbs chopped off. The soul is withdrawn and taken from the limbs, yet the trunk still lives and draws the breath of life.)

Despite this possibility, like Epicurus, Lucretius' goal is to prove body, soul and mind are mortal and that we are 'nothing,' when the union of body and spirit is disrupted. Consequently, there is nothing to fear from the gods, or any other capricious force, in either this world or the next. As he says in *De Rerum Natura* 3. 830-831:

Nil igitur mors est ad nos neque pertinet hilum/, quandoquidem natura animi mortalis
habetur.

(Therefore death is nothing to us, nor is important to us at all, because the nature of the mind is mortal.)

In contrast to Plato and Aristotle, who had essentially immaterial conceptions of humanity and the human soul, Epicureans believed that everything was material, and thus subject to all the vulnerabilities of ordinary matter. This meant that the soul was material, and that it would perish after death, just like the body.

Stoicism

The next philosophy we will consider is that of Stoicism, founded by the philosopher Zeno, who was born in Citium in 335 B.C., and moved to Athens in 311 B.C., where he studied philosophy under Crates, the Cynic, and founded his own school in the *Stoa Poikile*.⁷¹² After Zeno's death in 263 B.C., the school was run by his disciple, Cleanthes, and then after him by Chrysippus. Under Cleanthes the school seemed to be under threat, but it was unified and its teachings were codified by Chrysippus.⁷¹³ In the third and second centuries Stoicism was in the process of reforming in the face of criticism, as well as spreading far afield. In particular,

⁷¹¹ Kenny 2012: 197.

⁷¹² Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 1587; cf. Long 1974: 109, 111.

⁷¹³ Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 1403.

it found a home in Rome and Paul's Tarsus.⁷¹⁴

Stoicism had three central aspects of its philosophy, all of which worked together, like Epicureanism's physics and ethics, to give a coherent picture of the world.⁷¹⁵ The first part is logic, which deals both with the laws of thought as well as the study of language. The second part of Stoic philosophy is physics, which is roughly equal to what contemporary philosophers think of as metaphysics, and finally ethics, which covers what it means to lead a good life.⁷¹⁶ Originally, the Stoics, who were materialists, believed that the basic element of the universe was fire, but later changed this to *πνεῦμα*.⁷¹⁷ They were also pantheists, who believed that all that existed was made up of the active *πνεῦμα*, which was divine, and the passive *ὕλη*, all of which was material.⁷¹⁸ They claimed that the history of the world moved in cycles, from pure fire, to life as we know it, to fire and then back again. In addition, the Stoics maintained that everything that happens is fated to happen, and in the same way in every single cycle of history. In terms of free will, the Stoics were compatibilists, since they believed that all is fated, but they still wanted to affirm that people are responsible in affirming the destiny assigned to them.

719

In terms of ancient Greek and Roman polytheism, the Stoics believed, rather like contemporary Hindus, that all the gods were simply manifestations of the one God who is everything and is in everything. Stoics are thus essentially monotheists, but they view the traditional gods as primitive versions of aspects of the one God. They also prayed, but since they believed that all is God, it is not totally clear how they understood prayer.⁷²⁰ For after all, if there is a part of the divine contained within you, and the divine is all, what exactly does it mean to converse with this being?⁷²¹

Like the Epicureans, the Stoics taught that the *ψυχή* was material. Chrysippus equates the *ψυχή* with *πνεῦμα*, where earlier Zeno had aligned it with fire.⁷²² We learn about this further in Diogenes Laertius' *Vitae Philosophorum* 7.156.5-157.1:

⁷¹⁴ Long 1974: 114-115.

⁷¹⁵ Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 1403.

⁷¹⁶ Long 1974: 118-119.

⁷¹⁷ Hornblower, Spawforth, Eidinow 2012: 1404; Kenny 2012: 82.

⁷¹⁸ Wright 2013: 213-214.

⁷¹⁹ *Ibid.* 215-216.

⁷²⁰ *Ibid.* 217-218.

⁷²¹ There is, of course, Cleanthes' Hymn to Zeus, but this is a didactic work, rather than a piece of devotional literature.

⁷²² Kenny 2012: 198.

Δοκεῖ δ' αὐτοῖς τὴν μὲν φύσιν εἶναι πῦρ τεχνικόν, ὁδῶ βαδίζον εἰς γένεσιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πνεῦμα πυροειδὲς καὶ τεχνοειδές: τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αἰσθητικὴν <φύσιν>. ταύτην δ' εἶναι τὸ συμφυὲς ἡμῖν πνεῦμα: διὸ καὶ σῶμα εἶναι καὶ μετὰ τὸν θάνατον ἐπιμένειν: φθαρτὴν δ' ὑπάρχειν, τὴν δὲ τῶν ὅλων ἄφθαρτον, ἧς μέρη εἶναι τὰς ἐν τοῖς ζώοις.”

(They think that nature is fire working artistically, on its way to create. This is like a fiery and creative breath. The soul is capable of perception. They also think that it is the breath of life for us. Therefore they infer that it is first a body and secondly that it survives death. Though it is perishable, the whole, of which each living soul is just a part, is imperishable.)

Here the souls are taught to be a part of the “all,” indicative of Stoic pantheism.

Furthermore, the Stoics added to both Platonic and Epicurean refinements of ψυχή by claiming that the soul was made up of eight parts, the most important of which was called the ἡγεμονικόν, which lived in the heart and governed the other parts of the body with currents of warm air.⁷²³

While there are some similarities between Stoicism and Epicureanism, most notably their materialism, there were fundamental differences regarding ethics and metaphysics which made Stoicism a much more popular philosophy in Paul’s day than Epicureanism, which seems to have belonged to an elite minority.

Cynicism

Finally, I will briefly discuss the philosophy of Cynicism, which had a certain popularity in the time of Paul, and thus merits a few words.

Cynicism, perhaps by its very nature, is a tricky movement to define.⁷²⁴ Cynicism began in Athens where it was founded by Diogenes, inspired by the Platonic Antisthenes, who, when he was quite old, gave up the majority of his possessions and devoted himself to a simple life of virtue.⁷²⁵ Diogenes followed Antisthenes’ teaching, and lived a mendicant life in the open air.⁷²⁶ Cynicism was, in essence, about living life in a strictly Socratic way that challenged the conventions of one’s day in a way that caused others to think more clearly about what they

⁷²³ Long 1974: 171. See Diogenes Laertius *Vitae Philosophorum* 7. 157: Μέρη δὲ ψυχῆς λέγουσιν ὀκτώ, τὰς πέντ’ αἰσθήσεις καὶ τοὺς ἐν ἡμῖν σπερματικούς λόγους καὶ τὸ φωνητικὸν καὶ τὸ λογιστικόν.(They say the soul has eight parts, which are the five senses, the generative parts in us, the speech and the reason.)

⁷²⁴ Wright 2004: 66.

⁷²⁵ Russell 2010: 222.

⁷²⁶ *Ibid.*

believed.⁷²⁷ In many ways, by the time of Paul, Cynicism was thought to be a more extreme version of Stoicism.⁷²⁸ Indeed, Wright is probably correct to describe Cynicism at the time of Paul as “more of a mood than a movement.”⁷²⁹

Regarding metaphysics and the ψυχή, the Cynics do not appear to have had much new to add.

Conclusion

In this section I considered three different Hellenistic philosophies. The Epicureans, who were materialists dedicated to freeing humankind from the fear of death; the Stoics, who believed that all the world was one living entity and the good life was found in living according to the spark of that entity within you; and the Cynics, who believed that a good life was found in living outside of the constraints of ordinary society. In what follows, I will discuss the usefulness of each of these ideas for understanding the Apostle Paul because they are crucial for a rounded picture of the world into which he was born, and indeed, the world that may have influenced him.

⁷²⁷ Wright 2004: 67.

⁷²⁸ Wright 2013: 229.

⁷²⁹ *Ibid.*

Chapter Six: Final Conclusion

Introduction

Having completed my analysis of the use of the words ψυχή and πνεῦμα in their various contexts, I will now see what the evidence I have gathered tells us about what Paul believed. In my introduction, I asked three major questions. The first is how Paul uses the words that modern translators often render as ‘spirit’ or ‘soul.’ The second is which of the many linguistic and ideological backgrounds in Paul’s world provides the best context for helping to flesh out what Paul is saying. The final one is how Paul’s language and his background can come together to help us understand of what Paul believed about the human soul. In my conclusion I will answer each of these questions in turn based on the material I have collected throughout the thesis.

Paul’s Use of Soul Words

In my analysis, I examined Paul’s use of the two Greek words often translated as ‘soul.’ These are ψυχή and πνεῦμα.

Ψυχή is less common than πνεῦμα, but it also has a wider scope of potential meanings. The most common way Paul uses the word is simply to mean ‘life,’ i.e. that which animates a person and which is lost at death. The second most common meaning is when Paul uses the word to refer to the inner functioning of a living person. This can be in terms of thinking, feeling or intention. Finally Paul uses it as a strong personal pronoun to refer to a person who is alive.

Πνεῦμα, by contrast, appears far more often, even when it is referring to a human being.

Although it appears more often, it really only refers to a person's spirit. But there is a fair amount of nuance within this meaning. For example, it can on occasion refer to the simple fact that there is a spirit. It can also refer to the part of a person that connects with God, or is put into that person by God. Paul also describes it as the seat of morals, something that survives death, as distinct from the mind, as the part which displays someone's attitude, and finally, in greetings, he uses it to refer to the whole person. From the evidence that I have gathered, Paul apparently considered the *πνεῦμα* either to be a divine part of the human put there by God, or else a part of the human that was oriented towards connection with God.

By itself, this analysis is suggestive, but it is also incomplete. For this reason, I examined two of the cultures with which the Apostle Paul was familiar, to see if those could shed further light on what he meant by using these two words in the ways he did.

Background

In chapters three and four, I looked at both the Israelite Scriptures and the texts that were common to the Greek world. I did this because Paul, like anybody, was a product of his environment. In keeping with *Sitz im Leben* methodology, therefore, I believe that any attempt to unravel what Paul thought must involve an exploration of the ideas with which he would have been familiar. My method for judging to what extent Paul's use of these words was influenced by a particular author or body of literature is to find out to what extent his use of the word is continuous with how the word is used in that body of literature.

Scriptures of Ancient Israel

When looking at the Scriptures of Ancient Israel, I used both the Hebrew text, largely based off the Masoretic version, and the Septuagint.⁷³⁰ There I looked at the uses of the Hebrew words *נְפֹשׁ* and *רוּחַ* to determine what lexical range they have, and also briefly noted how they had been translated into Greek, because our records of Paul using these words would be in Greek.

When investigating these words, I divided the Israelite Scriptures into the three commonly accepted blocks: the Law, the Prophets and the Writings. Regarding *נְפֹשׁ*, I found that the meanings through these blocks of literature remain consistent. The three meanings that do not change and are consistently translated as *ψυχή*, are 'life,' as in the animating force which is lost at death, 'living thing,' as in that which has this force, and the inner life of a person. In the Law and the Prophets, this word can also mean 'death' or 'the dead,' as in that which was

⁷³⁰ *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 1967.

previously alive, and in the Prophets and the Writings, it is used to mean ‘throat’ or ‘craving.’

This suggests that what Paul understood by ψυχή is highly continuous with how the Scriptures of Ancient Israel use שָׁרֵף, which is translated ψυχή. There are some areas where they do not overlap. For example, Paul never uses ψυχή to refer to throat. This is possibly because we have such a small sample of Pauline writings that he never had a need to use the word ‘throat,’ or it is possibly because Paul’s Greek was good enough to be able to distinguish between the lexical range of שָׁרֵף and that of ψυχή and to use the appropriate Greek word. But the most consistent meanings of שָׁרֵף align well with Paul’s use of ψυχή.

רוּחַ is a far less common word than שָׁרֵף, and it is even less common for it to refer to a person. When it does, however, it always refers to a person’s spirit. And, again, it does this with considerable nuance. The רוּחַ is variously described as being the seat of morals, emotions, capabilities, dispositions or beliefs, and decision making.⁷³¹

Although the continuity is not as strong as it is with שָׁרֵף, there are similar meanings in the Scriptures of Ancient Israel and in the Pauline letters for רוּחַ. In my view this makes it highly likely that Paul drew at least some of his inspiration for how he used ψυχή and πνεῦμα from the Israelite Scriptures.

In this section I also considered the Apocrypha, which are Jewish works written during the Second Temple period in various places and at various times. In this case, the usages are slightly different. Ψυχή, in the Apocrypha, often means ‘soul,’ which seems to be an immaterial part of the body which can survive death. It does also mean ‘life’ and ‘self,’ as it did in the Scriptures of Ancient Israel. They use πνεῦμα sparingly, but when they do it means ‘spirit,’ and in particular a part of a person connected to God. The differences between the Scriptures of Ancient Israel and the Apocrypha can be explained by recognising that these texts were produced by people who were grappling with their identities in the midst of foreign, notably Greek, rule. Thus, while some embraced Greek rule and its ideas (like those who wrote the *Wisdom of Solomon*), others, (like those who wrote *Sirach*) seem to have been stricter in their Judaism, and thus stay closer to the Israelite Scriptures in their usage.

Regarding Paul, I think that any influence these texts may have exerted on him, especially in his use of ψυχή, is minimal. The use of the words is simply not similar enough for this to be the case.

⁷³¹ It is not clear the extent to which these texts represent a systematic understanding on the part of Ancient Israel or a collection of different ideas of what this רוּחַ might be. However, reading the Scriptures of Ancient Israel as a collection, Paul himself would have understood them as representing a worked out understanding of רוּחַ and so, if it did influence him, all the ideas in the text would have.

Greek Writing on the Soul

In the next chapter I surveyed the Greek notion of the soul from the Homeric texts right through to the Hellenistic era. In the Archaic and Classical periods, I examined representative uses of the word ψυχή. There were no anthropological uses of πνεῦμα in this period, except for where it meant ‘breath.’

In the case of the Archaic Greek period, for which I focused on the Homeric Epics, the word ψυχή means ‘life,’ ‘vitality,’ as in the life-force made visible in action, and refers to the shades that are found in Hades. Indeed, it seems that the ψυχή was one of several ‘vital organs’ to which internal functioning was attached at this time. While there are potentially some interesting connections to be made with these ideas and the Scriptures of Ancient Israel, there is very little continuity with Paul. As a result, I will not consider Homeric literature an important influence on Paul’s anthropology.

In the case of Classical Greek, there are two groups of authors who used this word very differently. Firstly, there are those who wrote literature, such as the Tragedians, and Herodotus. They may have used the word ψυχή in their writings, but their writings are not an attempt to develop a deeper understanding of this word. In Classical literature, there are three uses of ψυχή. The first two are ‘life’ and ‘the shades of the departed.’⁷³² The third is where it refers to the ‘inner self.’ When used in this way, it refers to the emotions, the desires, and the moral reasoning of a person. As with the Archaic literature above, the way the word is used in this period is largely different to how Paul used it, and so I will also regard the Classical literary texts as unimportant when establishing Paul’s background influences.

The other group of writers I will discuss is the philosophers, who, in the course of their work, sought to develop an understanding of exactly what the ψυχή is and what it can do. In the Classical period, the two most important of these were Plato and Aristotle.

Regarding Plato, there is much confusion. Walter Burkert claims that in his “great synthesis ... the new concept of the soul was able to become the foundation of both philosophy and religion. At the same time, Plato, drawing on and transforming many varied traditions, created those myths of the afterlife that were to exert lasting influence. They are presented in a playful manner, without the arrogance of revelation, but they pointed the way to many an apocalypse. By comparison the earlier poetic texts faded into almost irrelevant fairy tales.”⁷³³ And Plato’s thought is not simply significant on its own, but it is regularly considered to be the

⁷³² Similar to Homer, discussed above.

⁷³³ 1985: 199.

source of Christian philosophy, a point that Bertrand Russell makes well: “the *Phaedo* is important as setting forth, not only the death of a martyr, but also many doctrines which were afterwards Christian. The theology of St. Paul and of the Fathers was largely derived from it, directly or indirectly, and can hardly be understood if Plato is ignored.”⁷³⁴ Indeed, Plato’s ideas on the soul were very influential. Therefore, his thought must be considered. For Plato, there are three significant ideas about the soul. These are that the ψυχή is immortal, tripartite, and the principle by which the philosopher ought to live. At this point, the distance between Plato and Paul should be clear. For Paul, the ψυχή is in no way immortal. Further, although it does on occasion refer to something that appears to be involved in thinking or feeling, there is no discussion in Paul of different parts of the ψυχή. It is, of course, described in different ways, but this is never defined as different *parts* of the soul acting, but rather this same ψυχή acting differently. Finally, there is nothing in Paul about bringing oneself into alignment with one’s ψυχή. Thus, while Plato is an important figure in philosophy of mind generally speaking, he does not seem to be an important figure in Paul’s psychological thinking.

Paul’s ψυχή is actually closer to Aristotle’s. Aristotle’s soul is a unified aspect of a person which was responsible for giving people life. He calls this the ‘form of the body’s matter.’ Moreover, he argued that it disappeared at the time of death. In addition he argued that it was the body’s impetus to change, and that the soul is a unity with different functions, rather than being made up of parts. Finally, Aristotle distinguished the ψυχή from the νοῦς.

There are certainly similarities between Aristotle’s ψυχή and Paul’s. For example, both Aristotle and Paul understood it to be mortal. They also saw it as one entity with multiple functions. But that is where the similarities end, and because Aristotle’s thought is so systematic, his understanding of the soul is tightly bound up in his understanding of everything else. Therefore, if Paul were to use his idea of the soul, we should expect to see him explaining it in Aristotelian terms. Of course, we do not. Therefore, given that the continuity is limited and Paul displays no other Aristotelian ideas anywhere else, it seems fair to discount Aristotle as a major influence on Paul.

In the Hellenistic section of this chapter, I considered the three major schools of Hellenistic philosophy: the Stoics, the Cynics, and the Epicureans. I argued that while Cynicism was an important school at this time, their interest was not in developing a new understanding of the world, but rather living a certain way in it. Therefore, they contribute nothing to this discussion.

⁷³⁴ 2010: 147.

The Epicureans, however, were interested in engaging the world around them as they saw it. Driven by a desire to remove a fear of death, Epicurus developed a materialistic philosophy based on earlier atomic thinking. In line with this, he believed that the human soul was made of atoms and dissolved upon death. While there does not seem to be much in common with Paul, some scholars do see a commonality of goal with Paul, seeking to show that the soul is not immortal. But on the whole there does not seem to be much by way of continuity between Paul and Epicurean thought. Some, however, see a connection between what Paul has to say in 1 Corinthians 15 and Epicurean thinking. Benfield and Reeves argue that “[like] Lucretius Paul is concerned to rebut the Platonic conception of the body as the soul’s temporary instrument. Again like Lucretius he denies the natural immortality of the soul, which cannot exist apart from the body. Paul’s conclusion, however, is that the body will be, like Christ’s in the Resurrection, ‘raised’ and ‘changed.’ There will be a resurrection, but it will not be crudely physical. There will be after death a continuity of existence in a higher form, for which, says Paul, the best analogy is of a seed which produces its own characteristic plant at death.”⁷³⁵ Some further argue that Paul’s use of the word ἄτομος in 1 Corinthians 15 is evidence that he was reacting to Epicurean thinking. This, however, confuses Paul’s meaning. Paul is speaking about the smallest conceivable unit, not of matter, but of time, to explain how quickly the body will change. As Thiselton says, “The change or transformation will be instantaneous, ἐν ἰσχύρῳ (τέμνω, *I cut*, with alpha privative), denoting *that which is* indivisible, i.e., **in an instant**, *the smallest conceivable moment of time.*”⁷³⁶ Therefore, even though Paul did know Epicurean thought,⁷³⁷ I am not going to consider them a source from which Paul drew his ideas about the soul.

The Stoics, on the other hand, present a more interesting study. This is not so much because of similarities in their use of ψυχή, though there are some, but rather in their uses of πνεῦμα. As I said above, Paul seems to understand the πνεῦμα as a person’s connection to the divine, possibly given to them by God. This is indeed remarkably similar to the Stoic understanding of the πνεῦμα as the divine breath within all of us, which sustains us. For the Stoics, the ψυχή is simply a material manifestation of the life, which is made up of atoms and which perishes at death. This, I believe, sounds very similar to Paul’s understanding of both ψυχή and πνεῦμα. And yet, while there is a high degree of continuity, I am not arguing that Paul was a Stoic philosopher. This is because, while his ideas of the soul are similar, his overall

⁷³⁵ 1967:48.

⁷³⁶ 2000: 1295. Emphasis original.

⁷³⁷ Cf. Acts 17:22-34.

understanding of the world is so different to that of the Stoics that he is unlikely to be a Stoic himself. He was, for example, a monotheist, unlike the pantheism of the Stoics. He also believed that history had a particular end to which it was coming, and from which it would never return. Thus, in the majority of his thinking he was very different to a Stoic. I will therefore attribute his similarity in understanding to the fact that Stoicism gave him the language to explain his way of thinking to the world. Since Stoicism had spread far by this time from Athens and the Stoa Poikile as far afield as Rome and Rhodes,⁷³⁸ Paul would have had at least a passing familiarity with what it taught.

So it seems clear that the best way to understand the Apostle and his thought is not in Greek terms. Despite growing up in Tarsus, there are good reasons to think that Paul himself was neither a philosopher nor strongly influenced by Hellenistic philosophy. The first reason for this is because Paul himself was a Pharisee,⁷³⁹ which would have meant he was not very open to foreign influence.⁷⁴⁰ Secondly, there are Paul's own words which show him being cautious about the influence of philosophy,⁷⁴¹ and dismissing human truth in favour of God's truth.⁷⁴² These are reasons to think Paul was not influenced by Greek philosophy. Furthermore, since E.P. Sanders wrote his book *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, there has been a growing consensus in New Testament scholarship⁷⁴³ that the most pertinent context for understanding the whole New Testament, but especially Paul, is against a Jewish background, not a Greek one.⁷⁴⁴

While Paul was a citizen of the Greek world, he was nevertheless primarily a Jew. This means that most of his ideas were formed and sustained in reference to other Jewish ideas, primarily found in their Scriptures. So, while one must be aware of the Greek world when studying Paul so that one can understand the world into which he spoke, this is a secondary consideration when trying to understand the world from which he spoke.

Paul on the Soul

Having conducted this research, what can we now say about what Paul believed about the soul? In my introduction, I made the hypothesis that Paul did indeed believe in a human soul.

⁷³⁸ Long 1974: 115.

⁷³⁹ Galatians 1:13-14; Philippians 3:4-6. Cf. also arguments made earlier in this thesis on pp. 28-30.

⁷⁴⁰ Wright 2013: 199.

⁷⁴¹ Colossians 2:8.

⁷⁴² 1 Corinthians 1:18-2:5.

⁷⁴³ Of all ideological backgrounds.

⁷⁴⁴ Wright 1997: 20.

I now realise that this hypothesis was far too simple. Paul's anthropology, especially relating to his soul words, is a variegated concept.

When discussing the *ψυχή*, Paul uses it to mean 'life,' or that which has life, or the internal functioning of the life-force which results in the person's inner experiences. *Ψυχή* for Paul, then, is not what a modern reader would understand by the word 'soul.' It is not immortal, nor does it go on to an eternal paradise. It is simply a force which animates the being to which it is attached and which, in some manner, is lost. In this use, Paul is following closely in the footsteps of the Scriptures of Ancient Israel, which used the word *נְפֶשׁ*, translated *ψυχή*, in precisely the same way, with the same lexical range.

Regarding the *πνεῦμα*, the lexical situation is slightly different. The way that Paul uses this word clearly suggests that it is immortal, or at least survives death, that it connects with God and that it is non-physical. This does seem closer to what a modern person would call a soul, although it is not the same. Paul distinguishes between the *πνεῦμα* and the *νοῦς*, which he seems to understand as the rational processing mind. Instead, what the *πνεῦμα* appears to be, in Paul's thinking, is the part of a person which connects with God. In this, he is again close to the Scriptures of Ancient Israel, but I believe that he is communicating these ideas in Stoic language, to make them more accessible to the Gentiles he felt so called to reach.

Thus far, we can already see that my original hypothesis, that Paul believed in a human soul, was far too simplistic. Instead of a Platonic duality between body and soul, we have a complex interrelationship of entities. I have argued to this point that the *ψυχή* represents the life-force, and the *πνεῦμα* represents the part of a person that connects with God.⁷⁴⁵ But the question I must now deal with is how these two entities relate to one another within the human person. The first thing to note is that there is some overlap between *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*. They both refer to the inner life of a person in ways that are similar, in that they both govern one's thinking and feeling. This leaves us two options. Either Paul was using his words in a way that lacked finesse, or he was using these two words, with a similar meaning, but with a different nuance. I favour the second interpretation. Therefore, we need to see what the difference is.

A clear hint occurs in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. Throughout that letter, Paul distinguishes between what is *ψυχικός*, and what is *πνευματικός*. This distinction suggests that these are two similar concepts, but with important differences that, in Paul's mind, make being *πνευματικός* favourable. The clearest hint as to the substance of this distinction comes in 1 Corinthians 15, when Paul is discussing the resurrection. In this chapter, he compares the

⁷⁴⁵ Cf. Moo 2021: 454.

current body, which is called ψυχικός, with the body to come, which is πνευματικός. Paul argues that this πνευματικός body will supersede the ψυχικός body when Christ returns. This means that the body which is ψυχικός is current, but will be surpassed by that which is πνευματικός.

To develop this, we need to situate this dynamic within the larger context of Paul's theology, especially his thinking about the Holy Spirit and the end times. The first important aspect of Paul's theology to understand is his understanding of the story of Israel. By this I mean the story that Israel was a nation created by God and chosen by him, and in need of some deliverance, a deliverance that Paul believed God himself had promised in the prophets of old.⁷⁴⁶ The second important aspect of Paul's theology is that he believed that deliverance had come to the world through the person of Jesus, the one Paul believed had commissioned him to preach his message to the Gentiles.⁷⁴⁷

Against this backdrop of an errant but God-chosen people, and a decisive revelation from God, Paul now preached that the world had transitioned from the previous age to the age to come, a time that had been anticipated in the Jewish Scriptures but was broadly agreed had not yet arrived.⁷⁴⁸ Paul believed that in Jesus Christ the world had changed from the previous evil age to a new age marked by God's presence.⁷⁴⁹ This presence Paul understood in terms of the Holy Spirit, the manifestation of God to his people.⁷⁵⁰ But that was not all. Paul believed that the world would be judged one day soon by a returning Jesus Christ, and that the faithful, when that happened, would be resurrected or transformed into bodies that Paul can only describe as πνευματικός.

From here it is, perhaps, not too difficult to see how to understand the interrelationship between the ψυχή and the πνεῦμα. At the first creation, God gave the man life by breathing into him, and from then on, he was a living ψυχή. That life is the mark of the Old Creation. But when, as described above, the New Creation comes about, the person's new body is not animated by ψυχή, but instead by πνεῦμα. For Paul, this is not only a future situation. He believes that people at this time, who have surrendered to the rule of Jesus, interact with the πνεῦμα in a preliminary sense. This is why in his Corinthian correspondence Paul can refer to people who are ψυχικός and those who are πνευματικός. The ψυχικός are those who are marked by belonging to the Old Creation, and the πνευματικός are those who are experiencing a

⁷⁴⁶ Cf. Jeremiah 31; Moo 2021: 461.

⁷⁴⁷ Acts 26:12-18.

⁷⁴⁸ Wright 2013: 476. Cf. Joel 2:28-32; Malachi 4:1-6.

⁷⁴⁹ Galatians 1:3-5; 6:14-16.

⁷⁵⁰ πνεῦμα ἄγιον; cf. Moo 2021: 465; Romans 8:9; 2 Corinthians 1:22.

foretaste of the New Creation. But, according to Paul, this will come into being fully when Jesus comes again. Therefore, the relationship between ψυχή and πνεῦμα is that the ψυχή is the life-principle which animates the person for this age, but which is being and will be superseded by the Godward-facing πνεῦμα now and in the age to come.

The challenge when looking at ancient texts, perhaps especially those of the New Testament, is that one always feels one knows what questions to ask of them. The joy of reading ancient texts is to see those questions grown and transformed, delivering a richer, more developed understanding of the subject into which one was enquiring. Did Paul believe in a human soul? If the question is referring to an immortal, immaterial aspect which transcends the human body, the answer is no. If the question is asking about an immaterial aspect of a person that God joins to the body and which carries one into the world of the New Covenant, the answer is yes. Paul's thought is tricky, varied, but never dull. He always returns to challenge us anew.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

- Aeschylus. *Persians* (Smyth, H.W. 1926). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Aland, K. Aland, B. Karavidopoulos, J. Martini, C.M. Mertzeger, B.M. (eds.). 2012. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Münster: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Alt, A. Eißfeldt, O. Kahle, P. Kittel, R. 1997. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Aristotle. *De Anima* (Ross, W.D. 1956). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aristotle. *Ethica Nicomachea* (Bywater, J. 1894). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Barclay, H.S. 1909. *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, W. Danker, F.W. Arndt, W.F. Gingrich, F.W. (eds.). 1979. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [BDAG]
- Brannan, R. *Lexham Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*. Washington: Lexham University Press. [LALG]
- Brown, F. Driver, S.R. Briggs, C.A. (eds.). 1951. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [BDB]
- Cicero. *Ad Familiares* (Shuckburgh, E.S. 1909). London: George Bell and Sons.

- Clines, D.J.A. 2009. *The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press. [CDCH]
- Diogenes. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* (Hicks, R.D. 1972). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Euripides. *Euripidis Fabulae Vol. 3* (Murray, G. 1913). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Euripides. *Euripides with an English Translation* (Kovacs, D. Forthcoming). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History* (Bright, W. 1872). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Flavius Josephus. *Against Apion* (Thackeray, H. St. J. 1926). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Flavius Josephus. *Antiquities* (Niese, B. 1892). Berlin: Weidmann.
- Flavius Josephus. *Jewish War* (Niese, B. 1895). Berlin: Weidmann.
- Goldingay, J, Wright, N.T. 2018. *The Bible for Everyone*. London: SPCK.
- Herodotus. *Histories* (Godley, A.D. 1920). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Homer. 1920. *Homeri Opera in Five Volumes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoogendyk, I. 2017. *Lexham Analytical Lexicon of the Hebrew Bible*. Washington: Lexham University Press. [LALH]
- Hoogendyk, I. 2018. *Lexham Analytical Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Washington: Lexham University Press. [LALS]
- Iamblichus. *Life of Pythagoras* (Taylor, T. 1818). London: A.J. Valpy.
- Ignatius. *Ad Ephesios* (Lightfoot and Harmer, 1891). New York: Macmillan Publishers.
- Ignatius. *Ad Polycarpum* (Roberts A, Donaldson, J. 1885). Buffalo: Christian Literature Publishing Company.
- Irenaeus. *Against Heresies* (Roberts, A. Donaldson, J. Coxe, A.C. 1885). Buffalo: Christian Literature Publishing Company.
- Kittel, G. Friedrich, G. 1985. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: W.M. Eerdmans Publishing Company. [TDNT]
- Liddell, H.G. Scott, R. 1899. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [LSJ]
- Louw, J.P. Nida, E.A. 1989. *Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies. [LN]
- Lucretius. *De Rerum Natura* (Leonard, W.E. Dutton, E.P. 1916). Wisconsin:

University of Wisconsin Press.

- Lucretius. *Selections from Lucretius* (Benfield, G.E., Reeves, R.C. 1967). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Montanari, F. 2015. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden: Brill. [GE]
- Plato. *Platonis Opera* (Burnet, J. 1903). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pliny the Younger. *Letters, by Pliny the Younger* (Eliot, C.W. 1909-1914). New York: Collier & Son.
- Plutarch. *Cato Minor* (Perrin, B. 1919). London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- Polycarp. *Letter to the Philippians* (Roberts A, Donaldson, J. 1885). Buffalo: Christian Literature Publishing Company.
- Sophocles. *Vol 1: Oedipus the king. Oedipus at Colonus. Antigone.* (Storr, F. 1913). New York: Macmillan.
- Sophocles. *Vol 2: Ajax. Electra. Trachiniae. Philoctetes With an English translation* (Storr, F. 1913). New York: Macmillan.
- Sophocles. *The Plays and Fragments Part III: The Antigone* (Jebb, R.C. 1891.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Souter, A. 1917. *A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Strabo. *Geographica* (Meineke, A. 1877). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Swanson, J. 1997. *A Dictionary of Biblical Languages: Greek New Testament*. Logos Research Systems. [DBL]
- Tacitus. *Annals* (Fisher, C.D. 1906). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tertullian. *Against Marcion* (Evans, E. 1972). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tertullian. *De Baptismo* (Evans, E. 1964). London: SPCK.
- Thucydides. *Historiae in two volumes* (1942). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Xenophon. *Anabasis in Xenophontis Opera Omnia* (1961). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1900. *King James Version*. Grand Rapids: Baker. [KJV]
- 1989. *New Revised Standard Version*. New York: National Council of Churches of Christ. [NRSV]
- 2001. *English Standard Version*. Wheaton: Crossway. [ESV]
- 2011. *New International Version*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan. [NIV]
- 2017. *Christian Standard Bible*. Nashville: Holman Bible Publishers. [CSB]
- 2020. *New American Standard Bible*. La Habra: A Corporation Not for Profit. [NASB]

Secondary Sources

- Armstrong, D.M. 1993. *A Materialist Theory of the Mind*. London: Routledge.
- Barnett, P. 1997. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Berthelot, K. Price, J. 2019. *In the Crucible of Empire: The Impact of Roman Citizenship Upon Greeks, Jews, and Christians*. Leuven: Peeters Publishers.
- Best, E. 1997. Who Used Whom? The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians. *New Testament Studies* 43. 72-96.
- Black, D.A. 1981. Peculiarities of Ephesians and the Ephesian Address. *Grace Theological Journal* 21. 59-73.
- Blomberg, C.L. 2016. *The Historical Reliability of the New Testament*. Nashville: B&H Academic.
- Bock, D.L. 2007. *Acts*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Bremmer, J. 1983. *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brenck, F.E. 1984. Review: The Early Greek Concept of the Soul by Jan Bremmer. *Gnomon* 56. 1-4.
- Brown, R.E., Fitzmyer, J.A., Murphy, R.E. 2020. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Bengaluru: Theological Publications in India.
- Brown, W.S. Murphy, N. Malony, H.N. 1998. *Whatever Happened to the Soul?* Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Bruce, F.F. 1977. *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit*. Grand Rapids: The Paternoster Press.
- Bultmann, R. 1955. *Theology of the New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Capes, D.B. Reeves, R. Richards, E.R. 2007. *Rediscovering Paul: An Introduction to His World, Letters and Theology*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
- Carson, D.A. Moo, D.J. 2005. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Carson, D.A. 2010. *Collected Writings on Scripture*. Wheaton: Crossway.
- Cooper, J.W. 2000. *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting: Biblical Anthropology and the Monism-Dualism Debate*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- DeSilva, D.A. 2005. 'The Apocrypha.' In: Vanhoozer, K.J. 2005 (ed.) *The Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 53-57.
- DeSilva, D.A. 2018. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context and Significance*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Dillon, R.J. 2020. 'Acts.' In: Brown, R.E., Fitzmyer, J.A., Murphy, R.E. 2020. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Bengaluru: Theological Publications in India, 722-767.
- Dodds, E.R. 1963. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dunn, J.D.G. 1996. *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Dunn, J.D.G. Rogerson, J.W. 2003. *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Ehrman, B.D. 2011. *Forged: Writing in the Name of God – Why the Bible's Authors Are Not Who We Think They Are*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Eichrodt, W. 1967. *Theology of the Old Testament: Volume Two*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Fee, G. D. 1987. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Fee, G.D. 1994. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. 2020. 'Paul.' In: Brown, R.E., Fitzmyer, J.A., Murphy, R.E. 2020. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Bengaluru: Theological Publications in India, 1329-1337.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. 2020. 'Introduction to the New Testament Epistles.' In: Brown, R.E., Fitzmyer, J.A., Murphy, R.E. 2020. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Bengaluru: Theological Publications in India, 768-771.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. 2020. 'Romans.' In: Brown, R.E., Fitzmyer, J.A., Murphy, R.E. 2020. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Bengaluru: Theological Publications in India, 830-868.
- Fleming, T. 1984. Review: The Early Greek Concept of the Soul by Jan Bremmer and Toward the Soul: An Inquiry into the Meaning of Psyche Before Plato by David B Claus. *The Classical Journal* 2. 165-168.

- Gill, C. 1985. Review: The Early Greek Concept of the Soul by Jan Bremmer. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105. 205.
- Gottwald, N.K. 1985. *The Hebrew Bible: A Socio-Literary Introduction*. Augsburg: Fortress Publishers.
- Green, G.L. 2002. *The Letters to the Thessalonians*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Green, J. 2008. *Body, Soul and Human Life*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Gundry, R.H. 1976. *Soma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, M.J. 2005. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Harrison, E.L. 1960. Notes on Homeric Psychology. *Phoenix* 14. 63-80.
- Heckel, T.K. 2000. 'Body and Soul in saint Paul.' In: Wright, J.P. and Potter, P. (ed.) 2000. *Psyche and Soma: Physicians and Metaphysicians on the Mind-Body Problem from Antiquity to Enlightenment*, Oxford: Clarendon, 117-132.
- Hoehner, H. W. 2002. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Hornblower, S. Spawforth, A. Eidinow, E. 2012. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jewett, R. 1971. *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*. Leiden: Brill.
- King, N. 2012. *The New Testament: Freshly Translated with a Cutting-Edge Commentary*. Suffolk: Kevin Mayhar.
- Kobelski, P. J. 2020. 'The Letter to the Ephesians.' In: Brown, R.E., Fitzmyer, J.A., Murphy, R.E. 2020. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Bengaluru: Theological Publications in India, 883-890.
- Koons, R.C. Bealer, G. 2010. *The Waning of Materialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, A.A. 1974. *Hellenistic Philosophy*. Bristol: Western Printing Services Ltd.
- Kenny, A. 2010. *A New History of Western Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Marshall, I.H. 1978. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: The Paternoster Press.

- Mason, S. 2016. N.T. Wright on Paul the Pharisee and Ancient Jews in Exile. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 69. 432-452.
- Mitton, C.L. 1951. *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Moo, D.J. 1996. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Moo, D.J. 2008. *The Letters to Colossians and Philemon*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Moo, D.J. 2021. *The Gift of the New Realm in Christ: A Theology of Paul and his Letters*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic.
- Moreland, J.P. 2014. *The Soul: How We Know It's Real and Why It Matters*. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Moser, P.K. Trout, J.D. 1995. *Contemporary Materialism: A Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Murphy, N. 2006. *Bodies and Souls, or Spirited Bodies?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murphy O'Connor, J. 1995. *Paul the Letter-Writer: His World, His Options, His Skills*. Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.
- O'Brien, P.T. 1999. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans.
- Papineau, D. 1993. *Philosophical Naturalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Richards, E.R. 2004. *Paul and First Century Letter-Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection*. Leicester: Apollos.
- Russell, B. 2010. *A History of Western Philosophy*. London: Routledge.
- Sanders, E.P. 2015. *Paul: The Apostle's Life, Letters, and Thought*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Sanders, E.P. 2017. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Silva, M. 1988. *Philippians*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academics.
- Smith, D.L. Kostopoulos, Z.L. 2017. Biography, History and the Genre of Luke-Acts. *New Testament Studies* 63. 3.
- Suggit, J. 2014. *The Wonder of Words: A Look at some Significant Words of the Greek New Testament*. Westhoven: Anglican Church of Southern Africa.
- Thiselton, A.C. 2000. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

- Travis, S.H. 1977. 'Form Criticism.' In: Marshall, I. H. 1977 (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*. Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 153-164.
- Vielhauer, P. 1980. 'Paulinism in Acts', In: Keck, L.E., Martyn, J.L (eds). 1980. *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 33-50.
- Walton, J.H., Sandy, D.B. 2013. *The Lost World of Scripture: Ancient Literary Culture and Biblical Authority*. Illinois: IVP Academic.
- West, M.L. 1985. The Soul in Early Greek Thought. *The Classical Review* 35. 56-58.
- Wright, N.T. 1986. *Colossians and Philemon: An Introduction and Commentary*. Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Wright, N.T. 1992. *The New Testament and the People of God*. London: SPCK.
- Wright N.T. 1997. *What Saint Paul Really Said*. London: SPCK.
- Wright, N.T. 2004. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. London: SPCK.
- Wright, N.T. 2013. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Wright, N.T. 2018. *Paul: A Biography*. New York: Harper One.
- Wurthwein, E. 1988. *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Yarbrough, R.W. Naselli, A.D. Ortlund, D. Thielman, F. 2020. *Romans-Galatians*. Wheaton: Crossway.