

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1971

ΛΟΤΙΚΉ ΛΑΤΡΕΙΑ The Dedication of the Body to the Will of God

Aaron L. Uitti

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Uitti, Aaron L., "ΛΟΤΙΚΉ ΛΑΤΡΕΙΑ The Dedication of the Body to the Will of God" (1971). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 472.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/472>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

ΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΛΑΤΡΕΙΑ

THE DEDICATION OF THE BODY TO THE WILL OF GOD

THESE TITLE: Reasonable Worship (Rom. 12:1-2)

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Aaron L. Uitti

June 1971

Approved by:

Edgar Wentz
Advisor

Aaron L. Uitti
Reader

ARCH

BV

4070

C69

M3

1971

no. 1

89415

SHORT TITLE: Reasonable Worship (Rom. 12:1-2)

Uitti; S.T.M., 1971

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABBREVIATIONS.	i
Chapter	
I. THE PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY	1
II. SACRIFICE AND HELLENISM	6
The Stoics: Seneca and Epictetus	6
Apollonius and the Hermetic Writings	22
Philo Judaeus	34
III. SACRIFICE AND JUDAISM	47
Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Pre- suppositions for Post-Exilic Judaism	47
Sacrifice in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	56
Sectarian Attitudes toward Sacrifice	65
Rabbinic Judaism and Sacrifice	67
IV. GOD'S WILL IN CONCRETE LIFE: SOMATIC SACRIFICE	71
Introduction	71
Somatic Sacrifice: Living	73
Somatic Sacrifice: Holy	77
Somatic Sacrifice: Well-pleasing to God	80
Somatic Sacrifice: <u>Λογικὴ Λατρεία</u>	84
V. SEEKING GOD'S WILL IN CONCRETE LIFE	93
Seek God's Will!	93
Seeking Out the Will of God	101
VI. CONCLUSION	114
BIBLIOGRAPHY	123

ABBREVIATIONS

<u>bT</u>	The Babylonian Talmud
<u>Corp. Herm.</u>	<u>Corpus Hermeticum</u>
Epic., <u>Diss.</u> <u>Ench.</u>	Epictetus, <u>The Discourses</u> <u>The Encheridion</u>
Euseb., <u>Praep. Ev.</u>	Eusebius, <u>Praeparatio Evangelica</u>
Herm. <u>Tract. Asclep.</u>	Hermetic <u>Tractate Asclepius</u>
Marc. Aur., <u>To Himself</u>	Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, <u>The</u> <u>Communings with Himself of Marcus</u> <u>Aurelius Antoninus</u>
<u>Or. Sib.</u>	<u>The Sibylline Oracles</u>
Philo, <u>Abr.</u>	<u>De Abrahamo</u>
<u>Cher.</u>	<u>De Cherubim</u>
<u>Det.</u>	<u>Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari solet</u>
<u>Fug.</u>	<u>De Fuga et Inventione</u>
<u>Leg. All.</u>	<u>Legum Allegoriae</u>
<u>Mig.</u>	<u>De Mitratione Abrahami</u>
<u>Mos.</u>	<u>De Vita Mosis</u>
<u>Op.</u>	<u>De Opificio Mundi</u>
<u>Plant.</u>	<u>De Plantatione</u>
<u>Post.</u>	<u>De Posteritate Caini</u>
<u>Praem.</u>	<u>De Praemiis et Poenis</u>
<u>Prov.</u>	<u>De Providentia</u>
<u>Quis. Her.</u>	<u>Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres sit</u>
<u>Quod. Om. Prob.</u>	<u>Quod Omnis Probus Liber sit</u>
<u>Som.</u>	<u>De Somniis</u>
<u>Spec. Leg.</u>	<u>De Specialibus Legibus</u>
Sen., <u>Bene.</u>	Seneca, <u>De Beneficiis</u>
<u>Ep. Mor.</u>	<u>Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium</u>
<u>Helv.</u>	<u>De Consolatione ad Helviam</u>
<u>Prov.</u>	<u>De Providentia</u>
<u>Wis. Sol.</u>	<u>The Wisdom of Solomon</u>

CHAPTER I

THE PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to ascertain what Paul means by the phrase λογικὴ λατρεία¹ and what its implications are for the worshiping Christian community. This phrase occurs only once in Paul, but at an important transitional point in the epistle to the Romans (12:1). Nowhere else in the New Testament or the Greek translation of the Old Testament does this phrase appear. In fact the combination logikê latreia did not appear in any of the literature or material investigated.

The word λογικός² is found only in Rom. 12:1 and 1 Peter 2:2 in all of Greek biblical literature. Logikos, a favorite word of the early Greek philosophers, was used in their polemic against the crude rituals of sacrifice in popular religions.³ In the use of the word logikos processes which led either to the outright rejection of the cult and its sacrifices or to their spiritualization can be

¹Hereafter logikê latreia.

²Hereafter logikos.

³O. Casel says that, already with the inception of Greek philosophy, men like Pythagoras (d. 496 B.C.), Heraclitus (544-484 B.C.), and Empedocles (495-435 B.C.) said that those offering bloody sacrifice did not know the gods according to their being; cf. "Die λογικὴ Θεοία der antiken Mystik in christlichliturgischer Umdeutung," Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft (Münster, Westf.: Aschendorff, 1924), IV, 37.

traced.⁴

Logikos is an adjective formed from the same root as Logos. The Logos for the Hellenists was the ordering principle pervading all the world. The only possible source of this term for Paul is the Hellenistic world. However, the question is whether there is anything in common between the connotations in Paul's use of the term and what the Hellenists mean by it. If not, then the question remains as to what Paul means by logikos and what it says about latreia.

A survey of New Testament translations and lexicons shows that logikê latreia is difficult to translate because of the lack of clarity as to the meaning of logikos. Two renderings occur often: rational and spiritual (worship or service). If the translation of logikos is based on its Hellenistic background, then in Paul either "rational" or "spiritual" would be the most likely choice. It would be difficult on the basis of Paul, who uses logikos only once, to establish a meaning for the word apart from its currency in Hellenism.

The investigation of sacrifice is an important part of this study. Logikos is in close proximity to *θερία* in Rom. 12:1. Paul says that the body presented as a sacrifice

⁴"Spiritual" in connection with sacrifice in this paper means "of the spirit" as opposed to "material, outward, sensual" and has no reference to the Holy Spirit of Christian faith.

which is living, holy, and well-pleasing to God is logikê latreia. The paper includes a general survey of the role of sacrifice among Paul's predecessors and contemporaries. As the conclusion of this paper shows, the concept of sacrifice is very helpful in delineating what Paul means by logikê latreia and for contrasting Paul's view of worship with both the Hellenistic and post-exilic Judaic understanding. Paul has no argument with the Old Testament.

In the Corpus Hermeticum the phrase $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}\ \theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$ ⁵ is used to describe a sacrifice that is spiritualized. Since logikos and thusia are closely associated by Paul in Rom. 12:1, an interpreter is tempted to see a conceptual relationship and a similar concern between Paul and the Hermetic writer in regard to sacrifice and to conclude that Paul "ethicises . . . the concept of sacrifice and the cultus."⁶ Other interpreters hold that Paul is saying that the true Christian cult is the sacrifice of the body.⁷ Another possibility is to let the

⁵The phrase is also found in Hellenistic Judaism; cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, A Commentary on Romans 12-13 in Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers (London: Oliver & Boyd, 1965) XII, 12.

⁶G. Kittel, "Logikos," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by G. Kittel, edited and translated by G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1967), IV, 143.

⁷J. Knox, The Epistle to the Romans in The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954), IX, 581. E. Kasemann seems to say that the (particular?) place for Christian cultic worship is in principle surrendered; cf. "Gottesdienst im Alltag der Welt (zu Rm 12)," Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias in Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1960), XXVI, 168.

emphasis of logikos fall upon latreia rather than thusia and to maintain that Paul is more concerned with the explication of the worship of the new aeon than with carrying on a polemic against cultic or non-Christian sacrifice.

In Rom. 12:1-2 logikê latreia is mentioned in connection with a sacrifice which is pleasing to God and also with the pursuing of God's will. The study of Hellenism and Judaism must ask the question: What relationship does sacrifice have to piety or to the will of the deity? In St. Paul there are also some important questions: What does the sacrifice of the body, somatic sacrifice, say about the will of God and the quest for God's will?

This study surveys sacrifice in the heritage of Paul and also among some schools of Hellenistic thinking in which the word logikos is used. The first part of Chapter II is a study of Stoicism's attitude toward sacrifice based chiefly on Seneca and Epictetus; next follows a discussion of the spiritualization of sacrifice in the mystical, philosophical Hermetic literature and Apollonius of Tyana. Part three of Chapter II is devoted to Philo, the Hellenistic Jew of Alexandria.⁸ In Chapter III sacrifice in the Old Testament and

⁸I have omitted any discussion of the Apostolic Constitutions (cited by O. Michel) because of its late date. Michel points out that logikos does not occur in the Septuagint, but that it is found in the Greek synagogue prayers of the Apostolic Constitutions; cf. Der Brief an die Römer in Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (thirteenth edition; Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), IV, 292.

post-exilic Judaism, mainly Palestinian, is discussed. Chapters IV and V deal with Rom. 12:1-2. In the concluding chapter I try to show that the study of sacrifice is useful for understanding what Paul means by logikê latreia and how his concept of true worship stands apart from Hellenism and Judaism.

Starting point for the investigation of Stoicism's attitude toward cult with its sacrifices is the Stoic concept of man. Man is treated dualistically; he is a "mixture of the divine and human."¹ His soul (psuchê) and his reason (logos) are of divine origin.² The body, on the other hand, is fitted only for the reception of food and is a source of evil.³ The body is a prison in which the soul of man is trapped or an inn in which the divine soul is temporarily lodged.⁴

Body and soul are not by nature opposed to one another.⁵

¹J. E. Ravenstein, Paul and Seneca in Supplements to Hellenistic Studies, edited by W. D. van Unnik, et al. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), IV, 74. Cf. Sen., Ep. Mor., 102, 22; Epic., Diag. 1.3, 2-3.

²Sen., Ep. Mor. 31, 11; 41, 2; 66, 12.

³Sen., Moly. 11, 7; Ep. Mor. 65, 21; Epic., Diag. 1.1, 9; cf. 1.3, 5-6.

⁴Sen., Moly. 24, 5; Moly. 11, 7; Ep. Mor. 120, 14; 65, 21; Epic., Diag. 1.1, 17.

⁵S. V. Arnold says in connection with Stoicism, "When we say that man 'consists of body and soul,' we are merely adopting popular language; for body and soul are ultimately one, and differ only in the gradation of spirit or tone which informs them"; Roman Stoicism (New York: The Humanities Press, 1958), p. 236. The body is necessary in this life; cf. Sen., Ep. Mor. 65, 24; 92, 1; Epic., Diag. 1.2, 13.

CHAPTER II

SACRIFICE AND HELLENISM

The Late Stoics: Epictetus, Seneca and Marcus Aurelius

The starting point for the investigation of Stoicism's attitude toward cult with its sacrifices is the Stoic concept of man. Man is treated dualistically; he is a "mixture of the divine and human."¹ His soul (animus) and his reason (ratio) are of divine origin.² The body, on the other hand, is fitted only for the reception of food and is a source of evil.³ The body is a prison in which the soul of man is trapped or an inn in which the divine soul is temporarily lodged.⁴

Body and soul are not by nature opposed to one another.⁵

¹J. N. Sevenster, Paul and Seneca in Supplements to Novum Testamentum, edited by W. C. van Unnik, et al. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961), IV, 74. Cf. Sen., Ep. Mor. 102,22; Epic., Diss. I,3,2-3.

²Sen., Ep. Mor. 31,11; 41,2; 66,12.

³Sen., Helv. 11,7; Ep. Mor. 65,21; Epic., Diss. I,1,9; cf. I,3,5-6.

⁴Sen., Marc. 24,5; Helv. 11,7; Ep. Mor. 120,14; 65,21; Epic., Diss. II,1,17.

⁵E. V. Arnold says in connection with Stoicism, "When we say that man 'consists of body and soul,' we are merely adopting popular language; for body and soul are ultimately one, and differ only in the gradation of spirit or tone which informs them"; Roman Stoicism (New York: The Humanities Press, 1958), p. 238. The body is necessary in this life; cf. Sen., Ep. Mor. 65,24; 92,1; Epic., Diss. I,9,11.

The dichotomy of body and soul is related by Stoicism to practical, moral life. The question with which the Stoic wrestles is this: how can a man bring forth ἀρετή (virtus)⁶ and arrive at εὐδαιμονία (harmonia),⁷ that is, "wie der Mensch seine Bestimmung erfüllen und den Stürmen des Lebens heiteren Sinnes trotzen könne."⁸ A man must know himself,⁹ his real nature, and the nature of things. The body, which can weigh down the soul unless disciplined,¹⁰ is nothing;¹¹ the soul and mind, on the other hand, are divine. Further, a man must know that his whole being need not be enslaved to the vicissitudes and undertow of the body;¹² his mind cannot be held in such bondage.¹³ Epictetus queries: "What am I? I am not paltry body, not property, not reputation, am I? None of these.

⁶Sevenster defines virtus as "the attitude towards life of the man of strong character who has attained spiritual inviolability and consequently inner peace, harmony and happiness"; IV, 147.

⁷Harmonia is the state of inner peace which a man arrives at through knowing and doing what is good. Cf. G. Hansen, "Philosophie," Umwelt des Urchristentums, edited by J. Leipoldt and W. Grundmann (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1967), I, 348.

⁸Ibid., I, 349.

⁹Epic., Diss. I,4, entire diatribe.

¹⁰Sen., Ep. Mor. 65,11

¹¹Sen., Ep. Mor. 65,22.

¹²Epic., Diss. I,1,10-13; Sen., Ep. Mor. 15,5.

¹³Further, Stoicism taught that man is not a helpless victim of providence since he can choose to submit to it.

Well, what am I? A rational creature."¹⁴ Epictetus then goes on, "Reflect on your acts. Where have I omitted things which conduce to happiness? Been friendly or unsocial, done things that I shouldn't have?"¹⁵ A man's inclinations, planning, judgments and behavior must be governed, not by the body, but by the soul and reason under the control of one's δαίμων .¹⁶

It is Logos-philosophy which helps a man know and understand himself and the meaning of existence. For Stoics like Seneca (4 B.C. to 65 A.D.), Epictetus (about 50 A.D. to 130 A.D.), and Marcus Aurelius (121 A.D. to 180 A.D.) the Logos is held to be the unifying principle of the world.¹⁷ "Der Logos ist der Zentralbegriff der stoischen Philosophie, der den aristotelischen Nus in der Lehre wie in der Terminologie

¹⁴ Λογικὸν ζῷον refers to the whole cosmos or, as here, to an individual person; both are ordered and permeated by the same Logos or Reason. Hence Epictetus, endowed with Logos, is a rational creature who is able to attune himself to the divine nature and order of things and understand the meaning of existence. Citation from Diss. IV,6,34; cf. I,16,21. Translation of Epictetus by W. A. Oldfather, Epictetus, The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual and Fragments (London: William Heinemann, 1935-1938).

¹⁵ Epic., Diss. IV,6,35.

¹⁶ Hereafter daimon.

¹⁷ With the world in turmoil through war and the dissolution of the polis, and with the interchange of ideas, the Stoics used reason as a unifying principle. The world was not a meaningless place, they held, nor was man subject to a capricious fate. Reason or the Logos pervaded the whole material order and upheld the natural laws. Man who had a germ of the divine Logos (a logos σπερματικός) was to live κατὰ λόγον.

ganz zur Seite gedrängt hat."¹⁸ The contrast between
and Logos is important for an understanding of Stoicism.
Pohlenz comments first on noûs.

Nus und Noein sind schon Homer geläufig. Sie bezeichnen bereits bei ihm eine rein geistige Funktion, die von der sinnlichen Wahrnehmung geschieden ist. Der Nus kann dann auch als der eigentliche Träger der Erkenntnis gefasst werden, durch den die sinnlichen Eindrücke erst zum Bewusstsein kommen . . . er ist aber in seinem Wesen nicht auf die Aussenwelt angewiesen, er ist der denkende Geist, der auch ohne sinnliche Organe tätig ist.²⁰

Turning to Logos Pohlenz says: "Mit dem Worte Logos verband sich . . . die Beziehung des Menschen zur Ausserwelt."²¹ In the case of Zeno:

der Logos war für ihn nicht nur die denkende und erkennende Vernunft, sondern auch das geistige Prinzip, das die ganze Welt vernunftgemäss nach festem Plane gestaltete und allen Einzelercheinungen ihre Bestimmung zuweis. Der Logos waltete . . . im Kosmos wie im Menschen und erschloss nicht nur den Sinn der Welt, sondern auch den unserer geistigen Existenz und die Einsicht in unsere praktische Bestimmung. Zugleich wies er damit den Weg für ein Verständnis des Weltgeschehens, das Zenons rationalem Denken wie seinem religiösen Gefühl gleichermaßen Genüge tat.²²

Divine reason which permeates all makes each species of living things live according to its nature (or instincts) with the result that within the various species the ordering of Nature (natura) can be observed. In this sense Seneca says that an animal (or a child) understands (intellego) what "its own constitution" (constitutio) is and lives according to its

¹⁸M. Pohlenz, Die Stoa (Second edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), I, 34.

¹⁹Hereafter noûs.

²⁰Pohlenz, I, 34.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid., I, 35.

nature, but cannot explain its constitution.²³ A man, however, by his reason can live secundam naturam. For a man to live according to divine reason (Logos) he must know and understand himself. Seneca says:

For how are you to know what character is desirable, unless you have discovered what is best suited to man? Or unless you have studied his nature? You can find out what you should do and what you should avoid, only when you have learned what you owe to your own nature.²⁴

The question of how a man lives according to the indwelling Logos must be prefaced by the Stoic view of man's higher nature. For Stoicism the study of the soul and its parts, much more than of the body, is uppermost. Orthodox Stoicism holds that the soul has eight parts (or activities): the five senses, the regenerative part, voice and the ἡγεμονικόν.²⁵ The hêgemonikon is the "ruling part" of the soul, the other parts being subordinate to it. It is man's dearest, truest possession.²⁶ According to another view of man, the division of the whole man, the Stoic holds that man has three parts: body (σῶμα, σαρκία, σωματίον), soul (πνευμάτιον, ψυχή),

²³Sen., Ep. Mor. 121,11; cf. Epic., Diss. I,6,13.

²⁴Sen., Ep. Mor. 121,3. Translation of Seneca by R. M. Gummere, Seneca, ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales (London: William Heinemann, 1961-1962).

²⁵Hereafter hêgemonikon. Seneca uses principale, which for him is a part of the world soul that moves living beings into actions; Ep. Mor. 113,23; 121,10. Cf. Arnold, pp. 90 and 245; also J. M. Rist, Stoic Philosophy (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969), p. 257.

²⁶Cf. Marc. Aur., To Himself XII,2-3.

and hêgemonikon or noûs.²⁷ Again it is the hêgemonikon which is outstanding in man. Man shares noûs with Zeus or the gods. At the age of reasoning he can learn by experience, store knowledge, reason and make comparison, assent to what is true and withhold judgment.²⁸

Hêgemonikon is related not only to reasoning, but also to moral activity.²⁹ Further, since it can also involve states of irrationality as well as rationality, the hêgemonikon is "best understood as the root of personality It will therefore more aptly be rendered by words referring to personality than words referring to rationality."³⁰ The best modern equivalent for hêgemonikon, according to Rist, is the "personality" or "true self" of the human being.³¹

There is some fluidity in the use and meaning of hêgemonikon. The term soul is often interchanged with it.³² Stoicism, however, tends to identify the hêgemonikon in man with divine reason. Later Stoicism identifies the ἀπολόγημα of god with noûs

²⁷So, for example, one of the latest Stoics, Marcus Aurelius, To Himself II,2; III,16; XII,3. Cf. Rist, p. 271 and Arnold, p. 243. The πνεύματιον is the soul in its lower aspect. There is much fluidity of definition of the above words as a check of the glossary (Index III) in C. R. Haines, The Communings with Himself of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961).

²⁸Cf. Epic., Diss. III,3,2.

²⁹In this and the following two paragraphs I follow Rist.

³⁰Rist, p. 24.

³¹Ibid., pp. 24 and 25.

³²Ibid., p. 257.

or hégemonikon; it is the god or daimôn within.³³ Marcus

Aurelius says:

Walk with the Gods! And he does walk with the Gods, who lets them see his soul invariably satisfied with its lot and carrying out the will of the 'genius' (daimôn), a particle (ἄνθρωπος) of himself, which Zeus has given to every man as his captain (προστάτης) and guide (ἡγεμῶν) --and this is none other than each man's intelligence (noûs) and reason (Logos).³⁴

The Greek words in parentheses show the kind of equations that Marcus is capable of using. Seneca is not unlike Marcus in this respect.

God is near you, he is with you, he is within you A holy spirit (sacer spiritus) indwells within us, one who marks (observator) our good deeds and bad deeds, and is our guardian (custos).³⁵

In response to the question "Do you marvel that man goes to the gods?" Seneca writes:

God comes to men; nay, he comes nearer--he comes into men. No mind (mens) that has not God, is good. Divine seeds (semina divina) are scattered throughout our mortal bodies; if a good husbandman receives them, they spring up in the likeness of their source and of a parity with those from whom they came. If, however, the husbandman be bad . . . he kills the seeds, and causes tares to grow up instead of wheat.³⁶

³³For the following see Rist, pp. 266-272.

³⁴Marc. Aur., To Himself V, 27. Translation of Marcus by Haines. Cf. also III, 5; IV, 12; V, 10; XII, 1.

³⁵Sen., Ep. Mor. 41, 1-2. Spiritus is equivalent to the Greek daimôn. Daimôn is interpreted variously by modern commentators. Pohlenz says a man can live in accord with nature with the aid of his conscience. "Aber über diesem Gewissen steht als letzte Autorität noch die Gottheit, die es uns als Wächter beigegeben hat"; Pohlenz, I, 320. Sevenster says that custos in Ep. Mor. 41, 1-2 means conscience. "Saying that God has given us a guardian is putting too personal a stress on God"; Sevenster, IV, 91.

³⁶Sen., Ep. Mor. 73, 16.

Seneca further identifies ratio (Logos) with pars divini spiritus which is set in a human body.³⁷

For both Marcus and Seneca, who were Romans, the daimôn (spiritus) does not merely oversee a man's activities, but it is actually a part of man's being. Epictetus is not so clear as to whether the daimôn is an overseer or is actually part of man's being. The point at issue, however, one way or another, is that man is under the control of the daimôn. Epictetus, to go on, says that man has a δύναμις equal to Zeus, but does not say this power is man's reason, but rather continues to say that Zeus has set a watchman (ἐπίτροπος) over each man, his particular daimôn.³⁸ He then proceeds though:

Wherefore, when you close your doors and make darkness within, remember never to say that you are alone, for you are not alone; nay, God is within, and your own genius (daimôn) is within.³⁹

This can be taken figuratively so that the daimôn is within the very self and part of one's being. Epictetus does not specifically say that nous in man is a daimôn, nor does he identify the hêgemonikon with the daimôn. Nevertheless, he thinks of the ἀνεύρεται of God as part of man, as something which man carries about, and which must be kept pure.⁴⁰

Philosophy, according to Epictetus, promises to keep the

³⁷Sen., Ep. Mor. 66,12.

³⁹Epic., Diss. I,14,13.

³⁸Epic., Diss. I,14,11-12.

⁴⁰Epic., Diss. II,8,11-17.

hegemonikon in accord with nature.⁴¹ The hégemonikon is the subject matter (ὑλὴ) to which the good man applies himself.⁴² Priority must be given to its training; one ought not lose himself or his true manhood in external things.⁴³ The highest task for man is to turn inward and live according to the Logos with the ultimate goal of realizing to the fullest

a personality which makes full use of all its power, which preserves its peace of mind in all circumstances, and which is capable of achieving by virtue of its inner strength a noble harmony within itself.⁴⁴

Inner peace is gained only by attending to those things over which one has control, τὰ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, as distinguished from the things over which one has no control, τὰ οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῖν.⁴⁵ Free from hindrance and under man's control are "those things which lie in the sphere of moral purpose, and subject to hindrance are those things which lie outside the sphere of moral purpose."⁴⁶ The gods have put the reasoning faculty under man's control.⁴⁷ The goal of training and education is to

⁴¹Epic., Diss. I,15,4; cf. III,5,3; III,6,3; IV,4,43.

⁴²Epic., Diss. III,3,1; cf. I,26,15; III,22,19.

⁴³Epic., Diss. III,15,13 (also Ench. 29,7).

⁴⁴Sevenster, IV, 107.

⁴⁵Epic., Diss. I,1, entire diatribe; Ench. 1. Things which are in man's control are: decisions, impulses, desires, abstention, rejecting things; those not are: possessions, respect, authority, death and so forth. Cf. Hansen, I, 361. These are the things that τὰ λογικὸν μέρος can actually decide for or against. Cf. Epic., Diss. II,8,11.

⁴⁶Epic., Diss. IV,7,8.

⁴⁷Epic., Diss. I,1,4 and 7; IV,7,7.

cast aside whatever militates against one's kinship with the gods and to give attention to τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν .⁴⁸ External things do not contribute to the true nature of man. The wise man who knows about things divine and human will look to himself and to the preservation of his manhood, his own πρόσωπον .⁴⁹

Die stoische Erkenntnistheorie ist . . . sensualistisch. Die sinnliche Wahrnehmung, führt zur Erkenntnis der Wirklichkeit, aber dieser Weg ist für den Menschen nur durch Einschaltung des Logos gangbar. Die einzelne Wahrnehmung, ein rein physiologischer Vorgang, muss nämlich zunächst als ein deutliches Anschauungsbild (φαντασία) der Seele, genauer dem leitenden Seelenorgan, dem ἡγεμονικόν, übermittelt werden; erst durch die "Zustimmung" (συγκατάθεσις) des Logos wird sie als gültig und für Erkenntnis und Handeln massgebend anerkannt.⁵⁰

As to what a man is to do, Epictetus says, "The function (ἔργον) of the good and excellent man is to deal with his impressions (φαντασία) in accordance with nature."⁵¹ The right χρῆσις τῶν φαντασιῶν is important,⁵² not only for gaining knowledge of the world and making the hêgemonikon pure, but also for preserving the hêgemonikon from undesirable involvement in external things and, especially, for giving it moral direction and

⁴⁸Epic., Diss. I,9,10-11; II,5,4-9.

⁴⁹Epic., Diss. I,2,7; cf. entire diatribe.

⁵⁰Hansen, I, 356.

⁵¹Epic., Diss. III,3,1.

⁵²Epic., Diss. III,22,20; I,1,7. "Für Epiktet wird der rechte 'Gebrauch der Vorstellungen' durch Logos zum Zentralbegriff, der dem Menschen seine Autonomie gegenüber der Aussenwelt ermöglicht Dem Menschen hat Gott als Teil seines Wesens die Fähigkeit mitgegeben, die Vorstellungen mit eigenem Urteil zu begleiten und sich daraufhin nicht nur ein Gesamtbild der Welt zu machen, sondern auch sein eigenes Leben zielbewusst aufzubauen"; Pohlenz, I, 329.

purpose.⁵³

Now just as it is the nature of every soul to assent to the true, dissent from the false, and to withhold judgement in a matter of uncertainty, so it is its nature to be moved with desire toward the good, with aversion toward the evil, and feel neutral toward what is neither evil nor good.⁵⁴

The Logos, finally, makes it possible for a man to gather, order and assent to his (true) impressions because the very same Logos, which orders and pervades the world, is shared by man.⁵⁵

Der Logos verbindet als Weltgesetz und Weltvernunft den ganzen Kosmos mit den Menschen, die selbst im Besitze des Logos λογικός sind und als solche das Gesetz ihres Handelns, und somit auch des wahren Gottesdienstes, in sich tragen.⁵⁶

Man, a microcosm in the macrocosm, is to live in accord with the Logos or Nature. Seneca says, "It is our aim secundum

⁵³Epic., Diss. III,22,19.

⁵⁴Epic., Diss. III,3,2. Outside of man's προαίρεσις, his moral character, which in itself may be good or bad (Diss. I,29,1), "there is nothing either good or bad" (Diss. III,10,18). What is good or bad is not outside a man, but within. "If a man is good, his προαίρεσις will make good use of what is external to his true self: his life, his body, external possessions, and so on. And the προαίρεσις itself is the product, continually undergoing modifications, of judgments about what is external. Good judgments make our moral character good, bad ones bad"; Rist, p. 228.

⁵⁵Hansen, I, 355 and 357.

⁵⁶P. Seidensticker, Lebendiges Opfer (Röm. 12,1) in Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen (Münster Westf.: Aschen-dorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1954), XX,iii, 19.

rerum naturam vivere et deorum exemplum sequi."⁵⁷

"Der Gedanke der Gottesverwandtschaft des höherer Ich oder der ganzen Seele" is the foundation for the rational ethic of the Stoic.⁵⁸ Man bears divinity. There is a kinship or a bond of friendship between the gods and mankind.⁵⁹ Pohlenz quotes the Stoic, "Ich gehorsche nicht Gott, sondern stimme ihm zu."⁶⁰ This thought of the Gottesverwandtschaft can also lead to the spiritualization or rejection of the cult and its practices. The right place for the cult is within man.⁶¹ For both Seneca and Epictetus the way to worship the gods is to have the right impression (ὀρθὴν ὑπόληψιν) of them: that they both exist and administer the universe well and justly.⁶² Consequently the Stoic, if consistent, should be a critic of cultic religion and its rituals.

Seneca, on his part, scorns cultic worship.

Der wahre Kult besteht darin, dass man die rechte Erkenntnis vom Wesen der gütigen Gottheit hat, alle anthropomorphen Vorstellungen und namentlich die

⁵⁷Sen., Bene. IV,25,1; Ep. Mor. 66,39. Expressions of earlier Stoics and Epictetus are: τὸ ἐπεσθαὶ θεοῖς (Epictetus) and τῇ φύσει ζῆν, ὁμολογουμένως ζῆν (Zeno); also ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν (Zeno?, Cleanthes).

⁵⁸Cf. H. Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament," Angelos, Archiv für neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte un Kulturkunde, IV (1932), 59 and 62.

⁵⁹Sen., Prov. 1,5.

⁶⁰Pohlenz, I, 322.

⁶¹Sen., Ep. Mor. 31,11; Epic., Diss. II,8,10-14; cf. I,14,15.

⁶²Sen., Ep. Mor. 95-50; Epic., Ench. 31,1.

widerwärtigen Riten der orientalischen Modereligionen ablehnt, und dass man vor allem Gott nur mit reinem, frommen Herzen naht.⁶³

Seneca makes sacrifice subordinate to the uprightness of man; external things in themselves are neutral--this is true in the giving of gifts--what counts is the good desire of the worshiper.⁶⁴ Prayer or rushing to the temple is foolish because God's spirit dwell's within men.⁶⁵ Prayer can only appear somewhat useless before irresistible and irreversible fate.⁶⁶ Again, prayer suggests that man is helpless, which is not the case.⁶⁷ For Seneca there is no indispensable need for sacrifice, prayer or outward rituals for the good man. All that is required is doing the good and following the gods.⁶⁸ Cultic worship, which is attributable to an incorrect knowledge of the gods,⁶⁹ is at best an adiaphoron. Seneca, it would be accurate to say, rejected, not spiritualized, the cult and its rites.

Epictetus is more conservative than Seneca. He too knows of a piety, as was said, that is free from all externals of

⁶³Pohlenz, I,323.

⁶⁴Sen., Bene. I,6,2-3.

⁶⁵Sen., Ep. Mor. 41,1.

⁶⁶Sen., Prov. 5,8; cf. Sevenster, IV, 45.

⁶⁷Sen., Ep. Mor. 60,2.

⁶⁸Sen., Ep. Mor. 95,50; cf. 41,8-9; 66,39; Bene. IV,25,1; Vita Beata 4,2-3.

⁶⁹Sen., Ep. Mor. 41,1.

the cult.⁷⁰ This piety centers in the relationship of Zeus and man.

Je mehr dieser personal als der in der Seele anwesende Gott gefasst wird, desto mehr nähert man sich dem Gedanken, dass die Seele auch der rechte Ort der Verehrung der Gottheit, der rechte Tempel ist.⁷¹

The consequence of a temple within man should be the rejection of the popular cult. Yet in Epictetus there is no direct polemic against the cult or its sacrifices. In fact Epictetus endorses the sacrificial rites.⁷² For Epictetus there is no discrepancy between his religious knowledge and such religious practices.⁷³ The task of the reasoning man is simply and emphatically to thank God.

If, indeed, I were a nightingale, I should be singing as a nightingale But as it is, I am a rational being, therefore I must be singing hymns of praise to God. This is my task; I do it, and will not desert this post, as long as it may be given me to fill it; and I exhort you to join me in this same song.⁷⁴

Loyalty to the gods is at the core of Epictetus' piety.⁷⁵ This allegiance is in itself none other than following one's own daimôn and true nature. At this juncture Epictetus returns to his often repeated call to tend to those things over which

⁷⁰Epic., Diss. II,8,10-14; Ench. 31,1.

⁷¹Wenschkewitz, IV, 54.

⁷²Epic., Ench. 31,5; Diss. I,18,15.

⁷³Epic., Diss. II,18,19-20. Cf. Wenschkewitz, IV,54.

⁷⁴Epic., Diss. I,16,20-21.

⁷⁵Epic., Diss. I,14,15; II,14,11-13.

one has control.⁷⁶ By tending to what one can control a man will understand that he is free to live according to his true nature. He will also acknowledge that the gods are good and just. This is the motivation which Epictetus offers to the good man for the course of piety. "Der beste Gottesdienst ist die innere Reinheit und der Glaube, der alles Geschehen als Gottes Geschenk hinnimmt."⁷⁷ The peak of Epictetus' religious disposition comes out in these words:

Lift up your neck at last like a man escaped from bondage, be bold to look towards God and say, "Use me henceforward for whatever Thou wilt; I am of one mind with Thee; I am Thine; I crave exemption from nothing that seems good in Thy sight; where Thou wilt, lead me; in what raiment Thou wilt, clothe me."⁷⁸

Here is true piety--to be at one with the will of God.

The teaching of the divine fragment within each man had a powerful individualizing effect. Stoicism was not a religious community. The fact that each man shared in the same divine Logos however promoted a bond of fellowship among mankind. The Stoic as microcosm and world-citizen was related to both the universe and his fellow men, both of whom also shared the same Logos. The Stoic often took the lead in community and world affairs--as is exemplified by such men as Seneca, Cicero and Marcus Aurelius. Ideally the Stoic

⁷⁶So, for example, Epic., Ench. 31,1-2.

⁷⁷Pohlenz, I, 340.

⁷⁸Epic., Diss. II,16,42; cf. I,9,16; Ench. 31,1-2.
Cp. Sen., Ep. Mor. 65,24.

acted without emotion and without being perturbed (ἀταραξία).⁷⁹ However, the unfolding of the inner Logos was the task and ultimate purpose in the Stoic's endeavors. His efforts focused inward on his hêgemonikon.

Gut kann für ihn nur sein, was ihn gut macht, das Vernunftgemässe, das Sittliche. Nur dieses darf die Richtschnur für unser Handeln abgeben, und nur aus ihm fliesst die wahre, menschenwürdige Lust. Neben dem Trieb zur Selbsterhaltung und der Zuwendung zum eigenen Ich trägt der Mensch von Geburt an auch die Liebe zu den Mitmenschen in sich, die ihn zum Dienst an der Gemeinschaft treibt und die egoistischen Neigungen zurückzustellen heisst. Sein Ziel aber ist die seelische Harmonie, die das dauernd gleichmässige Handeln nach dem Vernunftgebot verbürgt und damit zugleich den wahren Seelenfrieden und die Eudämonie bringt.⁸⁰

Stoicism had an inherent coldness about it with its distaste for the affections of the body and its emphasis upon the inner worth of man. The Stoic was self-sufficient. Cultic practices were unnecessary for him, at best an adiaphoron. The Stoic believed that God helped man, to be sure; God helped man by his inner presence, his immanence. Consequently it was not the (historical) circumstances in which the Stoic lived as much as his philosophical reflection which was of moment--not history, but Nature. The Logos was, in the final analysis, a principle of morality. To know is to do.

⁷⁹Even the gods could be unmindful of individual persons as they tended to their tasks and followed the once and for all decreed course of providence. Cf. Sen., Ep. Mor. 95,50; Prov. 5,8; Sevenster, IV, 37.

⁸⁰Pohlenz, I, 306.

The Hermetic Writings and Apollonius

Many commentaries on Romans refer to the Corpus Hermeticum⁸¹ and to Apollonius of Tyana in connection with Paul's use of the phrase λογικὴ λατρεία⁸² in Rom. 12:1. Some scholars see a conceptual relationship between Paul's phrase, on the one hand, and the phrase λογικὴ θουσία⁸² in the Corpus Hermeticum (and the thinking attributed to Apollonius), on the other hand.

Apollonius, a contemporary of Paul, had the reputation of being a magician, wonder-worker, astrologer, philosopher and so forth. He left no records of his own. His life story and the thoughts ascribed to him were put into writing by Philostratus (sometime in the early third century A. D.) and by Eusebius of Caesarea. The religious and philosophical writings of the Hermetists are contained primarily in the

⁸¹I use Corpus Hermeticum as W. Scott does in his four volume Hermetica (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924-1936). In Scott's Hermetica the Corpus Hermeticum consists of Libelli I-XIV, XVI-XVIII. Libellus I, the first tractate of the Corpus, is entitled and better known as Poimandres. The Hermetica includes the Corpus Hermeticum as well as other Hermetic writings. My reference to the Corpus Hermeticum and other Hermetic literature are according to Scott as follows: Corp. Herm. I, 21; this indicates: Libellus I, paragraph 21. (Libellus I, 21 can also be designated by Poim. 21.) The text and English translation of the Hermetica are in Scott's first volume; I use them unless otherwise noted. Corpus in this section means Corpus Hermeticum; Hermetica refers to the Hermetic writings in general, including the Corpus.

⁸²Hereafter logikê latreia or logikê thusia.

seventeen tractates of the Corpus.⁸³ The principal tractate in the Corpus is Libellus I, better known as Poimandres. The Poimandres is singled out because of its teaching concerning cosmogony, anthropogony, salvation and the concept of God.⁸⁴ In working with the Hermetic writings it is important to remember that the viewpoints of various authors are not always consistent; within the Corpus Hermeticum itself there are diametrically opposed positions.⁸⁵ The Hermetica, of Egyptian origin, were written in Greek in the second and third centuries of the Christian era.⁸⁶ The dating of all these documents makes it dubious whether they are of direct value in the study of Paul. However, in the case of the Hermetica it is more than probable that they are the deposit of an oral teaching. What is preserved in connection with Apollonius,

⁸³The theological-philosophical Hermetica intended here are to be distinguished from the astrological texts which also contain the revelation of the God Hermes Trismegistos. Cf. W. Gundel and H. G. Gundel, Astrologumena in Sudhoffs Archiv, edited by J. E. Hofmann et al. (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1966), VI, 10-27 and 309.

⁸⁴Ibid., VI, 310.

⁸⁵Dodd, for example, says of Libellus III in comparison with Poimandres that "there is no transcendent God, no archetypal universe, and the immortality of man, which is the dominant religious interest of the Poimandres, is here emphatically denied." Cf. C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), p. 216.

⁸⁶Dodd dates the Poimandres as early as the late first century A. D.: ibid., p. 209. W. Scott, on the basis of internal and external evidence, looks to the third century A. D. for the writing of most of the Hermetica; cf. I, 8-15.

though garbed in much fantasy, most likely still has a core of historical and philosophical truth for the study of Paul and the consideration of logikê latreia. The Hermetic and Apollonian thought, in any event, serves as a useful and helpful background for elucidating Paul.

The phrase logikê thusia occurs in Libelli I (Poimandres) and XIII (Περὶ Παλιγγενεσίας); the latter has affiliations with the former according to Dodd.⁸⁷ These two tractates, and the Hermetic literature in general, diverge from Stoicism in several cardinal points. The Hermetists work with a sharp dualism. In their radical rejection of the body and everything material they move far from what might be called Stoic pantheism. God is placed in the intelligible (νοητός) world, the ogdoad, far beyond the material world and heavenly spheres. The Logos is not held to be the unifying principle which orders the universe and by which a man gains an understanding of the world. Unlike the Stoic, the Hermetists do not ask their hearers to turn inward and live according to the Logos or Nature. The Hermetica deal not with the understanding which derives from philosophy but rather they proclaim a revealed gospel. Libellus XIII calls for a rebirth: "No one can be saved until he has been born again."⁸⁸ Man is viewed by the Hermetists as an ephemeral creature who amounts to very little in the passing world. For the Hermetist, Fate

⁸⁷Dodd, p. 240.

⁸⁸Corp. Herm. XIII, 1.

(αἰμαρμένη), to which the Stoic can yield willingly, defies understanding, is unalterable and holds men in its sway from birth to death, often as a hostile power.⁸⁹

In Poimandres, which is the revelation of the God Poimandres, the Primal God is Noûs, the Father of all, who is Life and Light.⁹⁰ The First Mind brought forth as his Son the Logos,⁹¹ and also gave birth to the Demiurge, the Second Mind.⁹² The Demiurge, in turn, created seven administrators, the planets, which embrace the visible universe in their orbits and whose administration is called Fate.⁹³ It can be stated here that between the Primal Noûs and the world of empirical man there is a considerable power structure, consisting in part of the planetary powers. Man, to be saved, must escape the Fate which the spheres work.

Further, the First Mind gave birth to a Man in his own image.⁹⁴ This Urmensch is not a creature, but a Being of Life and Light like his Father. His native sphere is outside the seven spheres in the ogdoad, where the purely spiritual beings reside with God.⁹⁵ The First Man, however, did not remain in his proper sphere, but descended through the

⁸⁹Corp. Herm. XII,5-7.

⁹⁰Corp. Herm. I,9.

⁹¹Corp. Herm. I,6.

⁹²Corp. Herm. I,9. God, who is above all contact with matter, produced the Demiurge to undertake (with the Logos) creation.

⁹³Corp. Herm. I,9.

⁹⁴Corp. Herm. I,12.

⁹⁵Cf. Corp. Herm. I,26.

successive spheres into union with irrational, corruptible elements. On his descent to incarnation he received from each sphere various passions and desires.⁹⁶ As a result of union with matter, Man, who is naturally immortal, became mortal. The Primeval Man, to whom authority over all created things was given,⁹⁷ became subject to Fate.⁹⁸

According to the Poimandres, man, as we know him, is a descendant--though there is an intermediate stage--of Primeval Man. The myth of the Urmensch explains the origin and nature of empirical man. As one with a material body, man is destined to death because of carnal desire.⁹⁹ But in addition to the body there is the essential man (ὁ οὐρανὸς ἄνθρωπος).¹⁰⁰ The constitution of the original Man is Nous, Life and Light.¹⁰¹ "From life and light," however, empirical man became "soul and mind The Life which is in God is manifested in man as soul The light . . . appears in man as mind."¹⁰²

The myth of Primeval Man also indicates man's predicament and the way of escape. The Poimandres was written to bring men the gospel of salvation. The Hermetist writes:

⁹⁶Corp. Herm. I, 13, 24-26.

⁹⁷Corp. Herm. I, 26.

⁹⁸Corp. Herm. I, 19, 26. Cf. Dodd, p. 159.

⁹⁹Corp. Herm. I, 18.

¹⁰⁰Corp. Herm. I, 15.

¹⁰¹Corp. Herm. I, 12.

¹⁰²Dodd, pp. 161-162. Corp. Herm. I, 18.

O men, why have you given yourselves up to death, when you have been granted power to partake of immortality? Repent, ye who have journeyed with Error, and joined company with Ignorance; rid yourselves of darkness, and lay hold on the Light; partake of immortality, forsaking corruption.¹⁰³

For the Hermetic writers in general the knowledge of God is the way to salvation,¹⁰⁴ or more pointedly: "This is the good end for those who have knowledge, to be deified ($\theta\epsilon\omega\theta\eta\iota\mu$).¹⁰⁵ The knowledge of which the Hermetic writer speaks is the secret, all-important $\gamma\nu\omega\iota\varsigma$ which he received in answer to this prayer to "learn the things that are, and understand their nature, and get knowledge of God."¹⁰⁶ The general message which the Hermetist has to proclaim is that knowledge of self and God is the way to salvation and that the love of the body and its pleasures is the way of ignorance and death.

The Hermetist characterizes the two ways of life and death by a series of antithetical terms. The way of death is $\sigma\kappa\acute{o}\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\lambda\gamma\nu\omega\iota\alpha$, $\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta$, $\phi\theta\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}$: the way of life is $\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\gamma\nu\omega\iota\varsigma$, $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$, $\nu\eta\psi\iota\varsigma$, $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$: to pass from the one to the other is $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$: and the prophet offers himself as $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\delta\eta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ to the way.¹⁰⁷

In the dualistic thought of the Hermetica salvation consists in escaping the body and material world and

¹⁰³Corp. Herm. I, 28.

¹⁰⁴Corp. Herm. X, 15.

¹⁰⁵Corp. Herm. I, 26. Text according to R. Reitzenstein, Poimandres (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966), p. 336. Translation by Dodd, p. 169.

¹⁰⁶Corp. Herm. I, 3.

¹⁰⁷Dodd, p. 183.

journeying to the ogdoad. Salvation is gained through acquiring knowledge. In order to secure knowledge a man must have noûs. Noûs is not simply a thinking faculty, but the "substance" of the Primal God, which radiates from God like the rays of the sun.¹⁰⁸ Both knowledge and noûs are gifts from God.¹⁰⁹ The Hermetist writes: "Let the man who has mind in him (ἐννοῦς) recognize that he is immortal and that the cause of death is carnal desire."¹¹⁰ Again, "If then, being Life and Light, you learn to know that you are made of them, you will go back into Life and Light."¹¹¹ And again, "He who has recognized himself has entered into that Good which is above all being; but he who . . . has set his affection on the body, continues wandering in the darkness of the sense-world, suffering the lot of death."¹¹² Ignorance leads to death. Ignorance must be expelled by knowledge, the knowledge of one's origin and of God.

¹⁰⁸Corp. Herm. XII,1.

¹⁰⁹Corp. Herm. I,3. According to Libellus IV (ὁ κρατῆρ) all men do not have noûs; it was offered to all, but some did not accept the offer. Cf. Corp. Herm. IV,4.

¹¹⁰Corp. Herm. I,18. By calling man ἐννοῦς the Hermetist shows that man is related to the Primal Mind.

¹¹¹Corp. Herm. I,21.

¹¹²Corp. Herm. I,19. Men may be divided into two groups: those with self-knowledge and those abiding in ignorance. This self-knowledge is not that of the critical philosopher. It means knowledge of one's place in the Hermetic cosmological myth and the knowledge of the mystical way of salvation. Cf. C. K. Barrett, The New Testament Background: Selected Documents (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), pp. 86-87. Cf. also Corp. Herm. IV,7; XII,6-7.

Poimandres reveals to his prophet how the enlightened man ascends to his Father. This ascent is the heart of the Hermetic message. Man, who is burdened by his body and its desires, is subject to Fate beneath the spheres. For salvation he must depart his mortal frame and ascend through the spheres. Only at death can he be liberated completely from the body and Fate and rise to the ogdoad. Yet even in this world he can prepare, by asceticism and abstract contemplation, for his ascent to God. The characteristics and vices, the passions and desires which Man acquired on his descent to incarnation are laid aside by the devotee on his trip to the ogdoad through the successive spheres.¹¹³ Leaving behind everything mortal and corruptible, the mystic attains the powers proper to his true nature. He is deified; he becomes a *δύναμις* of God, a part of God.¹¹⁴

The Corpus uses cultic terminology to describe worship of God. This should not, however, conceal the fact that the terms have been spiritualized. The Hermetic writer says: "*δέξαι λογικῆς θουρίας ἄχνας* from soul and heart strained upward to Thee, O ineffable, unspeakable, named in silence."¹¹⁵ Scott translates the initial words "Accept pure offerings of speech," and comments that the sacrifice here "consists in

¹¹³Corp. Herm. I, 24-25.

¹¹⁴Reitzenstein, p. 53. Cf. Corp. Herm. I, 26.

¹¹⁵Corp. Herm. I, 31. Translation by Dodd, p. 195.

verbal adoration, as opposed to material offering."¹¹⁶ For Scott the words (λόγοι) of praise constitute a "verbal offering." The logikê thusia of the Hermetist must, of course, be seen in the context of a thoroughgoing renunciation of irrational elements and as a polemic against popular sacrifices. Like many of their predecessors--Jewish and Hellenistic--the Hermetists reject material offerings and insist upon rational and spiritual worship. It would be profanatory for those who hold matter to be defiling to honor God with material offerings. Dodd, however, suggests that, instead of designating the "matter" of sacrifice, logikos indicates that the sacrifices are on "a rational plane, offered by the λογικὸν μέρος τῆς ψυχῆς."¹¹⁷ If Dodd is correct, then we would here translate: "Accept pure rational offerings" or "Accept pure sacrifices fit for a rational being."

Asclepius asks if one should add to prayers an offering of incense, as is the custom. Trismegistus answers:

Hush, Asclepius; it is the height of impiety to think such a thing with regard to him who alone is good. Such gifts as these are unfit for him Let us adore him rather with thanksgiving; for words of praise are the only offering he accepts.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶Scott, II, 71.

¹¹⁷Dodd, p. 196.

¹¹⁸Lactantius, Div. inst. 6,25,11, as cited by Scott, I, 372. The last phrase reads: "huius enim sacrificium sola benedictio est"; Scott equates benedictio and εὐλογία.

Apollonius also forbids sacrifice of incense to the great transcendent God who may be honored only with nôus. He too protests against externals in sacrifice because this would be ascribing to the Deity sensory perception.

It is in this way (in my opinion) that one would best perform one's devotions to the divine . . . if one offered no sacrifice at all, nor kindled fire, nor gave to Him any name belonging to the world of sense . . . but employed in relation to Him only the higher Logos (I mean that which does not pass through the mouth), and besought good things of the Noblest of beings through the noblest thing in ourselves; and this is mind, which needs no instrument.¹¹⁹

Logikê thusia, in the singular, occurs in Libellus XIII also. The Hermetist writes: "It is thy Word that through me sings thy praise; through me accept . . . logikê thusia."¹²⁰ The logikê thusia here "seems to be connected with the idea that when the reborn man worships God, the worship really proceeds from the indwelling divine Logos: ὁρὸς λόγος δι' ἐμοῦ ὑμνεῖτε ."¹²¹ We would translate logikê thusia here as a "sacrifice corresponding to the Logos."

Simple words of praise are not in themselves worthy enough of God. The logos of the mouth must also be silent; only the holiest and purest part of man, that part which is

¹¹⁹Euseb., Praep. Ev. IV,13. Translation by Dodd, p. 196.

¹²⁰Corp. Herm. XIII,18, following Reitzenstein's text, p. 346. Cf. also Corp. Herm. XIII,19, (21).

¹²¹Dodd, p. 196. Dodd explains that this conception of the Logos is not found in Poimandres. This is beyond my evaluation.

closest to the highest Being, should speak.¹²² Lietzmann explains what is significant in the position of the Hermetists here and of others, like Philo, who share a similar point of view.

Das Eigentümliche dieser Stellen ist nicht die Ueberordnung des Sittlichen über das Kultische--das ist ja bereits für die Prophetenpredigt typisch und auch der griechischen Polemik der Philosophen wohlbekannt--sondern die Betonung, dass die Art des Opfers dem Wesen des *λόγος* entsprechen muss.¹²³

With the spiritualization of sacrifice and the removal of worship from externals the Hermetists stand on a pinnacle mounted by the Stoics: the individual comes to the fore. The Hermetists, however, take a different stance. The devotee is passive; he withdraws from activism. In complete renunciation of all external and even cultic activity the Hermetist is quiet. Unlike the Stoic he awaits his final perfection as a gift of God. *Logikê thusia* itself is a gift of God; it is grace.¹²⁴ Further, the rejection of external rites and offerings also spells the rejection of the community of worship.¹²⁵ The single worshiper has to do only with himself and God.

¹²²O. Casel, "Die *λογικὴ Θυσία* der antiken Mystik in christlich-liturgischer Umdeutung," Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft (Münster, Westf.: Aschendorff, 1924), IV, 38.

¹²³H. Lietzmann, An die Römer in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 8 Abteilung (Third edition; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1928), p. 108.

¹²⁴Seidensticker, XX, 42.

¹²⁵The *Hermetica* does not promote the practicing of a ritual, which is, however, essential for the mysteries.

The individual $\epsilon\nu\nu\alpha\upsilon\varsigma \ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is the receptacle of the Deity.¹²⁶

The God of the Hermetica is altered radically from the Stoic Weltvernunft to a transcendent Being. God is stuck away at an unreachable distance. He dwells in the ogdoad, far removed from empirical man. No audible praise, no thanks reaches his ear. He is unknowable except when he chooses to reveal himself and is only accessible by the flight of the soul. In the ecstasy of the mystic God discloses himself. The cult with its practices is rejected not simply as being superfluous as with the Stoic, but because the transcendent God is above the sensory world and can not be known through bodily perception.

The piety of the mystic, being ethically dualistic, is world-denying and ascetic.¹²⁷ His ethical behavior and his worship are a means to ecstasy. When the highest part of man is offered in speechless ecstasy, that is, without the logos of the mouth, this is logikê thusia. Logikê thusia points to the deep longing of the worshiper: his sacrifice is a means to penetrate deeper into the contemplation of God and into union with him.¹²⁸ Finally, after ascending from this world, the mystic will merge with the ogdoatic

¹²⁶Seidensticker, XX, 43.

¹²⁷Cf. Corp. Herm. I, 23.

¹²⁸Cf. Casel, IV, 39.

powers and lose his identity in God. For the Stoic, as we saw, to know is to do. For the Hermetist, to know is to become God.

Philo Judaeus

Philo, a Jew of Alexandria, was a contemporary of Paul, but this is about as far as any relationship can be drawn between the two men. Stacey, after showing how differently Paul and Philo use the same key words, concludes in effect that the only important resemblance between the men in this regard is in their mutual use of the Septuagint.¹²⁹ Paul proclaimed the Christian gospel. Philo was a propagandist for Hellenistic Judaism, though he was by no means representative of all Hellenistic Judaism.¹³⁰

Er sieht in Mose und den jüdischen Erzv Vätern die wahren Urbilder des Weisen und Philosophen und in der jüdischen Bibel die Schatzkammer aller Weisheit.¹³¹

The large amount of written material left behind by Philo shows that he was a loyal Jew and at the same time well-versed in Hellenistic philosophy. Philo built a loose eclectic

¹²⁹W. D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man (London: Macmillan & Co., 1956), p. 221.

¹³⁰W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited in the third edition by H. Gressmann (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1966), XXI, 436-438. Bousset points out here that Philo was not in fact cherished by later Judaism and would have fallen into obscurity if it had not been for Christians who were attracted to him. Cf. also p. 455.

¹³¹H. Hegermann, "Das hellenistische Judentum," Umwelt des Urchristentums (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1967), I, 332.

system. What resulted was a syncretism which was unified by Philo's burning zeal for the true God and by his devotion to the divine law as revealed to Moses. To bring out the eternal truths of the Old Testament, especially the Pentateuch, in terms of both Hellenistic philosophy and Judaic faith was the task which Philo set before himself.

What estimation one makes of Philo depends largely on what measure is applied to him. Hegermann compares Philo favorably with Palestinian Judaism:

So ist Philo im Grundzug seiner Werke ein Theologe des biblisch-jüdischen Schöpferglaubens und hat als Prediger nicht Tugendideale, sondern Gehorsam gegen die göttliche Thora verkündet. Der Glaubensverkündigung des AT ist er durch die unmittelbarere Beziehung auf die Bibel in manchen Punkten näher gewesen als das palastinische Judentum. ¹³²

On the other hand, Sevenster, who published a study on Philo, compares Philo with the Old Testament faith and says in his book Paul and Seneca:

It is noteworthy that the Old Testament has no equivalent for the Greek word ἀρετή. It is only Hellenistically influenced Judaism that adopts the word. Philo's writings, for example, are full of it. He is, however, never able to derive it from the Old Testament texts, but introduces it by way of his lengthy allegories, with the aid of which he transplants Biblical words into quite a different climate of ideas. The mere fact that "virtue" is a central ethical notion in Philo proves that he was estranged from the essential message of the books of the Old Testament, in spite of his obvious familiarity with them and the sincerity of his desire to point out to his contemporaries the significance of the Old Testament for them. ¹³³

Philo interprets the biblical passages literally and

¹³²Ibid., I, 342.

¹³³Sevenster, IV, 152-153. Cf. footnote 130 infra.

allegorically. He usually only makes exclusive use of allegory when the literal meaning is not clear or is unworthy of God. He does not endorse the practice of some who reject the literal meaning outright.

There are some who, regarding laws in their literal sense in the light of symbols of matters belonging to the intellect, are overpunctilious about the latter, while treating the former with easy-going neglect.¹³⁴

Philo, as a rule, holds to the literal meaning while at the same time expounding the inner meaning.

It is true that receiving circumcision does indeed portray the excision of pleasure . . . but let us not on this account repeal the law laid down for circumcising Nay, we should look on all these outward observances as resembling the body, and their inner meanings as resembling the soul If we keep and observe these [laws], we shall gain a clearer conception of those things of which these are symbols.¹³⁵

Philo does not reject material sacrifice. How could he renounce the literal meaning of cultic ordinances! He himself offered both sacrifice and prayer to God at the Temple in Jerusalem.¹³⁶ Philo does raise some of the commonplace objections to the abuse of sacrifice. To those who do not practice righteousness and nevertheless sacrifice, he says:

God does not rejoice in sacrifices even if one offer hecatombs, for all things are His possessions . . . but He rejoices in the will to love Him and in men that

¹³⁴Philo, Mig. 89 Translation of De Migratione Abrahami by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Philo with an English Translation (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949-1953), IV.

¹³⁵Philo, Mig. 92-93; cf. whole section 86-105.

¹³⁶Philo, Prov. II, 64.

practise holiness, and from these He accepts plain meal.¹³⁷

Philo also discards the notion of the mechanical working of sacrifice:

If the worshipper is without kindly feeling or justice, the sacrifices are no sacrifices . . . the prayers are words of ill omen For, when to outward appearance they are offered, it is not a remission but a reminder of past sins which they effect.¹³⁸

Again, others must have been more concerned with the condition of the victim than their own hearts, biblically speaking, or their own minds, Hellenistically speaking.

So he who intends to sacrifice must consider not whether the victim is unblemished but whether his own mind (*διάνοια*) stands free from defect Let him examine the motives which determine him to make the offerings.¹³⁹

Wolfson, after noting the above passages and others, makes this conclusion:

There is no indication that sacrifices are rejected by Philo as an improper means of divine worship; there is only an insistence that they must be inspired by a right motive and that they must be accompanied by righteous conduct.¹⁴⁰

The Hebrew prophets¹⁴¹ and Philo's contemporaries¹⁴² raised

¹³⁷Philo, Spec. Leg. I, 271. Translation of De Specialibus Legibus by Colson (alone), VII. There is no rejection of sacrifice as a proper means of divine worship. Cf. H. A. Wolfson, Philo (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), II, 243.

¹³⁸Philo, Mos. II, 107. Translation of De Vita Mosis by Colson, VI.

¹³⁹Philo, Spec. Leg. I, 238. ¹⁴⁰Wolfson, II, 247.

¹⁴¹I Sam. 15:22; Hos. 6:6; cf. Chapter III, pp. 50-56.

¹⁴²For example see Rabbinic Judaism, Chapter III, pp. 67-70.

criticism against the abuse of the cult and its sacrifices. It is clear that Philo also rejects the notion of sacrifice without corresponding piety. Philo, like other Jews,¹⁴³ can also speak of a man offering sacrifice without a victim.

If he is pure (of heart) and just, the sacrifice stands firm, though the flesh is consumed, or rather, even if no victim at all is brought to the altar. For the true oblation, what else can it be but the devotion of a soul which is dear to God?¹⁴⁴

It would seem as if Philo is thoroughly reflecting the Hebraic concern for proper sacrifice and the meaning of it. Philo, however, works with a Hellenistic dualism, which colors his thinking about sacrifice. "Es ist der Gegensatz von Geist und Materie, ideellem und materiellem Sein, oder um in Philos eigenem Sinn zu reden, von Gott und Welt."¹⁴⁵ For Philo God is utterly transcendent, yet the God to whom faith is directed. Empirical man is a twofold being.¹⁴⁶ He belongs to two worlds;

¹⁴³This is true of writers in the Old Testament, inter-testamental literature, the Rabbis and so forth; cf. Chapter III.

¹⁴⁴Philo, Mos. II, 108. The words in parenthesis are not in the Greek text. In Plant. 126 Philo says that the honor worthy of God "must be expressed by means of hymns of praise, and these not such as the audible voice shall sing, but strains raised and re-echoed by the mind too pure for eye to discern." God is not genuinely honored by buildings and sacrifices. (Translation of De Plantatione by Colson and Whitaker, III.)

¹⁴⁵Bousset, XXI, 441.

¹⁴⁶For Philo there are two men described in the initial chapters of Genesis. One is the heavenly man, who is in the image of God and who has no part in corruptible or earthly substance. The earthly man is a creature of "dust," not an offspring as the heavenly man. Cf. Leg. All. I, 31-42; Op. 134-147 for Philo's elaboration.

he is spirit and material, soul¹⁴⁷ and body. Philo is particularly concerned with man as a rational being. In connection with Gen. 2:7 he writes:

We must account the man made out of earth to be mind (noûs) mingled with, but not yet blended with, body. But this earthlike mind is in reality also corruptible, were not God to breathe into it a power of real life; when He does so, it does not any more undergo moulding, but becomes a soul, not an inefficient and imperfectly formed soul, but one endowed with mind and actually alive; for he says, "man became a living soul."¹⁴⁸

Within the soul--which appears in Philo to have two parts or aspects, a seat of desire and a seat of reason--is the noûs.¹⁴⁹ The mind is the dominant element in the soul.¹⁵⁰ Without the πνοὴ βωή, however, it would have remained corruptible and irrational.¹⁵¹ God breathed into the earthlike noûs, and it became a living, intelligent (νοερά) soul. The rational soul governs the irrational soul, or as Philo

¹⁴⁷"The term 'soul,' when applied to man, is used either in a general sense so as to include both the irrational and rational souls or in a special sense with reference to the rational soul. For the latter, the more specific term is mind (noûs) or common equivalents of the term mind." Such equivalents are δῖάνοια, λόγος, πνεῦμα, λογικὸν πνεῦμα; Wolfson, I, 362. Wolfson supplies the relevant passages.

¹⁴⁸Philo, Leg. All. I, 32. The translation of Legum Allegoria is by Colson and Whitaker, I.

¹⁴⁹Philo, Quis. Her. 64. Cf. footnote 147 infra; Stacey's comments on the soul, p. 216; and Hegermann, I, 336. The rational and irrational aspects of the soul cause the conflict in man between good and evil; cf. Wolfson, II, 288-290.

¹⁵⁰Philo, Leg. All. I, 39.

¹⁵¹Philo, Leg. All. I, 32. Wolfson says that noûs here is used loosely in the sense of the irrational soul; cf. I, 362.

here says:

The mind imparts to the portion of the soul that is devoid of reason a share of that which it has received from God, so that the mind was be-souled by God, but the unreasoning part by the mind. For the mind is, so to speak, God of the unreasoning part.¹⁵²

"By 'man' I mean not the living creature with two natures," Philo says, "but the highest form in which the life shows itself; and this has received the title of 'mind' and 'reason.'"¹⁵³ In respect to his mind (*διάνοια*) man is allied to the Logos; but in respect to his body he is allied to the world.¹⁵⁴ Reasoning (*λογισμός*) is "a piece torn off from the soul of the universe (*τῆς τοῦ παντὸς ψυχῆς ἀπόσπασμα*) . . . a faithful impress of the divine image."¹⁵⁵ What makes a man a man, for Philo, is the fact that the higher aspect of his soul is a *μίμημα* and *ἀπεικόνισμα* of God, who is "the Archetype of rational existence."¹⁵⁶ Philo says, however, that God made man not "the image of God" but "after the image." Thus between the mind of man and his Maker stands a "paradigm,"

¹⁵²Philo, Leg. All. I,40; the same idea is in Op. 69.

¹⁵³Philo, Det. 83; nous and logos. Translation of Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Solet by Colson and Whitaker, II.

¹⁵⁴Philo, Op. 146.

¹⁵⁵Philo, Mut. 223. Translation of De Mutatione Nominum by Colson and Whitaker, V.

¹⁵⁶Philo, Det. 83; Quis Her. 231.

the Logos.¹⁵⁷

Philo's view of man is Hellenistic. Man is seen as being related to God by his higher nature, the rational soul or the mind. What enables man to think about divine things is the noûs. Man's highest task is to contemplate his better self, to turn from the world and to find his way back to his heavenly origin or back to God.¹⁵⁸ This high life--and here Philo begins to leave Hellenism to a degree--is outside of natural life because the transcendent, unknowable God is beyond natural existence and beyond all human knowledge and probing.¹⁵⁹ Yet man, since he has noûs, is able to gain some conception of the real, living God.¹⁶⁰

Man seeks God in faith--Philo holds to a personal God; his intensity here sets him apart from Hellenism.¹⁶¹ To apprehend God one must withdraw from the body, the senses and even one's own mind; they must in turn be dedicated wholly to God.¹⁶² It is God who, by his grace ($\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$), enables the mind to be changed and redirected, when diverted, to its proper course; it is God who recalls the noûs from its

¹⁵⁷Philo, Quis Her. 231; cf. Plant. 18.

¹⁵⁸Philo, Quis. Her. 63-70; cf. Bousset, XXI, 442.

¹⁵⁹Philo, Som. I, 66-67, 68-69.

¹⁶⁰Philo, Quod Deus 143; cf. Spec. Leg. I, 345.

¹⁶¹Philo, Abr. 268; cf. Bousset, XXI, 446-447.

¹⁶²Philo, Quis. Her. 71-74.

bodily, sensory and even intellectual meandering.¹⁶³ All praise is then to be rendered to God.

Whenever the mind goes out from itself and offers itself up to God . . . then does it make confession of acknowledgement towards the Existent One. But so long as mind supposes itself to be the author of anything, it is far away from making room for God and from confessing or making acknowledgement to Him. For we must take note that the very confession of praise itself is the work not of the soul but of God who gives it thankfulness.¹⁶⁴

Philo deals with sacrifice on two levels--external and outward, and inward, of the soul. Both levels are important; the latter is indispensable. What is crucial in sacrifice is not the sacrifice itself, but the inner disposition of the sacrificer. For the law demands first that the mind be sanctified, and consistent with that, that the offerer have done no injustice.¹⁶⁵

The inward offering of the pious soul is the superior offering. This can be illustrated by the deeper meaning that Philo finds in the two altars at the sanctuary. An altar of unhewn stone for bloody sacrifice is outside the sanctuary;

¹⁶³Philo, Leg. All. II,32; cf. 24-34; III, 42-44. Philo says that, after God made the mind of man, he then added sense perception to make the soul complete (Leg. All. II,24). Sense perception was added after man had been put to sleep (Gen. 2:21). From this Philo draws the principle that "when the mind has gone to sleep . . . perception begins," and conversely, when the mind is awake perception is quenched (24-25). Philo then points out how the necessities of the body (29), and the wakefulness of the senses (30) divert the mind from its appropriate work.

¹⁶⁴Philo, Leg. All. I,82.

¹⁶⁵Philo, Spec. Leg. I,203-204.

within the sanctuary is a molded gold altar for incense.

Philo comments:

The least morsel of incense offered by a man of religion is more precious in the sight of God than thousands of cattle sacrificed by men of little worth. For as gold is better than casual stones and all in the inner shrine more sacred than what stands outside, so and in the same measure is the thank-offering of incense superior to that of the blood of beasts.¹⁶⁶

Not only is the offering of incense superior to the blood of beasts, but Philo states:

The symbolical meaning is just this and nothing else: that which is precious in the sight of God is not the number of victims immolated but the (true) purity of a rational spirit in him who makes the sacrifice.¹⁶⁷

When the will itself is the right sacrifice, then the thought of a pure inner cult within the soul is reached. The superlative place for worship is not the temple "made with hands." It is impossible to genuinely express gratitude to God with external things, such as buildings or the customary sacrifices, because the whole world would not be an adequate offering to God.¹⁶⁸ The highest and truest temple is the world.¹⁶⁹ There is another temple though.

¹⁶⁶Philo, Spec. Leg. I, 275.

¹⁶⁷Philo, Spec. Leg. I, 277; cf. 283-290. The word parenthesized is not in the Greek text.

¹⁶⁸Philo, Plant. 126.

¹⁶⁹Philo, Spec. Leg. I, 66. Philo, of course, has high regard for the Temple at Jerusalem; cf. 67.

One worthy house there is--the soul that is fitted to receive Him. Justly and rightly then shall we say that in the invisible soul the invisible God has His earthly dwelling-place.¹⁷⁰

"The soul alone can truly pray, give thanks, and offer sacrifice without blemish."¹⁷¹ Philo says (in regard to prayer) that men honor God

sometimes with the organs of speech, sometimes without tongue or lips, when within the soul alone their minds recite the tale or utter the cry of praise. These one ear only can apprehend, the ear of God, for human hearing cannot reach to the perception of such.¹⁷²

For Philo the ceremonial ordinances are the serious demand of God, but they also have a deeper significance. He sees also in these laws symbolic expressions of eternal truths or guides to be understood allegorically.¹⁷³ Ethics are important for Philo, but his overriding concern is religious.¹⁷⁴ The nature of the deeds for which Philo calls are not social or covenantal, though these are by no means inconsequential for Philo. His ethics are world-denying and ascetic when it comes to the decisive *métier* of the mind.¹⁷⁵ The purpose of

¹⁷⁰Philo, Cher. 100-101. The translation of De Cherubim is by Colson and Whitaker, II. Cf. also footnote 144 infra.

¹⁷¹S. G. Sowers, The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews in Basel Studies of Theology (Zürich: Erv-Verlag, 1965), I, 53.

¹⁷²Philo, Spec. Leg. I, 272; cf. Plant. 126.

¹⁷³For example, Philo, Mig. 89-93. "Der äussere Kultus ist ihm nur Hinweis auf das viel wichtigere, innerseelische Geschehen, auf die mystische Hingabe der Seele an Gott"; Wenschkewitz, IV, 82. Cf. W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament (London: SCM Press, 1961), I, 170.

¹⁷⁴Cf. Bousset, XXI, 445

¹⁷⁵Wenschkewitz, IV, 82.

his ethics is the emancipation of the soul from the body and ecstasy. It is the mystical giving of the rational soul which is the essential goal of the pious man. According to Philo, a man's primal task is to know the unknowable God and then to honor him. Only noûs, which received the divine breath and which is the ἀπόκαταμνηθῆναι Θεῶν, can receive and accede to the knowledge of him who is not called by name, τὸ ὄν .¹⁷⁶ And this it achieves out of love for God and by God's grace.¹⁷⁷

What we have seen is that Philo treats sacrifice literally and spiritually. However, his thought must be put into perspective. For Philo a problem like sin centers not in original sin nor in the total corruption of man, but in man's imperfection occasioned by the duality of his nature.¹⁷⁸ The rational soul must be purified if it is to ascend from its earthly confines of the body.¹⁷⁹ The practice of sacrifice, the execution of the divinely prescribed ritual of

¹⁷⁶On τὸ ὄν see Dodd, pp. 4,7.

¹⁷⁷"Während alle philosophische Ethik auf dem Vermögen des Menschen basiert, ist für Philo nach vielen Belegen die höchste Gottlosigkeit die φιλαυτία, in der sich der Tugendbeflissene seine guten Werke selbst zuschreibt"; Hegermann, I, 337. The opposite of φιλαυτία (Philo, Sac. 58; Post. 52; Praem. 12) is φιλόθεος (Spec. Leg. I,271; Quis. Her. 82; Abr. 50).

¹⁷⁸Hegermann, I, 339. Philo, by his strategic positioning of piety, renders the sin offering of little use. Cf. Wenschkewitz, IV, 82.

¹⁷⁹For Philo's view of the body see Leg. All. III,71; I,108; Mig. 9; and Bousset, XXI, 441-442.

sacrifice, and the performance of deeds in keeping with sacrifice--be these deeds social or ascetic--all contribute to the cleansing of the rational soul and the mind.¹⁸⁰ The whole man, with his body, his sense perception and his nôûs, ought and must be dedicated to God in praise and thanksgiving. In a word, sacrifice, both literal and spiritual, serves the purpose of training the rational soul, of purifying it, and preparing the soul for its flight to God. The struggle of faith leads to the vision of the invisible, transcendent God.

¹⁸⁰Philo, Spec. Leg. I, 269.

CHAPTER III

SACRIFICE AND JUDAISM

Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Presuppositions for Post-Exilic Judaism

The faith of the Old Testament, being related to God's word and work in history, is different than the philosophies and religions of Hellenism and the ancient Near East. It is not linked to nature¹ or mythology² but constituted and shaped by God's calling of Israel with the words "I am the Lord."³ Yahweh's election presupposes divine initiative and also excludes any kind of natural relationship between God and men.⁴ It is this fact which gives the covenant between Yahweh and Israel its distinctiveness and enables the cult to be understood.

The covenant relationship between God and his people is

¹The Old Testament gives man dominion over the earth (Gen. 1:26); he is not to confuse himself or God with nature. E. Jacob says that in the Old Testament the only legitimate attitude for man before nature is that of sovereignty; E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), p. 265.

²For the faith of Israel history is of decisive importance, not timeless truth.

³Cf. H. J. Kraus, Gottesdienst in Israel (Second enlarged edition; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1962), pp. 145-146. For a discussion of the holiness of God as the basis for Israel's worship see A. H. Herbert, Worship in Ancient Israel in Ecumenical Studies in Worship (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959), V, 5-6.

⁴Cf. G. v. Rad, Old Testament Theology (London: Oliver & Boyd, 1962), I, 130-131.

one of God's own making. This relationship is stimulated and preserved by Yahweh's promise and judgment. The word "judgment" gives an ethical character to the covenant; at the same time it points to a covenantal ethic which is determined neither by the degree nor the quality of Israel's response to God but rather by the holiness and sovereignty of Yahweh. God weighs and judges; he has called a people into his service. The law which was given to Israel is an absolute demand of God; performance of the law, however, neither creates nor maintains the covenant. The law, rather, presupposes the covenant.

The law is not . . . an unconditional and vaguely existing mass with regard to which two possibilities were equally available--fulfilment and non-fulfilment, good works and bad ones, reward and punishment, blessing and curse. The law, rather, presupposes the view which calls the Old Testament the covenant between God and people, which was established by Yahweh on his own initiative and which is bound up with the promise freely made by Yahweh. On the basis of this law, which can and does demand fulfilment, there is no place for the idea of good, meritorious works and a reward which may be earned thereby; the blessing is not earned, but freely promised. On the basis of this law there is only one possibility for man of having his own independent activity; that is transgression, defection, followed by curse and judgment.⁵

Evil and disobedience can not stand before Yahweh; he is the Holy One. Herein lies one of the functions of sacrifice within the covenant. Through sacrifice God issues new life

⁵M. Noth, "For all who rely on works of the law are under a curse," The Law in the Pentateuch and Other Studies (Second enlarged edition; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1961), p. 131.

and restoration. Out of his sovereignty and holiness God acts and speaks.⁶ He is not bound by the cultic and sacrificial ordinances and forms at all. On the contrary, God commanded these ordinances as a means of expiation and preservation of communion with his people. Because he commanded them merit, as well as any hold upon the Lord of the covenant, is excluded from their practice.⁷ Sacrifice is grace, the gift of the saving God.

For the covenant-breaker restoration is a gift of God's mercy. This means that the service (הַקָּרְבָּנִים) to which the restored man is called is a privilege, a calling, a new life created by God's free action. The life which the covenanter has restored ought to be joyful, renewed obedience to Yahweh. "Das grosse Ereignis des Alten Testaments ist die Einfügung des gesamten Opferdienstes in das Heilsgeschehen und die Tatsache der בְּרִית." ⁸

Unfortunately it does happen that sacrificial obligations are observed while covenantal love and duties are neglected.

⁶Jacob says that behind the three main forms of sacrifice (gift, communion and expiation) there are "three aspects of a single purpose which was to ensure the revelation of God. And so we think that the sacrifice takes its place in the general purpose of the cult, which is the affirmation of God's sovereignty"; cf. pp. 268-269

⁷W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament (London: SCM Press, 1961), I, 164.

⁸Kraus, Gottesdienst, pp. 145-146.

The paradoxical opposition between social ethics and cultic obedience arose already in early times. Samuel has to call for obedience rather than sacrifice (I Sam. 15:22). The latter prophets also reject the idea that sacrifice and ethics can be separated.⁹ Isaiah calls for justice and correction of oppression rather than sacrifice (Is. 1:11-17); Hosea for love and knowledge of God (Hos. 6:6); Micah for justice, love of kindness and humble walking with God (Micah 6:6-8); and Amos for allegiance to Yahweh (Amos 5:5-6).¹⁰ Before 596 B. C.

⁹Eichrodt says that the prophets' protest against abusing sacrifice, "by regarding it as an act with intrinsic value, not only safeguarded God's sovereign right to forgive even where no sacrifice was offered, but made it clear that the rightful status of the cult as the machinery of divine grace could only obtain within the framework of the covenant relationship." Eichrodt, I, 168.

¹⁰A statement concerning the types of sacrifice in the Old Testament will be helpful. Jacob (pp. 268-269) says the three main forms of sacrifice are: (1) gift (halocaust): זֶבֶח (sometimes זֶבֶח, Ps. 51:21 in MT), זֶבֶח; (2) communion: זֶבֶח, זֶבֶח; (3) expiation: זֶבֶח, זֶבֶח. To these three forms the incense offering may be added: זֶבֶח (זֶבֶח). According to R. de Vaux these terms are not always clearly distinguished; on the basis of the latest and most complete ritual in Leviticus de Vaux says the following. The זֶבֶח was a sacrifice in which the whole victim was burned; the purpose seems to have been to do homage to God, though in the Priestly Code it had an expiatory value. The communion offering was a "sacrifice of thanksgiving to God which brings about union with him." The ritual in Leviticus 7 divides communion-sacrifices into three types: (a) זֶבֶח, the sacrifice of praise; (b) זֶבֶח, the voluntary offering, "offered out of devotion, not because of any precept or promise"; and finally (c) זֶבֶח, the votive sacrifice, offered by a person who had bound himself by a vow. The expiatory sacrifices were offered "to re-establish the covenant with God when it had been broken by the sin of man." Cf. R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), pp. 415-423.

It is worth noting that in none of the above prophetic

Jeremiah warns his hearers not to cry, "The Temple, the Temple, the Temple," when confronted with the divine word of judgment.¹¹

It is often said that Israel returned from Exile as Jews. As exiles, away from the Temple and amid non-Jews, they rallied around the Torah. Upon returning to Palestine, painstaking adherence to the law was undertaken by a people conscious of their election.

In the exilic and post-exilic prophets the polemic against cultic practices is not limited to ethics, but is grounded also in the awareness of Yahweh's universal majesty. No animal sacrifice is adequate for Yahweh (Is. 66:1-5). Indeed Jerusalem is still lauded as the eschatological focal point for worship (Isaiah 60), and those who worship there must still bring offerings worthy of the Lord of the whole world (Mal. 1:6-14).

We turn to the Psalms to understand the background for the spiritualization of sacrifice which took place in post-exilic Israel and Judaism.¹² In Psalm 40 not sacrifice but

passages are the words for expiatory sacrifice used; only those for the communion and gift sacrifices occur. The overriding issue is not reconciliation, though this is important (Micah 6:7), but rather walking in covenant with God.

¹¹It is not a matter of man and the cult, but of man and God. "Der Ruf zum Recht, zur Gerechtigkeit und zum Gehorsam will das in der **ה'ר'א** gegründete personale Gegenüber von Gott und Mensch wiederherstellen." Kraus, Gottesdienst, p. 46. The point of Kraus in his context is that the cult is not magic.

¹²By this statement I do not mean that the psalms to be

the Torah is central (verses 6 to 8);¹³ worship is not centered in the priestly office alone but also in the pious worshiper.¹⁴ The emphasis on the Torah is linked with the ethical demands of the pre-exilic prophets. "I delight to do thy will . . . thy Torah is within my heart" (verse 8 = MT verse 9). The psalmist accordingly goes before Yahweh without sacrifice. What sacrifice is worthy of God? Man can only listen and obey. The whole sacrificial cult is pushed aside.¹⁵ The pious worshiper virtually says, "Ich selbst bin das Opfer!"¹⁶

The majesty of the Weltherr colors the cultic worship of Psalm 50. God owns the wild beasts (verse 10). Therefore he does not need the domesticated animals of man (verse 12). God is not hungry (verse 13). What Yahweh demands¹⁷ is

considered are all post-exilic. According to A. Weiser "only a comparatively small number of psalms can . . . be proved conclusively to have originated in the post-exilic period"; A. Weiser, The Psalms (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), p. 25.

¹³References to chapter and verses are according to the Revised Standard Version of the Bible unless otherwise noted: LXX = Septuagint; MT = Massoretic Text.

¹⁴H. Gunkel, Die Psalmen in Handkommentar zum Alten Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926), II,ii, 170.

¹⁵Weiser, p. 338. In Ps. 40:7 (MT) all three main categories of Old Testament sacrifice are set aside by the psalmist. Cf. footnote 10 infra.

¹⁶H. J. Kraus, Psalmen in Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960), XV, i, 309.

¹⁷The Lord himself sits in judgment over the sacrificial cult (vv. 7-15). Kraus notes the use of the authoritative prophetic "I" in this section; Kraus, Psalmen, XV, i, 367.

הַיְהוֹדָה ¹⁸ (verse 14). This is not a polemic against the sacrificial cult; but it should be observed that the presentation of "thanksgiving" is set into sacrificial terminology.¹⁹ Though spiritualization is not present here in Psalm 50, the psalm is available for such an interpretation.

The essence of the cult does not consist . . . of the external offerings of sacrifices and the observance in man's intercourse with God of a ritualism borrowed from the Canaanite environment; rather it consists of the humble testimony which is borne by the cult community in praise of God, and of man's obedience to God's commandments, and so of a piety which is in real earnest about the manifestation of God's nature and will that took place in the cult, and which acts accordingly.²⁰

Israel cannot charm Yahweh with its offerings as do the other nations in sacrificing to their gods. Thanksgiving is the only response worthy of God's majesty.

According to Psalm 69 **הַיְהוֹדָה** is better than animal sacrifices (verses 30 to 31). It must be remembered that in

¹⁸In Lev. 7:12 the **הַיְהוֹדָה הַזֶּה** is a sacrifice designated for thanksgiving; here in Ps. 50:14 thanksgiving is the sacrifice.

¹⁹MT = **הַיְהוֹדָה** . . . **הַזֶּה**; LXX (49:14) = **θύραρον τῆ θείῃ θυρίδι** (!) **ἀνέρεως**. **הַיְהוֹדָה** is used in (MT) Pss. 27:6; 42:5; 50:23; 69:31; 95:2 in cultic settings, especially in 69:31 which will be taken up next. In these passages cited, the LXX has various renderings. However, the translation of the LXX here in Ps. 49:14 heightens the sacrificial aspect of thanksgiving or praise, a fact which was not to be overlooked later. Kraus (Psalmen XV, I, 378) warns against seeing a spiritualization of sacrifice here; when the technical term **הַזֶּה** is used, "so wird man hier doch wohl an die Mahlgemeinschaft des Schlachtopfers denken dürfen, die nun allerdings einen neuen Sinn und Inhalt empfangen soll."

²⁰Weiser, p. 393.

early times sacrifice was presented accompanied by a thanksgiving ceremony.²¹ In this psalm the two are pitted against each other with **הַתְּפִלָּה** coming out on top. The psalmist himself, nevertheless, is a (persecuted) devotee of the Temple (verses 9-10); he is not opposed to the cult per se.²²

"Beides ist so zu vereinigen, dass der Dichter beim Tempeldienst von den blutigen Opfer absieht, aber seine ganze Liebe den ihn begeisternden Gesangesfeiern darbringt."²³

In Psalm 141 **הַתְּפִלָּה** (prayer, verse 2) has the effect of spiritualizing two old cultic words for unbloody sacrifice (incense, **קָטֹרֶת**, and the grain offering, **הַקֹּמֵחַ**). "Hier soll das fromme Lied, das sonst das Opfer begleitete, an die Stelle der Handlung selber treten."²⁴ The worshiper is not anti-cultic,²⁵ but is trying to "appropriate the world of the cult" to himself.²⁶ As the individual person seeks meaning in his worship a new point of reference is established within the cult, namely, personal piety. This

²¹Kraus, Psalmen, XV,i, 484.

²²The psalm perhaps reflects controversies concerning the sacrificial cult at Jerusalem. Cf. Weiser, pp. 493-494.

²³Gunkel, II,ii, 297.

²⁴Ibid., II,ii, 596. Also Weiser, p. 811.

²⁵"But my eyes are towards thee, O Lord God," indicates that the worshiper is in the Temple; cf. Weiser, p. 812.

²⁶G. v. Rad further explains that we have "the intrusion of rational thinking into the patriarchal cultic world"; G. v. Rad, I, 397-398.

development can contribute to the spiritualization of the cult as well as to the deepening of man's relationship with God in cultic worship.

Psalm 51 has a beautiful balance between the prophetic ethic and the demands of sacrificial worship.²⁷ The problem of forgiveness is introduced in the opening verses of this penitential psalm. For forgiveness the psalmist can only trust God's promise. The writer asks for forgiveness and then renewal. He makes a vow. With his lips he will praise God in the midst of the congregation for his deliverance. The forgiven and restored man will turn other sinners from their ways. He also vows to bring sacrifice after his deliverance (not an expiatory sacrifice!). In the older psalms the fulfilment of such a vow was an animal sacrifice of praise.²⁸

²⁷The tension between the broken spirit as an acceptable offering (נִזְבֵּחַ, v. 17 = MT v. 19) and the non-expiatory communion (נִזְבֵּחַ) and gift (תְּרוּמָה) offerings in which the Lord does not delight (v. 16 = MT v. 18) is resolved by the appendix (vv. 18-19), which was added later in the view of most commentators; cf. Weiser, p. 410. If verses 18-19, which say that God delights in communion and gift offerings, were added later (perhaps when the Temple was rebuilt after the Exile), they still bring out the criticism of the prophets that sacrifices must be sacrifices of righteousness (קִרְבָּנֵי צְדָקָה, MT v. 21). It is difficult to place verses 16-17 and 18-19 into the mind of the same writer, unless forgiveness, renewal and submission to God are seen as the necessary preparation for burnt offerings. Kraus (Psalmen, XV,i, 391) says that the concluding verses point ahead to Rom. 12:1 and at the same time hold fast to the Old Testament cultic law and the worship which is regulated by cultic law.

²⁸Kraus, Psalmen, XV,i, 390; Gunkel, II,ii, 225.

The psalmist is familiar enough with these sacrifices. But he boldly says that God has no delight in **עֹזָה** and **חַבֵּל** (MT, verse 18).²⁹ What this man will offer to God after his deliverance is a broken spirit. This sacrifice, described in cultic terminology,³⁰ is the one that is acceptable to God.

No substitutionary sacrifice is offered here. The psalmist offers himself:

The sacrifice that God demands is a sacrifice of man's self-will and self-importance; in other words, it is the surrender of man's own self to God.³¹

Unlike the sacrifices against which the prophets raised voices of protest, this sacrifice will not be declared invalid. In the light of the last verses of the psalm it can be said that the prophetic demand and the cult merge with a call for reformation of sacrifice.³²

Sacrifice in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

In Psalm 141 **קָפְלָה** was placed side by side with the

²⁹The psalmist is speaking of what sacrifice he will bring after his deliverance, so the expiatory sacrifices are not mentioned in verses 18-21 (MT). Cf. footnote 10 supra.

³⁰MT (v. 19) = **זָבַח־יְלֵה־יָם רִחַ וְשִׁבְרָה** ;
LXX (50:19) = **θυσία γὰρ ψαλμὸς ἁγίου σου τὸ πνεῦμα σου**.

³¹Weiser, p. 410.

³²Kraus, Psalmen, XV, i, 390.

incense and meal offerings.³³ Wenschkewitz points out that prayer was not only a part of the sacrificial ritual, but was also used in non-cultic worship.³⁴ Since prayer carried its sacrificial association from cultic to non-cultic life, it was possible for any pious activity to take on sacrificial overtones by association with prayer. The more the emphasis was placed on prayer or praise in the rite of sacrifice, the more the actual sacrifice descended from its position of dominance. This aided the interiorization and spiritualization of the cult and its sacrifices. Sacrifice was not set aside; however, pious deeds also became sacrifices. In the extra-biblical literature spiritualization of sacrifice and a theory of substitution are prominent.

O. Schmitz³⁵ and H. Wenschkewitz separate the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical materials into categories based on their attitude toward the cult. The most favorable attitude is in books like the Hellenistic³⁶ Sibylline Oracles III, and

³³Cf. pp. 47-48 supra.

³⁴H. Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung der Kulturbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament," Angelos, Archiv für neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte und Kulturkunde, IV (1932), 13.

³⁵In Die Opferanschauung des späteren Judentums und die Opferaussagen des Neuen Testaments (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1910).

³⁶Those books designated Hellenistic were written outside of Palestine (mostly in Alexandria) in Greek originals; those designated Palestinian were written in Palestine, all of them probably in Aramaic or Hebrew originally.

the Palestinian books of Jubilees and 1 and 2 Maccabees.³⁷

In the second group is the Palestinian Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach or Ecclesiasticus. Here sacrifice appears as the presentation of gifts to God which have been prescribed by the law. Sacrifice presupposes that the offerer will have influence upon God and receive a recompense.³⁸ For Sirach sacrifice does not have expiatory character in itself;³⁹ faithfulness to the law on man's part is what matters. Sirach has a statement which captures the general attitude toward sacrifice in the extra-biblical literature being considered.

He who keeps the law makes many offerings;
 he who heeds the commandments sacrifices a peace offering.
 He who returns a kindness offers fine flour,
 and he who gives alms sacrifices a thank offering.
 To keep from wickedness is pleasing to the Lord,
 and to forsake unrighteousness is atonement.
 Do not appear before the Lord empty-handed,
 for all these things are to be done because of the commandment.

³⁷Sibyl. Or. III demands obedience to the law (255-260); rejects pagan sacrifices, while at the same time consoling "all the sons of God" who will in the Messianic age "process to the Temple" and "ponder the law of the Most High" (562-570; 573-583; 702-720); and urges repentance and sacrifice (624). "All must sacrifice to the Mighty King" one day (808). Translation of the Oracles by H. C. D. Lanchester, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, edited by R. H. Charles (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913), II. Hereafter AP. In Jubilees the sacrificial laws are read back into the lives of the patriarchs; repentance is essential in sacrifice since God does not regard persons or gifts (5:16-17). 1 and 2 Maccabees will be dealt with later.

³⁸Schmitz, p. 68.

³⁹Ibid.

The offering of a righteous man anoints the altar,
and its pleasing odor rises before the Most High.
The sacrifice of a righteous man is acceptable,
and the memory of it will not be forgotten.

.
Give to the Most High as he has given,
and as generously as your hand has found.
For the Lord is one who repays,
and he will repay sevenfold.⁴⁰

In the final grouping (of attitudes toward sacrifice) is the Hellenistic Sibylline Oracles IV. It has a negative attitude. The peoples (of Asia and Europe), it says, will disown all temples and stones "befouled with constant blood of living things and sacrifices."⁴¹

As to the value placed upon sacrifice in these books, three classifications are used by Wenschkewitz.⁴² Those books which speak of expiation through cultic sacrifice are in the first division.⁴³ The second division includes those

⁴⁰ Eccles. 35:1-11. Translation from The Apocrypha of the Old Testament, Revised Standard Version, edited by B. M. Metzger (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 173.

⁴¹ Sibyl. Or. IV, 27-30. This passage might only refer to the sacrifices of the pagan and not be a polemic against all sacrifice. Book IV was probably written after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem in any event. Cf. O. Eissfeldt's dating in The Old Testament, An Introduction (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 616. Cf. 2 Enoch 45:1-3; 59:1-2. Sibyl Or. III, IV, V are of Jewish origin; cf. C. T. Fritsch, "Pseudepigrapha," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), III, 961.

⁴² Wenschkewitz, IV, 14.

⁴³ Here is the Hellenistic 2 Enoch or The Book of the Secrets of Enoch; this book does, of course, say that God "demands a pure heart" on the part of the sacrificer; yet sacrifice is held highly in its own right; cf. 59:1-2; 66:2; (also 54:3), but 45:3. Jubilees and Sibylline Oracles III also belong here; cf. footnote 39 supra.

books which respect sacrifice because it is demanded by the law. The Palestinian Psalms of Solomon (as well as Ecclesiasticus), for example, view the cultic practices through the law.⁴⁴ There is a reverence for the Temple (Ps. Sol. 8:10-19), but it is to the pure heart, much more than the Temple, that expiation is attached. The unmerited grace of God is for the pious. Also (Palestinian) 2 Esdras (4 Ezra) laments the destruction of the Temple, but this poses no problem for forgiveness (10:21-22) since the Lord is merciful to the humble and pious (10:24; 16:51-78).⁴⁵

The third and last group places value on cultic law as the embodiment of the national and religious hopes and claims of Judaism. In this division heroes of Israel's past are praised. In 1 Maccabees obedience to the law (2:51) and faithfulness to the ritual cult are demanded (2:68). These aspects of religious piety are linked to the past heritage and to people like Aaron and Daniel for motivation. The Palestinian Book of Judith says that every sacrifice is a "small, little thing," but "he who fears the Lord shall be great forever" (16:16). Yet even Judith as a prominent figure is careful to carry out the prescribed sacrificial rites of the law (16:18-19).⁴⁶

⁴⁴Wenschkewitz, IV, 15.

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶Translation by A. E. Cowley, AP, I.

Under the influence of Hellenism The Wisdom of Solomon says that the wise man who has been tested is accepted as a whole burnt offering (3:6). God is pictured as gracious and merciful: "For even if we sin, we are thine, knowing thy dominion; but we shall not sin, knowing that we are accounted thine."⁴⁷ Knowledge of God is righteousness (15:3); ignorance leads to sin. Ritual sacrifice is small in comparison to wisdom. Schmitz remarks:

Bei dieser Seichtigkeit des Schuldgefühls ist es kein Wunder, dass auch das Sühnedürfnes sich sehr schwach entwickelt zeigt, und darum die Opfersühne weder kritisiert noch empfohlen wird, so freundlich der Verfasser dem Opferbrauch im allgemeinen gegenübersteht.⁴⁸

Two further documents merit consideration: the Hellenistic Letter of Aristeas and the "Palestinian" Testament of Levi in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The Letter of Aristeas, which defends the Torah and asserts its superiority to Greek philosophy and wisdom, is largely indifferent to the expiatory value of ritual sacrifice. When the writer speaks of offering tame, not wild, animals in sacrifice, this means symbolically "offering the soul in all its moods" (170). Aristeas, the writer, does not eliminate cultic sacrifice completely (170, 172), but he emphasizes that God is not honored with outward gifts. God is honored with purity of

⁴⁷Wis. Sol. 15:2. Translation by S. Holmes, AP, I.

⁴⁸Schmitz, p. 128.

soul. The consecration of the inward soul is the real sacrifice.⁴⁹ In the Testament of Levi the angels in the third (?) heaven serve the Lord and implore him in behalf of all the sins of ignorance of the righteous; they bring to the Lord ὄσμὴν εὐωδίας λογικὴν καὶ ἀναίμακτον προσφοράν, "a sweet-smelling savour, a reasonable and bloodless offering" (3:6).⁵⁰

Portions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. One might wonder what Hebrew or Aramaic word lay behind the Greek λογικός. However, it seems on the basis of the fragments of the Testaments found at Qumran in caves I and IV that the Testament of Levi, in which λογικός is found, does not have any connection with the Testament of Levi found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Christian flavor of our Greek Testament of Levi suggests it is a Christian writing in the literary genre of the Essenes and the Qumran community.⁵¹ The concern of the writer (a converted Essene⁵² or Jewish

⁴⁹Aristeas was a forerunner of Philo. Philo too fits well into this section.

⁵⁰Translation by R. H. Charles, AP, II.

⁵¹The fragment of the Testament of Levi discovered at Qumran (cave IV) is "not similar to the one we know and has no Christian character whatsoever" according to J. Danielou, The Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity (New York: American Library, 1958), p. 116.

⁵²Ibid., p. 114.

Christian⁵³) is to pit the unbloody sacrifices of the heavenly sanctuary against the bloody sacrifices offered on earth. The use of the word λογικός in the Testament of Levi probably reflects the thinking of the wider circles in which the Stoics moved. It is also post-Pauline.

The law looms large in this period. Its stipulations are to be carried out meticulously. Often sacrifice is offered even if little value is attached to it simply because it is commanded in the law. In the background of sacrifice in the psalms studied above is the thought that "was Gott im letzten Grunde will, ein Herz ist, das sich in Drangsal und Glück zu dem alleinigen Helfer bekennt."⁵⁴ In post-exilic Judaism, however, sacrifice is seen as something demanded from men by God, and so it lost its character as a gift of grace. "The obedience which it demonstrated became the thing that mattered; hence side by side with it grew up other acts of obedience of equal value."⁵⁵

In the section of Ecclesiasticus quoted above⁵⁶ it is clear that various moral actions and attitudes, which are not arbitrarily selected but are in accord with the law, are

⁵³J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea in Studies in Biblical Theology (London: SCM Press, 1959), X, 34-35.

⁵⁴Gunkel, II,ii, 217.

⁵⁵Eichrodt, I, 169.

⁵⁶Supra p. 51.

equivalent to or even superior to ritual sacrifice and also have expiatory value.

The offering of a righteous man who keeps the law is expiatory as is also the doing of kindness (Eccles. 35:1,2,7). Where no sacrifice, prophet or prince can find mercy, the contrite heart succeeds.⁵⁷ Alms work expiation (Tob. 4:12). The release of Jewish slaves is a thankoffering.⁵⁸ Prayer is sacrifice.⁵⁹ Martyrdom appeases God's wrath which is seen quantitatively and can be counterbalanced by compensating martyrdom.⁶⁰ In Philo substitutes or equivalents for ritual sacrifice are the soul,⁶¹ truth,⁶² virtue,⁶³ and faith.⁶⁴

Man now comes before God on the basis of his obedience or the execution of some action which is equivalent to ritual sacrifice. No polemic against cultic sacrifice is necessarily intended. What has happened is that ethical deeds and the

⁵⁷Dan. 3:39 (LXX) which is similar to Ps. 50:19 (LXX). But Daniel does not simply say that the contrite heart and lowly spirit is sacrifice; it is the equivalent of the sacrifice rejected in Ps. 50:18 (LXX) and moves into its place.

⁵⁸Aristeas 19:17.

⁵⁹2 Macc. 12:43-44; Dan. 3:40 (LXX).

⁶⁰4 Macc. 6:28-29; 2 Macc. 7:38.

⁶¹Philo, Som. II,74; Fug. 80.

⁶²Philo, Det. 21.

⁶³Philo, Sac. 51.

⁶⁴Philo, Cher. 85.

disposition of the heart are placed on the same level as the prescribed ritual sacrifice.⁶⁵ The same benefits apply to spiritual sacrifice as to cultic. For the most part atonement is the purpose of sacrifice in post-exilic Judaism.⁶⁶

Sectarian Attitudes toward Sacrifice

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Essenes denounced the official cult at Jerusalem, whose priests were accused of violating the sanctuary. Under these conditions the sectarians covenanted to avoid the Temple. They were not opposed to cultic worship per se; they did send offerings to the Temple, but through a ritually cleansed person.⁶⁷ At Qumran documents relating to the priesthood had been prepared and preserved by the covenanters with the hope, presumably, of one day exercising the duties of the priesthood at the Temple themselves.⁶⁸ Whether or not the sect (Essenes?) offered animal sacrifice of their own is a point of controversy.⁶⁹

⁶⁵Wenschkewitz, IV, 17, calls this the Äquivalenztheorie.

⁶⁶Cf. Eichrodt, I, 168.

⁶⁷G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962), p. 46.

⁶⁸F. M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran (Revised edition; New York: Doubleday & Co., 1961), p. 101.

⁶⁹The bones of animals, slaughtered and eaten, found at Qumran raise the possibility of animal sacrifice; cf. Cross, pp. 102, 120. T. H. Gaster says that it is hard to see "how a community so firmly committed to the traditional law could ever have countenanced sacrifice outside the 'chosen place,'" in "Sacrifices and Offerings, OT," The Interpreter's Dictionary

The covenanters considered their own piety to have expiatory and atoning value. Moreover, in keeping with their sectarian attitude, they believed that their piety was more acceptable to God than sacrifice as it was being carried out at that time in Jerusalem. The Manual of Discipline is important here.

When these become members of the Community of Israel according to all these rules, they shall establish the spirit of holiness according to everlasting truth. They shall atone for guilty rebellion and for sins of unfaithfulness that they may obtain lovingkindness for the Land without the flesh of halocausts and the fat of sacrifice. And prayer rightly offered shall be as an acceptable fragrance of righteousness, and perfection of the way as a delectable free-will offering. At that time, the men of the Community shall be set apart as a House of Holiness for Aaron for the union of supreme holiness and (as) a House of Community for Israel, for those who walk in perfection.⁷⁰

The sect did not reject sacrifice, but in view of the intolerable situation in which they deemed the cult at Jerusalem to be, they attached the value of ritual sacrifice to their pious suffering and prayers.⁷¹

of the Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), IV, 158. As to the problem of whether Josephus says the Essenes did or did not offer sacrifices of their own, see L. H. Feldman's note (a) in Josephus with an English Translation (London: William Heinemann, 1965), IX, 16-17. Cf. Philo, Quod Om. Prob. 75, who says the Essenes served God, not by offering the sacrifice of animals, but by resolving to sanctify their minds.

⁷⁰1QS 9:3-6. Translation by Vermes, p. 87.

⁷¹Cf. J. M. Baumgarten, "Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumrân) Scroll," Harvard Theological Review, XLVI (1953), 149.

Rabbinic Judaism and Sacrifice

The Seder Kodashim of the Mishnah presents a detailed account of the sacrificial cult from the time of the second Temple. This in itself, especially in view of the fact that the Mishnah was codified after the destruction of the Temple, shows the rabbinical concern for the sacrificial cult. In the tractate Taanith of the Mishnah it is said that the daily burnt-offerings in behalf of the people (the Tamid) ceased and finally on the ninth day of the month Ab the Temple was destroyed; ruefully it is said: "When Ab comes in, gladness must be diminished."⁷² With the ruin of the Temple Rabbi Joshua cried, "Woe to us, for this house lies in ruins, the place where atonement was made."⁷³ Without question sacrifice in the Temple was valued highly by rabbinical Judaism, not only as ordained by the law, but as a divine means of expiation and atonement.

The destruction of the Temple was a severe blow to Judaism. Nevertheless Judaism was able to carry on remarkably well without the sacrificial cult. While sacrifice was still being conducted at the Temple, it was believed that the essential element in sacrifice was repentance. "With the

⁷²Mishnah, Moed, Taanith 4,6. Translation by H. Danby, The Mishnah (London: Oxford University Press, 1950).

⁷³'Aboth D'Rabbi Nathan 20^a; translation from A. Cohen, The Minor Tractates of the Talmud (London: The Soncino Press, 1965), I.

cessation of the cultus repentance itself was left the sole condition of the remission of sins."⁷⁴ In place of the sacrificial apparatus repentance and its fruits, good works, were regarded as equivalent.⁷⁵ Even before the destruction of the Temple the Jews in Palestine and the Diaspora used a theory of equivalence. The Rabbis too could speak of the expiatory and atoning value of prayer,⁷⁶ deeds of kindness,⁷⁷ the reading of the law,⁷⁸ repentance,⁷⁹ and the disposition of the heart⁸⁰ as being equivalent and even superior to the sacrifices of the cult.

The rationale for substitution was not dependent on the destruction of the Temple for its formulation. The validity of this theory of equivalence was seen in the written tradition. Already the prophets had called for obedience rather

⁷⁴G. F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1946), I, 505.

⁷⁵Ibid., I, 506.

⁷⁶bT Berakoth 32^b; Tanhuma B., Zaw VIII, 9^a, cited by C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe from Buber's edition in A Rabbinic Anthology (New York: Meridian Books, 1963), p. 346.

⁷⁷bT Sukkah 49^b.

⁷⁸bT Taanith 27^b; bT Megillah 31^b; bT Menahoth 110^a; Tanhuma B., 'Ahere Mot 35^a, cited by Montefiore and Loewe, p. 119.

⁷⁹bT Berakoth 23^a; Tosefta Yoma 5,9 (Z., p. 190, line 22), cited by Montefiore and Loewe, p. 323, from Zuckermann's edition.

⁸⁰Cf. H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926), III, 296 and 26.

than sacrifice. Rabbi Simeon ben Gamaliel said, "Do not sneer at justice." He quoted the written tradition to give weight to his admonition: "To do justice . . . is better than sacrifice" (Prov. 21:3). Justice could be done at all times, but sacrifice only while the Temple was standing. Sacrifice atoned for involuntary sins, but justice for voluntary and involuntary sins. Justice could be exercised in this world and the next, sacrifice only in this world by man.⁸¹ Again, sacrifice atoned only for a particular sin, but suffering for all.⁸² Suffering was also better than sacrifice because it effected the body whereas sacrifice effected the pocket.⁸³ Not only was there precedent in the written and oral tradition for the substitution on pious deeds for sacrifice, there was also at the destruction of the Temple a rationale at hand for embracing and developing the theory of equivalence.

The Pharisees, the immediate predecessors of rabbinic or post New Testament normative Judaism, had preserved a

⁸¹Deuteronomy Rabbah, Shofetim V, 1 and 3. Translation and citation from Montefiore and Loewe, p. 382.

⁸²Midrash, Ps. 118:18 (243^b, 16), cited according to folio and section of Buber's edition by Montefiore and Loewe, p. 543.

⁸³Mekilta, Bahodesh, Yitro 10, pp. 240-241, cited according to the edition of Horovitz by Montefiore and Loewe, p. 546.

long oral tradition which had a resilience.⁸⁴ When the destruction of the Temple occurred, they were able, unlike their opponents the Sadducees,⁸⁵ to adjust to the suddenness of the disappearance of the place of sacrifice. They could and did use the substitution of pious deeds for ritual sacrifice.

The attitude and teaching of the Pharisees in regard to sacrifice was codified by their successors the Tanna'im in the Mishnah and also the later Gemara, which together with the Mishnah comprises the Talmud. Though the dating of the material in the Mishnah and Talmud is by no means easy, it can be safely presumed that rabbinic Judaism gives an insight into the Pharisaic view of ritual and spiritual sacrifice in the day of St. Paul.

The biblical tradition places Paul at the feet of a certain Gamaliel, who was a member of the Pharisaic Sanhedrin (Acts 22:3). Paul himself--until his conversion--had been a part of the Pharisaic movement which led to the drafting of the Mishnah. After his conversion, however, Paul's conception of sacrifice and its function was profoundly changed.

⁸⁴M. Black, "Pharisees," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), III, 777.

⁸⁵The Sadducees held only to the Pentateuch and then in a literal fashion; they opposed the living oral tradition of the Pharisees. With the destruction of the Temple the leadership of Judaism passed over fully to the Pharisees who could adapt to the situation.

CHAPTER IV

GOD'S WILL IN CONCRETE LIFE: SOMATIC SACRIFICE

Introduction

"I appeal to you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God," Paul begins in Rom. 12:1.¹ The mercies of God are the source and foundation of λογικὴ λατρεία.² God's mercy had already made Paul's readers what they are. Now this mercy presses them to the fulfillment of their new life in Christ. Paul's words are not his own (Rom. 15:18); he appeals as the spokesman of God, God making his appeal through the apostle (2 Cor. 5:20; 6:1). Paul calls for logikê latreia; yet this challenge for both Paul and his readers comes through the mercies of God. Paul's request is not therefore the voice of the law, but the voice of the saving God.³ The call for logikê latreia rests entirely on the new situation created and sustained by God's grace and δικαιοσύνη (Rom. 1:17). Without the activity of God's

¹Paul begins his exhortation by reminding his readers of the saving work of God; see Rom. 1:16; 3:20-22; 6; 8:1-13 and 11:32. Cf. R. C. Tannehill, Dying and Rising with Christ in Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1967), XXXII, 71.

²Hereafter logikê latreia.

³H. Schlier, "Vom Wesen der apostolischen Ermahnung nach Römerbrief 12,1-2," Die Zeit der Kirche (Freiburg: Herder, 1956), p. 80. Schlier says that, although Paul is the grammatical subject of the apostolic exhortation in "I appeal to you," the conceptual subject is nevertheless the mercies of God; cf. pp. 78-80.

mercies the exhortation of Paul would be powerless and general moralism.

In Rom. 12:1-2 Paul is concerned about the service which believers must render to God. Accordingly he directs them to two aspects of the proper response, the reasonable response, of the Christian to the mercies of God: (a) Somatic sacrifice which is the surrender of one's intercourse in the world to the rule of God, and (b) The transformation of the believer which is necessary to be enabled to test and prove what is the will of God in everyday life. Fundamental for logikê latreia is the once and for all giving of one's own self as σῶμα⁴ to God. This decisive surrender must be followed by a quest to grow in the affirmation of God's will. Briefly stated, logikê latreia is the surrender of the believer to the will of God.

Three adjectives modify θυρία⁵ in Rom. 12:1. Each epithet has its own distinctive meaning; yet they merge into one another and complement each other. These adjectives reflect the initiating work of God. Somatic sacrifice can be "living" only because God has created a new life situation in Christ. This life is holy because it is God's and in this new aeon is freed for God's service. The body given in response to God's mercy is an acceptable or well-pleasing

⁴Hereafter sôma. Sôma is man as he is related to the world. See infra p. 85.

⁵Hereafter thusia.

sacrifice to God⁶ because it is the concrete realization of God's dominion and rule inaugurated in Christ. On the part of the believer somatic sacrifice is the concrete dedication of himself to God's will in obedience ("holy") from the heart ("well-pleasing").

Somatic Sacrifice: Living

Paul calls for a somatic sacrifice which is "living." The combination "living sacrifice" is somewhat paradoxical. Sacrifice has the notion of death attached to it. The epithet "living" was not part of customary sacrificial language and not directly related to ritual sacrifice before or in Paul's day. In the sacrifice of animals the victim gave up its life.

In "living sacrifice" Paul has placed the ideas of death and life together, a living-dying.⁷ The background for living sacrifice is not the cultic sacrificial ritual⁸ but the death

⁶I take τῷ θεῷ with εὐάρεστον.

⁷Paul elsewhere speaks of Christians as dying, yet living: Gal. 2:19-20; 2 Cor. 4:8-16; 6:9.

⁸The adjective "living" ought not be emphasized so that the other two epithets modify "living sacrifice." This interpretation has led to pitting the somatic sacrifice of Christians against the "dead" sacrifices of cultic worship (even though these sacrifices were also living when offered); for this view see E. Gaugler, Der Brief an die Römer (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1952), II, 230; E. Kühl, Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1913), p. 416; M. Luther, Luther: Lectures on Romans, translated from the German by W. Pauck (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), XV,

and resurrection of Jesus in which the believer participates through his sacramental union with Christ.⁹ It was Christ who died and rose; the believer was baptised into his death (Rom. 6:3). Christ died; the believer through baptism was buried with Christ (Rom. 6:4). In other words, the believer lives in the new possibility created by Christ. He can have a new Lord. This does not mean he did not die. He died to sin in Christ (Rom. 6:4b, 11). The emphasis, however, is on Christ's death; his death broke the power of sin and makes possible a new life for the believer freed from the tyranny

323; et al. For a correcting view see H. Schlier, p. 83; and especially C. E. B. Cranfield, A Commentary on Romans 12-13 in Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers (London: Oliver & Boyd, 1965), XII, 9-10. It would be more reasonable to see a resemblance between Paul's sacrifice and animal sacrifice. F. J. Leenhardt says, "The putting to death of the deeds of the body resembles very closely the death of the sacrificial victim, a death which is intended to release life and produce a liberating, revivifying effect"; The Epistle to the Romans (New York: The World Publishing Co., 1961), p. 212.

⁹Cf. Rom. 6:13; 8:13. For brief discussions of the relationship of baptism to the death and resurrection of Christ see H. Schlier, "Die Taufe nach dem 6. Kapitel des Römerbriefes," Evangelisch Theologie, V (1938), 335-347; G. Bornkamm, "Taufe und neues Leben bei Paulus," Das Ende des Gesetzes, Gesammelte Aufsätze, I in Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie (Fifth edition; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966), XVI, 37-44; V. P. Furnish, Theology and Ethics in Paul (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968), pp. 171-181; and R. C. Tannehill. In baptismal union with Christ the believer does not lose his identity. The word union only says that Christ dwells in the believer and that the life of the believer is not his own except to accept it (Gal. 2:19-20). The continuing task of faith is to recognize the union which God has wrought between the believer and Christ. Faith exercises itself in appropriating this fact. The believer retains his identity in union with Christ as a believer.

of sin. Before baptism the non-believer was dead in sin (Eph. 2:1; Col. 2:13). Through union with Christ the believer died to sin's dominion (Rom. 6:2,6). He has no more life to give to it.

What life the believer has now, he has in Christ. This life is not a repetition of Christ's dying and rising, but is based upon the Christ event. The believer now dies to himself and sin in order to rise to life for God. In order to understand the quality of the believer's life in Christ, the living sacrifice must be seen in the light of Paul's sin/righteousness antithesis (Rom. 6:13,16-18). The non-believer was a slave under the power of sin, the law and death. His concrete life and the members of his body were bound in death. Likewise the concrete disposal of the body in righteousness exhibits Christ's life-giving Lordship. As the antithesis of sin, the believer's life in Christ is life from God and for God. It is deliverance from the old slave-master to life under a new Lord. It is deliverance from the old aeon to the rule of God (Gal. 1:4; Col. 1:13). "Thus man is saved because he has a new Lord. What God gives to man through Christ is himself as Lord."¹⁰

The body-sin relationship was destroyed (Rom. 6:6); the believer was delivered from the body under death (Rom. 7:24). Nevertheless the believer is still in a mortal body and a

¹⁰Tannehill, p. 82.

tempted body (Rom. 6:12; 8:11).¹¹ The believer must live under God's promise: "Sin will have no dominion over you, since you are not ὑπὸ νόμον but ὑπὸ χάριν" (Rom. 6:14). This is a promise, a promise to which the believer relates himself through faith. He is under grace; he is no longer under the domination of the old aeon. Since the believer still has a mortal and tempted body, he must "take heed lest he fall" (I Cor. 10:12,6). He must trust God, who will uphold him in temptation (I Cor. 10:13; Col. 1:23).

The foundation of the believer's life of obedience to God rests upon what Christ accomplished by his death and resurrection. Christ died to sin and rose to God. He inaugurated the kingdom of grace. Once and for all he established himself as Lord. Once and for all he founded a new dominion. The believer can only live under grace. However,

¹¹I do not take σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου (Rom. 7:24) and θνήσκον σῶμα (Rom. 6:12; 8:11) to be equivalent phrases; but see F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, a revision and translation by R. W. Funk of the 9-10th German edition of Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954 and 1959) (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), par. 165. I believe there is a distinction between phrases such as the body of sin (Rom. 6:6) and of death (Rom. 7:24) on the one hand and the mortal body (Rom. 6:12; 8:11) on the other. Through baptism into Christ the body of sin was destroyed as was the body under death. The believer still has a mortal body, though, and must resist its temptations (Rom. 6:12), and he must put to death the deeds of the body by the Spirit's power (Rom. 8:13). The fact that the mortal body can be presented to God (Rom. 6:13b; 12:1) and is indwelt by the Spirit sets it apart from the body of sin and death. The presentation of the mortal body to God is possible not by virtue of the body itself, but because it is under a new Lord.

the Christian still lives in and participates in the unredeemed world. He has a mortal body. As a member of the new aeon he must live in the present age by faith. "Consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 6:11). The believer is not to live as if he died to sin. He died to sin! He was delivered from the dominion of darkness and transferred into the kingdom of God's Son (Col. 1:13). Being "dead to sin" is not an ideal to strive for, but an eschatological fact. The life of the believer must now be a continuous manifestation and affirmation of his burial with Christ and rising to newness of life. The Christian must put to death the deeds of the body (Rom. 8:13) and what is earthly in himself (Col. 3:5). He must place himself at God's disposal. The paradox of a living sacrifice includes both dying to sin and living to God. A man's dying to himself and to sin releases his life for God. Since the Christian is a member of the new aeon, he has in reality no more life to give to the old powers.

Somatic Sacrifice: Holy

God's will for his people is their growth in holiness (I Thess. 4:3). This holiness is not the production or accumulation of moral deeds. It is none other than the rule of grace or Spirit in the believer. In the Old Testament the word "holy" denotes "being set apart." Israel was created a holy people by God's calling and set apart for his service.

Paul is in accord with the Old Testament.¹²

In the background of Paul's thinking about holiness is his affirmation that the created world belongs to God even though at the present time it is under the powers of darkness and the dominion of the old aeon.¹³ The believer was called for holiness or God's service in this present evil age (I Thess. 4:7). He not only has been set apart for God's work but is himself the recipient of new life created by the Spirit. This life is determined by the believer's relationship to Christ. Without Christ man is subject to the powers of this world which exercise their rule over his sôma. The life of the believer is not of this world, but under the rule of grace. Consequently its nature and function is not to serve the powers of this world or the flesh, but to live through baptismal union with Christ for the praise of God's glory (Eph. 1:11-14).

A key thought for the response of the Christian to God's calling to holiness is obedience. Yielding to the world (Col. 2:20) or being conformed to this aeon (Rom. 12:2) is of little value in checking the flesh (Col. 2:23) and leads to disobedience and death. Obedience, on the other hand, brings to light righteousness, not of one's own as

¹²Paul sees himself as set apart for the gospel (Rom. 1:1). Romans itself was written to present Paul's program of bringing the nations to obedience to the gospel (Rom. 1:5; 15:14-21).

¹³Rom. 1:20; I Cor. 2:6; 2 Cor. 4:4; Gal. 4:3.

under the law, but of grace, and leads to sanctification and life (Rom. 5:18-21; 6:19-22). This obedience is absolutely necessary because to be freed from sin does not mean one is free to do whatever he wishes. That is slavery. As Paul sees man his life is determined by powers without. He can be either a slave of unrighteousness or of righteousness. Obedience to God shows that the believer confronts the present age in which he lives as a slave of the new aeon. He has a new Lord.

What is done in the body is not a matter of indifference. How a man engages in life in this present aeon is vital. Paul does not reject the body as did the Stoics and the writers of the Hermetica in a dualistic manner. What is crucial for Paul in this age is not deliverance from the tempted body--which is not possible--but the deliverance of the body from subjection to the dominion of sin, law and death. The body is the temple of the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 6:19) and a member of the Body of Christ (I Cor. 6:15-16). The body is meant for the Lord, and the Lord for the body; as God raised the Lord, he will also raise the body on the Last Day (I Cor. 6:13-14; 15:44). As Christ entered the flesh to overcome sin (Rom. 8:3), so the Spirit enters the believer and leads him against the flesh (Rom. 8:5; Gal. 5:17). The Spirit becomes the standard of the new life (see $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\nu\epsilon\omega\sigma\mu\alpha$ Rom. 8:4). As the members of the body once served sin, so now they ought to be weapons of righteousness (Rom. 6:13),

and they ought to serve with equal zeal (Rom. 6:22).

God called the believers (Rom. 1:6-7). They have been set apart for his service by this call. Christians are not called upon for moral deeds of their own devising, but are called to surrender themselves to God's will in obedience to the gospel. Somatic sacrifice is holy in that the believer gives himself to the end for which he was and is called.

Somatic Sacrifice: Well-pleasing to God

What is pleasing (ἀρέσκειν) to God is the fulfilling of his saving will. Those who yield themselves to this will are offering a sacrifice pleasing to God. Those who withstand this saving will, for example, by hindering the proclamation of the gospel (I Thess. 2:15-16), are under wrath. The believer must understand that he lives in Christ and that his activities must be determined by this fact. He ought to imitate God in Christ (Eph. 5:1-2). The placing of the body at God's disposal corresponds to God's will and is an acceptable sacrifice.

In the Old Testament what was pleasing to God was not sacrifice but sacrifice coupled with obedience from the heart. The mere execution of ritual stipulations allowed for the possibility of duplicity on the part of the sacrificer.¹⁴

¹⁴In the folk religions, against which the Hellenistic philosophers inveighed, sacrifice was a means of appeasing the wrath of the gods and influencing them. O. Schmitz says that in post-exilic Palestinian Judaism sacrifice was executed

Paul in a similar fashion warns slaves of the eschatological community (slaves of righteousness) to serve their earthly masters not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but as serving the Lord (Ep. 6:5-8; Col. 3:22).

The sacrifice of the community of saints rules out duplicity. The concrete disposal of the body in love and obedience to God is itself the sacrifice. Sacrifice and sacrificer are one. This phenomenon is a manifestation of the new aeon. The will of the Lord and the will of the believer meet in the believer's relationship to the world through his sôma. The believer must serve God from the heart in actual life in the old aeon. In this sacrifice the saving will of God is being affirmed.

Called by God the Christian is not to seek to please himself. That is the standard of the old aeon to which the believer must not be conformed. The believer ought not to seek to please himself (Rom. 15:1) nor to press for his own advantage (I Cor. 10:33). The antonym to pleasing oneself is not "to detest oneself"¹⁵ but (as in Rom. 15:1) "to bear

as God demanded, but often to further the will of those who sacrificed, a will which may or may not have been in accord with the will of God; cf. Die Operanschauung des späteren Judentums und die Opferaussagen des Neuen Testaments (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1910), p. 194.

¹⁵W. Foerster notes that the expression is used this way in Epic., Diss. II, 18, 19; cf. "ἀπερκεω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), I, 455.

with the failings of the weak" or "to deny oneself."¹⁶ Paul is not appealing for physical or spiritual martyrdom, but love. In response to the gospel he calls for the service among men of the new, not the old, aeon. Denying oneself means to bear a brother's weaknesses and pursue mutual edification (Rom. 14:9; 15:5; Gal. 6:22). If to serve a brother one must deny himself, this is God's good will and the sacrifice of the new aeon which is well-pleasing to God.¹⁷ Foregoing meat offered to idols, if eating would injure a brother's faith, is well-pleasing to God, serving the Lord (Rom. 14:18; I Cor. 10:31-32), and walking in love (Rom. 14:5). Paul's concern is that the Christian not destroy the saving work of God in the believing community just to satisfy himself (Rom. 14:19-20). Moreover, in the world the believer ought to try to please all men, that they might be saved (I Cor. 10:33). The pattern for giving oneself for another is Christ himself, the Head of the new aeon, whom the Christian ought to imitate as Paul himself does (Rom. 15:3,7-8; I Cor. 11:1).

Pleasing all men is to be based upon the gospel and not done at the expense of the gospel. As a slave of Christ Paul does not empty the gospel of its power to please men (Gal. 1:10; I Cor. 1:17). In bringing the gospel to men,

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Cf. Phil. 4:18.

Paul strives to please God who tests the heart (I Thess. 2:4,15). Paul's defense of his ministry in a letter to the Thessalonians centers in the integrity of his pastoral concern as a bearer of the gospel to men (I Thess. 2:1-13). He sees himself as obligated to bring the nations to obedience to the gospel (Rom. 1:5). Paul prays many times that his hearers might be strengthened by the gospel and thus be enabled by its power to live in a manner worthy of eternal life.

Paul exhorts his readers in Rom. 12:1 to present their bodies as a sacrifice well-pleasing to God. *Εὐάρετος*, with one exception (Titus 2:9), refers to God's attitude toward the conduct of the believer.¹⁸ Not eating meat offered to idols for the sake of a brother (Rom. 14:8), the obedience of children to their parents (Col. 3:20), the gift of the Philippians to the imprisoned apostle (Phil. 4:18) are all acceptable to God. All indicate that man's relationship to his outside world must be placed under the Lordship of Christ.

The reference to the body given once and for all as a sacrifice well-pleasing to God (Rom. 12:1) looks ahead to Rom. 12:2, where Paul asks his hearers themselves to test (approve) what is pleasing to God (Eph. 5:10; 2 Cor. 5:9). In all walks of life and in all circumstances (Col. 1:10)

¹⁸Foerster, I, 457.

in this present aeon the believer must seek to please God. This dedication of the body to God's will is the crown of the life of faith.

Somatic Sacrifice: Λογικὴ Λατρεία

The connotations of sōma are somewhat fluid in Paul,¹⁹ but important in Rom. 12:1. The meaning here is best illustrated by Romans 6. Paul has said that the body of sin was destroyed (Rom. 6:6). The believer ought to reckon himself dead to sin and alive to God (Rom. 6:11). "Therefore," Paul continues, "let not sin reign in your mortal σώματα" (Rom. 6:12); this means: "Do not place your members as weapons of unrighteousness at the disposal of sin (Rom. 6:13a). Positively Paul urges: "Put yourselves at God's disposal" (Rom. 6:13b); this in turn means: place "your members as weapons of righteousness at God's disposal" (Rom. 6:13c). Again Paul says: "As you placed your members as slaves at the disposal of iniquity . . . so now place your members as slaves at the disposal of righteousness" (Rom. 6:19). In Rom. 12:1 Paul exhorts his readers to present their sōmata (plural) as a sacrifice.

Sōma in Rom. 6:12 is parallel to ἑαυτοῦς in Rom. 6:13b; it can be translated "oneself." This is true also in Rom. 12:1;

¹⁹Cf. W. D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man (London: Macmillan & Co., 1956), pp. 181-193; R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 192-203.

The New English Bible, for example, translates sômata as "selves." However the retention of bodies as a translation of sômata is to be preferred. The Stoics and the writers of the Hermetica (as well as much of modern day piety) could applaud the surrender of the self to the good. But Paul makes his point inescapable by using sôma rather than the reflexive pronoun. Paul is talking about the surrender of one's physical self in the broad sense. Tannehill says that for Paul sôma

refers to man in his openness to that which is outside of himself. Man as body is man-in-relation. He is open to be essentially conditioned by his participation in what is larger than himself. Sôma is not that which distinguishes one person from another, but that which relates him to others and which forms the basis of a self-determining participation in self-transcending realities. Thus sôma is clearly man in his physicalness, that is, in his connection to the outside world and interaction with it.²⁰

When addressing more than one person in a similar context, Paul uses sôma in the singular as well as the plural. This is not inadvertence on Paul's part, but reflects his

²⁰Tannehill, pp. 70-71. K. Barth says, "Now, the body is the observable, historical man, of whom alone we have knowledge"; The Epistle to the Romans, translated from the 6th German edition by E. C. Hoskyns (London: Oxford University Press, 1950), p. 429. E. Käsemann, suggesting a correction of Bultmann's analysis of sôma, writes: "Doch geht es beim paulinischen Begriff des Leibes nicht ausschliesslich und vor allem um die Personalität des Menschen, sondern zum mindesten an den theologisch bedeutsamsten Stellen um seine Fähigkeit zur Kommunikation und die Realität seiner Zugehörigkeit zu einer ihn qualifizierenden Welt"; E. Käsemann, "Gottesdienst im Alltag der Welt (zu Rm 12)," Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1960), p. 167.

view of man as sôma. In presenting sômata to God the believers are not offering something they have, but what they are. When Paul exhorts, "Let not sin reign in your (plural) mortal body," he is not thinking about their individualism (to use a modern term), but about what they are. They are mortal body. In Rom. 12:1 Paul does not qualify sômata with μέλη . He is referring to the whole of man's relationship to the outside world. The rest of chapter twelve shows that this includes how a man relates to others by his members, his emotions and his mental capacities.

"Sôma exist for and to something or someone. It is determined by what has power over it."²¹ The reign of sin manifests itself in the body and its members. But the body is meant for the Lord (I Cor. 6:13). The believer must let the claim of God show itself forth in his relationship with the world. The believer must let his life be determined by the cross and resurrection of Christ Jesus; he must dedicate himself to God's service in his intercourse with the world. In short, Paul appeals for his readers to "present your bodies as a sacrifice--living, holy and acceptable to God" (Rom. 12:1).

In Paul there appear no sacrifices which are not outwardly embodied. Though Paul uses thusia only five times, it is worth noting that he does not advocate any spiritualization of sacrifice. There is no logikê thusia in the sense

²¹Tannehill, p. 71.

that man has a higher nature with which to honor God. Further, Paul does not take occasion to say that prayer or the reading of the law is sacrifice. Paul is not interested in a theory of substitution at all in regard to sacrifice. Paul aims at the zenith of service to God which is the giving of oneself as sôma to the will of God. Further, Paul sees Christ's offering of himself for others (Eph. 5:2) and the material gift of the Philippians which he received (Phil. 4:18) as sacrifice to God. Paul pictures his possible martyrdom as sacrifice (Phil. 2:17); he was willing to offer himself for others, and not martyrdom or some acts of piety to God (as a substitutionary means of atonement). Concreteness, corporality, how a man relates to the world, are consistent with Paul's thoughts on sacrifice of the body. Paul sees the believer under grace in a new relationship to the world. Paul is not merely talking about a Weltanschauung or of the disposition of the heart, though these are not excluded. He goes beyond that to outward action where the issue of obedience is at stake, where the Christian man under grace meets the world of everyday life.

The offering of the body is described by Paul in sacrificial terminology.²² In cultic action the offerer places

²² Παριστάσαι θυσίαν is a technical term in the language of Hellenistic sacrifice. Cf. O. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer in Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Thirteenth edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), p. 291, footnote 5.

his sacrifice at the disposal of the Deity with a finality. In Rom. 12:1 the aorist infinitive calls for the surrender of sômata in sacrifice once and for all, with decisiveness and without reservation.²³ Continuation in sin does not take into account the reality of the new life already created by grace. The mercies of God challenge the believer to bring forth somatic sacrifice, but the believer is challenged in such a way that the very challenge brings out the new situation in which the believer stands. Paul does not ask his readers to gain the initial victory over sin (Christ did that), but he asks them to commit themselves to it. Since the believer is still in the mortal body, God's mercies must challenge and re-challenge him. Paul's use of the aorist infinitive does not mean that the believer need not renew his surrender, but it does indicate that logikê latreia demands total and decisive commitment. Without this decisive surrender of one's sôma in concrete life, slavery to righteousness is not seriously entertained.

In apposition to "present your bodies as a thusia which is living, holy and acceptable to God," is not simply latreia, but logikê latreia. The word logikos was a favorite word of

²³In Rom. 6:13a Paul's charge to cease yielding one's members as weapons of unrighteousness is in the present imperative. The believer must constantly be on guard against the temptation and deeds of the body (Rom. 6:12; 8:13). The demand to present oneself as sôma to God for righteousness is in the aorist imperative (Rom. 6:13b, 19b). In order to engage in the struggle against sin the believer must decide and re-decide to let the cross determine his life with decisiveness.

Hellenistic philosophers. In general logikos in Hellenism referred to the higher or intelligent aspect of man which distinguished him from animals and other forms of being. Without being technical the word would mean either "spiritual" or "rational." The word logikos was undoubtedly in current use in the pagan circles in which Paul worked. The materials which were examined earlier in this paper offer abundant evidence of that.

Paul, in my opinion, took the word logikos and placed it into a new setting, while maintaining its general meaning. Since Paul only uses the word once there does not seem to be any recourse other than to settle for either "rational" or "spiritual" service (to God) or worship as the translation of logikê latreia. In using this favorite word of Hellenism, Paul applies it not to man, however, not to thusia, but to latreia. What kind of worship is consonant with this high expression of Hellenism? Or, for Paul, what kind of worship corresponds to the new aeon? Or, what kind of service to God corresponds with truth? There seems to be little evidence that Paul works with a theology of the Logos. In Paul logikos does not appear to mean "corresponding to the Logos." Nor can logikos mean "spiritual" in the sense that logikê latreia is that service which issues from the supernatural event in Christ. Then Paul would be indicating with logikos the worship of the new aeon. However, if one were compelled to choose between "spiritual" and "rational," "rational" would seem to be the best choice. Logikos in its general

Hellenistic use referred to the intelligent aspect of man. Paul said earlier that the heathen have a "base mind" (Rom. 1:28). The very fact that Paul speaks of the renewal of the mind in Rom. 12:2 would argue in favor of "rational" as the translation of logikos in Rom. 12:1. Somatic sacrifice is what Paul calls reasonable or rational service to God. Contrast the life of a man with a renewed mind in Christ with the life of a man with a noûs under the flesh (Col. 2:18). The life which issues from the noûs under the power of the flesh is in striking contrast to that of the renewed noûs. One is filled with boasting, self-reliance and self-centeredness; the other bears the fruits of the Spirit such as faith, hope and love.²⁴

The thrust of reasonable service to God is at odds with what we discovered in the Hellenistic and much of the extra-biblical literature. The sacrifice which is τῷ θεῷ εὐάρεστον is not directed immediately to God, but brings God's love into man's intercourse with others. Christ gave himself for others; this is sacrifice to God. The believers must imitate the pattern of Christ. Somatic sacrifice is different than the logikê thusia of the mystic which is hermetically sealed between the wise man and his God, or the Stoic virtus which is determined by what corresponds to man's true manhood. Somatic sacrifice which is submission of a man's will to God's

²⁴Cp. Rom. 1 and 12. Cf. G. Bornkamm, "Faith and Reason in Paul's Epistles," New Testament Studies, V (1957-1958), 93-100.

will is often at odds with sacrifices in extra-biblical literature. Here sacrifices at times serve as a means of bringing God to some desired course of action such as guaranteeing the preservation of nationalistic hopes.

The setting for self-surrender is first of all--as a minimal demand--the Christian cult, and secondly, and equally important, the world. The highest expression of worship is to stand in the freedom of Christ in order to serve others, both believers and non-believers, in love. Love is the fulfilling of the law of the covenant which in the Old Testament was not established to create an in-group or a sect.²⁵ Israel was to be a light to the nations.

Love is at the core of reasonable worship.²⁶ Love in Christ, if it be genuine, reaches into concrete everyday life and brings the redeeming power of God to men within and without the fellowship of Christ. After Rom. 12:1-2 Paul proceeds in the remainder of his letter to urge his readers to let God's rule be manifested in their intercourse with those within and without the Christian community. The task is not easy; commitment is required. The task is not to be taken lightly; it is the reasonable and serious

²⁵Cf. Gal. 5:13-14.

²⁶If Paul has a polemic in Rom. 12:1, which I am suggesting, it lies in the unreasonableness of the worship of God which is divorced from ethics. For Paul, of course, ethics cannot be separated from his understanding of salvation. Cf. Tannehill, p. 82; Bornkamm, Studies, V, 100.

demand of God in Christ. The task is not idealistic; the believer already stands in the new aeon with Christ as his Lord. In this present evil age the life of the world to come takes the form of somatic sacrifice. For Paul this is the only conclusion to be drawn from his soteriological assertions in the chapters preceding Rom. 12:1-2. "Therefore, my brothers, I appeal to you, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a sacrifice . . . which is your reasonable service" (Rom. 12:1).

They are no longer of the world, they are still in the world (1 Cor. 5:10). Bought with a price, they must glorify God in their body (1 Cor. 6:20). The way the members in Christ's sphere relate to the world is crucial.

There are no areas in the Christian's life in which he can settle for independent action. There is no adiaphoron in the sense of the Stoics. What God's will is for the individual Christian and the worshipping community, however, is not always spelled out. The examples and teachings of Christ and the leading figures in the primitive church are models and patterns to be emulated, but they are not, and are not intended to be, detailed blueprints for everyday living. The law itself, which is God's will, is not co-extensive with his will. Further,

1. V. P. Furnish, who also points out that there is no appeal to the law in Rom. 12:1-2, and further that God's will is continually being revealed to man, cf. Theology and Ethics in Paul (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1963), pp. 101-102, footnote 67.

CHAPTER V

SEEKING GOD'S WILL IN CONCRETE LIFE

Seek God's Will!

Paul is concerned about the moral life of believers in Rom. 12:1-2. Christians are new moral beings because they have a new Lord. They have been set apart (Rom. 1:1,6-7). They are in a new realm within this present evil age (Col. 1:13). They have a new Weltanschauung (Col. 3:1-4). Though they are no longer of the world, they are still in the world (I Cor. 5:10). Bought with a price, they must glorify God in their body (I Cor. 6:20). The way the members in Christ's sphere relate to the world is crucial.

There are no areas in the Christian's life in which he can settle for independent action. There is no adiaphoron in the sense of the Stoics. What God's will is for the individual Christian and the worshiping community, however, is not always spelled out. The examples and teachings of Christ and the leading figures in the primitive church are models and patterns to be emulated, but they are not, and are not intended to be, detailed blueprints for everyday living. The law itself, which is God's will, is not co-extensive with his will.¹ Further,

¹V. P. Furnish, who also points out that there is no appeal to the law in Rom. 12:1-2, and further that God's will is continually being revealed to man; cf. Theology and Ethics in Paul (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968), pp. 104-105, footnote 67.

Christians cannot rely on the immediacy of the Spirit in ascertaining God's will. There are many areas and circumstances in which the believer will need to find out for himself what the will of God is.

Paul introduces a new step in Christian ethics in Rom. 12:1-2.² He writes to Christians whose situation he does not fully know, yet he can counsel them in the matter of finding out what the will of God is in concrete everyday life. Paul urges his readers to prove (by testing) what God's will is. Δοκιμάζειν³ is not superfluous. Paul presses his demand. His appeal is based on a singular motivation: in response to the mercies of God the man in Christ must examine his life in this present aeon and in his Christian life test for God's will with a view toward pleasing God.

Paul believes that Christians are able to discern and approve God's will. This ability resides in their new sphere of existence. They are no longer in Adam, but in Christ (Rom. 5:12-21). Separation from the old aeon and its bondage, though a reality for the believer, is not irreversible. Paul's use of the present passive imperative

²Cf. E. Käsemann, "Gottesdienst im Alltag der Welt (zu Rm 12)," Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias in Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960), XXVI, 166.

³Hereafter dokimazein.

συσχηματίζεσθε⁴ shows that the old age, with its ethical content, has a menacing potential to influence and shape the existence of the baptized person. The believer must live in this present aeon, but in his Christian life he is urged to stand free from it. Man is always ruled. Either the old age or the Holy Spirit will have power over a man. The power of the flesh is stronger than man, and the believer, unaided by the Spirit, will fall under its dominion. Only the Spirit, who mediates the Victory of Christ, is stronger than sin. The Spirit enables the baptized person to live in detachment from the old evil age (Gal. 5:22-26). To reject the Spirit's power and leading, however, is to be prey for the power of the flesh (Rom. 6:18; 8:13; Gal. 3:3; 5:25). The Christian is always ruled; it is only a question of the proper Lord. Paul urges the members of the new aeon, "Do not be conformed to this present age" (Rom. 12:2).

It might appear as if Paul contradicts himself in urging his hearers not to be conformed to this present age. He has already said that in baptism the Christian died to sin and is alive and open to God (Rom. 6:3-4,11). Paul says in the indicative, as I see it, "You died to the powers of the old

⁴Hereafter suschematizesthe. The Greek uncial manuscripts A, D and G have two infinitives dependent on παρακαλῶ instead of imperatives in Rom. 12:2. Michel and the majority of other commentators say that the imperatives are surely the original form. Cf. Der Brief an die Römer in Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Thirteenth edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), IV, 292, footnote 2.

age"; in the imperative he urges, "Do not be conformed to this aeon." How can the old aeon, to which the baptized person died, continue to be a threat to the Christian man? This raises a question about the use of Paul's indicatives and imperatives.⁵

This much can be categorically stated: the imperative does not summon the believer to make his life in the sphere of Christ valid, but rather arises out of the absolute reality of the indicative, that is, of his inclusion in the realm of Christ;⁶ the indicative does not describe the ideal and then the imperative reality.⁷ Baptism is entrance into life under grace; the imperative can no more require the believer to make entrance again than one can be asked to be re-circumcised.

In order to answer the question as to whether Paul's indicative and imperative are in tension the relationship between them must be seen in its proper context. Christ died to sin once and for all. He rose from the dead. The believer

⁵Here is another example which illustrates the seeming paradox in Paul's use of the indicative and imperative. In the indicative Paul says, "As many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. 3:27); in the imperative, "Put on the Lord Jesus Christ and make no provision for the flesh" (Rom. 13:14).

⁶Cf. G. Bornkamm, "Taufe und neues Leben bei Paulus," Das Ende des Gesetzes, Gesammelte Aufsätze, I in Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie (Fifth edition; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966), XVI, 45.

⁷H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater in Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Thirteenth edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), VII, 265.

was baptized into Christ and lives in him in this present age. The dominion of the Lord is a fact, which the imperative does not question. It affirms it. The address of the imperative to Christians is based on their inclusion in the sphere of the Lord Jesus Christ. The imperative "do not be conformed" means to resist the tyranny of the old age. There is no contradiction in telling a man that he is a member of the new age and then urging him to appropriate allegiance.⁸

The question was raised above as to whether Paul by his use of the imperative is asking the believer to make the indicative valid. In other words, after having asserted the indicative, does Paul then give the last word to the imperative in the final analysis? When confronted with life as it really is, does Paul in actuality make use of the imperative alone? The unity of the indicative and the imperative lies in these words of Paul: "You are in the Spirit" (Rom. 8:9,11,16). The Spirit is the enabling power and guide in the new life of the Christian (Rom. 8:2,4). "If we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit" (Gal. 5:25). The imperative never proceeds beyond the sphere of the Spirit.

⁸To tell a man that he is in a new sphere of existence and then to ask him to exhibit its moral quality is not incongruous. The seeming tension between the imperatives and indicatives in Paul is resolved when the imperative is seen as the (ethical) product of the indicative; compare Gal. 3:37 with Rom. 13:14; Rom. 6:2 with 6:12-13 and Col. 3:5; also Col. 3:9 (Rom. 6:6) with Eph. 4:22.

When Paul moves from the indicative to the imperative, he never sets aside or takes lightly the presence and power of the Holy Spirit. The importance of the gift of the indwelling Spirit for the understanding of the imperative is observable in that Paul never addresses his imperative to anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ.

Paul calls for the fruits of the Spirit, not works, with the imperative. The imperative suschématizesthe has an intimate connection with the indicative. The indicative presupposed here is: "You were set free from, you died to the old aeon." The imperative does not say: "Set yourselves free" or "Keep yourselves free from this age by your own resources."⁹ The imperative urges: "Do not be conformed to this present aeon." Resisting conformation is not a work on the part of the believer, but the fruit of life under grace. The subject addressed by the imperative is the Christian man. He must not be made the embodiment of the old aeon. He is not asked to break the "schema" of the present aeon, but is urged not to be "re-schematized."

There is a need for the imperative, an urgent need. The believer must struggle against sin, even though he died to it in baptism. Paul must encourage and exhort his readers

⁹Bornkamm says that the believer has been set free from sin and is therefore in a new situation. Accordingly, he continues, the imperative "let not sin reign" (Rom. 6:12) does not mean: "werfet die Sunde von ihrem Thron, sondern: lasst sie nicht mehr auf ihren Thron." Bornkamm, XVI, 48.

to live by faith. The old age, not the new aeon, seems to be in control; the latter may appear to be illusory. At the same time there is much in the believer that is susceptible to the temptations of the body and flesh (Rom. 6:12; 13:14; Gal. 5:16). Paul explicitly names his body and its members as an adversary (Rom. 6:13; I Cor. 9:27).¹⁰ Further, the real identity of the believer is hidden with Christ in God (Col. 3:3). That Jesus is stronger than sin and that his victory is in behalf of the believer can be grasped and brought into one's concrete life only through faith (Gal. 2:20); the present age makes no such assertion (I Cor. 2:6-8). Again and again the indicative must be proclaimed to the believer who is still in, but not of the old aeon. The Christian must be exhorted again and again to take the indicative into his intercourse with the world where the struggle between the Spirit and the flesh takes place. It is only by hearing the indicative (the gift of power from on high) and by heeding the imperative (to use the power of God) that the believer can assert the life of

¹⁰The members of the body are in a particularly precarious situation because of the manner in which sin operates. Bornkamm (*ibid.*), in speaking of the urgency of the imperative, underscores the deceptiveness of sin: "Die Mahnung bekommt von daher ihre Dringlichkeit, denn eben dies ist der betrügerische Weg der Sünde, dass sie nichts haben will als die Glieder und dabei den Eindruck noch vorgaukelt, als blieben wir selbst ungeschoren, als verfielen wir ihn nicht dadurch, dass wir ihr unsere Glieder überlassen, "mit Haut und Haar." Sie greift nicht mehr frontal an, sondern auf dem Umweg über ἐπιθυμία des [sic] Leibes."

Christ in this present age. The on-going struggle to which the Christian as a resident alien in this world is called is a demonstration of the power of the Spirit and a testimony to the new life in Christ and to the reality of the new age in this present aeon. The emphasis on the Spirit's power in the life of the believer does not mitigate at all against the dignity and responsibility of the believer, for significantly, the imperative is addressed not to the Holy Spirit, but to the Christian man. The believer is a member of the eschatological community which possesses the Spirit. He ought not conform to this present age. As a member of the new aeon, he must affirm his death to the old aeon. The imperative is a call to battle¹¹ and a call for obedience.¹²

Paul's imperatives stand within the limits of his indicatives. This is true for suschématizesthe. The indicative assumed here is "You died to the powers of the old age." The believer must live in detachment from the old aeon. The works of the flesh are alien to him; the believer senses this (Rom. 6:21). The works of the flesh are alien to the Christian because he lives in a new sphere of existence with a new Lord. The imperative "do not be conformed to this aeon" is based on the fact that the Christian stands free from it.

¹¹P. Althaus, Der Brief an die Römer in Das Neue Testament Deutsch (Tenth edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), VI, 59.

¹²Bornkamm, XVI, 45.

His proper Lord is not the old aeon.

Paul's imperative "do not be conformed to this age" is intimately connected with his concern about the moral life of Christians. "Christianity according to St. Paul is not mere morality, but for him morality itself is not mere morality."¹³ The immediate purpose of Paul's imperative suschêmatizesthe is to exhort his readers to resist being conformed to the present evil age and its standards. For Christians the standard is κατὰ πνεῦμα. If the believer's intercourse with the world corresponds to the standards of the old aeon, he will have little success in seeking out God's will for himself in everyday life. Accordingly the ultimate purpose in the use of suschêmatizesthe is related to the quest for God's will. An indispensable step in the pursuit of God's will for the Christian life is the rejection of inappropriate standards.

Seeking Out the Will of God

The second imperative, μεταμορφοῦσθε,¹⁴ is positively related to the pursuit of God's will. Paul's purpose clause "that you may prove what is the will of God" is attached to metamorphoûsthe: "Be transformed . . . that you may

¹³D. E. H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul (Philadelphia: The Fortress Press, 1964), p. 205.

¹⁴Hereafter metamorphoûsthe.

prove what is the will of God" (Rom. 12:2). The immediate agent for the required metamorphosis is the $\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$:¹⁵ "Be transformed by the renewal of your noûs." The subject of the metamorphosis is the believers. In order to state Paul's instructions for seeking God's will, we must first investigate the word noûs. Secondly, an understanding of the relationship between the renewal of the noûs and the metamorphosis of the believer must be gained; this understanding will enable us to proceed to dokimazein. This much can be stated now: In order to gain a more comprehensive, more profound knowledge and affirmation of God's will for his life, the believer must be continually transformed in this present aeon by the renewal of his noûs.

For Paul noûs is not a divine element in man which relates man by nature to God; it does not have an existence apart from physical man. The noûs is not a special faculty which is confined to intellectual and rational activities; noûs does not function in vacuo. Paul uses noûs in a non-philosophical, popular manner to depict man as a thinking, evaluating and planning creature. $\xi\omega\mu\alpha$ ¹⁶ and noûs both describe the same historical entity, but from different points of view. Man as sôma is man-in-relation;¹⁷ man as

¹⁵Hereafter noûs.

¹⁶Hereafter sôma.

¹⁷R. C. Tannehill, Dying and Rising with Christ in Beziehung zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1967), XXXII, 71.

noûs is man-in-direction. Noûs can be translated "mind," "character," "attitude," and "understanding."¹⁸ Noûs is man in his capacity to orientate himself to his surroundings; it tells what kind of a man one is.

The character of a man is determined by what rules him, whether it be the flesh or the Spirit (Gal. 5:16-25). If a man is under the flesh, he has a noûs of flesh (Col. 2:18); if he is in Christ, he has the noûs of Christ (I Cor. 2:16). He lives either according to the flesh or according to the Spirit. There is no neutral position. Further, noûs is inseparably part of man; it does not function in vacuo. Moe comments on Col. 2:18:

Ist der Mensch fleischlich, so bleibt auch sein Sinn, seine Vernunft, fleischlich. Ist dagegen der Mensch geistlich geworden, dann wird sein Sinn erneuert und geistlich. Deshalb fordert denn auch der Apostel, dass der Nus seiner Leser erneuert werden soll. Der Nus gehört an und für sich zur natürlichen Ausstattung des Menschen. Aber er soll durch die Wiedergeburt nicht ausgeschaltet werden, sondern nur einen neuen Charakter erhalten, so dass er von einem voûs τῆς σαρκὸς zu einem voûs τοῦ πνεύματος wird. Die Erneuerung des Sinnes geschieht eben durch den Geist.¹⁹

The renewal of the noûs goes to the very core of the believer's being, into the spirit of the noûs (Eph. 4:23). Renewal

¹⁸On noûs, cf. W. D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man (London: Macmillan & Co., 1956), pp. 198-205; R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated from the German by K. Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 211-220; and O. Moe, "Vernunft und Geist im Neuen Testament," Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie, XI (1934), 351-391.

¹⁹Moe, XI, 361.

of the noûs means that the basis of a man's life has shifted from the ground of the flesh to that of the Spirit.

In order for the Christian to test for God's will in daily life, he must be continually transformed by his renewed noûs. An observation concerning Paul's use of renewal (καίνω and its derivatives) and transformation (μορφή, σχῆμα and derivatives) is in order here. Paul does not speak of the transformation of man as noûs, but he does speak of man as sôma as being transformed. On the other hand, Paul does not assert the renewal of the sôma, but he does speak of the renewal of man as noûs. Paul's use of "renewal of your mind" in connection with the transformation of the believer indicates that the Christian must no longer let his relationship to the world be determined by the old aeon; in order to discover God's will for himself in daily life, the believer must let his intercourse with the world be governed by his renewed noûs.

The noûs of flesh is claimed by the old aeon; it can in no way enable a man to please God. Paul says that the heathen knew God, but did not respond properly to this knowledge. The truth exposed the futility of the noûs of flesh. Although the heathen knew God, the ethical range of their thinking did not permit them to honor God as God. They confused the Creator with his creation (Rom. 1:25). "They became (ἐμταλιώθησαν) futile in their thinking" (Rom. 1:21). In that the noûs of flesh made God μάταιος²⁰ it showed itself

²⁰Hereafter mataios or mataioi.

to be mataios and was condemned to emptiness and vanity.²¹ The heathen not only did the things worthy of death, they also applauded others who did the same things (Rom. 1:32). "Since they did not see fit (ἐδοκίμασαν) to hold God in knowledge, God gave them up to an ἀδόκιμον νοῦν" (Rom. 1:28). Paul plays on words here: no worth placed on God; no worth derived from the noûs.

The noetic (man-in-direction) and somatic (man-in-relation) aspects of man under the flesh are complementary and reenforcing. How man thinks and what he is have a bearing on what he does; what he does has an effect upon his character. The threefold judgment "God gave them up" (Rom. 1:24,26,28) falls upon both the somatic activity and the futile thinking of the heathen man, a potent description of the hopeless position of the man under the powers of the old aeon. Any sensitivity he might have toward the truth of God is clouded by what he does, and he proceeds into greater iniquity and darkness (Rom. 6:19; Eph. 4:18).

The believer as sôma, that is, the believer in his capacity to relate to the world, must be under a new sphere of influence. His somatic life must be governed by his renewed noûs. The believer as sôma must be transformed into an actual instrument of the new aeon within the old. As sôma the

²¹In the LXX the pagan gods were called mataioi, "worthlessnesses," "nothingnesses"; those who went after them were themselves made mataioi (4 Kings 17:15; Jer. 2:15).

Christian is neither a force for righteousness nor sin. This is true before and after baptism. The believer as sōma is always ruled. After baptism the sōma, though not a body of death (Rom. 7:24), is still weak and mortal (Rom. 6:12) and ethically dead (Rom. 8:10). Αἰών and noûs serve as opposite poles (Rom. 12:2), while the sphere of contention is the believer as sōma. Paul urges his readers: "Be transformed by the renewal of your noûs."

The believer is transformed by his renewed mind. A word of caution needs to be noted here. Through renewal of the noûs the Christian does not become a divine being,²² nor is the noûs an independent moral agent. The believer lives according to the Spirit, not according to noûs. The noûs is not a self-authenticating standard. The Spirit, by his presence and power, makes of the noûs of flesh, which is ἀδόκιμος,²³ a renewed noûs, which is renewed for dokimazein (Rom. 1:28; 12:2). Further, the Spirit does not overwhelm or displace the noûs as in ecstasy and so render man as noûs superfluous. The Spirit does not rule autocratically. The Spirit mediates

²²The opposite of a noûs of flesh is not, to be sure, a noûs of the Spirit. Paul can and does speak of the noûs of flesh as being flesh (Col. 2:18), but he does not say that the noûs which is renewed by the Spirit is in actuality the Spirit. "Das Produkt der Geistesmitteilung ist nicht ein neues Gottwesen, sondern ein neuer Mensch! Das Ich und das Selbstbewusstsein des Christen bleiben erhalten"; cf. Moe, XI, 383.

²³Hereafter adokimos.

the Lordship of Jesus.²⁴

The renewed noûs can transform the believer and also dokimazein the will of God because it is sustained by Christ and has Christ as its center (I Cor. 1:10; Phil. 2:2,5). Believers have the noûs of Christ and consequently an insight into the very counsel of God (I Cor. 2:16). Through the renewal of the noûs the Christian does not merely gain new information and correct insight; rather Christ himself becomes the light of his mind. A living Lord, not abstract guidelines, directs the believer. In this connection it can be observed that Paul uses noûs in the singular (Rom. 12:2). Believers have one mind, a new mind, the mind of Christ. The mind of Christ is the only option apart from the mind of flesh. Believers have one Lord; he determines what they are. This all suggests that Christians are not individual moral agents, but they are part of a movement, a whole segment of redeemed humanity, who are to resist conformation to the old aeon and manifest the rule of Christ.

The immediate purpose of metamorphou̓sthe is to call the believer to live in accord with his new life in Christ.

Transformation has its practical manifestation in the life of

²⁴The revelation of Jesus as Lord is not recognized by the noûs of flesh (I Cor. 1:18-25), but is taught by the Spirit (I Cor. 2:12-14; 12:3). The Spirit is of the Lord (I Cor. 15:45; 2 Cor. 3:17); he opens the mind of the believer to the Lordship of Jesus. Accordingly Jesus, not the Spirit, is the ultimate authority in the church for Paul. Paul can and does speak of himself as taking every thought (νοῦμα) of Christians captive to obey Christ (2 Cor. 10:5).

the Christian in the world. The believer must resist the "schema" of the old aeon and must be continually changed into the likeness of the Head of the new aeon (2 Cor. 3:18). The "schema" of the old aeon shows itself in a man's dealings and interaction with the world; this "schema" must cease appearing in the believer's life. The continual transformation of the believer as sōma (Rom. 12:2; Phil. 3:21) manifests itself in the Christian's concrete life as he lives in the old aeon claimed by the new.

Paul urges his readers to be transformed that they might prove what is the will of God. This is the ultimate purpose of metamorphousthe. Believers can test for God's will because their mind has been and is being renewed. Renewal is important. All men have noûs, but not all can dokimazein the will of God. Paul's emphasis on renewal can be seen in the issue of eating meat and observing special days in Romans 14. What is at stake is not the question of the rightness or the wrongness of eating or not eating meat, nor is it simply the observance of certain days. As far as they are concerned Paul advises: "Let every man be fully convinced in his own mind" (verse 5). The real issue, however, centers in judging and in offending one's brother in the faith. As such there is no purely logical, mathematical course to follow, and certainly no legalistic one. Love for the Lord and for the brother breaks all bounds of purely rational thinking by this world's standards. The believer must relate himself to real need, to actual circumstances.

He must act, not contra rationem, but supra rationem. It is not noûs, but noûs renewed and led by the Spirit of Jesus which enables the believer to live as a member of the new age in this fallen world.

Paul often asks his hearers to scrutinize (as God does) their lives. His use of dokimazein offers abundant examples of this. Believers should examine themselves: "Let a man examine himself, and so eat of the bread . . ." (I Cor. 11:28); "Examine (πειράζεσθε) yourselves, to see whether you are holding fast to your faith. Test yourselves . . . unless you fail to meet the test (εἰ μήτι ἰδοκιμοί ἐστε)" (2 Cor. 13:5). The Christian also ought to "test his own work" (Gal. 6:4). "Test everything, hold fast to what is good" (I Thess. 5:21). Christians ought to walk as children of light and "try to learn what is pleasing to the Lord" (Eph. 5:8-10).

Paul himself runs, and he pommels his body, not to receive a perishable wreath, but an imperishable one (I Cor. 9:24-27). He does not merely want to live, and certainly not in an aimless (I Cor. 9:26) and adokimos manner (2 Cor. 13:5). He wants to live for Christ (Rom. 14:8; 2 Cor. 5:12; Phil. 1:21).

To every believer there come situations not of his own making, for which there are no known or proven courses of action for him to follow. In these uncharted areas of life the Christian will desire to please God. Then again there

are numerous opportunities for deliberate pursuit of God's will. The aim of the baptized man is to please God by doing the divine will in every circumstance. But to do the will of God one must know it, and to know it one must probe for it.

The noûs is renewed for dokimazein (as well as for transforming the believer). The renewed noûs, however, is no guarantee that one will secure God's will. The renewed noûs is not able to extrapolate or theorize as to what is pleasing to God in isolation from concrete life. The will of God is given. This does not mean that the believer is to await a special revelation of God's will. The noûs, however, does not function in vacuo. Paul's purpose clause "that you may prove what is the will of God" is dependent upon the present imperative "be transformed." One would expect dokimazein to fall exclusively within the domain of the renewed noûs, and this is the case. However Paul does not simply turn to the renewed mind for dokimazein in Rom. 12:2. His appeal is: "Be transformed . . . that you may prove what is the will of God."

In the uncharted areas of life the believer as noûs can only test and weigh as to what is or might be the will of God. The testing ground is the believer's encounter with the world. Theorizing as to what is pleasing to God apart from real life and actual involvement in concrete life has no promise of success. On the other hand, the believer cannot engage in life arbitrarily in accordance with the

standards of the passing aeon. The possibility of testing for God's will is excluded when one is living *κατὰ σάρκα*. Paul's instruction is to meet life in this fallen world as a member of the new age, as one who is in the realm of Christ. Only if one's life is under the transforming power of Christ is he able to test for the will of God in this present evil aeon.

The preface for seeking God's will is the sacrifice of the sōma. The surrender of the body, though it must be repeated, must be decisive. The presentation of the body as a living, holy and well-pleasing sacrifice is already the will of God. The believer who attempts to test for God's will apart from somatic sacrifice has little hope for success. If the Christian seeks God's will with reservation, he is not taking the will of God seriously. Only with prior commitment and total, decisive surrender in actual life to the will of God can the believer further seek God's will with the promise of establishing it for himself.

More than commitment is required, however, if one wants to approve (by testing) what God's will is for his everyday life. Here Paul's imperatives lend assistance. "Do not be conformed to this aeon" since the standards of this age are at cross-purposes with the will of God. The old aeon, further, is not the baptized man's proper Lord. The believer, if he allows himself to be conformed to this age, cannot discover God's will for himself. "Be transformed by the renewal of

your noûs." The subject of the imperative is the believers as sôma. His somatic activity or his intercourse with the world must be in opposition to the flesh. He must live κατὰ πνεῦμα. The Christian lives in the Spirit; he must also walk in the Spirit (Gal. 5:25). Both imperatives point the Christian to his proper Lord; both imperatives must be heeded if the believer is to seek God's will with the promise of establishing it for himself. Both imperatives are ultimately concerned with dokimazein.

The immediate agent for the transformation of the believer, the noûs, was renewed for dokimazein. The believer is encouraged to test for the divine will. The man in Christ must set his mind (ὑπονοέω) on the things of the Spirit and the things above (Rom. 8:5; Col. 3:1-2). By directing himself to the things above the Christian maintains his distinction from the "schema" of this present age and is free (to become a slave of righteousness). To set the mind on the things of the Spirit is to put to death the deeds of the mortal body and its members (Rom. 8:13; Col. 3:5-6). Far from being a call for "spiritual" or other-worldly living, setting the mind of the things above is down to earth, concrete living. The believer, by allowing himself to be transformed by the renewal of his noûs, is the manifestation of the new life in Christ in the midst of the present evil age. For the first time his encounter with real life is reasonable and unencumbered by the passing standards of this world; his

life corresponds to the truth of God. He affirms his proper Lord. His life in the mortal sōma is accordingly the testing ground for the will of God.

The reasonable response to the mercies of God is the dedication of the sōma to the will of God. This sacrifice is worked by the mercies of God. The mercies of God also urgently press the Christian to a deeper knowledge and more profound affirmation of the divine will. The mercies of God are decisive. Even though the believer dedicates himself to God's will and also tests for it, he nevertheless cannot establish God's will by himself. The believer must simply and faithfully entrust himself to God and trust that God will direct his steps, that is, reveal his will. The life and worship of the believer is upheld by the mercies of God.

At the heart of λογικὴ λατρεία is somatic sacrifice. The surrender of one's will and self to God is what Paul calls reasonable service (to God). It is with noûs, renewed noûs, which is open to the truth of God and the Lordship of Jesus, that one matures in Christian worship.

¹ Hereafter sōma.

² Hereafter λογικὴ λατρεία.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The concept of sacrifice is helpful for distinguishing Pauline worship from the piety or worship of Hellenism and Judaism. For Paul somatic sacrifice is worship. The surrender of oneself as **σῶμα**¹ in a sacrifice which is living, holy and acceptable to God corresponds to the will of the true living God. At the same time placing oneself at God's disposal in actual life is the presupposition for earnestly seeking out what God demands, **λογικὴ λατρεία**.²

Stoicism virtually rejects sacrifice; somatic sacrifice--regardless of how sōma is understood--would be unheard of. The Hermetic literature completely spiritualizes sacrifice; **λογικὴ θυσία** is the total renunciation of the outward, material world and withdrawal into an inner sanctuary. Philo and Hellenistic Judaism do not flatly set cultic sacrifice aside, yet because they are away from Jerusalem, they can not execute the Old Testament regulations concerning sacrifice. Philo and other Hellenistic Jews, among whom there is a greater or lesser degree of Hellenistic influence, treat sacrifice symbolically or establish a theory of

¹Hereafter sōma.

²Hereafter logikê latreia.

substitutes for sacrifice. Palestinian Judaism, as long as it is possible, practices the Old Testament sacrificial ordinances exactly. However Palestinian Judaism also holds that the demands of the law are met in the spiritualization of sacrifice and the theory of equivalence. Sacrifice is a means of carrying out the law!

In Hellenism and in Paul the conception of the Deity and of man are important for answering the questions of what worship or piety is and how one arrives at it. Though Paul and his Hellenistic contemporaries speak of worshiping God in spirit, they are not in accord as to what this means. Man in Hellenism is a dichotomy of body and soul. Though both of these are materially conceived, the soul is seen as man's inner, higher, immortal nature through which he has kinship with the gods. Worship or piety is related to man's higher being. The word λογικός itself has its conceptual origin in the polemic of the early Greek philosophers against the cultic sacrifices of popular religion. Man, as λογικὸν ζῷον,³ worships or pursues excellence according to the higher nature which he shares with the gods. As the outward and material recede in piety, the spiritual, inward perfection gains sway. The body itself is of slight significance for perfection or for the good, and it is even despised.

³Cf. note 14, Chapter II, p. 8.

For Paul, who does not seem to hold a dichotomy of body and soul at all, and certainly does not view the sôma as a prison of the soul, the sôma, or the believer as sôma, is the whole self of the Christian as he is able to communicate and come into contact with the concrete world. In contrast to Hellenism the metamorphosis of the sôma is God's will. This is clearly a notion absurd to the Stoics as well as incompatible with their view of man and the gods. For Paul worship is set in the antithesis of Creator/creature and not based upon a natural relationship between man's higher being and the gods. The will of God for the Christian is the sanctification of the whole of creaturely life. For Hellenism piety is the severance of the divine part of man from the lower material existence and the inner perfection and final liberation of the soul. The wise man strives for a distant goal. For Paul salvation is not redemption from the body but redemption of the body; even now the sôma, called to obedience, exhibits the bestowed goal of sonship with God. The will of God for daily life in this present aeon is for the believer to surrender himself to God's redemptive purpose.

According to the Stoics and mystics the possibility of arriving at the truth is inherent to man as man (or by nature).⁴ For the Stoics (or mystics) a man cannot discover

⁴Paul would not deny that the Gentiles know God's will, but this does not mean that this knowledge arises out of nature

the good because of faulty reasoning (or ignorance). If he is taught to think correctly, that is according to nature or the indwelling Logos, he will be able to arrive at the truth.

St. Paul would reject the possibility of finding out God's will by turning inward (to the Logos) or by resorting to natural reasoning. God's will is given. While Hellenism cannot extol the union between man as λογικὸν ζῶον and the gods and the potential for arriving at the truth highly enough, Paul sees the νοῦς⁵ of natural man as bearing witness to the heathen's separation from God.⁶ Paul can even speak of a noûs which is flesh and a base mind, a thought which would be abhorrent to Hellenism. For Paul the will of God is given to the believer, not when he turns inward or theorizes, but when he places himself in love and trust (without qualifications) at God's disposal among his brothers and other men. The Christian must respond to actual life and

or the immanence of the Logos. Whatever knowledge of God's will the heathen might have has been worked by the Creator God. Cf. M. Pohlenz, "Paulus und die Stoa," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLII, No. 1 (1949), 76-77.

⁵Hereafter noûs.

⁶Cf. Pohlenz, XLII, 96. G. Bornkamm commenting on The Wisdom of Solomon (13:1) in connection with Paul says, "The futility of men is for Wisdom an expression and a result of their ignorance of God, for Paul, of their knowledge of him. For they have neither praised nor thanked him, and for that reason their thoughts have become vain and darkened"; cf. G. Bornkamm, "Faith and Reason in Paul's Epistles," New Testament Studies, IV (1857-1958), 96.

actual needs of fellow men!⁷ Only in such self-giving can the renewed man be aided by the Spirit to test for God's will when necessary.

Paul not only denies to natural man the ability to establish the will of God without revelation, he also rejects the natural man's capability of executing God's will. In Paul's thinking it is an illusion both to believe that one can posit God's will simply through a coherent system of reasoning and that the good can be done once it is known. The core of man's problem is not in his reasoning or will, but in the grip of sin over himself as noûs and sôma. The good which man knows and consents to is what he can not do. Under the dominion of the flesh man is unable to check the flesh nor please God; the gospel is indispensable. How radical Paul's assessment of the unbeliever's predicament is can be seen in his statements concerning the real, essential will of God. What pleases God is the edification of a brother in Christ and the calling of the nations to obedience to the gospel. God's will is on a plain unknown, undreamed of, and even foolish as far as the unrenewed noûs is concerned.

The will of God is revealed by and the carrying out of this will occurs only with the aid of the Holy Spirit, who

⁷Much could be said about the locale where God's will is to be sought. God's will is encountered in concrete life and in meeting one's neighbor. Cf. V. P. Furnish, Theology and Ethics in Paul (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968), pp. 203-207; 235-238. I have dealt with what God's will is and how one pursues it.

is not natural to man. The whole of the believer's holy life began in the Spirit of Jesus and the continual yielding of the believer to this supernatural Spirit is required both for learning and doing the will of the living God. The believer must give up his natural, created self to God; only in this way does he become one who both discerns and pursues God's will.

In apposition to God's will in Rom. 12:2 Paul places "the good, well-pleasing and perfect." These words are general in content and undoubtedly meaningful to Paul's readers at Rome. The good, well-pleasing and perfect, no matter what they meant for the pre-believer, cannot be divorced from the fundamental contrast between life in Christ and life apart from Christ. The good is not what men think ("Do not be conformed to this aeon."), but what is acceptable to God. The perfect is God's absolute demand to which the believer ought to commit himself wholeheartedly. In that Paul calls for the surrender of the sôma he rules out any idea of adiaphora; he calls for the total surrender. God's will ought to pervade all of the believer's thinking and doing.

Paul is not able to be more specific about what God's will is for the congregation and its individual members at Rome than to posit the general words the good, the acceptable and perfect. This does not mean that Paul cannot be precise

in detailing aspects of God's will.⁸ An extensive blueprint Paul does not attempt, nor is he able to do so for others. The intent of his exhortation in Rom. 12:2 is that the Roman Christians ought to seek out God's will for themselves. The good cannot be codified and defined and thereby limited; it cannot be given full, absolute content. The Christian can never be in possession of God's will in toto so as to obviate testing for what is pleasing to God. The will of God is given. The believer can only dedicate himself to God's will. God's will is revealed. God will make it known for the believer. Unlike Hellenism which sought absolutes, the Christian lives under the promise of God.

Paul and post-exilic Judaism part ways on the purpose of sacrifice. In post-exilic (Palestinian) Judaism expiation and atonement are almost the exclusive purpose of sacrifice.⁹ This includes the equivalents for ritual sacrifice. For St. Paul atonement through sacrifice came to an end in the sacrifice of Christ; it is Christ who reconciled men with God and who intercedes for them (Rom. 5:6-11; Eph. 5:2).

Sacrifice in the Christian life is worked by the mercy of God as is the case with Judaism, but never, as is often

⁸Cf., for example, I Cor. 1:1; 8:5; Rom. 15:32; I Thess. 4:3-4; 5:18.

⁹W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), I, 168.

the case with Judaism, is sacrifice a means to secure or assure God's mercy. Paul holds somatic sacrifice to be God's will; but he would never consider Christian sacrifice as an avenue for bending God's will. In Judaism, on the other hand, sacrifice can be and often is connected with the will of the people. The will of Israel, which may or may not have been in accord with God's will, centered for many Jews in their nationalistic and Messianic hopes, the hopes of the descendents of Abraham according to the flesh.¹⁰ Ritual sacrifice and its equivalents are seen as acts of obedience which will atone for the sins of the people and so insure the destiny of Israel according to the flesh. Whether this obedience is the will of God or not, is not seriously questioned, nor can it be as long as obedience to the demand of God for sacrifice is a means to influence God or bind him to some course of action unilaterally on the basis of Israel's obedience or merit. For many Jews, sacrifice has lost the covenantal setting it originally had.

For Paul and the Old Testament sacrifice calls for the surrender of self-will, and so the whole of the life of the community and its members, to the will of God. Paul can

¹⁰For a discussion of sacrifice in post-exilic Judaism in the context of the will of God and the will of the sacrifices see: O. Schmitz, Die Opferanschauung des späteren Judentums und die Opferaussagen des Neuen Testaments (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1910), pp. 193-196. For material relating to the role of atonement and merit in post-exilic sacrifice see: Eichrodt, I, 168-172.

speak of the believers as worshiping God, not on the basis of the flesh or merit, but in placing the sôma at God's disposal. In this way, a people can show forth God's will and be a light to those within and without the household of faith, truly a light to the nations.

The community of faith in Christ and its members witness not to themselves. They are not the light, and certainly not the Light of the world, but, in somatic obedience, a light. They witness to and serve him who is the Light of the world. Logikê latreia is not the elevation of what is noble or divine in man, nor is it the furtherance of the will of a people. Logikê latreia is self-surrender and dedication to the will of God in all of life. Placing one's relationship to the world under God's claim is the proper response to the mercies of God. This self-oblation constitutes for Paul "reasonable worship."

Arnold, E. V. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.
 Press, c. 1911.

Aranson, H. Der Römerbrief.
 Verlagswort, c. 1952.

Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.
 Harper's New Testament Commentaries, Vol. 10.
 Harper & Brothers, 1956.

-----, editor. The New Testament.
 2 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952.

Barth, K. The Epistle to the Romans.
 German 5th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Basore, J. V., editor. The Letters of Paul.
 3 vols. The Loeb Classical Library.
 Heinemann, 1928-1933.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aland, K., et al., editor. The Greek New Testament.
New York: American Bible Society of the United Bible
Societies, 1966.
- Allan, J. A. "The Will of God. III. In Paul," Expository
Times, LXXII (5, 1961), 142-145.
- Althaus, P. Der Brief an die Römer. Das Neue Testament
Deutsch. VI. 10th edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck
& Ruprecht, 1966.
- Andrews, H. T., editor and translator. "The Letter of
Aristeas," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the
Old Testament in English. Edited by R. H. Charles.
Vol. II. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.
Pp. 83-122.
- Andrews, M. E. The Ethical Teaching of Paul. A Study in
Origin. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina
Press, pr. 1934.
- "The Problem of Motive in the Ethics of Paul,"
Journal of Religion, XIII (1933), 200-213.
- Argyle, A. W. "The Logos of Philo: Personal or Impersonal?,"
Expository Times, LXVI (1954-55), 13-14.
- Arnold, E. V. Roman Stoicism. New York: The Humanities
Press, c. 1911.
- Asmussen, H. Der Römerbrief. Stuttgart: Evangelisches
Verlagswerk, c. 1952.
- Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.
Harper's New Testament Commentaries. New York:
Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- , editor. The New Testament Background: Selected docu-
ments. New York: Harper & Row, c. 1956.
- Barth, K. The Epistle to the Romans. Translated from the
German 6th edition, by E. C. Hoskyns. London: Oxford
University Press, 1950.
- Basore, J. W., editor and translator. Seneca Moral Essays.
3 vols. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William
Heinemann, 1928-1935.

- Bonhöffer, Adolf. Epiktet und das Neue Testament. Vol. X in Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten. Edited by R. Wunsch and L. Deubner. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1911.
- Bornkamm, G. "Taufe und neues Leben bei Paulus," Das Ende des Gesetzes, Gesammelte Aufsätze, Band I. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie. XIV. 5th edition. Munchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966.
- . "Faith and Reason in Paul's Epistles," New Testament Studies, IV (1957-1958), 93-100.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter. Vol. XXI in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited in the 3rd edition by H. Gressmann. General editor G. Bornkamm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1966.
- Box, G. H., and W. O. E. Oesterley, editors and translators. "The Book of Sirach," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Brunner, E. The Letter to the Romans. Translated from the German by H. A. Kennedy. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c. 1959.
- Bultmann, R. "ἐπίκουρος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, II. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated and edited by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964. Pp. 832-875.
- . "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXIII (1924), 123-140.
- . "Das religiöse Moment in der ethischen Unterweisung des Epiktet und das Neue Testament," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XIII (1912), 97-110; 177-191.
- . Theology of the New Testament. Vol. I. Translated by K. Grobel from the German. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Buttrick, G. A., editor. The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vols. I-IV. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

- Casel, O. "Die Λογικὴ Θυσία der antiken Mystik in christlich-liturgischer Umdeutung," Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft. IV. Münster in Westf.: Aschendorf, 1924. Pp. 37-47.
- Charles, R. H., editor. "Διαθήκη Λογί" The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1908.
- , editor. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Cohen, A., translator and commentator. The Minor Tractates of the Talmud. Vol. I. London: The Soncino Press, 1965.
- Colson, F. H., and G. H. Whitaker, editors and translators. Philo with an English Translation. 10 vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949-1962.
- Conzelmann, H. Der erste Brief an die Korinther. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. V. 11th edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Cowley, A. E. "The Book of Judith," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913. Pp. 174-271.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. A Commentary on Romans 12-13. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers. No. 12. London: Oliver & Boyd, 1965.
- Cross, F. M. The Ancient Library of Qumran. Revised edition. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961.
- Danby, H., translator and commentator. The Mishnah. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Danielou, J. The Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity. Translated by S. Attanasio from the French. New York: New American Library, 1958.
- Delling, G. Worship in the New Testament. Translated by P. Scott. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c. 1962.
- de Vaux, R. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions. Translated by J. McHugh from the French. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Dinkler, E. "Zum Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, XLIX (2, 1952), 167-200.

- Dodd, C. H. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder & Stoughton, c. 1935.
- The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. Vol. VI of The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. New York: Harper & Brothers, c. 1932.
- Eichrodt, W. Theology of the Old Testament. Vol. I. Translated from the German by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.
- Eissfeldt, O. The Old Testament. An Introduction. Translated from the 3rd German edition by P. Ackroyd. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Feldman, L. H., editor and translator. Josephus with an English Translation. Vol. IX. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1965.
- Foerster, W. "ἁγία," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. I. Edited by G. Kittel. Translated from the German and edited by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1964. Pp. 455-457.
- Forbes, N., and R. H. Charles, editors and translators. "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Edited by R. H. Charles. Vol. II. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913. Pp. 425-469.
- Fritsch, C. T. "Pseudepigrapha," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. III. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 960-964.
- Funk, F. Z., editor. Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum. Vol. I. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schoeningh, 1905.
- Furnish, V. P. Theology and Ethics in Paul. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968.
- Gaster, T. H. "Sacrifices and Offerings, OT," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. IV. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 147-159.
- Gaugler, E. Der Brief an die Römer. Part II. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1952.
- Goodspeed, E. J. The New Testament; An American Translation. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1945.

- Grabner-Haider, A. Paraklese und Eschatologie bei Paulus. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen. Neue Folge IV. Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1968.
- Grundmann, W. "ῥόκίμος (κ.τ.λ.)," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, II. Edited by G. Kittel. Translated and edited by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964. Pp. 255-260.
- Gummere, R. M., editor and translator. Seneca ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales. 3 vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930-1943.
- Gundel, W. and H. G. Gundel. Astrologumena. Vol. VI of Sudhoffs Archiv. Edited by J. E. Hofmann et al. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1966.
- Gunkel, H. Die Psalmen. II Abt., 2 Bd. in Göttingen Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Edited by W. Nowack. Vierte Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.
- Hahn, W. Worship and Congregation. No. 12 of Ecumenical Studies in Worship. Translated by G. Buswell. London: Lutterworth Press, 1963.
- Haines, C. R. The Communings with Himself of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. Cambridge, Mass.: 1961.
- Hansen, G. "Philosophie," Umwelt des Urchristentums. I. Edited by J. Leipoldt and W. Grundmann. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1967. Pp. 346-370.
- Hatch, E., and H. A. Redpatch, et. al. A Concordance to the Septuagint. 2 vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1897.
- Hegermann, H. "Das hellenistische Judentum," Umwelt des Urchristentums. I. Edited by J. Leipoldt and W. Grundmann. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1967. Pp. 292-345.
- Heikel, I. A., editor. Die Demonstratio Evangelica. Eusebius Werke. VI. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte. In der Reihenfolge des Erscheinens Band 23. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1913.
- Herbert, A. S. Worship in Ancient Israel. No. 5 of Ecumenical Studies in Worship. Edited by J. G. Davies and A. R. George. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.

- Hering, J. The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. Translated from the 2nd French edition by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. London: The Epworth Press, 1962.
- Holmes, S., editor and translator. "The Wisdom of Solomon, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913. Pp. 518-568.
- Jacob, E. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated from the French by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. New York: Harper & Row, 1958.
- Käsemann, E. "Gottesdienst im Alltag der Welt (zu Rm 12)," Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. XXVI. Edited by W. Eltester. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960. Pp. 165-171.
- Kittel, G. "λογικός," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, IV. Edited by G. Kittel. Translated and edited by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1967. Pp. 142-143.
- Kittel, R., and P. Kahle, editors. Biblia Hebraica. 7th edition. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1951.
- Knox, J. "The Epistle to the Romans," The Interpreter's Bible. IX. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954. Pp. 353-668.
- Knox, W. L. "Parallels to the N. T. Use of σῶμα," The Journal of Theological Studies, XXXIX. (July 1938), 243-246.
- Koehler, L., and W. Baumgartner, editors. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.
- Kramer, W. Christ, Lord, Son of God. Vol. I in Studies in Biblical Theology. Translated by B. Hardy from the German. London: SCM Press Ltd., c. 1966.
- Kraus, H-J. Psalmen I-II. Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament. Vol. XV, i-ii. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960.
- Gottesdienst in Israel. 2nd edition. Munchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1962.

- Kühl, E. Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer. Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle & Meyer, 1913.
- Lanchester, H. C. O. "The Sibylline Oracles," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913. Pp. 368-406.
- Leenhardt, Franz J. The Epistle to the Romans. Translated from the French by Harold Knight. New York: The World Publishing Company, 1961.
- Leipoldt, J., and W. Grundmann, editors. Umwelt des Urchristentums. Vol. I. Zweite Auflage. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1967.
- Leisegang, I. Indices ad Philonis Alexandrini Opera. Vol. VII, 1-2, of Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt. Edited by L. Cohn and P. Wendland. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1926-1930.
- Leisegang, J. "Philon aus Alexandria," Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft. XX, 1. Edited by Georg Wissowa. Neue Bearbeitung. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1914. Cols. 1-50.
- Liddell, H. G., and R. Scott, compilers. A Greek-English Lexicon. Revised and augmented by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie. New (9th) edition. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, c. 1940.
- Lietzmann, H. An die Römer. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Band 3, I. 3rd edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1928.
- Lightfoot, J. B. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. 6th edition. London: Macmillan and Co., 1881.
- Lohmeyer, E. Der Brief an die Philipper. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. IX, 1. 13th edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament IX, 2. 12th edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- Lohse, E., editor. Die Texte aus Qumran. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.
- Lowrie, S. T. "Romans XII. 1-8--Translation and Interpretation," Princeton Theological Review, XVII (1919), 627-643.

- Luther, M. Luther: Lectures on Romans. Translated from the German and edited by W. Pauck. The Library of Christian Classics. XV. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.
- Metzger, B. M., editor. The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Michel, O. Der Brief an die Römer. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. IV. 13th edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Milik, J. T. Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea. Translated by J. Strugnell from the French. Vol. XXVI in Studies in Biblical Theology. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Miller, J. "Apollonios von Tyana," Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumsweissenschaft. Edited by G. Wissowa. Neu Bearbeitung. II, 1. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Buchhandlung, 1895. Cols. 146-148.
- Moe, O. "Vernunft und Geist im Neuen Testament," Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie, 11 (1934), 351-391.
- Moffatt, J., translator. The New Testament. New edition, revised. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1935.
- , editor and translator. "The Second Book of Maccabees," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Edited by R. H. Charles. Vol. I. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Montefiore, C. G., and H. Loewe, compilers. A Rabbinic Anthology. New York: Meridian Books, 1963.
- Moore, G. F. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. Vols. I-II. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1946.
- Moule, C. F. D. An Idiom-Book of the New Testament. 2nd edition. Cambridge, Eng.: At the University Press, 1959.
- , "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament," Journal of Theological Studies, New Series I (April 1950), 29-41.
- , Worship in the New Testament. No. 9 of Ecumenical Studies in Worship. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.
- Moulton, H. K., editor. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. Edited by W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden. 4th edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

- Mras, K., editor. Die Praeparatio Evangelica. Eusebius Werke. VIII, 1. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. In der Reihenfolge des Erscheinens Band 43, 1. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954.
- Murray, J. The Epistle to the Romans. Vol. II. The New International Commentary of the New Testament. Edited by F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965.
- Nestle, E., Erwin Nestle and K. Aland, editors. Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.
- New English Bible New Testament. The Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1961.
- Niklaus, G. Taufe und Ethik. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie. Vol. XLVII. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1967.
- Noth, M. "'For all who rely on works of the law are under a curse,'" The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies. Translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas from the German. 2nd enlarged edition. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1961. Pp. 118-131.
- Leviticus. Translated by J. E. Anderson from the German Das dritte Buch Mose, Leviticus. Das Alte Testament Deutsch. VI. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.
- Nygren, A. Commentary on Romans. Translated from the Swedish by C. Rasmussen. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949.
- Oesterley, W. O. E., translator and editor. "The First Book of Maccabees," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913. Pp. 59-124.
- Sacrifices in Ancient Israel. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938.
- Oldfather, W. A., editor and translator. Epictetus, The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual, and Fragments. 2 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1935-1938.
- Oltramare, P., editor and translator. Senèque, Questions Naturelles. 2 Vols. Paris: Societe d'edition "Les Belles Lettres," 1929.

- Pohlenz, M. "Paulus und die Stoa," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLII. (1949), 69-103.
- Die Stoa. 2nd edition. Vols. I-II. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.
- Procksch, O., and K. G. Kuhn. "ἄγλος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, I. Edited by G. Kittel. Translated and edited by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964. Pp. 88-115.
- Rad, von G. Old Testament Theology. Vol. I. Translated from the German by D. M. G. Stalker. London: Oliver & Boyd, 1962.
- Rahlfs, A., editor. Septuaginta I & II. 6th edition. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1959.
- Reitzenstein, R. Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen. 3rd enlarged edition. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927.
- Poimandres. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1904.
- Richardson, A., editor. A Theological Word Book of the Bible. New York: Macmillan, 1950.
- Rist, J. M. Stoic Philosophy. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969.
- Robinson, J. A. T. The Body, A Study in Pauline Theology. Vol. V in Studies in Biblical Theology, Alec R. Allenson, Inc.: Naperville, Illinois, 1957.
- Rowley, H. H. Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Russell, D. S. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.
- Sanday, W., and A. C. Headlam. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Vol. XXXII of The International Critical Commentary. 5th edition, 1902. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1964.
- Sasse, H. "αἰών, αἰώνιος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, I. Edited by G. Kittel. Translated and edited by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964. Pp. 197-209.
- Schlier, H. Die Brief an die Epheser. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963.

- . Der Brief an die Galater. Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. VII. 13th edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- . "Die Taufe nach dem 6. Kapitel des Römerbriefes," Evangelische Theologie, V (1938), 335-347. Also in Die Zeit der Kirche. Freiburg: Herder, 1956. Pp. 47-56.
- . "Vom Wesen der apostolischen Ermahnung nach Römerbrief 12, 1-2," Die Zeit der Kirche. Freiburg: Herder, 1956. Pp. 74-89.
- Schmidt, H. W. Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament. VI. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962.
- Schmitz, O. Die Opferanschauung des späteren Judentums und die Opferaussagen des Neuen Testaments. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1910.
- Schmitz, O., and G. Stählin. "παρακαλέω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, V. Edited by G. Friedrich. Translated from the German and edited by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967. Pp. 773-799.
- Schrage, W. Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paränese. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1961.
- . "Die Stellung zur Welt bei Paulus, Epiktet und in der Apokalyptik," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LXI (1964), 125-154.
- Schürer, E. "The Priesthood and the Temple Worship," A History of the Jewish People. II Division, Vol. I. Authorized English translation. Edinburgh: by T. & T. Clark, 1924. Pp. 207-305.
- Scott, W. Hermetica. 4 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924-1936.
- Seidensticker, P. Lebendiges Opfer (Röm. 12,1). Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen. XX, iii. Münster, Westf.: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1954.
- Sevenster, J. N. "Education or Conversion: Epictetus and the Gospels," Novum Testamentum, VIII (1966), 247-262.
- . Paul and Seneca. Supplements to Novum Testamentum. IV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

- Simpson, D. C., editor and translator. "The Book of Tobit," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Edited by R. H. Charles. Vol. I. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Sowers, S. O. The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews. Basel Studies of Theology. I. Zürich: Evz-Verlag, 1965.
- Stacey, W. D. The Pauline View of Man. London: Macmillan & Co., 1956.
- Stoessel, H. E. "Notes on R. 12.1-2. The Renewal of the Mind and Internalizing of the Truth," Interpretation, XVII (2, 1963), 161-175.
- Strack, H. L. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. Authorized translation from the 5th German edition. New York: Meridian Books, 1959.
- Strack, H. L. and P. Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash. 4th edition. Vol. III. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965.
- Strathmann, H. "ἱατρούω, ἱατρεία," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, IV. Edited by G. Kittel. Translated and edited by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967. Pp. 58-65.
- Talmud, The Babylonian. Under the editorship of I. Epstein. London: Soncino Press, 1948 (Index, 1952).
- Tannehill, R. C. Dying and Rising with Christ. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche. XXXII. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1966.
- Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962.
- von Arnim, H. "Epiktetos aus Hierapolis," Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Edited by G. Wissowa. Neue Bearbeitung. VI. 1. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1907. Cols. 126-132.
- , editor. Stoicorum veterum fragmenta. I-IV. Index by M. Adler. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1964.
- von Schlatter, A. Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief. Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1935.

- Weiser, A. The Psalms. Translated from the German Die Psalmen. Das Alte Testament Deutsch. XIV-XV. 5th revised edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.
- Wendland, H. D. "Ethik und Eschatologie in der Theologie des Paulus," Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, XLI, (1930), 757-783.
- Wenschkewitz, H. "Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament," Angelos, Archiv für neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte und Kulturkunde, IV (1932), 70-230.
- Whiteley, D. E. H. The Theology of St. Paul. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.
- Windisch, H. "Das Problem des paulinischen Imperative," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXIII (1924), 265-281.
- Wolfson, H. A. Philo. 2 vols. 2nd printing, revised. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Wordsworth, J., H. J. White, et al. Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi. II. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1889-1954.
- Yerkes, R. K. Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952.
- Zahn, T. Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. VI. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. [Georg Böhme], 1910.