

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
EVANGELICKÁ TEOLOGICKÁ FAKULTA

Disertační práce

ΑΓΙΟΣ

**The Development of the Semantic Field of
the Term “ΑΓΙΟΣ” in the New Testament
and Writings of Apostolic Fathers**

Eliška Havelková

Katedra Nového zákona
Vedoucí práce: Doc. Jiří Mrázek, Th.D.
Studijní program: Teologie
Studijní obor: Biblická teologie

Praha 2015

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto disertační práci s názvem “The Development of the Semantic Field of the Term “ἄγιος” in the New Testament and Writings of Apostolic Fathers” napsala samostatně a výhradně s použitím uvedených pramenů.

V Praze dne 7.7.2015

Eliška Havelková

Anotace

Tato práce mapuje vývoj sémantického pole termínu “*ἅγιος*”. Jedná se o lexikálně-teologickou analýzu, která sice vychází od jednotlivých lexémů, avšak přes hledání významů v kontextech se dostává až k teologickým závěrům. Vychozí bod je starozákonní pojetí svatosti shrnuté v Levitiku 10,10, jež také zároveň vyznačuje sémantické pole. V deseti kapitolách jsou vybrány nejrepresentativnější spisy Nového Zákona a Apoštolských Otců, které se svatosti věnují. Autorka vychází od jednotlivých výskytů termínů sémantického pole v jejich kontextu a z nich pak usuzuje na teologii svatosti, jež se takto odráží v jazyce daného spisu. Všechny kapitoly mají dvě části, jednu o svatosti a druhou o čistotě. Hlavními otázkami kladenými textu jsou: Zaprvé: Zda je u daných autorů svatost chápána jako transcendentní kvalita Boží, jež darem blízkosti s ním mění věřící, či zda se jedná o popis svatého, čili asketického života. Zadruhé: Jaký je vztah čistoty a svatosti. Je čistota předpokladem pro setkání se se Svatým? Zatřetí: Nastal posun vnímání svatosti oproti starozákonnímu pojetí, a jak se autor vyrovnává s opuštěním rituálních předpisů v církvi? Všechny tyto otázky lze zahrnout do zkoumání posunu významu daných termínů v jejich nejužším kontextu.

Klíčová slova

Svatý, čistý, nečistý, rituální čistota,

Summary

The present thesis maps the development of the semantic field of the Greek term “ἅγιος”. It is a lexical-theological analysis, which starts linguistically from single lexemes and, in search of the meanings, pays attention also to their contexts resulting in the theological summaries. The starting point is the Old Testament concept of holiness, summarized in Leviticus 10,10, which also delineates the semantic field. In the ten chapters of this thesis, ten of the most representative authors of the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers are explored as to their use of the holiness word-group. This thesis starts with the single occurrences of the terms in their original context and from here, the theology of holiness is drawn, reflected by the use of the words in every single of the authors. Every chapter is divided into two parts, the first describing holiness and the second one dealing with purity. The main questions asked to the text are: First, is the holiness understood as the transcendent quality of God, which, by being near to him, changes believers, or whether, on the other hand, it is a description of holy, i.e. ascetic life. Second, what is the relation of holiness and purity? Is purity presupposition for meeting with the Holy? Third, is there a visible shift in understanding of holiness compared with the Old Testament? How does the author reflect the abandonment of the ritual laws by the Church. Answers to all these questions are drawn from close inspection of development of meaning of the specific terms in their nearest context.

Keywords

Holy, pure, impure, ritual purity.

Acknowledgements

First of all my greatest thanks goes to doc. Mrazek, who has diligently read everything whenever I needed in a very short time, suggested comments and provided insightful ideas, who gave me freedom to work as I wished, yet gave strong boundaries to my exceedingly vivid intuition and imagination, who provided me with several scholarships and never lost faith in me.

I would also like to thank to prof. Prinzivalli from the university of La Sapienza in Rome, who opened the door for me in the library of Augustinianum and Biblicum and always warmly welcomed me, who also stressed that I should focus on the most important things and not read everything I find interesting.

Next, I am grateful to Mgr. Fritzova who helped me to scholarships to Italy.

I would also like to thank to all my friends in Marathon cafe, who have been by my side, lifted my spirit, talked with me endless hours about holiness and life. Special thanks to Jan Picka, who helped me with the last graphical adjustments and to Sandy Rogers ,who checked my English.

I am thankful to my mother who supported me, let me stay with her, provided a shelter, food and home to me.

I am grateful to Francesco, who has joined me on my way in St. Anton and has never left my side, who forced me to rest, who held me together, his bottomless love and acceptance made it possible that I eventually finished.

Most of all, I am thankful to God, for being, for encouraging me, for loving me and for pushing me not to give up till the end.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	11
Methodology	12
Development.....	13
Semantic Field.....	14
History of the Research.....	18
Structure.....	20
1. The Semantic Field of Holiness in the Gospel of Matthew.....	22
1.1 Introduction.....	22
1.2 Holiness.....	23
1.3 Purity.....	43
1.4 Other Cases.....	63
1.5 Summary.....	66
Chapter 2: The Gospel of Mark.....	67
2.1 Holiness.....	67
2.2 Purity.....	70
2.3 Conclusion.....	85
3. Chapter, Luke and Acts.....	87
3.1 Introduction.....	87
3.2 Holiness.....	87
3.3 Purity.....	152
3.4 Conclusion.....	159
Chapter 4: Hebrews.....	161
4.1 Holiness.....	161
4.2 Purity.....	182
4.3 Other cases.....	187
4.4 Conclusion.....	201
Chapter 5: Pauline literature	202
5.1 Holiness.....	202
5.2 Purity.....	272
5.3 Conclusion.....	287
Chapter 6: The Epistles to Ephesians and Collosians.....	289
6.1. Holiness.....	289
6.2 Purity.....	314
Chapter 7: Pastoral Epistles.....	316
7.1 Holiness.....	316
7.2 Purity.....	321
Chapter 8: The First Epistle of St. Clement	333

8.1 Holiness.....	333
8.2 Purity.....	364
8.3 Conclusion.....	368
Chapter 9: Didache.....	369
9.1 Holiness.....	369
9.2 Purity.....	382
Chapter 10: The Epistle of Barnabas	389
10.1 Holiness.....	389
10.2 Purity.....	401
Conclusion.....	409
Development of the Semantic Field.....	409
New Testament.....	409
Apostolic Fathers.....	415
Common Issues in Holiness.....	416
Common Issues in Purity.....	417
Bibliography.....	418

Introduction

Coming from charismatic background, I grew up being told that I should strive for sanctified life consisting mostly of “living biblical life”, which exhausted itself almost entirely on premarital sexual purity. Yes, I was “saint by grace”, but should I take my salvation lightly in defiling myself “with this world”, I might lose my salvation as well. When I started working on this thesis five years ago, I was still a fully charismatic evangelical with a lot of questions. I wanted to live my life in holiness, but how could I when I did not know what it meant. Was it sexually pure life, as majority of the nowadays books on holiness suggest? Was it ascetic striving for perfection, since “without holiness no one can see God?” What did I need to do to be worthy of the calling? And then another questions were coming: How can I know, that I am accepted even if I am a Gentile, even if I do not bring sacrifices and where did the whole ritual purity, so important for the authors of the book of Leviticus, disappear, and is the Priestly theology valid for us today?

I wanted to encounter teaching of the first Church. What did the first generation of Christians say about holiness, did they develop any specific teaching? And if not, how can I try to spy on their thinking and guess what they meant when they used the words they did? The only way for me to find the answer was to ask the Scriptures themselves, and to be sure, also some of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers¹. Could I find there my way to salvation for the life of holiness? Inspired by Descartes, I wanted to come out of my own experience, this time not experience of my personal spirituality, but the experience with the text.

1 Which I was discouraged by many teachers, since they were aware of the scope I was going to put on myself. Special thanks to prof. Priznivalli from Rome.

Methodology

In the first step, I defined the semantic field, then, at the courtesy of my faculty, I searched BibleWorks and set out on the journey to writing a lexicon. I first grouped all of the occurrences according to the author and then I was looking for collocations within the writings of the given author and tried to group them, if possible. Next, I made analysis of the Greek text of the verses in question and, if needed, I sometimes had to exegete entire chapters, in order not to lose the context.

The most challenging in this process was finding the balance between lexical and contextual approach. You cannot write a semantic analysis without context. I attempted to come up with my own understanding of the texts, based on my own work with them. After having compared the cases of the given collocation in the specific authors, I opened, first of all, four commentaries: The Word Biblical Commentary, The Anchor Bible Commentary, The New International Commentary and The Evagelisch-Katolischen Kommentar. Further, I was searching for other literature about the verses or cases in question². To my knowledge, I went through all issues of NTS and SBL since 1960 to present time. Sometimes, I found overwhelming number of articles, essays and monographs on a verse or a word. After having read them, I implemented the findings into the text I had written.

To my great surprise, my method paid off. I was open to change my mind on many of my presuppositions and I genuinely wanted to “find the truth” and “let the Word speak”. In these five years, my understanding of holiness has been turned upside down, and I am thankful for that. From the start, more than a

² I had the opportunity to spend three semesters studying in the libraries of Augustinianum and Biblicum.

thesis to accomplish a degree, this was about my personal search for what the early Church really teaches about holiness, whether they all agree, whether there is some change between different Christian groups and generations and finally how their views changed from the Old Testament times. I genuinely wanted to search the whole New Testament and writings of all Apostolic Fathers, but as many had warned me, it was a “mission impossible”, at least as far as postgraduate studies go. I hope that after some time of rest, I shall restart working on the missing points of the chain. Now I shall introduce you to the building blocks of my thesis, the development of the semantic field of ἅγιος.

Development

“Mouse”. Imagine a “mouse”. Now, imagine a “mouse” and a “window”. And now, imagine a “mouse”, a “window” and a “lawn”. And now, imagine a “mouse”, a “window” and a “monitor”. I dare say that you have just understood the idea behind the “development of the semantic field”. The first triad of “mouse”, “window” and “lawn” describes a mammal, a part of a house and part of nature. It is the original life of the first two lexemes. The second triad of “mouse”, “window” and “monitor” describes a hardware control of a cursor, a virtual space for work and a hardware of interface. The second triad has been subject to the change of semantic field of the first two lexemes. Hipkiss writes that: “A word activates a semantic field or domain of words, and words are generally used in association with one another become recognizable and recallable together.”³

3 R. A. Hipkiss, *Semantics: Defining the Discipline*. Routledge, 2014, pg. 69.

About thirty years ago the first idea connected with the lexeme “mouse” was the rodent, but nowadays it is the hardware. The lexical development does not carry any judging connotations, it is merely descriptive. Development from a living thing to a swarm of wires can hardly be considered an improvement or unfolding of deeper truth of the essence of the “mouse”. I am writing this, since I have heard many hesitant reactions by some Old Testament scholars on my endeavor of “development”. The development of the semantic field of holiness is not development to anything “better”. In the same way as “mouse”, some words changed their meaning in just thirty years and it kept changing. Had the change been sudden and singular, then we could speak about a “change” or a “shift”, but the early Church authors were looking for words and the ideas were slowly unfolding and thus also developing. Imagine that the same process that befell the lexeme “mouse”, affected, within similar time-span, concepts such as “holy”, “pure”, “defiling”, “temple”, “priest” and that finally, influenced by the Jesus event, these lexemes with the change of meaning also changed their mutual relations. My description of the development of the semantic field of ἅγιος then comes out of the pre-conception that the authors betray their theology based on how they write and what words they use in which contexts.

Semantic Field

As we have seen on the example of the lexeme “mouse”, a semantic field is a range of possible meanings associated with a word, reflected in its derivatives, collocations, synonyms and antonyms. It starts in the stem and can be observed according to the forms the word takes.

The semantic field of “ἅγιος” starts with the root *αγι-*. From here, by adding suffixes, we can reach the adjective, which is the most common form of the word. It is an adjective describing quality of belonging to God and him being special, different, mighty and beautiful⁴. The adjective is mostly collocated with Spirit and it describes the quality of God. We can form the verb, “ἁγιάζειν”, which describes transition of a subject to the sphere of holy. The noun can then describe either this process of transition, in case of “ἁγιασμός”, or it can describe the final product and quality of God, holiness, “ἁγιότης”, which, however, is scarce. There is another word describing holiness, which is not so common in the New Testament corpus, but appears often in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers: “ὅσιος”. Surprisingly, the most common Greek adjective describing holiness, “ἱερός”, does not appear in the studied literature - with few exceptions. This is because the Church built on the LXX choice of the words, which try to avoid any pagan associations with this notion, it is therefore a puristic selection. The first word describes mostly the transcendent quality of God, the second one represents the human response and the third is associated with the temple-worship.

4 Hannah Harrington in her book: *Holiness, Rabbinic Judaism and the Graeco-Roman World* (2001) writes the following: "...holiness describes God more closely than any other designation. His very essence is holiness (pg.11)" She goes on to say that God's holiness is described in several ways in the OT. e.g. like a consuming fire - absolutely perfect, pure and fathomless...fire is a good symbol of God's exalted, dangerous holiness...For that which can stand its heat, fire functions as purifier and perfecter (13)...the divine holiness is perfect...God himself models...perfect separation for he is not a mixture of physical and metaphysical essences...God's perfection is moral and it must be reflected in human, social relationships as well as in cultic ritual (19)..Holiness without an active goodness, or righteousness, is not holiness...God does not use his power like some kind of omnipotent tyrant, but always has in mind a supremely good end. Thus God's holiness is intrinsically linked to his will to do good, especially to those in need (27).H. K. Harrington, *Holiness: Rabbinic Judaism in the Graeco-Roman World*. London; New York: Routledge, 2001.

Where do we go from here and how shall we decide what other words belong to the studied group in question? The answer can be found in the Old Testament, Holiness Code: „*You are to distinguish between the holy and the common, and between the unclean and the clean*“ is the order given by God to Aaron and his sons Nadab and Abihu in the Leviticus 10,10. This verse has been the source of the precision of the holiness semantic field. Let us now have a look at the original text: “ולהבדיל בין הקדש ובין החל ובין הטמא ובין הטהור”. This is rendered by the LXX: “διαστεῖλαι ἀνά μέσον τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τῶν βεβήλων καὶ ἀνά μέσον τῶν ἀκαθάρτων καὶ τῶν καθαρῶν.” This is the original biblical definition of “holiness”, including its antonyms. The opposite to holy in the biblical language is not “profane” like nowadays. It is “impure”. The definition also includes the order to divide these and keep them separate, which is the key to understanding of holiness, since the original meaning of קדש is to separate⁵ (for the special use of God). The holy and impure have to be separated and therefore there is the realm of *purity* in between. The separation goes both ways, first, it is divorcement *from* something impure, second, it is also a relational word of belonging, it is setting apart *for* God, where God is the one who does the separation⁶.

5 E. Jenni and C. Westermann, Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament, 7th ed. Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001.

6 For the literature among others (in the order of importance) viz: A. Friderichsen, “Hagos-Qados. Ein Beitrag zu den voruntersuchungen zur christlichen begriffsgeschichte; E. Zocca, Dai “santi” al santo: un percorso storico- linguistico intorno all’idea di santità: Africa romana, secc. II-V. Studium, 2003., P. P. Jenson, Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World. A&C Black, 1992.; H. K. Harrington, Holiness: Rabbinic Judaism in the Graeco-Roman World. London; New York: Routledge, 2001; .J. A. Adewuya, Holiness and Community in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1: Paul’s View of Communal Holiness in the Corinthian Correspondence. Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2011.; M. Poorthuis and J. J. Schwartz, Purity and Holiness. Leiden * ; Boston: Brill, 1999.; D. G. Peterson, Possessed by God: A New Testament theology of sanctification and holiness. Leicester, England: Downers Grove, Ill: IVP Academic, 2001.; K. E. Brower and A. Johnson,

The antonym of “ἅγιος” is therefore, according to the definition, “טמא” translated as “ἀκάθαρτος” with all its derivatives. In between, there are “טהור” rendered as “καθαρός” and “לֵךְ” translated as “βέβηλος”, but in the New Testament the more frequent synonym is “κοινός”. The word describing transition from “ἀκάθαρτος” to “καθαρός” is the verb “καθαρίζω” and further the transition from purity to holiness is defined by the verb “ἁγιάζω”, this is the way of sanctification “ἁγιασμός”. If we move away from holiness, a subject is first desecrated, “βεβηλώ”, which does not appear in our corpus, then it is defiled “κοινόω”.

In the Old Testament, all these words were associated with the cult described meticulously in the Holiness Code, motivated by the association with the Lord in order to be his special separated people. This law was ruling in the lives of the believers every day practically. In the New Testament, the ritual requirements, however, disappear. The Rabbinic Judaism transformed all the ritual demands in Mishna into the spiritual worship of lips, they did not abandon the original laws, they transformed them.

“*What happened with the holiness in the New Testament?*” is my main question and then second: “*How can it be reached?*” There are other questions that need to be asked such as: “How is it possible that the same God who was so exalted and distant, requiring perfection in purification upon approaching him, even on the pain of death, can be now worshiped in such a relaxed way? How is it possible that that he would not be offended by the ritual impurity?” And then from another angle the question that pained me was: “Is holiness a transcendent quality of God, which can be assumed by nearness to him in worship,

Holiness and Ecclesiology in the New Testament. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2007.; S. C. Barton, Holiness: Past and Present. A&C Black, 2003.; R. Asting, Heiligkeit im Urchristentum. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930.

or is there same space for ethical ascetic achievement of holiness and what role does the purity play in the changed game, when the ritual demands are deactivated and how did this exactly happen?” As suggested above, I expected the authors to betray their answers to my question in the way they use the words of the semantic field of ἅγιος.

History of the Research

If you search for information on “holiness and purity” on the internet, the vast majority of the entries offered to you are popular study-books connected to asceticism and sexual abstinence in some way. It is quite shocking to realize that this is the reality of nowadays popular theology. But how about the theological books explaining the concept from truly biblically sound perspective?

In 1916 the first to describe the semantic field was Anton Friderichsen in his monograph “Hagios-Qados. Ein Beitrag zu den Voruntersuchungen zur christlichen Begriffsgeschichte”. It is a thorough study of the use of the words in MSS and LXX. The author mostly lists the cases according to the collocations, but does not derive any theological conclusions from his findings.

In 1930, in his footsteps went Ragnar Asting with the monograph “Heiligkeit im Urchristentum”. The author describes the semantic field of holiness in both the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers. The monograph is concise and follows theological concepts associated with the collocations rather than authors.

Recently, in 2001, from the evangelical background, D.G. Peterson wrote his New Testament theology of holiness in “Possessed by God: A New Testament

theology of sanctification and holiness”, but his approach is more systematic than biblical, though he comes out of the New Testament and follows the writings very closely.

Last, but not least, dealing with the holiness in the Old Testament, the work of Hannah Harrington requires attention and her monograph “Holiness: Rabbinic Judaism in the Graeco-Roman World” also from 2001.

As far as the Old Testament semantic field of holiness goes, the monograph of P.P. Jensen “Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World” describes very well the situation and it is an excellent introduction to Priestly theology.

For the semantic field of purity, the most important authors dealing with the Old Testament concept whose many works are key to any good basis for understanding it and whom I often quote are: M. Douglas⁷, J. Neusner⁸, J. Milgrom⁹

7 M. Douglas, “Deciphering a Meal,” *Daedalus*, pp. 60 – 81, 1972; *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo*. Psychology Press, 1966.; .

8 J. Neusner, *Judaism when Christianity Began: A Survey of Belief and Practice*. Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.; *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. Yale University Press, 1991.; *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities, Part 22: The Mishnaic System of Uncleanness: Its Context and History*. Eugene, Or.: Wipf & Stock Pub, 2007.; *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities, Part 3: Kelim: Literary and Historical Problems*. Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2006.; *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism: The Haskell Lectures, 1972-1973*. Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2006.; “First Cleanse the Inside. The ‘Halakhic’ Background of a Controversy Saying. ,” *NTS*, vol. 22, pp. 486 – 95, Jun. 1975.

9 J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st edition. New York: Anchor Bible, 1998.; *Leviticus 17-22*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2000.; *Leviticus 23-27*. New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2001

and J.Klawans¹⁰. In the New Testament J.D.G. Dunn¹¹ and P. Fredriksen¹² are the most quoted authors.

Structure

The whole thesis is divided into two main sections, that of the writings of the New Testament and that of Apostolic Fathers. Each chapter first describes the holiness word-group and then the field of purity. The collocations are grouped from the most frequent to rather unique ones. Each of the sections starts with quoting the given verse where the lexeme occurs in context. Every verse is then exegeted with help of the secondary literature. In the end of the in-

-
- 10 J. Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. OUP USA, 2009. There are many authors who deal with partial problems of holiness and purity in different writings of the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers, they shall be mentioned along the way.
- 11 J. D. G. Dunn, "Baptism in the Spirit: a Response To Pentecostal Scholarship On Luke-Acts," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 3–27, Oct. 1993. "Pistis and the Righteous One," *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 400–402, Jul. 2009.; "Spirit-and-Fire Baptism," *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 81–92, Apr. 1972.; *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*. Hymns Ancient and Modern Ltd, 2010.; *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135* : the Second Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism, Durham, September, 1989. Mohr Siebeck, 1992.; *Word Biblical Commentary: Volume 38A, Romans 1-8*. Dallas, Tex.: Thomas Nelson, 1988. et al.; *The New Perspective on Paul*, 2 edition. Grand Rapid, Mich: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007.; *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*, 1st American ed edition. Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990.; *New Perspective on Paul: Collected Essays*. Tübingen, Germany: J.C.B. Mohr, 2005.; *The Parting of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, 2nd edition. London: SCM Press, 2006.; *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, 3 edition. London: SCM Press, 2006.
- 12 P. Fredriksen, "Paul's Letter to the Romans, the Ten Commandments, and pagan 'Justification by Faith,'" vol. 133, no. 4, pp. 801–808, 2014.; "Paul, Purity, and the Ekklesia of Gentiles," in *The beginnings of Christianity, Jerusalem, 2005*, pp. 205–217.; "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," *New Testament Studies*, vol. 56, no. 02, pp. 232–252, Apr. 2010.

dividual section, a summary is provided to re-focus on the semantic field in question.

1. The Semantic Field of Holiness in the Gospel of Matthew

1.1 Introduction

In this chapter, as well as in all the following, the use of the ἅγιος word group is going to be treated in the first place. The most recurrent collocations containing this word shall have precedence. They shall be grouped and listed according to the frequency of occurrences, starting from the collocation „Holy Spirit“¹³. Then, the field of purity shall be examined. Possible connections between the two terms shall be searched in respect whether “holy” and “pure” belong to the same semantic field in the writings of the given author. Similarities with the Old Testament treatment of these subjects will be examined. In the end, other possible clues will be searched for, that lead to better understanding of the notion of holiness as it is used by the author, such as sacrificial language or other suitable metaphors which may not explicitly use any holiness word at all, but hint at the holiness in some way. My ultimate goal is to come to a conclusion about how the author's specific use of the holiness word group reveals their theology of holiness.

13 The collocation πνεῦμα ἅγιον, as an exception, shall be always treated as first, even in the cases, where there are not numerous.

1.2 Holiness

1.2.1 The Holy Spirit, “πνεῦμα ἅγιον”

Out of the thirteen cases of the adjective ἅγιος and its derivatives in the Gospel of Matthew, five collocate with πνεῦμα, and all of these are used in the sense of the person of the Trinity. These are the following: Mary conceived her Son by the Holy Spirit (1,18: ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου), which is acknowledged a few verses later by the angels to her future husband (1,20: ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου). John the Baptist says that the one coming after him would baptize in [the] Holy Spirit and fire (3,11: βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί). Later, Jesus speaks about the sin against the Holy Spirit: those speaking against it (12,31 κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου) would not find forgiveness. The final instance is at the Great Commission as a part of the baptismal Trinitarian formula (28,19 εἰς ...καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος). Obviously, these do not cover all the cases of the use of πνεῦμα; however, the scope of this work does not allow us to inquire deeper into or to discuss all of the examples. We shall, therefore, limit ourselves to the above mentioned occurrences.

From the list of cases of the collocation „Holy Spirit“ it can be suggested that Matthew had already some unformulated idea about Trinity, though the doctrine was established much later. His use of the πνεῦμα ἅγιον betrays certain pneumatology, sustaining such complex issues as the „baptism in the Holy Spirit“ and „sin against the Holy Spirit“. The theologoumenons are not explained, since common understanding is expected on the part of the readers, this is, however, is hardly reconstructible. With certainty, it can only be claimed

that the author understands the Spirit as being the Spirit of God, who gives life to the Son and in whose name Christians are baptized; it is rather person than power, it can be blasphemed against and is opposite to the impure spirits.

1.2.1.1 Jesus Born of the Holy Spirit

Out of the two mentions of the Annunciation in the Gospels, the version of Matthew is the less eloquent one. In 1,18 he only writes that Joseph found out that Mary had already been carrying a child in her belly before they were able to “get together” and while they were already betrothed¹⁴. Immediately this pregnancy is classified as work of the Spirit. “Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν. μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου. “ (Mat 1,18) The Spirit is the one who puts the baby in her “belly”. This is not a Hellenistic reminiscence of celestial origin of a semi-divine hero¹⁵, nor is a sexual intercourse understood¹⁶.

After an intermezzo describing Joseph's doubts, the divine origin of Jesus is restated again in the verse **1,20**: “ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου κατ’ ὄναρ ἐφάνη αὐτῷ λέγων· Ἰωσήφ υἱὸς Δαυὶδ, μὴ φοβηθῆς παραλαβεῖν Μαρίαν τὴν γυναῖκά σου· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου.” That, which is in Mary, is from the Holy Spirit, Joseph should therefore not fear to accept his fi-

14 Luz, 102, 103: “Josef und Maria sind verlobt, d.h. rechtlich gesehen aneinander gebunden. Eine Verlobung kann nur durch Scheidebrief gelöst werden.“

15 Hagner, 17: „Mary's pregnancy is attributed to the agency of God's Spirit – not a pagan notion of sexual relations... the divine origin of Mary's baby in turn marks him out as the Son of God, a Christological title. That, although not used here, is very important to Matthew...“

16 Albright, Mann point out that the virgin birth “was a well known polemical battleground in the time of Origen (Contra Celsum 2, 28,32,33,39)” and continues to be to this day, considering e.g. the feminist reading suggesting that Mary was raped by a roman soldier.

ance as she is¹⁷. The transcendental origin is thus twice repeated and interconnected with the Davidic lineage.

1.2.1.2 Baptism in the Holy Spirit

Baptism in the Holy Spirit is prophesied by John the Baptist in **Mt 3,11**: „Ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν, ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί.“ At the first reading, it is obvious that Matthew's John understood his water-baptism as a preliminary ritual that would prepare people for a future one, which would be different from his own.

John's baptism in the waters of the Jordan River was, according to the Matthew, unlike the other Evangelists, *εἰς μετάνοιαν*. Its purpose, was primarily sealing of repentance¹⁸. Water was used in Judaism as the medium of ritual purification, transferring an object or a person from the realm of the unclean to that of the clean¹⁹. John's baptism is a typical ritual that connects a specific act with in-

17 Luz 104, „Die Engellerscheinung wird nicht beschrieben, es fällt alles Gewicht auf die Botschaft, Josef wird als Davidsson angesprochen: Wie schon V.18a andeutete, geht es Matthäus darum, die Einpflanzung des Jungfrauensohns in den Stamm Davids zu erläutern... Der aus V.18 schon bekannte Hinweis auf den Heiligen Geist wird wiederholt. Es ist dabei an das kreative Eingreifen Gottes durch den Geist und nicht an den (neutrischen!, hebräisch weiblichen!) Geist als geschlechtlichen Partner Marias zu denken.“ In the original version of this thesis I attempted to refer to the Holy Spirit in feminine based on the Hebrew feminine notion. However, I was discouraged to proceed in this direction, since the complications were too vast, especially in connection with the writings of rather Hellenistic origin.

18 Luz, 148: “Weil dieses Stichwort nur im Zusammenhang mit der Johannestaufe theologisch bedeutsam ist, kann man – im Unterschiebe zum Lukas – vermuten, daß er an eine einmalige Umkehr am Anfang des Christlichen lebens denkt.”

19 Compare with all the cases of the book of Leviticus where the ablution is commanded to deal with the impurities. It was important first to wash, and then to wait. Water and time were therefore the two means how to regain the purity. This includes, among many others, all the cases of the “unclean until evening” of Leviticus. E.g. Lv 11,25.28.32.40; 14,47; 15,5 etc.

ner ethical movement. This type of ritual is well known to Rabbinic Judaism²⁰ which also uses the ritual ablution as means of purifying Proselytes into the holy nation of God. In his discourse, the evangelist might have hidden behind the words of the Baptist, in order to promote his contemporary agenda, which is in polemic with other groups, such as e.g. the followers of John²¹.

The following can be said with certainty of Matthew's depiction of John the Baptist: John's baptism was a preliminary one, subordinate to the coming baptism. The purifying element was water and the purpose was to support the recipients in their *μετανοια*²².

The second baptism was supposed to be different in key ways. First, it would be administered by Jesus, who was "stronger", i.e. of higher spiritual importance, than the Baptist²³. Second, the purifying medium is no longer water

20 For this use of ritual ablution of the body, or rather full immersion, serves the ritual bath Mikveh. All the ablutions are described in the Mishnaic tractate Mikvaot. There were many ritual baths in the temple itself (Yeb. 22a; 48b; 97b; Mass. Ger. c.ii). For a popular introduction to the problem e.g.: <http://www.haydid.org/ronimmer.htm> 4.4.2015 13:01. However Neusner claims that the Christian baptism has nothing to do with the Mishnaic teaching on baths. In J. Neusner, Ed., *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities, Part 22: The Mishnaic System of Uncleanness: Its Context and History.*, 1977. on the page 87, note 1 he writes the following: "...the Mishnaic conception of the immersion-pool bears no relationship to baptism for the removal of sins, and lustration for cultic purity at table is totally irrelevant to the washing away of sin ...for the Mishnaic system, cleanness and uncleanness bear no metaphorical valence in an ethical, let alone historical-eschatological, framework, but are addressed to a quite distinctive ontology."

21 C.F. Keener says that John's call for water baptism was understood as the call to the "once-for-all repentance, the kind of turning from [the] old way of life to a new [one] that Judaism associated with Gentiles converting to Judaism." Keener, Craig, S. *The Spirit and the Gospels and Acts*, pg. 92. (This, however, has been refuted by Neusner, viz previous note). further he says that "John treats his fellow-Jews as if they were Gentiles" because they "were not acting like good descendants of the Patriarchs," which was obvious from their fruit. They are therefore warned "not to take their status as God's people for granted." As Neusner describes meticulously, there was not only one type of immersion, but none of them seems to fit the baptism ablution.

22 Hagner, 51: "...by which is not meant that repentance is the goal or result of baptism...since the baptism itself presupposes the existence of repentance"

23 And who actually did not baptize anybody while on earth, therefore "spiritual".

but rather the Holy Spirit²⁴ itself and Fire. Third, it is to be received by the same audience, which points to its imminence, as well as to the insufficient and preliminary nature of John's water-baptism.

In his article from 1972, J.D.G. Dunn lists six main streams of understanding the text²⁵. He then comes to the following conclusion, where he links the designation and the origin of the theology of the Spirit-baptism back to the Baptist as “he spoke of a baptism in Spirit”²⁶:

“We may believe then, that John himself had a part in the creative molding of the eschatological hopes to which he fell heir, and influenced by the Qumran sect, it is quite probable that it was John the Baptist who finally linked the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit to the Messiah and who first spoke of the Messiah's bestowal of the Holy Spirit under the powerful figure, drawn from the rite which was his own hallmark, of baptism in Spirit-and-Fire.”

24 There is an ongoing discussion whether John the Baptist could have predicted the trinitarian thinking. Dunn in “Baptism in the Holy Spirit (2010)” (pgs. 8 - 10) comes to the conclusion that “...there is no really decisive reason for denying the originality of the Q version of the *logion*...the fuller saying makes excellent sense when interpreted in the context of the John's ministry and against the background of Jewish thought prior to John” Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today, Hymns Ancient and Modern Ltd, 2010, pg. 10.

25 J.D.G.Dunn, ‘Spirit-and-Fire Baptism’, NovT 14 (1972): 81-92. The list of the possible readings can be summarized as follows: *Chrysostom* understands the fire as synonymous to the Holy Spirit. *Origenes* understood the text as describing two separate baptisms: One in the Spirit, for those who repent, and second by fire of judgment for the unrepentant. The next is e.g. the attempt of *Briggs* (followed by *Wellhausen*, *Dibbelius*, *Butmann*.) to reconstruct the Aramaic text. He believed that in its original form, there was only the *logion* of fire and no mention of the Spirit. Dunn also adds the explanation of *Bruce* who renders the Holy Spirit as a “*strong wind of judgment, holy, as sweeping away what is light and worthless in the nation*”. The *Religionsgeschichtlich* argument argues that “Mk contains the original traditions” and all the others are a work of Christian addition. Finally, reflecting the Dead Sea Scrolls has lead some to believe that “*the Baptist did speak of gracious Spirit*”. Pgs. 81 – 83.

26 Dunn, *Spirit-and-Fire Baptism*, pg. 90,1.

Even though some interpreters follow Origen's explanation²⁷ that the baptism in the Holy Spirit²⁸ is for the righteous, in order to purify²⁹ them for the future life, whereas the baptism in the fire is the eternal judgment of the wicked³⁰, it can be well understood, as suggested by Dunn, as a two-fold movement of the “one purgative act of messianic judgment, which both repentant (as a blessing) and unrepentant (as destruction) would experience.”³¹ He draws on the Jewish eschatological uses of the image of fire which include the “destruction of the wicked,” as well as, and at the same time, the “purification of the righteous.”

The anathorous Holy Spirit here, therefore, works as purifying agent as the Spirit sent by Jesus. Nonetheless, rather than as a person, here the Spirit is understood as a (liquid) element parallel to water and fire, an element which a person can be immersed into, either for purification or for destruction. The outcome of such a baptism would be the ultimate purity and holiness, given by Jesus to those whom he thus immerses. This baptism, unlike the John's does not

27 For more viz Dunn, Spirit-And-Fire.

28 Everett Ferguson in his book *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries recognizes four types of baptism in Origen*: “The shadows or types in the Old Testament (including the baptism of John), Christian baptism in water, the spiritual baptism by the Holy Spirit, and the eschatological baptism of fire. Origen added another baptism in the experience of some Christians, the blood of martyrdom.” pg. 400,401 Also see Origen's commentary on John 1, 24n. http://biblehub.com/library/origen/origens_commentary_on_the_Gospel_of_john/13_john_i_24_25.htm 27.4. 2015

29 “Origen in his Homilies on Jeremiah distinguishes the baptism in the Holy Spirit and the baptism in fire. ‘The holy person is baptized in the Holy Spirit, but the person who after believing and being counted worthy of the Holy Spirit sins again is washed [lou/ei] in “fire”.’ ‘Blessed is the one who is baptized in the Holy Spirit and has no need of the baptism that comes from fire. Triply to be pitied is the one who has need of being baptized in fire’ (2:3:1-2).” E. Ferguson, *Baptism according to Origen*,” EQ, vol. 78, no. 2, pp. 117–135, 2006. Especially pages 123,124 dedicated solely to the eschatological baptism of fire.

30 So e.g. Keener.

31 Dunn, *Baptism*, 11.

just seal the effort of the believers, this one is active and effectively purifies and sanctifies.

The language of holiness remains the same as in the Old Testament, it is still “purity”, not only “blamelessness” or “righteousness” that is sought. However, here, it is not achieved by keeping the ritual-law ethics finalized in the ritual ablution. The purity is received in an “ablution” in the Spirit, which is distributed by the Coming One. This purification does not concern body (hands) anymore. It is the same type of purity that shall later be encountered in other writings under the name “purity of heart³²” or “purity of conscience”. The Spirit, accepted in faith purifies the inner man by its residence in their hearts.

In the end of the Gospel, the risen Christ commissions his disciples to go to the whole world, to preach, to disciple and to baptize, the commanded baptism is expressed in triadic, rather than trinitary³³, formula, including the Holy Spirit. **Mt 28,19**: “πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος,” Luz believes that the triadic formula was written especially with the view of Gentiles, who upon believing in Jesus were also expected to embrace the faith in the God of Israel, as well as the Spirit³⁴.

32 In Matthew, this collocation appears in the beatitudes, where the stress lies rather in the achievement of a righteous conduct. Among other authors the collocation is rather a gracious gift of God who purifies the inside of a person: Acts 10 and 11, Hebrews 9.

33 Hagner 887, “The threefold name (at most only an incipient trinitarianism) in which the baptism was to be performed...seems clearly to be a liturgical expansion of the evangelist consonant with the practice of his day”.

34 Luz, pg. 452,3: “Die Nennung des dreifachen Namens hat sich wohl aus der schon bei Paulus belegbaren, bereits liturgisch üblichen Nebeneinanderstellung von Vater, Sohn und Geists heraus entwickelt. Sie lag bei der Taufe zumal von Heiden und Heiden, welche nicht nur den Glauben an Christus, sondern auch denjenigen an Gott annahmen und für die mit der Taufe die Erfahrung der Geistesausgießung verbunden war, von vornherein nahe...”

In the baptism a believer receives not only salvation, but also the Spirit - by being immersed into it as well; they are thus connected with it and purified and sanctified by it. There is insufficient coverage on the baptism in the (name of the) Holy Spirit in the secondary literature. All the commentaries busy themselves with the issue of whether this commission is widening the reach of the mission from the Israel only to all the world or whether this commission is successive, meaning that the Gentiles have taken over the blessing of Israel and now they are the “new Israel” exclusively. Despite the insufficient coverage in the secondary literature, it can be stated that this triadic baptism is not the same fire-and-Spirit baptism that was promised by John. The Spirit is received at the triadic baptism together with adherence to Jesus and his Father, but the Spirit-and-fire baptism pledged by John was eschatological in nature³⁵. Our present triadic baptism is also focused on the future and it does herald to those who receive it that they are set apart for God (thus sanctified) and his eschatological reign, but not yet in the fulness.

1.2.1.3 Sin against the Holy Spirit

In **12,32**, Matthew writes *„και ος εαν ειπη λογον κατα του υιου του ανθρωπου, αφεθησεται αυτω· ος δ' αν ειπη κατα του πνευματος του αγιου, ουκ αφεθησεται αυτω ουτε εν τω τω αιωνι ουτε εν τω μελλοντι.“* This saying appears in the middle of chapter 12, marked by the disagreement between Jesus and the Pharisees. Jesus heals even on Sabbath, for he values mercy over ossified exegesis of the Law. On the other hand, the Pharisees are rather scared, when they watch him bind

35 The Christian baptism is eschatological as well to a certain degree. By it Christians are separated and therefore sanctified for God as his special people belonging already to the eschatological aeon, they do herald the future, being eschatological community. However, they receive the baptism here and now, in this space-time.

evil spirits, and therefore they say that his power must come from the Devil himself. Jesus is trying to explain that in order to deliver people from the power of Beelzebub, he first needs to bind him. This means that he cannot be of the same origin as Beelzebub, and that he is even stronger than demons. The Pharisees should watch their language, because words do matter.

Blasphemy, which is desecration on the level of language, is a dangerous³⁶. The word describes the movement opposite to sanctification. In the prayer to the Father, Jesus teaches his disciples to pray for sanctification of the Name in line with the third saying of the Decalogue. Here, in his teaching on the opposite movement of the sanctification, Jesus makes difference between the objects of the profanation.

A blasphemy to the Son of Man is not the same as the blasphemy to the Holy Spirit. The Pharisees are profaning the Holy Spirit, by whom Jesus does his miracles. Had they blasphemed to Jesus, it would have been forgivable. However, when someone says that the powerful works of the Spirit are not pure, but devilish and of satanic origin³⁷, when the Pharisees call holiness “desecration,” that is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. They are closing them-

36 Since the language of the heart can eventually bear fruit in some blasphemous actions, which is also the message of the Sermon on the mount.

37 Albright, Mann, 156 “to confuse the Spirit of truth with the Spirit of falsehood, to confuse the Messiah's work with that of Beelzebub, is blasphemy”

selves away³⁸ from the new age, in which this very Spirit is going to reign.³⁹ With whom are they allied? Whom do they serve?

This case shows us that holiness is not necessarily recognizable by everyone. It can remain hidden to some who prefer their own ways; then the source of holiness, that is the Holy Spirit, can be desecrated in their minds and words when they profane its work, calling it the work of Satan.

Summary of πνεῦμα ἅγιον: The cases of the collocation suggest that the Spirit of God is the ultimate source of holiness and power. It is the Spirit, who works through Jesus, the Son, in order to promote holiness in the sense of mercy and healing. The Spirit also works through the Messiah in delivering the eschatological baptismal fire.

This close connection of the Spirit with Jesus, their interdependence, is then visible in both the Annunciation and the blasphemy saying. Spirit is the source of the life and force of Jesus, he is born of it and his power comes from it. This inter-connection is then summarized in the triadic formula at the end of the Gospel (28,19).

38 Hagner, 347 “To blaspheme against the Spirit was in this case to attribute the work of God's Spirit to Satan...this blasphemy by its very nature makes forgiveness impossible (in that sense, it is analogous to apostasy of Heb 6,4-6)”

39 Montague, G.T.: *The Holy Spirit: The Growth of a Biblical Tradition*, stresses the motivation of the evangelist, who is trying to speak in his situation where his Church, or, at least a part of it, would like to return to the Pharisaism. On the page 307 he writes: “...given the already obvious manifestations of the Spirit, one must either align with Jesus and the Holy Spirit or with the Pharisees who oppose the Holy Spirit”. Montague further points out, that there is high “likelihood, that Matthew is envisaging the sin against the Spirit as the disbelief of the Jewish nation after the resurrection”. I would say, that they are the ones of the old order of the rituals and they are afraid of the new coming Spirit.

1.2.2 The Adjective “ἅγιος”

The adjective is used five times in the Gospel. Twice it is applied to some space, and twice it characterizes beings: angels and dead people. Once it is used to describe an unspecified object, that is, “something holy.”

The first case of the adjective appears in the following saying (7,6): "Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσὶν μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μήποτε καταπατήσουσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτῶν καὶ στραφέντες ῥήξωσιν ὑμᾶς." Unlike in the other case of this saying in the Didache (9,5),⁴⁰ the verse in Matthew appears basically without any context that would help us understand the intention of the meaning. The wider context is the Sermon on the Mount, but the immediate context is teaching about intercession, which is not helpful.

History of interpretation of this verse is quite wild, ranging from taking the “holy” for “jewelry”⁴¹ to designating the “dogs and pigs”⁴² to stupid people, Gentiles etc. There have been some attempts of assigning the designation “dogs” to the Gentiles, in which case the “holy” would probably be the Jewish-Christian tradition, however, these stay unconvincing building on too many fluid variables⁴³. Just because in another context in the Gospel the image of the

40 The same saying appears also in Didache in different contexts. We shall compare them later. In the Didache, this proverb is handling the Holy Communion. Also the Gos. Thom93 reads: “(93) (1) "Do not give what is holy to the dogs, lest they throw it upon the dunghill. (2) Do not throw pearls to swine, lest they turn <them> into [mud].” Translation by the Berlin Working Group for Coptic Gnostic Writings in <http://www.earlyChristianwritings.com/text/thomas-fifth.html> 21.5.2015,18:31

41 J. A. Bolten, *Der Bericht des Matthäus von Jesu dem Messia.* (1792). Goes out of the similarity of the words and rhythm in Aramaic.

42 Luz,381: “Das unreine Schewin, das in rabbinischen Texten als unnennbar umschreiben wird, ist Inbegriff des Verabscheuten, in manchen texten erscheint „Schwein” als metaphor für „Heiden“ oder „Rom“.”

43 <http://danielngullotta.com/2015/04/16/why-is-Jesus-in-the-Gospel-of-matthew-racist-pt-2/> April 19, 2015 I suggest contra that rather than scaring the Gentiles away, the Gospel was written for Jews and it included also few anecdotes where the Gentiles were included, in order to soften the Jews. If the Church had an anxiety of Gentiles they would have, according to me, keep talking about them. If the suffered the fear of defilement by

dog is applied to a non-Jewish woman⁴⁴, it does not mean we are compelled to read this case in the same way. Hagner reasons very clearly, when he writes that “Matthew believes the Gospel *will* go to the Gentiles” and further that “it is uncertain that Gentiles, for whom the Gospel was only a kind of foolishness, would react this way”. He therefore summarizes: “it is applicable to both Gentiles and Jews, i.e., to all who are unreceptive”⁴⁵.

To ἄγιον in the original Jewish context is most likely the sacrificial meat or other leftovers from the sacrifice, called in Hebrew “קדש קדשים”⁴⁶. For the lack of refrigeration⁴⁷ these had to be consumed as soon as possible, in order to prevent desecration by either throwing it away or giving it to dogs. However, this was forbidden. Whatever the origin of the saying was, it is used metaphorically here. Jesus is warning against *desecration* as such. That, which is holy,⁴⁸

Gentiles, then that would be the focus of the Gospel, which is not. What the Gospel keeps repeating, on the other hand, is the Jewish ritual law. It is obsessed with what is still valid and what is not anymore. The question of “How far can we go and still remain orthodox” keeps coming back. This is portrayed on the representative Jew, Jesus, who touches the impure but instead of defilement, he promotes thus purification and sanctification. As the Gospel unfolds in the crescendo of Jesus' outpouring of holiness, it is viewed as crescendo of blasphemy by Jesus' opponents. Jesus is accused of the major possible violations against the law and then he translates them into the new situation, not marking them as a blasphemy, but rather as sanctification. The faith is said by other authors of the New Testament writings to be efficient in purifying the hearts of the Gentile believers, who thus become ritually pure.

44 It is not even certain that Jesus in Mt 15, 21 -28 is pointing solely to her ethnic origin and that the case binds us to read this one so.

45 Hagner, pg. 171,172

46 E.g.: Lv 2,3.10; 6,9.18 and many, many more.

47 Thus A. Milavec, *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary*. Collegeville, Minn: Michael Glazier, 2003.

48 Rather curious are the findings of G. Schwarz in his article MATTHÄUS vii 6a in *NovT* 14/1. 1972, who follows Jeremias and Bolten, for that matter, in their attempt to translate the logion back into Aramaic. His conclusion is then so minimalist that it is difficult to take seriously: pg. 24 “*Nimmt man nämlich Ringe und Perlen und Hunde und Schweine für das was sie sind, so beantwortet sich die Sinnfrage nahezu von selbst...Dies also, nicht mehr und nichts anderes als dies, wollte Jesus mit Mt 7,6a einschärfen. Verwendet euren Schmuck nicht sinnlos!*” and he goes on pg. 25: „*Statt also Autorität zu entscheiden, was mit dem Schmuck der Jüngerinnen zu geschehen*

is to be set apart and not to be profaned by giving it to somebody or something unworthy of it. Despite the possible general impression on the Jewish audience that Jesus was desecrating the old order by showing his mercy, touching the untouchables, by seeking the company of dubious people, which is viewed by his opponents as liberalism, there is still a thick line between mercy and desecration. Jesus did not come to desecrate. In spite of reversing the flow of holiness (viz. further), Jesus does not teach anarchy and blasphemy, the other way round: That which is sacred, should be held in high respect and it should still be kept apart.

The second case of the adjective ἅγιος in Matthew is in the following context (24,15): "Ὅταν οὖν ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου ἐστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω," there will be "the abomination that causes desolation ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ, when this comes to pass, the end is at hand." This saying appears in the beginning of Jesus' prophecy about Jerusalem's end, in the beginning of the Matthean apocalypse. It is connected with blasphemy as well. "The abomination which causes desolation" is a well known Old Testament theologoumenon for the woes coming at the end of times.⁴⁹ "The holy place" is where this desecration occurs. Daniel 9,27⁵⁰

habe, und damit deren persönliche Entscheidung vorwegzunehmen, überläßt er die Entscheidung ihnen selbst, erwartet er von ihnen nur das sie ihren Schmuck (oder den Wert, den er darstellt) nicht mißbrauchen – Eine wahrhaft gütige und zugleich pädagogische Antwort!" Were Jesus really speaking only about the rings and pearls of his female followers, he must have then considered this jewelry holy, given the parallelism. The author got lost in translation and forgot to watch also context and parallel occurrences.

49 At the end of the book of Daniel, to which Jesus is calling attention, there is a prophecy (12,11) about the exact number of days to when this comes to pass

50 „He will confirm a covenant with many for one 'seven.' In the middle of the 'seven' he will put an end to sacrifice and offering. And on a wing [of the temple] he will set up an abomination that causes desolation, until the end that is decreed is poured out on him."

describes the time of final judgment when the abomination would enter the Temple. When Jesus uses this collocation, his listeners probably understand the underlying context.⁵¹ He draws on the well known apocalyptic tradition. The Day of the Lord, the Judgment, shall be known as the time of the ultimate desecration. Holy places, such as the Temple, can sanctify that which is inside, but they cannot protect themselves from the judgment⁵². Then God himself will allow desecration: by His holy presence and glory leaving the holy place. When “sanctum, the holy” leaves, the temple becomes just a normal, common, place, thus allowing its enemies to defile it. The “holy place” receives its holiness from being associated with God, from being set apart *by* and *for* God. Its holiness stems from God's presence, which in turn grows with the uniqueness people grant the place. It is not holy in itself and it can only partially be sanctified by people. The sanctifier is the ultimate owner of the Temple. Therefore “the abomination of desolation in the holy place” is in the hands of God, who, when the time comes, allows His own enemies and the enemies of His people to enter the holy place and thus profane it, strip it of its eminence.

The next two cases of the adjective “ἅγιος” appear at the end of the Gospel. During the crucifixion of Jesus, in the horror scenes from the Matthean apocalypse, the resurrected *holy ones* visit the *holy city*, i.e. Jerusalem: (Mt

(NIV)

- 51 There are, of course, also other hidden meanings, pointing to the desecration of the temple by manifold emperors who, having subjugated Israel, enter into temple and desecrate it. Be it Antiochus IV. Epiphanes or Titus.
- 52 Discussion on the desecrating power of defilement affecting the temple by ritual impurity viz J. Neusner, *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities*, Part 22: pgs 103 – 109 on Essenes and desecration of the temple. Further J. Neusner, *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism: The Haskell Lectures* pgs. 28 – 31. Then for the opposite view and a summary of other authors dealing with the same issue H. Maccoby, *Ritual and Morality* pgs 199 – 208. And additionally possibly also Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple Symbolism* pgs. 223 – 245.

27,52n: “καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα ἀνεώχθησαν καὶ πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἠγέρθησαν, καὶ ἐξεληθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς.” Who are these *holy ones* supposed to be? We know that the Christians from the very beginning called themselves and each other “holy”⁵³. They based this on their Christian Trinitarian baptism as the act of purification, grounded in repentance on their part and the merciful sanctification by the sacrifice of Jesus on God's part. The baptism was the inauguration into the new life of the new Israel, i.e the new holy people.⁵⁴ Since there had not been any dead Christians at the time of the crucifixion, we must look for another explanation. Israel as a whole was considered God's special people, “holy” by virtue of being set apart by and for God. Also, in Judaism, the righteous people are sometimes called “holy”; these are the men of excellent moral profiles⁵⁵. Therefore “the saints” here, waking up from dead and flooding Jerusalem, are the righteous Jews set apart for the resurrection. However, Luz⁵⁶ points out that their state is not that of individual freedom. Only their bodies are risen and they do not choose where to go. We also do not know what

53 More cf. Delling, G. Merkmale der Kirche nach dem Neuen Testament New TestamentS 13 (1966-7) pg. 297 – 316. Esp 303 where he shows that ἅγιοι was not a new idea only of Christians, “Jedenfalls ist hagioi als Bezeichnung (wahren) Gottesvolkes dem sonstigen Spätjudentum nicht fremd.”

54 This shall be explained in depth in the chapter on Paul. However, here there is equally vivid discussion going on in the Gospel. I am aware of the discussions on how far is the Gospel Jewish or even Pagan and whether it preaches the succession or inclusion. I recommend very good recent article summarizing the present conflict, comparing the Gentile mission in Mathew and Paul, though shown on the example of the Great Commission: B. L. White, “The Eschatological Conversion of ‘All the Nations’ in Matthew 28.19-20: (Mis)reading Matthew through Paul,” JSNT, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 353–382, Apr. 2014.

55 Men who are able to fulfill the repeated order of Leviticus: “be holy as I am holy” wreathed in the list of manifold ethical norms.

56 Luz, 365: “Es ist von „vielen“ Leibern die Rede, aber nicht von den generellen Auferstehung „der“ Gerechten...Sie genießen nicht etwa die Freude des endgültigen Lebens bei Gott, sondern sie gehen hinein nach Jerusalem...”

happened with them after. This is not the final resurrection yet, it is the day of the Lord.

In the same way that Israel is the special selected people of God, Jerusalem is holy place by virtue of being set apart by and for God. Jerusalem is the host of the temple, it is therefore a city, where God has decided to dwell. It has a special status. Holiness emanates from the Holy of Holies through the Temple further into the city⁵⁷. Behind the walls of the city, there is wilderness, the place of impure spirits and the dead. When the dead “holy ones” enter the “holy city”, it is an apocalyptic hour when the heaven touches the earth and for a moment chaos mixes with everything. The lines dividing “holy” from “impure” are diluted. The impure dead bodies are called “the holy ones.” They should be dead but they are walking on the sacred grounds, and, even more notably, they are not desecrating them. They should be impure, yet they are called “holy.” The notion of “holy” and “impure” temporarily mingle. This is a cosmic judgment day.

The last case of the adjective “ἅγιος” in Matthew is again in the apocalyptic section. In **25,31**, Jesus says he would come back from the heaven with his angels, in some manuscripts⁵⁸ they are called “holy”, because they belong to God: they dwell with God, and they do God’s will.

Summary: The adjective “ἅγιος” can be used in the Gospel to describe either a place, angels or even some dead people selected for resurrection. They all are in

57 For further reading on spacial holiness-emanation P. P. Jenson, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*. A&C Black, 1992.

58 EFGHSVYΩ et permuti codd. minusc. + alii codices praeter nominatos lectionem illam praebent.

the service of God, they all belong to him, they all are his and his only, separated for him. The holy place is Jerusalem with its temple. What is holy should stay so, and it should be revered by the people as such. People are forbidden to desecrate, to give the holy things to the unworthy, to prevent anything of the “holiness” is forbidden. When Jesus shows mercy to the unworthy throughout the Gospel, he seems to be doing exactly this illicit desecration, but his touch is restorative and therefore what seems to be defilement is purification and sanctification. The only one who is allowed to both deprive something or someone of holiness and to mix these categories is God in the judgment time.

1.2.3 To Sanctify, “ἀγιάζειν”

There are three instances of the verb ἀγιάζειν in the Gospel of Matthew. The first one is as part of the Lord's Prayer. It is the first supplication, found in the verse **6,9**: “οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς· Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου·”. Being a divine passive, God is called upon to raise praise for God’s self. At the same time, it is a supplication for the change of heart on the part of the praying person⁵⁹. It is a prayer to protect the Name both on the level of language and subsequent actions, to protect it from all blasphemy. The Name, as metonymy for its carrier, is to be set apart; it should be revered with a special awe; and for this task, help from above is demanded.⁶⁰

59 H. Stettler, “Sanctification in the Jesus Tradition,” *Biblica*, vol. 85, no. 2, pp. 153–178, Jan. 2004. writes on the pg. 154 the following: “To sanctify God's name means, first of all, to perceive in ultimate reverence and fear God revealing himself...(in Ezech 36) God promises that his name will be sanctified as a result of the eschatological action of the Holy Spirit...it follows that the petition...implies nothing less than the recreation and restitution of Israel as a holy people in fulfillment of this prophecy.”

60 Cf. the same occurrence in *Didache*.

The following two occurrences of the verb *ἀγιάζειν* both appear in chapter 23, dedicated to the polemic of Jesus against the Pharisees, and they are both connected with cultic images. Jesus criticizes the Pharisees, whom he calls blind leaders (3x), for making people swear on the gold or their gift placed on the altar as an offering, as if they could thus add earnestness to it or to themselves⁶¹. He says that far more important than the gold of the *ιερος* / *ναός* and far more important than the actual sacrifice, is the temple itself that sanctifies that which is in it. First in **23,17** he says: “*μωροὶ καὶ τυφλοὶ, τίς γὰρ μείζων ἐστίν, ὁ χρυσὸς ἢ ὁ ναὸς ὁ ἀγιάσας τὸν χρυσόν;*” In reaction to the alleged Pharisees' saying⁶² that swearing by the temple gold is binding, unlike the swearing by the temple itself, Jesus lists the priorities in the opposite order. It should be noted, however, that earlier in the Gospel Jesus warned not to engage in oaths at all. He is asking about the importance of both members⁶³. The more powerful is the temple and therefore it also has the capacity to transmit holiness on that which is in it, i.e. the gold.

The same is repeated with a slight variation in the following two verses. Now the two members are the altar and the gift on it. Again, the more powerful is the altar which sanctifies (**23,19**): “*τυφλοὶ, τί γὰρ μείζον, τὸ δῶρον ἢ τὸ θυσίασθήριον τὸ ἀγιάζον τὸ δῶρον;*”. That which is bigger sanctifies that which is of smaller importance. The more significant grants sanctification to the secondary.

-
- 61 Luz, pg. 328: “Vielmehr steht ein kultisches Heiligkeitsverständnis hinter der rhetorischen Frage. Es ist nach jüdischer Auffassung der Altar, der das ...Opfertier heiligt,... Die Alternative, die sich hinter der rhetorischen Frage auftut, ist also zwischen schriftgelehrtem und kultischem Denken”
- 62 Albright, Mann, Matthew, pg. 280 “There is no rabbinic material known which would give us precise evidence for the distinction in oaths which is described here.”
- 63 Hagner, pg. 669: “The point is not that the Pharisees simply had matters reversed but that an oath must in every case be regarded as binding”

This is very impressive when we think about the direction of the transmission or “flow of holiness”. *Sanctification* is the change in status from one level of holiness / ritual purity to the holier one. The metaphorical notion that the holiness of the temple and altar is contagious is expressed herewith. Rather than defiling the altar, that which is laid upon it, becomes transformed and acquires a new quality of sanctity by now being set apart for the special use of God⁶⁴. Thus, for Jesus, the Temple and its altar have the characteristic of transforming that which comes near into their holy presence from just “pure” to “holy”⁶⁵.

On the level of language, the “flow of holiness” in “sanctification” starts from the “holy” that overcomes and transforms the “pure” which still does not possess the quality of holiness, unless it is sanctified. According to me, in the whole New Testament, the Gospel of Matthew included, that which is “holy” is also metaphorically stronger than that, which is not “holy” in whatever lesser degree of holiness: be it “pure”, “profane, or even “impure”. This is not true only of the sacrificial gift in Matthew⁶⁶. This is what I would like to call the “reverse flow of holiness” which, I think, keeps repeating throughout the whole of the Gospel of Matthew. Hence, *the fear of defilement is overcome by faith in sanctification*.

How could people think to bring anything holier than the temple or the altar itself? Yet, these are not defiled. Even gifts brought with impure intentions can-

64 Luz, pg.328: “Der Tempel bzw. der Altar ist offenkündig „größer“, d.h. auch wichtiger als das Gold, das im Tempel aufbewahrt wird, oder die Opfertgabe, die auf dem Altar liegt.”

65 In the moment of placing the meat on the altar, it is only “pure”, since the ritual purity is required of all the gifts. Nevertheless, in the moment of consumption, the portions of meat, especially those intended for priests, become literally “the holy of holies”, i.e. the holiest thing.

66 The same is e.g. applied also to the “impure”, when Jesus touches lepers.

not defile neither the Temple nor its altar⁶⁷, but they are sanctified instead. This is interesting particularly in the light that the ritual law is rather restrictive and protective of the holy precincts, so that they are not defiled. Here, on the contrary, it is the "place" which sanctifies the gift. It would be also interesting to ask at which point exactly does the gift become holy,⁶⁸ and in what way. Unfortunately, we only have this one statement which does not allow us to speculate any further.

Summary: Sanctification in the Gospel of Matthew is therefore used to describe the change of the degree of holiness of a gift on the altar and sacred awe for God's holy Name. The process of sanctification can affect both objects and abstract concepts. It is not clear at this point yet, whether there is the acknowledged possibility that something "impure" would have enough power to defile something in the state of purity or even sanctity - this shall be discussed later. For the time being, in these cases, it is obvious that the power of the "holy" is stronger and therefore "sanctifies". However, this should not be abused by devaluing its quality of uniqueness by sharing the holy things with those who are not able to see their inner quality and power and who would just trample on them. The sanctification also applies to the level of language, sanctification is asked for in case of the holy name, but blasphemy of it is forbidden. In all the cases it is only handled and distributed by the source of Holiness, God himself.

67 In Zebahim it is interesting to observe that not all the improper sacrifices are defiling, there is a room also for "invalid" sacrifices.

68 Parallels with the Eucharist are very tempting here.

1.3 Purity

Now we shall proceed to the language of purity. In the Old Testament, purity serves as a preliminary requirement in the ritual approach to the holy God⁶⁹. We shall be especially concentrating on whether the Old Testament connection between purity and holiness is kept also throughout the New Testament, or whether the semantic field altered. Is purity a vital part of holiness in this Gospel? Is it an essential prerequisite for meeting the Holy God?

Unlike “holiness”, “purity” is largely dealt with in the Gospel of Matthew both explicitly and implicitly. The words conveying purity are much more frequent than those connected with holiness. There are seven expressions in the semantic field of purity explicitly connected to holiness, i.e. not the purity of objects or people, divorced from the cult (clean in hygienic sense). The adjective, “καθαρός”, appears three times and the verb, “καθαρίζαι”, seven times. The adjective, “ἀκάθαρτος”, is used twice; the noun, “ἀκαθαρσία”, also twice; “ἀκέραιος” only once; and “κοινὸν” seven times. There are also several implicit situations, which describe events connected with purity.

1.3.1 Pure, “καθαρός”

The best known instance emerges in the Beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount (5, 8): “μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῆ καρδίᾳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται.” Those who have pure heart are blessed because they will see God. Can this particular blessing be read as the meritorious asceticism which enables us vision of God

69 There are strict requirements of people who want to present themselves in the temple. Basically the entire H in Pentateuch speaks about these. The best systematic summary viz P. P. Jenson, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*. A&C Black, 1992.

only in the state of purity⁷⁰? And what are the requirements? Who establishes them?⁷¹ The purity of heart can mean either clean intention,⁷² single-mindedness as opposed to the divided mind, but foremost, it is purity which is required as mandatory for meeting with the Holy One. In the Old Testament, it is mostly “condition of the inner core of a person...thoughts and motivation...a consistency between the inner springs of one's conduct and the conduct itself”⁷³. Luz then describes the purity of heart in the Old Testament as “ungeteilter Gehorsam gegenüber Gott ohne Sünde”. It is the inwardly focused and prolonged ritual purity⁷⁴.

The notion of the “pure heart” is not new to Jesus, it was also well known

-
- 70 S. Augustine, *Commentary on the Lord's Sermon on the Mount with Seventeen Related Sermons*. CUA Press, 2010. pg. 218 writes following: “Thus, the precept is that you cleanse the heart; the reward is that you shall see God...Do not so think of the pure of heart as if they alone see God, while all others will be excluded from the sight of Him...It is not because they are poor in spirit that they shall see, nor is it because they are meek or mourning or hungering and thirsting for justice or merciful - but because they are pure of heart.” however on the next page he continues exactly as has been suggested by me earlier: “Who would not seek where with cleanse it? Divine testimony has named it: it uses the expression, “cleansing their hearts in faith”. The faith in God makes their heart pure, and the pure heart sees God.” Next, Augustine divides strictly between the faith of devil, which does not cleanse him, and the faith of Christians who are cleansed, because their faith is more than just an acknowledgment of who God is, but also acting in the same lines.
- 71 Boyle, pg.43: “Although the beatitudes were widely preached and expounded, the very vagueness of the blessing to the pure of heart allowed its generous interpretation in the history of ideas. Still in modern piety its sense extends broadly- from a monk's definition of Neoplatonist contemplation to evangelist Billy Graham's conviction that even the poor can afford a bar of soap.” in M. O'Rourke Boyle, “Pure of Heart: From Ancient Rites to Renaissance Plato,” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 63, no. 1, pp. 41–62, Jan. 2002.
- 72 S. T. Lachs, “Hebrew Elements in the Gospels and Acts,” *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. 71, no. 1, pp. 31–43, Jul. 1980. Writes on the page 37 following: “Asher Finkel has correctly noted that “the pure in heart...goes back to Isa. 6: II 1 “to bind up the broken hearted.” We therefore retrovert the text of Matt. 5:8 as ...”blessed are the broken hearted, for they shall see God.” We suggest that as a result of haplography of the first two words... what remained was ... “blessed are the pure in heart.” We likewise suggest that the phrase “they shall see God” is possibly a midrash on Isa. 6I:I, rendered ... by the LXX (“and sight to the blind”). Note, too, a similar passage in Isa. 35:4-5.2,”
- 73 Hagner, 94.
- 74 Albright, Mann, pg. 47: “...the spiritual equivalent of being ritually pure”

thought both in the Old Testament⁷⁵ as well as in the Rabbinic literature⁷⁶. In this text, it is not explained how one can reach such purity, it is simply a criterion for seeing God, which is the usual course of actions in the ritual life. One needs to be ready for meeting God in the temple by keeping the body clean from ritual defilement.

This case, however, seems to promise direct vision of God, provided that the worshipers have their heart clean. In the Old Testament the looking upon God is in a certain sense connected with death. Nobody has seen God and lived, says God himself in Ex 33,20. Hagner summarizes: “Matthew describes the greatest possible eschatological reward, one that by its nature includes all else.”⁷⁷

In the letters of Paul, epistle to Hebrews, as well as in the book of Acts of Apostles, as we shall see later, the “purity of heart” or “conscience” has only been made available, once for all, through the sacrificially understood death of Christ accepted in baptism – this is *the process of ritual purification of the inner man*. However, here the purity in question seems rather as purity of conduct, especially if we set the saying in parallel with the other beatitudes.

The third case of the adjective in the Gospel (27, 59) says that the dead body of Jesus was wrapped in a pure linen: “καὶ λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα ὁ Ἰωσήφ ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ [ἐν] σινδόνι καθαρᾷ”. This information might have been important for the Jewish-Christian audience. The cloth had not been defiled by any other dead body before, so that it was ritually pure. Also, the grave was pure because it was empty. Graves were usually the place of ultimate impurity, because they

75 Psa 24,4; 51,10; 73,1.13; Pro 20,9

76 e.g. Midrash Rabba on Gen xl,8. Or e.g. the importance of intention in m. Zeb. 3,6S.

77 Hagner, pg. 94

contained dead bodies⁷⁸; this one was empty, though, and therefore undefiled. Also this case of the adjective “καθαρός” has therefore ritual connotations.

Summary: The adjective “καθαρός” is used in the Gospel mostly in both ritual and figurative sense. In all the cases it is impossible to divorce the ritual notion from the ethical or spiritual one. All the nuances of the meaning are united in the same way as was case in the Old Testament. The main shift in the semantic field occurs in the chapter 23 which will be discussed later.

1.3.2 To Purify, “καθαρίζειν”

There are seven cases of the verb “καθαρίζειν” in the Gospel of Matthew⁷⁹. All of them appear in ritual sense. Majority of them (5 cases⁸⁰) are in some connection with lepers. The remaining two are in the chapter 23, verses 25 and 26, portraying Jesus' discussion with Pharisees on the ritual-purity laws. All the instances describe the transition of something or someone defiled into the state of purity. It is a verb parallel with “ἀγιάζειν”, to which purification is the first step on the scale from “defiled” to “holy”.

78 Maccoby in “Ritual and Morality” a book not unanimously accepted, writes following in respect to the impurity of the graves: (pg. 149) “Some of the most respected members of the Jewish community were members of burial societies, which, without pay, looked after the corpses of the dead and prepared them for burial. Such people dedicated themselves to purity, and with an equal sense of service and general approval”...these then were not considered sinful, but they put upon themselves the burden of being the ones who come in contact with the corpses every day, still they were respected. Maccoby uses the example to show that the ritual purity was not considered a sin. This is a claim of common consent, however, his attempt to translate all the ritual language in the New Testament into biological raises some serious questions.

79 8,2n; 10,8; 11,5; 23,25n

80 8,2n; 10,8; 11,5

In the Old Testament, the purification is, in the majority of the cases, understood to be in the hands of people and *their* responsibility (hence all the ritual prescriptions). Far more than the requirement of sanctification, which presupposes divine intervention⁸¹. The notion, that purity is duty of people, is foremost reflected in the Pharisees' requirement voiced in Matthew 23.

However, all the other examples of the verb “καθαρίζειν” refer to the type of purification that had always been understood as requiring divine mediation. Humans can and are commanded in the Old Testament to purify objects, places and bodies. But it is out of human reach to purify themselves e.g. from leprosy. Consider, for instance, the reaction of the king of Israel when he was asked to cure Naaman from his leprosy in 2 Kings 5, 7. He tore his robes saying that he was not God possessing the power to kill or to make alive. It was only on very rare and very special occasions and by special people that leprosy was taken away from the inflicted ones⁸². The ability to do so on more than one occasion signals messianic presence.

Another case of purification that is out of reach of humans is the purification of heart or conscience, that is, the purification from sin. The “pure heart” appears mostly in the supplicatory prayers of Psalms reaching for God's help in that matter.

81 Though e.g. Lev 19 calls such process “sanctification”. The terminology is not clear-cut definable. The definitions are approximate.

82 Consider the use of “special” in my sentence. The notion of holiness the sub-idea of “holy” in Hebrew is that of “separatedness” or “being special”. Therefore when only “special people” were able to deal with this type of impurity, we can also say that they were “holy”, and the “special times” and circumstances were also exceptional and, yes, we could say “holy”. The times, places and people which were able to reverse the plight of such level of impurity as leprosy were the times of special divine intervention and therefore the finger of God was present in them. Such a strong impurity was only possible to be dealt with by someone who “can give life and take it away”, it is God who acts and for this he is using special people in special places and in special times.

First three cases of the verb are in **8,2n**: “καὶ ἰδοὺ λεπρὸς προσελθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων· κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρῖσαι. καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἤψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρῖσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα.”. Matthew's version of the story is the most succinct one⁸³. For the first time in the New Testament, the purifying power of Jesus is stated. In this Gospel, a leper comes to Jesus and bows down, addressing Jesus as κύριος, asking him if he wanted to purify him⁸⁴. The sick man shows therewith great faith⁸⁵. Jesus reaches out his hand in response, he *touches* the man and adds: “I want to, be purified”, immediately the man was purified from his leprosy.

First, there is no mention of healing, just purification⁸⁶. Also the usual chorus: “Your faith has healed you” is not here. It follows, that the man is not primarily “healed”, but rather “purified”⁸⁷. The discussion revolves around faith and willingness of Jesus to help. But the action involved and described speaks volumes. Jesus decides not only that he wishes to purify this man, he does so by a revolutionary way.

-
- 83 There is no mention of the further actions of the healed man, whether he did visit the priest or not or whether he preached about what happened to him, as we read in the Mk's version.
- 84 Hagner, pg. 198: “The leper's statement indicates that he had come to the conclusion, probably from having seen or heard of Jesus' other miracles, that Jesus could cure him of his leprosy.”
- 85 Both the address and the requirement.
- 86 This reflects how far the dermatological problems were perceived theologically. Albright, Mann translate directly “to cure”. Of course, Jesus did not just purify the man ritually, he did heal him as well. However, the text stresses the ritual part of the problem.
- 87 Does the healing include the purification and does the purification involve healing? And is there then still the need for the ritual? Hagner, pg.197 “Matthew further omits Mark's note that the offering in view was...“for your purification” (Mark 1,44) probably to emphasize that it was Jesus who had cleansed the leper; the priests could only certify the cleansing.”

Lepers were considered impure, their impurity was later classified as “father of impurities”⁸⁸. The decaying body was reminiscent of death⁸⁹. Leprosy had a hallmark of abandonment by God, or even His punishment⁹⁰. Leviticus, chapters 13 and 14, describe the purificatory measures in dealing with the declining leprosy. The condition is described there as a skin disease that can befall either a human or an animal or even inanimate objects, such as clothing⁹¹ or even a house⁹². In general, it is a state similar to mold, in which tissue disintegrates. Nowadays view of leprosy is different from the Levitical one, which so classified every eczema or a skin condition⁹³. Therefore Leviticus 13 and 14 can deal with the case that a person is healed from their “leprosy”.

Before a person is purified, they need to heal and then they still need to keep very strict hygienic rules including shaving and ablution; ideally, they are separated from the community behind the city-walls. Should they enter public places, it is imperative that they cry: “An impure!”⁹⁴, in order to avoid any *involuntary* physical contact, which would render the other person impure, would bind them to ritual washing and prevent them from entering the temple, they would be rendered impure until the evening. This is exactly why the easily avoidable and thereby purely *voluntary* touch of Jesus granted to this man is so revolutionary⁹⁵. Jesus not only eats with sinners, now he also touches lepers:

88 Pes. 1.6; Shek. 8.4; Eduy 2.1; Meil. 4.4; Kel. 1.1; Tor. 1.5; Maksh. 4.2, 8 and Teb Yom. 1.4, 5; 2.1, 8; 3.1

89 Therefore the answer to the king of Israel to Naaman in 2 Kings 5,7: “Am I God?”

90 e.g. Miriam, Moses' sister is struck by leprosy as punishment in Num12, or Naaman in 2 Kgs 5 etc.

91 Lev 13, 47-59

92 Lev 14, 33 - 53

93 Albright, Mann, pg. 91: “...it is important not to see here an indication that one of the three types of Hansen's disease is necessarily indicated.”

94 Lev 14,45n,or "As for the leper who has the infection, his clothes shall be torn, and the hair of his head shall be uncovered, and he shall cover his mustache and cry, 'Unclean! Unclean!' (Lev13, 45 NAS)

95 According to e.g. Lev 5,3 it is clearly forbidden to touch unclean people.

this must have been viewed by his contemporaries as an act of anarchy and defilement if not blasphemy⁹⁶. In effect, however, the leper's touch does not defile Jesus. On the contrary, Jesus purifies this man. The purity, or even holiness, in Jesus is stronger than the impurity and defiling force in the leper. Therefore Jesus' touch overcomes the abomination⁹⁷, the person used to be impure, now he is pure. The process of this transfer is called purification and it has been granted by Jesus to a man who asked it from him in faith.

In the end, Jesus sends the leper to accept the additional ritual of purification prescribed in Leviticus 13 and 14. This last commandment to the purified leper proves that Jesus does not abandon ritual law and that he does not teach its abolition, even if his very actions may have seemed to be blasphemous to his contemporaries. He still humbles himself in front of the law and acts in line with its Spirit.

Jesus imparts his power on his disciples when he sends them out two by two, telling them, among other things, to *purify* the lepers themselves in **10,8**: “ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύετε, νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε, λεπροὺς καθαρίζετε, δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε· δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε”. The list consists of the program Jesus is following himself, but should also his followers do the same things. These are the signs of the Messianic age, the kingdom of Heaven is at hand⁹⁸. It is interesting that Je-

96 This does not want to say that the impurity would be viewed as a sin. Minor impurities were the usual state. It was not required of the people to keep themselves all the time in the very strict state of the ritual purity required of priests. But to willingly defile oneself by recklessness was forbidden. It was acceptable to catch some impurity every day by accident but to get willingly defiled by a touch of the leper borders with anarchy.

97 H. Stettler, “Sanctification in the Jesus Tradition,” *Biblica*, vol. 85, no. 2, pp. 153–178, Jan. 2004., pg. 159 “Demons, scale disease, continuous blood discharge and death, all involved severe impurity and therefore excluded the people concerned from Israel. By cleansing and healing the sick, Jesus overcomes what separates them from God and reintegrates them in the holy people of God”

98 Luz, pg.93 “...Nähe des Gottesherrschaft umschreiben wird.”

Jesus is not the only one who performs these messianic miracles, also his disciples are called to do them. The entitlement and probably also the power comes from the master. That Jesus has, among other things, power to purify the lepers is itself shocking and proves him to be the Messiah, but his disciples? I would call this a “catalogue of messianic signs”.

A very similar one is to be found again in the next case. When John the Baptist has a moment of doubt in the prison he asks Jesus if it was really him, for whom he had “prepared the way” or whether there it is necessary “*ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν;*”. What follows is another “catalogue of messianic signs”. This is not a list of Jesus' own personal achievements, but an enumeration of miracles that are happening at this special time as a result of God's power distributed not only by Jesus, also in his name, wherefore it should be obvious to John that the Kingdom of Heaven is near: **(11,5)** “*τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται.*”.

Both of the lists in the Gospel share the “purification of lepers”. Almost the entire catalogue can be traced back to the messianic promises of Isaiah⁹⁹ with one exception, and that is “purification of the lepers”. The Gospel does not follow any Old Testament specific text which would comprise all of the items of the “catalogue”, they need to be looked up separately. Even the catalogue in 4Q521, frag ii. (especially the verse 12, which is often connected with the answer to the Baptist), which is sometimes connected with the present verse lists also the signs of messianic age: “For he will heal the badly wounded and the

99 De Witt enumerates the most important promises from Isa. “Expectations and the Expected One: 4Q521 and the Light It Sheds on the New Testament.” [Online]. Available: https://www.academia.edu/4209386/Expectations_and_the_Expected_One_4Q521_and_the_Light_It_Sheds_on_the_New_Testament. [Accessed: 04-May-2015]. Page 74 and 75.

dead he will make alive, to the poor he will bring a good tidings¹⁰⁰”, does not mention the lepers at all. Though there is probably no deeper meaning behind this additional item, it can be considered a special one of the signs of the messianic age. Present happenings are exceeding even the ancient prophecies and expectations.

The last two occurrences of the verb “καθαρίζειν” are found in the Matthew 23, where Jesus encourages Pharisees to deepen their faith and not stay on the surface, to clean not only “outside”, but also the “inside”. The precedence of “heart”, rather than the importance of “purity of hands”, is Matthew's favorite motif. In the polemic against the Pharisees, in the chapter 23, Jesus speaks figuratively of humans, as if they were some metaphorical cups¹⁰¹. He challenges the Pharisees by proving their concern for purity to be superficial¹⁰², since they are concerned only about the outside. **23,25n**: “Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι καθαρίζετε τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροψίδος, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας. Φαρισαῖε τυφλέ, καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου, ἵνα γένηται καὶ τὸ ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ καθαρόν.”

The usual problem with the interpretation of this verse is to balance the literal and figurative meaning. H. Maccoby¹⁰³, for example, claims that Jesus

100 Translation de Witt, pg. 23.

101 R. A. Wild, S.J., “The Encounter Between Pharisaic and Christian Judaism: Some Early Gospel Evidence,” *NovT*, vol. XXVII, no. 2, pp. 105 – 124, 1985. „Mt's version involves a more complete shift from the ritual to the ethical level with „the cup“ becoming largely a metaphorical term of the human person. In 23,26...katharison proton..both the „within“ and the „without“ had to be made clean. ...the particular point at issue involved a characteristic practice of a sectarian movement, the person who formulated this saying spoke in all likelihood from within Pharisaism rather than from outside.“ (pg.116, 117).

102 Albright, Mann pg. 280: “The judgment of Jesus is not against ordinary cleanliness but against excessive concentration on ritual cleanliness or defilement of eating and drinking vessels”

103 H. Maccoby, “The Washing of the Cups,” *JSNT*, vol. 14, pp. 3 – 15, 1982. “

means the whole talk figuratively and the impurity in question is just the hygienic dirt¹⁰⁴. Neusner¹⁰⁵, on the other hand, divides the saying in two parts, wherein the first one about washing the cups is literal and connected to ritual practice and the second one, addressed to the „blind Pharisees“, is figurative. I side with this second interpretation¹⁰⁶. There are other parallel sayings in the chapter¹⁰⁷, where Jesus starts his speech on the practical level of ritual practice and finishes in transforming the original problem into a metaphorical ethically-spiritual one.

As far as the ritual tradition of the washing goes, Neusner points to the Mishnaic tractate of Kelim, specifically 25:7¹⁰⁸ upon which he shows the

104 The same he writes in his book from 1999. E.g. in the page 152 he says the following: „Jesus is not disputing with the Pharisees about which is more important in ritual purity contexts, insides or outsides. He is attacking hypocrisy which may be defined as being different on the outside from what is on the inside.“ As happens very often with Maccoby's argumentation, he does make a point in connecting the text with teaching on hypocrisy, however, it does not mean that the teaching could not stem from the ritual practice described by Neusner. These two authors very much disagree with each other and have made several heated academic exchanges in monographs and articles. The comment on Mt 23 is closed by the following Maccoby's remark. pg. 153: „But as for washing, no distinction between inside and outside is even made, and therefore Jesus, talking in terms of washing, cannot have had any ritual purity demarcation law in mind, but must have had in mind a context in which there is an important distinction between washing the outside only and washing the whole cup – namely the context of ordinary kitchen cleanliness.“ Hardly do we know what Jesus had in mind, but we should search what it might have been, not what it was.

105 J. Neusner, „First Cleanse the Inside. The ‘Halakic’ Background of a Controversy Saying.“ NTS, vol. 22, pp. 486 – 95, Jun. 1975. pg. 488: „...when we are told, ‘first cleanse the inside’, that instruction bears both practical and metaphorical significance.“ Further he says on the next page: „...the rabbinic heirs of pre-70 Pharisaism,... took for granted that utensils may be divided. In the same period ... Luke and Matthew likewise took the same law for granted“

106 Though, Maccoby in both his article and his recent book brings a lot of new information, his conclusions are not well based. He mostly quotes only himself and when he mentions anyone else, it is mostly to „correct“ them. However, his explanations do not necessarily and only lead to the results he draws.

107 Basically the whole chapter 23.

108 Neusner's translation:
25:7 A. All utensils have outer parts and an inner part, and they [further] have a part by which they are held

history of unfolding interpretation. In his article, he first shows that in the time of the Gospels „Pharisees make a distinction between the inside and the outside of a cup or a plate¹⁰⁹“. Therefore the question arises which part is more susceptible to the uncleanness. Can unwashed hands defile the outer part of a cup and thus defile it completely? Does the impurity go both ways? The matter is even more obscured¹¹⁰ by the fact that the tractate distinguishes not only the inside from outside of a cup, but also introduces another separate part: the handle. Hillelites say in accord with Jesus that „the outer side is deemed always to be unclean“ and therefore „the condition of the outer part has no effect on the inner part. The cup becomes unclean only if the inner part is unclean¹¹¹“. The House of Shammai, on the other hand, „hold that one does not have to cleanse the outer part before the inner part or the inner part before the outer. The one has no effect upon the other.¹¹²“ In the end, Neusner explains that the

B. R. Tarfon says, „[This distinction in the outer parts applies only] to a large wooden trough.“

C. R. Aqiba says, „To cups“

D. R. Meir says, „To the unclean and the clean hands.“

E. Said R. Yose, „They have spoken only concerning clean hands alone“

F. How so?

G. „[If] one's hands were clean, and the outer parts of the cup were unclean, [and] one took [the cup] with its holding part, he need not worry lest his hands be made unclean on the outer parts of the cup.“

H. „[If] one was drinking from a cup, the outer parts of which are unclean, one does not worry lest the liquid which is in his mouth be made unclean on the outer parts of the cup and go and render the [whole] cup unclean.“

I. A Kettler [unclean on the outside], which is boiling – one does not worry lest the liquids go forth from its outer parts and go back to the inside [and make it unclean].

109 Neusner, *ibid* pg. 487

110 We shall set aside the complication of what type of impurity can be transferred on cups („if one is unclean, he makes his food unclean...one should be clean for eating and also should eat clean food so that he may be holy“. Neusner, 2007, pg. 78), also the material of the cups („The purification of clay objects by breaking and of other objects by immersion“ Neusner, 2007, pg.81). For further reading read J. Neusner, Ed., *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities, Part 22: The Mishnaic System of Uncleanness: Its Context and History*. Eugene, Or.: Wipf & Stock Pub, 2007. pages 78- 81.

111 Neusner, 1975, pg. 493.

112 *Ibid*. pg. 494

woe is addressed to the Shammaite house, criticizing their superficiality, but at the same time it is the criticism of the debate as such and an attempt to shift it to the moral-ethical level¹¹³.

The loss of focus on the inner man is actually exactly the core of Jesus' teaching throughout the chapter 23. He is stressing that Pharisees busy themselves with every little detail of the, mostly ritual, law, therefore they only remain on the surface of the law and do not go deeper. They are more concerned about the outer appearances than about the heart of the law. Since they stay on the “outside”, the law does not enter inside their hearts, which remain untouched by its purifying power. The original intention of the law was to cleanse the inner man and thus purifying them perfectly. The change of heart would turn into change of deeds. Jesus says that Pharisees have this in front of their eyes, they study the Scriptures, but they seem to be deaf to it. They focus on tiny unimportant details, which make them blind to the whole, to the weightier part of the holy law. For its purpose is not just random allowing forbidding, but „judgment, mercy, and faith (Mat 23,23)“ According to Jesus, the Law is not about tedious specifics¹¹⁴, but, as Paul would say, about the Spirit of the Law, or even, the Law of the Spirit.

Summary: The verb “καθαρίζειν” is therefore used mostly in figurative sense connected with the ritual purification. It is used actively in the discussion with

113 Ibid. pg. 495 „...when the Hillelites gained predominance, the saying was transferred to the polemic against them by writers who clearly did not know or did not care what their true position had become.“

114 In this respect, his teaching differs from that of Rabbinic Judaism. Even the Hellenistic Judaism in the letter of Aristeas teaches that the reason for the number of specific ritual laws is missionary. In being different from other nations where diaspora lives, they are truly special, holy, separated.

the Pharisees. One should be able to purify their own heart from evil rotten thoughts if they want to be rendered ritually pure. There are, however, also the cases where the lepers are being purified, which is only possible for them to accept as an act of sheer mercy. That which should have made Jesus impure is purified. Its defiling power is annihilated, overcome by the stronger one¹¹⁵. The purifying stream coming from Jesus, born of the Holy Spirit, lavishes mercy on the untouchables, restoring them to health. In all this, Jesus still respects the established ritual laws of purity and submits himself to them.

1.3.3 Impure, “ἀκαθάρτος”

Impure, “ἀκαθάρτος”, appears twice in the Gospel of Matthew. When Jesus sends his twelve disciples for the training, beside his instructions,¹¹⁶ he also gives them ἐξουσία, power, over the impure spirits: **(Mat 10,1)** “Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.” Matthew assumes the existence of different spirits. There is the divine “Holy Spirit” and on the other edge of the holiness semantic spectrum are the “impure spirits”, which are, unlike the former, some semi-personal entities. They can live inside a person, and they can be expelled out of there. They are stronger than humans; therefore ἐξουσία is needed in order to drive them away.¹¹⁷

115 Jesus has ἐξουσία.

116 Further in this section, Jesus sends this the disciples as turtledoves among wolves and therefore they are supposed to be pure like doves as well as cunning. Turtledoves were, as nowadays, the symbol of purity and innocence. The opposition would make their heart hard.

117 Εξουσία seems to be here the manifestation of the divine power, not only the power itself. It might also be said that the power which drives away the impure spirits is the

Towards the end of the 12th chapter, Matthew speaks further about impure spirits. The context suggests that he means “demons”. These impure spirits behave like persons, and they are numerous. They reside inside of a person and there can be several of them there at once. Their description is very suggestive: they have feelings, they can decide what to do and they even make friends among each other. When expelled, they wander around and find no rest; then, inviting other spirits, they come back in bigger numbers and ruin the person they reside in.¹¹⁸ It can, therefore, be suggested that Jesus views humans as having, figuratively speaking, some space inside of them, which can be either clean or unclean, depending on what fills them, whether the holy or an impure spirit. The semantic field of holiness is thus kept in the same lines as in the Old Testament, the opposite of “impure” is “holy”. We have encountered a similar notion already in the metaphor of humans as cups. Their inside can be occupied by evil and impure spirits, who damage the life of the possessed. The spirits can be expelled, but only by ἐξουσία which is beyond the natural reach of humans. Jesus owns such power, and he does free people from these spirits, cleaning the inner space of a person.¹¹⁹ People should be all the more careful after such a cleaning, though, not to invite the spirits back. It is a warning not to be proud about being cleansed, not to consider oneself pure and perfect.¹²⁰ Je-

power of the Holy Spirit, now in Jesus. It is the spirit of holiness that drives away the spirit of impurity. Could ἐξουσία be analogous to the Old Testament glory, δόξα, כבוד, that is manifest holiness that purifies everything around?

- 118 The language being highly illustrative, there seem to be some powers which can reside inside of a human soul. It is an interesting picture of a person as some sort of space. Later, Jesus arguing with the Pharisees says that they are like cups full of dirt.
- 119 The evil spirits do not leave when they are just told to by a person. They need to be dealt with by stronger power than they. They need to be expelled by force and there is still a chance that they might come back.
- 120 Jesus considers his generation “bad” and therefore more susceptible to this. Nevertheless, let us consider that not only possessed, even the sick people that Jesus had healed would likely later become sick again and one day eventually die.

Jesus drives the spirits away, yet he warns about the possibility of their return. He does not reveal how exactly these spirits get in a person or how their entrance can be prevented.¹²¹ It can only be deduced that the spirits are invited by one another into a person's inner space and cause further impurity upon their return. It is exactly this impurity that Jesus is concerned about, more than the outward one that deals with ritual ablution.

This is also the subject of the discussion with the Pharisees in chapter 23. The whole chapter is describing Jesus' polemic against them. There are several reproaches, each of which begins "*woe to you...*" Within only three verses (25 - 27), there are four words with the root of *καθαρ-*, in several manuscripts even five instances.¹²² After the hyperbolic reproach for swallowing an impure camel but viewing every little bug in the wine as rendering a whole barrel impure,¹²³ Jesus goes on to introduce the metaphor of a cup used to describe the inner life of a human. The Pharisees are hypocrites, Jesus says, because they only care about the outward appearance of the cup. In their preoccupation with ritual washing, they forget about the inside; they forget to pour out the bad things first.

Humans are cups which need to be purified inwardly first, in order to be really clean. The ritual purity does not make one pure if one does not give primary concern and attention to the inside. The hands do not need to be as clean as the heart does. The purificatory washing does not work "*ex opere operato*." Like graves, another metaphor used by Jesus to explain the same problem, they are white on the outside but dirty inside. The metaphor of a cup

121 Cf. a very well written essay on the demon possession in the Gospels in Vouga's *New Testament Theology*.

122 verse 25 "ἔσωθεν δὲ γεμουσιν ἐξ ἀπαρχῆς ἀκαθαρσίας" - Nal lat sys CI

123 I have commented on this in my master's thesis in much greater detail.

works along side the image of graves. Inside a grave, there is a corpse, which renders it impure. If touched, it defiles a person who then must wash with water and will remain unclean until the evening. Graves were therefore painted white before the feast of Pesach, in order to repel people, so that every pilgrim would know that this place needs to be avoided and thus remain pure, the only condition suitable for entering the temple.¹²⁴

Summary: Jesus, therefore, uses two metaphors when teaching on im/purity: the image of person as a vessel that can be filled with either good or bad and the image of a grave that is dirty inside and white outside. Jesus is interested in the inner person, in the heart or soul, rather than in the outward appearance of performing correct rituals. The impurity Jesus is concerned with, is rather the ethical impurity of the thought world, of the soul and the impure actions which stem from them. He continues in the same line as the late prophets, who called for the revival of the inner meaning of the rituals. Jesus agrees with the Pharisees on the need for purity, and he enhances their teaching by pointing to the core of that teaching. The real source of impurity is the inner life of a person.

In the same vein, the adjective “κοινὸν” is used. All the four occurrences are to be found in chapter 15, where Jesus explains origin of impurity. The whole discussion is called out by an incident described at the beginning of the chapter, when the Pharisees come to Jesus and reproach him because of his disciples, who do not wash their hands before eating and, thus, are supposedly tres-

124 Harrington, Holiness, pg. 111 “Graves were whitened one month before the Passover so that pilgrims would be sure to avoid them and not to become impure.”

passing the tradition of “the presbyters”¹²⁵. Jesus then moves on to another level of discussion when he changes the subject. Not having given any answer, he now accuses these men of issues far worse than just omission of hand-washing¹²⁶. In fact, he denounces the very tradition for contradicting the law of God. It is tradition of their own “presbyters”, it is not *the* Law of God. Their tradition is responsible for all the excuses serving to avoid the true life of love¹²⁷. This teaching hit hard, the Pharisees are offended, he stepped on a painful point, criticizing the tradition itself. Instead of repenting,¹²⁸ Jesus comes back to the initial dispute and in the esoteric circle of his disciples, he declares his own teaching on im/purity¹²⁹.

125 Many commentators point out that, as far as we know, there had not been any such official tradition which would require ritual hand-washing before every meal. Except for the strict purity laws regarding the washing of priests, found in Lv 15,11, there is no such a commandment in the whole Old Testament. This must have, therefore, been some specific group of Pharisees, who followed some minor tradition and who expected the disciples and Jesus himself to join in. It is unlikely that they were invoking the Halakah in oral form yet, though we may not say that with complete certainty. On the other hand, we do know that Jesus condemns this very tradition, saying that it is against the sacred Law of God.

126 Maccoby views the issue as purely hygienic matter. According to him, “defiled” here really means “dirty”. H. Maccoby, *Ritual and Morality*, pg. 155ff.

127 Because they are hiding behind this tradition, they do not honor their parents. The money and goods, which were supposed to be used for their parents in need, they prefer to give to the temple. Thus they impoverish their own and think to buy, with the same resources, mercy from God. Jesus further teaches against this tradition with the use of the metaphor of a wild plant, not planted by the master. According to the claims of the Pharisees themselves, their tradition descends from people, but the law comes from God. Therefore this teaching is all wrong. The disciples should not care about what these people say, and they should leave them behind. Within the Matthean recurrent concept of „leaving behind.“ is of great importance.

128 Another point is a question why should they be taken as such high authority? Why should Jesus and his disciples be subordinate to them, regarding the washing habit?

129 The form of Jesus’ response is structured with great precision. It has been preserved in all three Synoptics with minor differences which shall be discussed later.

Mat 15, 11

οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον,

ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦτο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

...

17 - 20

οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι

πᾶν τὸ εἰσπορευόμενον

εἰς τὸ στόμα εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ

καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται;

τὰ δὲ ἐκπορευόμενα

ἐκ τοῦ στόματος

ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἐξέρχεται,
κάκεινα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

ἐκ γὰρ τῆς καρδίας ἐξέρχονται
διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί, φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι, κλοπαί,
ψευδομαρτυρίαι, βλασφημίαι.
ταῦτά ἐστιν τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον,

τὸ δὲ ἀνίπτοις χερσὶν φαγεῖν οὐ κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

Verses 17 and 18 are explained by the two extreme poles expressed in the introductory verse 11, which contains all the word units in question, beside “defilement”, also the prepositions/prefixes suggesting the direction of it, hence the “reverse flow of holiness”¹³⁰. The difference between what enters and goes

130 The entanglement of defilement and holiness is very well explained by Neusner. Unlike majority of the commentators on the parallel version of Mk 7, he claims that the strict requirements on eating food did not concern just and only haberim, but all the nation. In History of Mishnaic Purities, vol. 22, pg. 77 he writes that “The principle...that ordinary meals...are to be eaten in a state of cleanness certainly can have been generated by the reading of Scripture” and further “what is suitable for the altar is suitable for the table, and what is unclean for the altar makes the Israelite unclean”. In the following page he then summarizes how the uncleanness and holiness were connected for the Israelites, especially in connection with food: “...if one is unclean, he makes his food unclean. And one should be clean for eating and also should eat clean food so that he may be holy”

out is expressed by the prefixes “ex-” and “eis-”. The tradition of the Pharisees is concerned with things that enter a person (εις). But Jesus uses, we can admit, a vulgar description of how he views the laws of their tradition. The end of these things is quite prosaic. One should not care about what enters them so much, because it will go away in the end. On the other hand, Jesus says, the real problem is caused by the refuse that comes out of a person. The direction ex-, out, is the real problem, that which goes out of the *mouth and heart*. The Pharisees are concerned with the *hands and mouth* and rely on the concept of the material transmission of impurity.¹³¹ Jesus, on the other hand, speaks of the mouth as a transmitter of information, not food.¹³² He warns about the ethical aspect of the mouth in the sense of speaking one's own heart. The heart is the fertile ground for all the impurities mentioned in the list of vices. These are the things that render one impure before God.¹³³ These are the things which fill the vessel of human soul. Compared to these grave problems, the lack of washing hands is literally cosmetic, according to Jesus.

Summary: Jesus calls out to Pharisees and other purity sects teaching about purity in the same way as the Old Testament prophets did: to come back to the roots of faith. He teaches that purity cannot be acquired by ritual washing but that it can only be gained by the *purity of the heart*, that is the inner man. The truly defiling impurities are the unethical thoughts that corrupt one's heart and mouth. In the case of unethical behavior no ritual ablution can help.

131 In accord with the laws of Lv. This approach is extreme for Lv itself.

132 Compare the parallel in Mk where Jesus says *ανθρωπος*; here in Matthew Jesus is more specific

133 Very similar texts can be found in Paul, in 1. Cor 5, also with the introduction: “Do you not know that...”

1.4 Other Cases

1.4.1 Implicit Allusions

We should also mention the **implicit allusions connected with holiness**. Foremost, I find it important to mention all the cases when Jesus has physical contact with people who are somehow broken. He touches a leper, a bleeding woman, a dead girl. He is accused of being a drunkard and a glutton because of the people he befriends. Not only according to the Levitical theology, Psalm 1, and the theology of the Proverbs, but also the to mood of that time, it was important whom one befriended, with whom one was associated. Jesus disregards this cultural custom¹³⁴, and he chooses his company as he pleases. For some, he may have been a prophet living in very bad company. It is important to note that a choice of company was also important because of the laws of the ritual im/purity. A single physical contact, a touch, could make one impure, and they would have to wash in the water and stay unclean until the evening.

When Jesus expelled businessmen from the temple (I would not be surprised if they were all ritually pure), he exchanged them for exactly those who were not allowed to come near: the lame, the deaf, the blind, the bleeding. In Jesus' presence the defiling people were rendered clean and their impurity, rather than being a threatening factor, was neutralized. The revolution happens in 21,14. The blind and lame come to Jesus in the temple. Not only do they not defile it, they are also healed. The purifying power of holiness in Jesus was manifested in these acts of mercy which showed that the Kingdom of God is at hand.

134 Which is very strongly present again in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers.

1.4.2 Sacrificial Language

There are also some cultic terms in the Gospel which should be mentioned. There are two terms for the temple: “ἱερόν”, “ναός”, as well as derivatives of the root “θύσῆ”, which is connected closely to our semantic field. Even though Jesus quotes two times the verse from Hosea: *I do not desire sacrifice, but the mercy*,¹³⁵ he nonetheless counts on the practice of the temple cult. He visits the temple almost every day, as he also admits later when attacked in Gethsemane.¹³⁶

Next, Jesus does not teach the abandonment of ritual laws. For example, he instructs his followers on how to bring a sacrifice to the altar correctly. The most important matter, in this case, is the pure heart. If a worshiper is in some conflict, they should reconcile first. Thus a sacrifice is an opportunity to make things correct. The altar sanctifies the gift upon it, it is a power working and radiating, like that of Jesus himself.

On one such visit to the temple with his disciples, Jesus does not admire the magnificent buildings, but foretells their near end. Later, on the cross, Jesus is mocked by the crowd for his prophecy about rebuilding the temple. In that very moment, according to the tradition of the Church, Jesus is bringing his own perfect sacrifice and thus building a new, spiritual temple.

The last explicit occurrence of sacrificial language is in chapter 12. Jesus is criticized because of his disciples, who are accused of working on the Sabbath. They were seen working: walking through a field and taking some grain. In order to defend them, Jesus gives two biblical examples of trespassing laws. First, he mentions “the Bread of Presence” eaten in the temple by David and his

135 9,13; 12,7

136 Ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ 26,55

friends in the time of need even though under normal circumstances their deed would be a desecration. He also points to the fact that the priests who work on the Sabbath break the law,¹³⁷ they literally defile (βεβηλοῦσιν¹³⁸) the Sabbath¹³⁹.

However tempting it would be to sum up all of this chapter by claiming that Jesus¹⁴⁰ has abolished all the sacrificial law, we would be wrong. In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus says he came to fulfill the law; he also explicitly says he did not come to cancel it.¹⁴¹ Even though he regularly visited the temple, he did not participate in the "building of the fence around Torah." He rather taught ethical maxims, which were in accord with the theology of the prophets. He was called the teacher, who has power.¹⁴² In him, the holiness of God was manifest; it made people recognize him and hope in him.

Rather than canceling the Law, Jesus brought a new interpretation. Leviticus 19,2 „be holy as I am holy,“ is interpreted by the Evangelist as „Be perfect as the God is perfect.“¹⁴³ This is not through outward ritual perfection, but through the inner perfection of heart. Nothing less than perfection is required, faithfulness till the end. How can it be achieved? In the same way the leper was purified. One has to come to Jesus, believe in him, and ask for mercy.

137 It seems to me, that Jesus is responding to the "fundamentalists" with even deeper and exaggerated fundamentalism in order to open their eyes, but maybe I am wrong.

138 This word appears only twice in the entire New Testament. It is a strong word; Jesus is showing that the untouchable sacred priests desecrate Sabbath every week, because they work on Saturday.

139 For exegesis of this part see my thesis.

140 so e.g. Booth etc.

141 Nonetheless, this is what effectively later happened though his disciples and the disagreements in the young Church.

142 viz *exousia*, above.. incarnated.

143 Mt 5,48.

1.5 Summary

In the first Gospel, the holiness is closely connected with Jesus. He is born of the Holy Spirit. Thus holiness is in him and it manifests itself by restoring everything that is broken, sick, and unclean. Jesus is not threatened by impurity; on the contrary, he emanates purity. He teaches that people should not be afraid of that which could theoretically transmit ritual uncleanness on them, but they should rather guard their inner heart. God favors ethical life rather than the sacrificial gift itself. Jesus does not teach the end of the sacrifices; instead, he submits himself to the cult by teaching in the temple and by teaching Israel what the proper way of sacrificing is. He stands thus beside the Old Testament prophets. His revolution is not in the abandonment of ritual, it is in accepting the unaccepted and in this way pointing to the true heart of the Law. In the Gospel of Matthew, holiness has a strong ring of restoration and mercy, the Kingdom of God is here.

Chapter 2: The Gospel of Mark

2.1 Holiness

There are only seven occurrences of the term “ἅγιος” in the Gospel of Mark. All of them are adjectives, and most collocate with the substantive “πνεῦμα”.

2.1.1 Holy Spirit.

Two of the cases of the term “Holy Spirit” appearing in the parallel synoptic versions were discussed in the previous chapter in their Matthean versions. They also appear in the Gospel of Mark but with a slight shift in some features; these are the baptism in the Holy Spirit¹⁴⁴ (1,8) and blasphemy against it (3,29)¹⁴⁵. Further, in 12,36, Jesus refers to Psalm 110 where David speaks prophetically about the Messiah as his Lord driven by the Holy Spirit. This indicates that Jesus considers the Old Testament Scriptures as inspired. The Spirit has not stopped speaking and Jesus expects it to instruct his disciples about what to say if they have to face a court (13,11).

In the Gospel of Mark, as we shall see in greater detail when discussing the issue of impurity, there is a very sharp clear-cut contrast between that which has its origin in the *Holy Spirit* or in the *impure spirits*. “Holiness” and “impurity” have nothing in common; they fight each other. They need to stay separated from each other and well defined, in line with the original order in the Lev 11,11. The “impure” and “holy” are opposites on the holiness scale of

144 Baptism in the Spirit in Mark’s version lacks the parallel of the fire. The apocalyptic ring is, therefore, absent. It is a further unexplained saying, therefore we shall not comment on it.

145 The context is the same as in Mt. Mark’s version has further explained the problem with his specific opposition of holy and impure spirits in the following verse.

the Old Testament language. Should someone mix holiness and impurity by designating the works of the Holy Spirit as the result of ungodly impure powers, this miss-assignment is an unforgivable sin. There are not dichotomies such as “holy and profane”, “pure and impure” in the Gospel of Mark. On the one side, there is “holy,” to which the only access is through “pure,” which is in the middle on the holiness scale; on the other side, there is “impure,” i.e. a defiling force reviling God.¹⁴⁶

Summary: In the Gospel of Mark, the Holy Spirit is the spirit of holiness in whose power Jesus performs his exorcisms, and who is the power behind the works of Messiah, prophesied in the Scriptures inspired by the same Spirit.

2.1.2 The Adjective “ἅγιος”

In addition to the “Holy Spirit,” there are also other collocations with the adjective “ἅγιος”. There is one case (8,38) of quite a common¹⁴⁷ collocation “ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι.” The angels are holy because they serve God;¹⁴⁸ they are set apart for God’s service and do not serve anybody else. These angels, in Mark, shall accompany the glorified Son of Man upon his return, which is the usual context of this expression¹⁴⁹.

146 On the subject in the introduction to the semantic field, people in ancient Israel lived most of the time in the state of general purity with some minor impurities that could be dealt with by ablution and time. Grave impurities needed a sacrifice. The ritual impurity was caused either by contact with a defiling thing (body fluids, corpse, idols etc.) or by an immoral behaviour. This second part was neglected and raised the strong opposition from the prophets who call back to the basic ethics of holiness.

147 It is not so common in the New Testament itself. To be precise, in the New Testament it is quite rare. However, in the Old Testament and other Jewish literature of the time outside the canonical texts, it is common.

148 This is not so much because they are transcendent, but rather the notion of holiness is rather that of allegiance.

149 // 1 Thess 3,13 speaks only of the holy ones.

Last two occurrences of the adjective “ἅγιος” come out of the mouths of Jesus' enemies. The first is uttered by a demon-possessed man. The impure spirit in him, addresses Jesus: "The Holy One of God," recognizing the holiness emanating from Jesus. The spirit is both attracted to and nervous about this holiness.

Compare this ambiguous approach of an impure spirit with the last occurrence of the adjective holy in the Gospel (**Mk 6, 20**): "ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον, καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν, καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει, καὶ ἠδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν." Here, the King Herod is at the same time attracted to and deflected by the holiness and righteousness of John the Baptist. Holiness and righteousness¹⁵⁰ in the Baptist caused the same reaction in the king¹⁵¹ as Jesus caused in the impure spirits. Therefore, the holiness of God emanates also from the Baptist in a similar way as has been witnessed with Jesus. Whatever is happening behind the scenes and who are the forces behind the different occurrences, the “holy” causes a reaction of ambivalent uneasiness in the “impure”.

150 Holiness and righteousness often stay hand in hand in the letters of Paul. Holiness in this case has both the ring of transcendence and good behavior. In ancient Israel, holy men were often called those who were righteous, those of pure conduct.

151 Herod was deflected, because he was afraid. The words John said were *tremendum*. He was also attracted to John; he kept him safe and liked listening to him, probably because of the effect of the *fascinans*.

Summary: In all of the above mentioned cases, it has been shown how the traditional Old Testament range of the holiness language has been kept throughout the Gospel of Mark. “Holy” is the opposite of “impure.” It is holy by the virtue of belonging to God, being separated for God’s use, serving God, and being of God’s provenience and, therefore, transcendent. It causes a reaction of both awe and fear on the side of the impure which is threatened by the former's presence. John the Baptist, as well as Jesus, both emanate this holiness and cause this reaction. The impure spirits recognize the origin of Jesus, unlike the Pharisees, who blaspheme the Holy Spirit by entitling the power of Jesus to that of impure spirits and not to the Holy One.

2.2 Purity

The occurrences of “purity” words are more frequent in Mark than those of “holiness.” Three different expressions are used in the Gospel: derivations of “καθαρός” (6x), “ἀκάθαρτος” (10x “πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον”), and “κοινός” (7x for ritual impurity of unwashed hands).

2.2.1 “Pure” and “To Purify”, “καθαρός” and “καθαρίζειν”.

The adjective “καθαρός”¹⁵² appears four times in different forms in the end of the first chapter (v 40 - 45). It is Mark’s version of the story of a leper which we have already encountered in the previous Gospel. The cases of the purity root are the following: v. 40: “Ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι”; v. 41: “Θέλω, καθαρῶς ἵσθαι”; v. 42: “ἐκαθαρίσθη”; and v. 44: “προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου”.

152 The majority of the cases appear in the last part of the chapter 2 where Jesus purifies a man from scale disease and in chapter 7 (4x verb, 1x substantive, 1x adjective).

A leper approaches Jesus asking for his attention: humble, pleading and invoking his will, not doubting his ability to cleanse. The man's faith is rewarded as he is heard out. Jesus stretches out his hand and, without much chatter, cleanses the man. Right after this happens, the approach of Jesus changes from almost silent to talking, from merciful to harsh. Jesus now addresses the man as if he were a demon. Jesus throws the man away. The evangelist says (1, 43): “εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν¹⁵³ αὐτόν.” Jesus forbids the man to speak about the event, except to a priest, to whom he should present himself with a sacrifice as prescribed by Moses. The man disregards Jesus' harsh warning and starts walking around, sharing the good news. Jesus, not seeking publicity, is thus forced into the wilderness.

There are several aspects of this story that are worth stressing. First, as we have seen in the previous chapter, Jesus is not *afraid of defilement* and *touches* the man. We have seen this as a very common motif in the previous Gospel. Where every well-behaved and cautious Jew would try to avoid any and all contact with a leper for fear of becoming defiled, Jesus comes and touches the man. Jesus' holiness is more contagious than the scale disease.¹⁵⁴ It is stronger; it is more powerful; it is not threatened; and it overcomes the evil and restores

Second, the *mood* of Jesus *changes* immediately after he heals the man. Despite the initial openness, a cloud passes over Jesus' face, and he starts treating the man with authoritative harshness. Had he done so before the cleansing, it would have been more understandable: the man had been defiled and thus risked defiling others, but now he is healed. The text itself is silent on

153 The verb is usually used for an exorcism. “Jesus threw him away.”

154 Gnlika, pg. 93: "Die Berührung ist nicht Verletzung der jüdischen Reinheitsvorschrift, sondern Übertragung der heilenden Kraft.

the reasons for the mood-swing.¹⁵⁵

Third, Jesus orders the man to *bring the sacrifice* prescribed by Moses. This is yet more evidence against the, quite popular, suggestion, that Jesus has abolished ritual law. "That, which comes into a man cannot defile them," says Jesus later, but he still visits the Temple and he sends the healed man to bring the sacrifice. Jesus does not let the man follow him immediately, but sends him to go through the beautiful but long ritual described in Leviticus. The ritual was performed on a healed person, who is just a passive recipient and does nothing other than wait¹⁵⁶. A priest first needs to examine the skin of the person who is healed or is healing, and, if it is in fact healing or healed, he invites the person nearer and nearer to the community over the course of several weeks. It is a ritual of sanctification, enabling the passive recipient of it to pass from the realm of the unclean into the realm of the holy. Mark mentions that the reason why Jesus sent the man to the temple was as a *testimony* to the priests.¹⁵⁷ However, the man chooses to *testify* to everyone everywhere he goes, perhaps even in the temple. Technically speaking the leper, though healed, had to stay behind the city for some time (2 weeks) before he would be reintroduced to the community by a priest. Here the healed leper skipped the ritual by walking freely around.¹⁵⁸

Fourth, through his disobedience, the healed leper practically *exchanged roles* with Jesus. Lepers, as we have seen, were forbidden to walk freely around

155 Maybe Jesus understands the character of the man, who cannot help but share about what had happened to him. Maybe Jesus knows that he would have to go to wilderness; maybe he understands at this point that he has to change his mind.

156 Maccoby, 1999, chapter 10 and especially 11, pgs. 118 – 140.

157 The lame are walking, the blind can see, lepers are healed.

158 Gnilka rightly notes that if the purification was to be acknowledged officially, the priest had to do the ritual: pg. 94: "Die offizielle Anerkennung der Reinigung wird dann, auch wenn sie nicht erzählt ist, zum Beleg dafür, daß die Heiligung Erfolgte."

cities¹⁵⁹. In cases they did actually enter a city, they were required to make their presence noted, otherwise they had to keep their residence in the wilderness¹⁶⁰. Jesus introduces the man into the city, taking upon himself the leper's lot of the outcast outside the city walls.

The two characters, Jesus and the healed leper, are connected and compared in respect to what they can or cannot do (*δύνασαι*).¹⁶¹ Jesus *can* purify the man so that the man *can* be among the pure in the city. Nonetheless, he himself *cannot* be there in the city because of the former.¹⁶² Jesus was not defiled by the touch he freely gave to the impure man, but the man's place was supposed to be, for several following weeks, according to Leviticus, in the wilderness. However, because of the man's eloquent "missionary" speech all over town, Jesus hides in wilderness in the man's place. Jesus is sent away to the place of uncleanness by the man to whom he had granted purity. This exchange is a slight foretaste of the end of the story of the Gospel, when Jesus takes on himself the role of sacrifice. In this case, Jesus *is* sacrificed. He sowed freedom, he reaped exile.

Summary: In the first chapter of the Gospel, in the story of the healed leper the power of purity in Jesus is stronger than that the power of impurity. Jesus is not threatened by ritual uncleanness, but he can be threatened and limited by the free-willed disobedience of the people he came to save. The Gospel here

159 The exception was that they could if they warned everyone around by loud call revealing to be lepers

160 For an excursive describing the plight of the Leppers in EKK 92 - 95

161 This is a similar way the *ἐξουσία* was used in the Gospel of Matthew.

162 The wordplay on *δύνασαι* is explained by J. Marcus. "The structure of the passage is dominated by repetition and contrast. At the beginning the sufferer "comes" (*ερχεται*) to Jesus and expresses confidence in his ability (*δύνασαι*)...Jesus inability (*μηκετι δύνασαι*) to appear in the public..." Joel Marcus, Mark, the Anchor Bible Dictionary pg. 208

describes the ritual purity in line with the theology of the Old Testament. No shift in semantic field of holiness can be traced here. The purification comes before sanctification and is necessary for it. The healed man robbed himself of the chance to be sanctified by the priest. Jesus, in sending the man there, acknowledges the temple, its cult and personnel, and its power of sanctification.

2.2.2 Defiling and To Defile, “κοινός” and “κοινειν”

In connection with what we have just discussed, let us now proceed to Mk 7, which is full of expressions of interest to us. There are seven occurrences of the word “κοινός”. All of them in the seventh chapter in the discourse parallel to that of Matthew 15.¹⁶³ Two times the expression describes hands in the form of adjective; the rest of the cases are verbs. The word is otherwise very rare in the New Testament. Rather than "impure" it should be translated "*common*, regular, normal, ordinary."¹⁶⁴ The defiling element is expressed in the fact that the designated subject is *not set apart for God*, it is not “special”. Especially in a world where all the other peoples “did not know God” and lived accordingly, to be “normal” and “ordinary” might have been considered negative, even defiling.

163 Note that Matthew does not use this word as often as Mark. In 15,2, the Gospel exchanges "unwashed" for "unclean." Jesus' explanation in Matthew keeps *κοινειν* as it is in Mark; he explains it more than the second Gospel, which is interesting, considering that Matthew was likely writing to a Jewish audience.

164 There is an extensive study of the language of purity made by W. Paschen in his book "Rein und Unrein" esp. pgs 165 - 169. Paschen says (167), "*Das adj HL bezeichnet an allen alttestamentlichen Belegstellen das Ungeweihte im Gegensatz zum Geweihten (QDS), während koinos das für den Jahwekult unfähige, ja ihm Entgegengesetzte, das Heidnische, ausdrückt. LXX hat den auch für HoL βεβηλος.*"

Mark 7,2 explains that “κοινός” in this specific context, signifies “unwashed:” “καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὅτι κοιναῖς χερσίν, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ἀνίπτοις, ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους¹⁶⁵” In the following two verses, the evangelist further explains the behaviour of the Pharisees, using other words also connected with washing.¹⁶⁶ "Tradition" is another word often used in this chapter. It is the tradition of the elders to wash hands. Even the elders are only people, and therefore, they should submit to the Law of God rather than invent new commandments,¹⁶⁷ says Mark's Jesus.

There is vast literature dealing with the possible origin of the tradition of washing hands¹⁶⁸. As I have already mentioned in the previous chapter, the washing required by those who visited Jesus might have been exaggerated.¹⁶⁹

165 Bread means food in general.

166 Especially interesting is the twice repeated verb “βαπτίζειν”. Though used for washing as a synonym to “νίπτειν”, it designates washing for a ritual purpose. After the *baptism* the vessels become ritually clean.

167 Mark is not as harsh in his account as Matthew. He also speaks of the tradition of the fathers, not the presbyters. There are other differences.

168 There are several problems. The main is what defiles what: 1, Do hands defile food before it enters the mouth or vice versa? 2, Do all people need to keep the same level of purity? (Booth vs. Neusner). Among others, I will just mention the most prominent: the issue is most representatively dealt with by: C. Carlston, “The Things that Defile (Mark vii. 14) and the Law in Mathew and Mark,” *New Testament Studies*, vol. 15, no. 01, pp. 75–96, Oct. 1968., R. A. Buchler, “The Law of Purification in Mark vii. 1-23.1,” *The Expository Times*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 34–40, Jan. 1909., H. Räisänen, “Jesus and the Food Laws: Reflections on Mk 7,15,” *JSNT*, vol. 16, pp. 79 – 100, 1982.

169 Only priests had to wash before offering every meal in order to prevent defilement of the sacrificial meat. On the other hand, the Essenes were known for their daily baptism, treating every meal as sacred, being the purity elite. The Gospel, however, speaks only about “some of the Pharisees;” therefore it cannot mean Essenes. Who were they? This confusion has raised questions regarding the authenticity of the text: Booth says: "If it was neither legally required, nor customary, for Jews or a group of Jews to wash their hands before eating, then the previously posited authenticity of the earliest form of the dispute is seriously prejudiced. To summarize, it seems probable that there were conflicting views from early days concerning the scope of the purity rules; but is it sufficient to render the Pharisaic question at v. 5 credible if some Pharisees could, consistently with their views on purity, have asked it." Booth: *Jesus and the Laws of Purity*, pg. 151

Booth presents the idea, that the Gospel does not speak of the Pharisees as a whole but only of a pietistic group, the so called *haberim*¹⁷⁰, who formed small groups and were engaged in stricter purity rules¹⁷¹. Their comment could be also understood as sort of missionary effort.¹⁷² The tradition of the elders that Jesus is against would then make a different sense; however, this is only one of the possible explanations. We have encountered in the previous chapter the view of Neusner who maintains that the whole nation kept themselves pure.

After the quote from Hosea and the discourse on *korban*, the Gospel repeats the same saying in a slightly different context. Now Jesus is teaching a general audience:

Mk 7,15

οὐδέν ἐστιν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτόν
 ὃ δύναται κοινῶσαι αὐτόν,
 ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔκπορευόμενά ἐστιν
 τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

Mark's version is less neat than the Matthew's one.¹⁷³ The question is,

170 R. A. Buchler, "The Law of Purification in Mark vii. 1-23.1," The Expository Times, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 34-40, Jan. 1909. on the other hand had ascribed already along time ago this to another group. He was among the first commentators who looked deeper in the whole problem: "There seems to be only one possible way of explaining all this which is not forced, namely, that the reproaches and statements refer to priests, Aaronites"

171 Contra Neusner, who preserves that the general population had interest on keeping the strict rules, viz previous chapter.

172 Booth, *ibid.* pg. 202: "We conclude that Pharisaic question is credible in the time of Jesus on the basis that the Pharisees concerned were haberim who did hand-wash before hullin, and when urging Jesus and his disciples to adopt the supererogatory hand-washing which they themselves practiced, i.e. to become haberim. It was an exhortation to undertake a higher standard of piety, addressed to Jesus as a spiritual leader."

173 For a quite interesting commentary, written from the point of view that Mark is later than Matthew (opposite to the usual notion), cf. C.S. Mann's Mark in the edition of The An-

whether an unwashed hand can ritually defile food, which would then defile a person. People were, already, living most of their lives in a neutral state of general im/purity. They were not ready to go to the temple every day, neither were they utterly defiled. Why then should all food be holy? Why should they eat every food in the state of temple-required purity? And why would a person be defiled by eating with their own hand? In reaction to the absurd accusation, Jesus teaches a maxim that “*there is nothing outside a man entering into them that could defile them.*”¹⁷⁴ The sentence is revolutionary, this is the first part of his teaching of the “reversed flow of holiness”.

In fact, it is so revolutionary, that the evangelist, or maybe some editor, stressed what just happened adding an explanatory note in the verse 19: “καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα.” Some major diet-law requirements seem abolished by such a bold statement. The dietary law, which had been yet several decades ago a sign of holiness and faithfulness to God's people, seems to be abandoned. The separation and the preparation that food-purity required and reflected in practical life seems to be abolished. Does Jesus really say that his followers and everyone can really eat unclean animals, or is he just speaking into some specific situation to specific people who pushed the purity laws over the limits? Is this just the evangelist's influence after the introduction of the

cor Bible Commentary. I would like to share his specific point of view (pg. 316): "In Matthew, the whole debate concerns eating with the unwashed hands, and the answer is given at the end of the pericope in the v. 20. For Mark the climax is the assertion that Jesus made all things clean (i.e., all the foods). In contradistinction from Matthew, with its Jewish background, Mark here reflects a later stage, or more burning concern to non-Jewish Christians, and we may have here a reminiscence from the "Roman" stage of the evangelist's career...(pg.317) Mark's list (of vices) adds five words familiar from Paul's letters and two which are unique to Mark"

174 Gnllka, pg. 284: "Wenn es keine äußere Einwirkung gibt, die den Menschen wirklich verunreinigen könnte, ist in der Tat der levitische Reinheitskodex im Kern erledigt. Die wahre Unreinheit ist in dem zu erkennen, was der Mensch redet und tut. Das Gewicht des Wortes wird vom abschließenden Weckruf unterstrichen"

Gentiles in the Church, trying to root the abolition of the food-laws with Jesus? The scope of this thesis unfortunately does not allow us to address all these questions in sufficient depth and therefore will have to, for the moment, remain unanswered¹⁷⁵.

The second part of the statement in verse 15, that the things coming out of people defile them, is, on the other hand, not problematic at all. Of course, the Levitical law of purity is of the same opinion. The purity laws had been preoccupied with avoiding that which comes out of people, mostly in the biological sense. Jesus, however, moves from the realm of the ritual “outward,” from “clean hands,” toward the realm of the *inner* soul, toward “clean hearts.”¹⁷⁶ What kind of food and in what way it is eaten is, therefore, less important than that which touches the heart.¹⁷⁷

Again, for the third time, now only in the intimate circle of his disciples, Jesus repeats the saying which is classified as “the parable” this time (v 17b):

175 I have tried to elaborate on this in E. Landovska/Havelkova, “From Clean Hands to Clean Heart,” in *Wichtige Wendepunkte/Pivotal Turns*, 2014, pp. 57 – 67.

176 One of the motives why I had chosen my topic of dissertation was that I wanted to understand how it is possible to hold both statements: A) that Jesus has not abolished law but fulfilled it and B) the present verse, which has caused an abolition of ritual laws. I must admit that after reading monographs, articles and commentaries I still have not been able to find an answer which I would consider satisfactory. I therefore will leave the question open for the time being. Carlston's article then, when speaking about the Matthean stratum of the verse, writes: “hence, even if we translate “fulfill” as “establish” rather than “perfect” or “complete” it must still be recognized that for Matt v.17 is deliberately intended to move beyond a strictly halakhic interpretation of the sense in which the Law is permanently valid” pg. 82 in C. Carlston, “The Things that Defile (Mark vii. 14) and the Law in Mathew and Mark,” *New Testament Studies*, vol. 15, no. 01, pp. 75–96, Oct. 1968.

177 How rebellious! Even the Pharisees of his time must have agreed that the heart and faith is important, but nobody would have dared to go so far as to rob the outward mark of faith of its validity. However, in Mishna, the intention is also a defiling source.

“ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολήν.” The problem is restated in a more eloquent way. V. 18 b n.

πᾶν τὸ ἐξῶθεν εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον
οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι,
ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν
ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν,
καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρώνα ἐκπορεύεται;
καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα.

More words using the prefixes εἰς- and ἐξ- are used to depict the two worlds and the exchange between them. Here the focus is explicitly on the heart. The inner person cannot be defiled by impure food as we have also seen in the parallel Mt 15.

What started as possibly an exaggerated requirement of purity by some of the Pharisees turns out to be just an opportunity for a new teaching of Jesus on the food-purity laws. Nothing that enters defiles; it is that which comes out of the heart that defiles¹⁷⁸. *Ritually impure food or hands are not able to defile one's own heart*. The discourse is closed, again, by the new list of defiling agents: not an inventory of unclean animals or prescriptions on how to wash ritually but a series of vices. The “new” purity touches the heart¹⁷⁹.

178 That which enters a person, says the evangelist, is not dangerous for them, be it impure food, defiled food, defiled hands. The note that “Jesus thus purified all the foods,” is not found in any other Gospels; it is unique and therefore I stress the evangelist's work.

179 It is not entirely “new”. The purity of heart was, of course, very much stressed by the Old Testament as well. The theology of Prophets balances well the Priestly Code. What is new is the stress and the precedence voiced in such a strong way.

The impurity of hands is secondary; the real fight for purity happens inside of a person, in the *καρδία*, as Mt and Mk call it, in the *συνείδησις* as Paul and Hebrews call it¹⁸⁰. The heart reveals itself in the speech and actions, and it needs to be purified. This will be very important further in the chapter on Paul and his discourse in 1Cor 8–10 and Rom 14, where the fight is for the purity of *συνείδησις*. In that case, the ritually impure food actually can defile one's own heart but only in the case that one feels guilty over eating impure food¹⁸¹.

Summary: “*Κοινός*” is used in the Gospel of Mark to say that something is not sufficiently ritually pure. That, which is common, not set apart, not special. Jesus uses the ritualistic understanding of the word to teach about the ethical dimensions of the issue of purity.

2.2.3 Impure, “*ἀκάθαρτος*”

The most frequent word of holiness/purity language in the Gospel of Mark is the word “*ἀκάθαρτος*”, “impure.” This Gospel speaks more often about “impure spirits” than about “the Holy Spirit.”¹⁸² In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus does not

180 The question which I am asking and have not able to answer is whether the version of Mk is just secondary coping with already existing practice of the Church and its secondary bracing in alignment with Jesus, commenting on his teaching, or how far Jesus taught these and all the tradition stems from this. I opt for the second version. Jesus in his life not only teaches these, but his actions underline this teachings. Viz H. Räisänen, “Jesus and the Food Laws: Reflections on Mk 7,15,” JSNT, vol. 16, pp. 79 – 100, 1982. pg. 85 “Jesus mixed...without scruples with “sinners” who did not meet the demands of the purity regulations of Torah.”

181 The only ritually impure food that can actually defile one's heart is idol-food, according to Paul. In the same way that Communion is understood as partaking in the sacrifice of Christ, the idol-food is partaking in the idol-ritual. It is not the matter of the food, but of the *κοινωνία*.

182 Of course, I am speaking about the full collocation “Holy Spirit”. The cases when the Gospel mentions the Holy Spirit without the adjective “holy” will be more numerous.

reveal what happens with the mentioned impure spirits. The lesson on impure spirits is not so developed as in Matthew. However, when comparing the occurrences, it can be well observed how they behave.

First, *they are attracted to Jesus*. Whenever Jesus appears somewhere, they attack.¹⁸³ Note what was said above in the beginning of this chapter; the holiness of God emanating from the Baptist and Jesus calls forth a reaction¹⁸⁴. The existence of the holiness alone raises an unexpected reaction. The impure spirits cannot stand the presence of holiness, so they come near and reveal themselves.

Second, *they appear immediately*. A favourite word of Mark is "εὐθὺς", which is very often used to describe the appearance of the unclean spirits. They emerge suddenly, like in a horror film. For example, Jesus preaches in the synagogue but then, *suddenly*, a possessed man enters screaming (**Mk 1, 23**): "καὶ εὐθὺς ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, καὶ ἀνέκραξεν." In another story, Jesus is getting onto a boat and *suddenly* a man possessed by a whole legion of unclean spirits crawls to him (**Mk 5, 2**): "καὶ ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ." The word *εὐθὺς* raises the factor of fear by including the element of shock. The impure spirits are scary.

Third, *they know who Jesus is* (**Mk 1, 24**):¹⁸⁵ "τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἤλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ." Also Mk 5,7: "καὶ κράξας φωνῇ

183 Mk 3,11.

184 H. Clark Kee, "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories," *New Testament Studies*, vol. 14, no. 02, pp. 232–246, Jan. 1968. Draws some very good conclusions: pg. 42: "it is in exorcisms that the authority of Jesus is supremely manifest, and this is through the exorcisms that the kingdom can be seen as having drawn near" the evil forces are nervous since pg. 43 "...the struggle is not a momentary one, but is part of a wider conflict, of which this is but a single phase...Satan's rule is being overcome"

185 also see 3,11.

μεγάλη λέγει· τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; ὀρκίζω σε τὸν θεόν, μὴ με βασανίσῃς.”¹⁸⁶ The impure spirits know who Jesus is; they recognize him. They live in the spiritual realm, and they are stronger than people and are aware of this fact. They trick and try slimy half-truths. They make their presence obvious when Jesus is near. Jesus also knows about them but is not afraid of them. In the context of the Gospel of Mark with its *messianic secret*, this is a particularly interesting moment. From the beginning until the Peter's confession, it is important for Jesus to stay incognito. Jesus keeps silencing people who would like to reveal his true identity. But the impure spirits, manipulating their hosts, try to break the news. In the moment when Jesus is openly acknowledged as the Messiah, his end begins. Revealing his identity sooner might lead either to his glory, and thus away from the cross, or to the cross directly and too soon. The impure spirits, by prematurely publicly proclaiming Jesus' true identity, threaten his mission.

Fourth, *the impure spirits devour personality*. Though they know who Jesus is, it is unclear who they are themselves. In the stories, it is not clear, who is the person and who is the spirit. There is a change in a person when the possessed speak. It is not clear who is exactly speaking and whom Jesus is addressing. The personalities are intermingled. This phenomenon of possession is expressed by the Greek prefix *εν-*. The possessed people are *in* the impure spirits. The Gospel of Luke and Acts often use a phrase that someone was *filled with the Holy Spirit*. Here, the same notion is expressed but even stronger. The person is not *filled by* the impure spirit; they are *in* it. Also, to be *in* the impure

186 We may be reminded of a similar story from the Acts of the Apostles when a woman, possessed by an impure spirit, follows Paul saying he is a servant of the Most High God. And we read again: "You believe that God is one. You do well; the demons also believe, and shudder". (Jam 2:19 NAS)

spirit is like being *in* Jesus. When an impure spirit envelopes a person, however, their identity melts away; the spirit eats them and occupies their body.

Fifth, *the impure spirits "worship" Jesus*. We have already discussed the language of unclean spirits. They reveal the true identity of Jesus; they come to him; and they are attracted to him. But what may be provocatively called "worship" here is their throwing their hosting person about; they usually throw them at Jesus' feet (**Mk 3, 11**): "*καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ καὶ ἔκραζον λέγοντες ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.*" In another case it is not obvious whether it was a demon or the person trying to find help prostrating himself at the feet of Jesus (**Mk 5, 6**): "*καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔδραμεν καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ*". In the following case (**7, 25**), it is a mother of a possessed girl, who is asking Jesus' help. She is not Jewish, and she has to persuade Jesus that she is worthy of his help by humiliating herself before him. When she heard about Jesus coming to Gerasa, she found him and "*ἔλθοῦσα προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.*"¹⁸⁷ In the final case, it is clearly the spirit throwing the person at Jesus' feet (**9, 20b**): "*καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα εὐθύς συνεσπάραξεν αὐτόν, καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκυλίετο ἀφρίζων.*"¹⁸⁸ Let us, therefore,

187 In this discourse, there is not much holiness language, except the "*πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον.*" However, only a few verses later in the discourse, Jesus says (7,27): "*ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα, οὐ γάρ ἐστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν.*" This verse is very similar to the saying in Didache and the Gospel of Matthew: "Do not give the holy to the dogs." In Didache it speaks about the eucharist. In the Gospel it is not quite clear what should be the holy thing/bread. It is sometimes mistakenly equated to Mt7,6.

188 This might be a homiletically strong moment. An impure spirit, though knowing who Jesus is, leads a person to their feet. Even though a person might feel lost while enveloped by the evil, this is not the true reality, since even the torturing impure spirits are less powerful than Jesus. This is the same meaning as Psalm 139 that even the darkness cannot hide a person from God. Even if a person is lost and the personality is being eaten by an evil spirit, there is hope. In the presence of Jesus, it is the evil spirits who bow down and are without power. They prostrate themselves, or the host, in humiliation. Jesus' heart, then, is to heal the person and expel the demon. Jesus is the therapeutic essence, in his presence everything happens, and the healed person only passively receives. Note

conclude that Jesus' exorcisms are, in Mk, usually preceded by an act of self-humiliation when a person in need prostrates themselves before Jesus. Sometimes the person is compelled by the impure spirit; sometimes the humility comes from the inner desire for help.

Sixth, *the impure spirits bargain with Jesus*. In the Gospel of Mark, if a person is *in* an impure spirit, the latter does not want to let them go freely. It is literally possession or occupation. The demons only go out by force. **(1, 26)**: "καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον καὶ φωνῆσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ"; or **(9, 26)**: "καὶ κράξας καὶ πολλὰ σπαράξας ἐξῆλθεν· καὶ ἐγένετο ὡσεὶ νεκρός, ὥστε τοὺς πολλοὺς λέγειν ὅτι ἀπέθανεν". When they are located and talked to by Jesus, the impure spirits try to bargain. First they begin by invoking his name in an attempt to magically compel or manipulate Jesus.¹⁸⁹ Calling Jesus by his proper name¹⁹⁰ may be the spirit's attempt to get a hold over him.¹⁹¹ Second, knowing who Jesus is, they know that they are doomed, and they try to get something for themselves. They are slimy in their pleading. On several occasions they ask Jesus what his business is with them. In another case, for no clear reason, they want to enter pigs. They just do not want to leave.

Summary: The occurrences of the collocation “πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον” have

that the “holy” is not afraid to be defiled. On the contrary, the “impure” cannot bear the presence of the Holy Spirit. The “pure/holy” makes the impure and defiling nervous by its presence. The “impure” does not know how to save itself, it invokes the Name, it prostrates, it bargains, but in the end it has to let go of the prey. The presence of Jesus is healing.

189 If a name of someone is known and pronounced, the person can be manipulated by magical practices. Therefore God in Exodus does not want to reveal the divine Name, therefore the Name should be hallowed and is holy.

190 This is now used for manipulation the opposite to the order of sanctification of the Name.

191 Which might also be the reason why they suddenly, out of blue, scarily appear.

shown some characteristics of impure spirits: They are attracted to Jesus because they already know who he is; they crawl before him and acknowledge his power. They try to manipulate him, using his name, bargaining with him, but they are weaker than him. They appear suddenly in order to scare; they devour the personality of the host, whom they throw around and do not want to leave. They are stronger than a potential host, but weaker than Jesus. These two realms with their spirits oppose each other. The realm of holiness is stronger than the one of impurity in the form of the impure spirits. This is the actual defilement, presence of an impure spirit in the heart inside of a man leading them into defiling actions. There is nothing in common between holy and impure, and, therefore, people, since they are weaker than these spirits, should watch their allegiances and keep their hearts pure. Whereas one cannot be defiled by eating with unwashed hands, they can be defiled by impure spirits if they do not keep their heart pure.

The impure spirits have nothing in common with Jesus. In 1,24 they ask: "τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ;" and again in 5,7: "τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί." The realms of holiness and purity are recognized by both sides as being opposite. The Old Testament distinction of the extremes of the holiness range is thus kept.

2.3 Conclusion

Rather than consciously keeping some sort of a defined range, the author of the Gospel betrays through his use of holiness language the fact that the relationship in the pair of "holy - impure" has not changed from the way it is understood in the Old Testament. The semantic field of purity has, however, moved toward a spiritual understanding in the Gospel. The impure, as opposite

of holy, is rather on the spiritual level. The word “ἀκάθαρτος” is the antonym to “ἅγιος”, rather than to “καθαρός”. Compared to demonic possession, the problem of unwashed hands is minor.¹⁹² Jesus is the Holy One of God, working through the Holy Spirit, who heralds the victory over the real impurity. This impurity is not concerned with food-laws and hand-washing, but with the inner man, their heart and who the heart is enveloped in. “Satan's rule is being threatened by the inbreaking of God's reign through the ministry of his agent, Jesus¹⁹³”.

192 Therefore, those who say (the Pharisees) that Jesus' good deeds of exorcisms and healings were powered by the impure spirits themselves rather than by Holy Spirit, have "sin[ned] against the Holy Spirit." Jesus was provoked to such a strong statement by the confusion of black and white (3,30): "ὅτι ἔλεγον· πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει." In Leviticus 10,10, it is important to divide between holy and unholy, pure and impure. Those who call the works of the Holy One the opposite, Jesus says in 3,29, shall not find forgiveness.

193 H. Clark Kee, “The Terminology of Mark’s Exorcism Stories,” *New Testament Studies*, vol. 14, no. 02, pp. 232–246, Jan. 1968. pg. 245.

3. Chapter, Luke and Acts

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter we shall discuss both the Gospel of Luke and the book of Acts of the Apostles together, as if they were just one work of the same author divided into two volumes¹⁹⁴. Both texts are full of references to holiness. Its source is the Holy Spirit, understood both in the sense of one person of the Trinity and an impersonal power. In the book of Acts, there is also the strong shift of understanding holiness in the practical sense and ethical requirements. The shift moves from the stress on ritually pure life to life full of the Holy Spirit.

3.2 Holiness

Majority of the occurrences of the “*ἅγιος*” are locked in the collocation “Holy Spirit”. Rather than presenting thorough pneumatology of Luke, we shall consider in what way is “the Holy Spirit” *holy* and what it means. In the cases where the collocation described rather the person of the Trinity we shall ask: Does the holiness only describe the quality of the Spirit? Can this quality be shared? How can the Spirit be received? Are there any conditions necessary in order to earn the Spirit? etc.

After having seen to these problems, we shall discuss the other occurrences of notion of holiness and search for their possible connection or disconnection to the person of the Holy Spirit.

194 The discussion of integrity and authorship of the two texts shall not be discussed. Out of the findings, it is highly likely that the two texts continue in the same line of thought.

3.2.1 Holy Spirit, “πνεῦμα ἅγιον”

The collocation “πνεῦμα ἅγιον” is nowhere in the New Testament more frequent than in the writings of Luke. Many monographs have been written on this subject. My focal point is the language of holiness and purity in general. This means that a lot of pneumatological problems shall be only touched upon and left unanswered. In this chapter, I am not attempting to elaborate on the pneumatology as such with all its problems and questions, I will only present the collocation “Holy Spirit”, since it can not be avoided.

As far as concerns the language of holiness, “πνεῦμα ἅγιον” is the Spirit that is holy and that has the ability of imparting this quality on others. In comparison with other books of the New Testament, the Holy Spirit in Lk-A is spoken of most often as a power or energy that can fill a person. It is a spirit who functions as a witness to the true change of heart and genuine faith, empowers the key characters in the story. It is God's gift in response to the individuals who live their life before him in truth and merciful love. The Spirit is agent as well as recipient of human actions. In the Gospel it occurs 13 times in the Acts 41 times.

3.2.1.1 To Be Filled with/ To Be Full of Holy Spirit¹⁹⁵

The most common phrase of the collocation “Holy Spirit” is “*to be filled with the Holy Spirit*”¹⁹⁶. Going through the list of cases of this phrase, the first

195 5x in Lk and 9x in Acts

196 There is variety of the forms of the collocation: with or without an article. Sometimes the collocation occurs with both correct articles, sometimes the articles are missing, many commentaries want to base on this fact the claim, that where the articles are missing, the author could not have been Luke, since he was well educated. We are not con-

thing that strikes us is that all of the examples appear in the beginning of something important. In the Gospel all five incidents fit within the first chapter and the last case is in the chapter 4. In the book of Acts, those who are filled with the Holy Spirit have the role of inauguration of something new. The beginnings in both books carry pathetic overtones of perfect old days and the person filled with the Spirit is always at the dawn of something new.

First we shall start with an overview, after that, the specific cases shall be discussed in detail. The following persons are said to have been filled with the Holy Spirit: John the Baptist (Lk 1,15 “πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται”), Mary (Holy Spirit will come on you, v 1,35 “ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ”), Elisabeth (Lk 1,41 “ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου”), Zachariah (1,67 “ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου”) and last but not least, Jesus¹⁹⁷ (Lk 4,1 “πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου”, Ac 10,38 says “annointed”: “ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ”,).

In the book of Acts, the disciples are filled with the Holy Spirit and start speaking in tongues (Ac 2,4 “ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες πνεύματος ἁγίου”). Peter is filled with the Spirit during his speech (Ac 4,8 “πλησθεὶς πνεύματος ἁγίου”) and then also his hearers, the elders were filled (Ac 4,31 “ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος”). Stephen was a man full of Holy Spirit (Ac 6,5 “πλήρης πίστεως καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου”), despite this, he is told to have been filled with the Spirit again at the moment of his martyrdom (7,55 “πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου”), gazing upon the glory¹⁹⁸ of the Lord. When Ananias lays his hands on Paul, the latter is filled by the Holy Spirit. Barnabas is a man full of Spirit (11,24 “πλήρης

cerned here with the critique of redaction, therefore we will take the text as it is, because the understanding of holiness does not depend on the difference concerning the article.

197 Though only coming back from his baptism.

198 In the Old Testament, the glory is holiness manifested.

πνεύματος ἁγίου”). The Holy Spirit also falls on Gentiles, taking possession of them (10,44 “ἐπέπεσεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον”), which is a sign for Peter that also they can be baptized by water. Paul, exactly like Stephen, despite being already a man “full of the Holy Spirit”, is said to be filled with Holy Spirit anew, on the special occasion of blinding Elymas. In all the above cases, the subject, the Holy Spirit, does not appear to be the person of Trinity but some positive active force accompanying important persons in the history of salvation.

The same metaphor “filled with the Holy Spirit” is used for the members of Jesus' family and the multitudes at the Pentecost. But is it really the same experience? Is there difference between being filled before the resurrection and after it? In what way were people filled with the Spirit before Jesus' resurrection? The text does not allow us to answer these questions with certainty. But one thing is certain, the experience is described in both of the cases, before and after the Pentecost, in the same way.

3.2.1.1.1 The Family of Jesus

Even before Jesus is born, before he enters their lives, all his family is full of the Spirit; the Holy Spirit is active around him, surrounding him. It is not until he is baptized, though, that Jesus is said to be full of the Spirit himself. However, even before this, all the people that come in the nearest connection with him are “full of the Holy Spirit”, the contact with baby Jesus brings about this “filling”.

After short survey on the holiness of the family, we shall discuss each member in greater detail. Angel Gabriel tells *Zachariah* that his son would be “filled with the Holy Spirit” already from his prenatal stage (1,15), which

actually happens when pregnant *Elisabeth* is filled with the Spirit at the meeting with pregnant *Mary* (1,41). Also *Mary*, filled with the Spirit, is told by the archangel *Gabriel* that she would conceive her child from the Holy Spirit, therefore her child would be holy (“διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται”). It cannot be said if she was filled at the notice of her Son or at the work of the angel. Even if it might seem natural to understand the “filled with Holy Spirit” as her own reaction, it is rather a merciful state that happens to her and is out of her control, as well as in all the other cases. When *Zachariah* regains his speech, he is filled with the Spirit again and he praises the Lord with his famous hymn (1,67 etc). *Jesus* himself is filled at his baptism, right before he goes to the desert in order to be tested. The Holy Spirit appears and fills these people. They do not ask for it, they do not do anything special in order to deserve it. They happen to be chosen to be the family of *Jesus*. The Holy Spirit “happens” to them. Where does this “filling” lead? It is a sort of endorsement for the task of being, literally, the *holy* family for the *holy* baby. In the case of *Jesus* himself, his baptism and “filling” with the Holy Spirit inaugurated his service and empowered him to endure the desert temptation. Let us look closer at the specific occasions.

John the Baptist. Lk 1,15: “ἔσται γὰρ μέγας ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ μὴ πίη, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ.” *Zechariah* is given promises considering his son in an annunciation similar to that of *Mary*, containing also a blessing. With no further explanation *John* is said to be “filled with Holy Spirit¹⁹⁹”. This shows that the author is coming out

199 All of the commentaries note the anathorous variation of the πνεύματος ἁγίου. Plummer dares to designate the secondary editions according to the usage of the specific version of the phrase “Holy Spirit”, Nolland and others are more cautious.

of a community for which this phrase has already clear theological contents. This phrase has for him certain meaning, which he is not compelled to explain to the readers, since to him, it is obvious. In this very case we are only told that an important person can be filled by the Holy Spirit before they are actually born, therefore it is not something that can be earned by good character or by good deeds. It is a pure gift, John was foretold, predestined before he could do anything in order to show he would deserve it²⁰⁰.

Mary. Lk 1,35: “καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται, υἱὸς θεοῦ.” Mary is not literally “filled”, but the Holy Spirit is promised to cover her from within, which can then be considered as filling as well²⁰¹. The son, fruit of this encounter, will be called “holy”. The text does not literally speak of conceiving either. Mary is surrounded by what could be called a cloud of the Spirit. She is not filled in the same way as the later people of Acts or the other members of the family. The Holy Spirit is here the One, who entrusts Mary

200 Plummer says that “filled with the Holy Spirit” is obvious negative to the “wine” (pg.14): “*In place of the physical excitement of strong drink he is to have the supernatural inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The whole phrase is peculiar to Lk...and the two elements are specially characteristic of him.*” Further, Plummer points out the similarity with Eph 5,10: Do not get drunk on wine,...instead, be filled with the Spirit.

201 Despite the fact that in Greek the spirit is neuter, in the Hebrew/Aramaic the Spirit is feminine. I would like to stress the possibility that the Spirit could also be perceived as Jesus' Mother, who, in the act of “hugging” Mary, bestows upon her the empowerment for special/holy motherhood. No need of sexual connotations is felt here, then. Jesus is not born out of humanly mother and godly father such as is the case in Graeco-Roman mythology. Viz. e.g. JBL 132, no. 3 (2013): 639 – 658 Andrew T. Lincoln: “Luke and Jesus' Conception: A Case of Double Paternity?” which also considers the possibility that the Gospel is using the language of a Graeco-Roman Biography “What ancient hearers or readers would have expected to be told about the births of great figures included stories handed down about predictions, prophecies, and omens preceding and surrounding their birth that attempted to show how their future greatness and significant deeds were already anticipated from the earliest days. It also included tales of their miraculous conceptions whereby the origins of their greatness could be attributed to the gods.”

with God's own baby and who empowers her to give birth to holy son. The Holy Spirit is here, again, associated also with the power.

Elisabeth. Lk 1,41: “καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤκουσεν τὸν ἀσπασμὸν τῆς Μαρίας ἡ Ἐλισάβετ, ἐσκίρτησεν τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς²⁰², καὶ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου ἡ Ἐλισάβετ.” In this case, Elisabeth is explicitly mentioned to be filled, not her son within her, but herself²⁰³. Another member of the founding family is given the special gift and quality of being filled with Holy Spirit without further explanation what it actually means²⁰⁴. It happens on the special occasion of meeting of two pregnant women of the holy family. All of the present characters experience of being filled with the Spirit in different times, but they are all special, set apart, holy, marked with It. This very moment is the beginning. Something new and someone new is about to be born and the Spirit imprints this on Elisabeth, she is the witness of this situation.

Zachariah. Lk 1,67: “Καὶ Ζαχαρίας ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφήτευσεν λέγων.” Zachariah is the typical example of a person who is filled with the Holy Spirit. Until this very moment he had been mute, but now the Holy Spirit fills him and makes him speak prophetically. The Spirit in him, which is Holy, fills his mouth, which now speaks new revelation out; again, beginning of something new is here. Why is Zachariah “typical example”?

202 Nolland, pg. 66 denies this was due to the fulfillment as promised beforehand: “*Lk 1,41 is hardly to be understood as the fulfillment of v15: the child leaps (obviously filled with the Sp already) before there is any mention of a filling with the Sp (x Jacquemin, AsSeign, 69.)*”. He is thus touching the question which I have asked in the beginning of this section about possible diversity of both of the experience of being filled with the Holy Spirit, before and after the Pentecost.

203 Fitzmeyer, pg. 363: “Jewish tradition is familiar with the idea that unborn children may take part in events of the world and anticipate prenatally the later positions in life...While Elisabeth responds to the greeting, the unborn John responds directly to the presence of the unborn Jesus”

204 Nolland, pg. 66 indicates the probable echo of David's leaping before the ark (2 Sam 6,16).

Beside standing in the beginning of something new, in the book of Acts the same pattern appears with Paul, who had been blind, until the very day he was filled with the Spirit. It was the precise moment he opened his mouth and started preaching. Likewise with Zachariah, the filling puts an end to his period of powerlessness and at the same time starts a new period of his life, in which he speaks prophetically.

Full of the Spirit²⁰⁵ Zachariah utters the Benedictus, the “Zachariah's canticle”, probably already a liturgical Christian hymn²⁰⁶ in the time of writing. It is a rhymed prophecy about the Messiah and his predecessor. It is full of the Old Testament language of holiness: God has awoken the Messiah, the one from the family of David, who had been prophesied through the mouths of the holy prophets. By the very fact that Zachariah is also taking part in this prophecy, full of the Holy Spirit, he is himself counted among these holy men. God has remembered his *holy* covenant. **Luke 1,72:** “ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ,” This covenant is special, it is holy. It is the agreement, with which Israel is set apart for God, and setting the Lord apart for Israel, as his wife. The time has come, what all the prophets had spoken about is happening. The eschatological time of the Messiah is coming.

About **Simeon** it is said that the Holy Spirit “was on him”. **Lk 2,25:** “Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος ἦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ᾧ ὄνομα Συμεών, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβής, προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ πνεῦμα ἦν ἅγιον ἐπ’ αὐτόν.” Simeon has the general quality of being a saint man. He was righteous and de-

205 Nolland, pg. 85: “The whole verse will have been formulated by Luke to add the Benedictus to his narrative at this point”.

206 Nolland, pg. 84 disagrees: “Like Magnificat, the Benedictus expresses its thought entirely within the categories of traditional Jewish expectations and the OT texts...only the...forgiveness of sins...is something that might look like a Christian development.”

vout. It is not explicitly said that he was full of Holy Spirit, but the Spirit was on him²⁰⁷. Rather than an instant moment of radical change and empowerment, this metaphor carries the notion of someone who “walks in the presence of God”. It is a man whom God has chosen to be with. Holy Spirit speaks to him, reveals him things (v 26), moves him to the temple in the right time (v 27). Everything around him is caused by the Spirit with the single goal, to be the witness and to deliver boldly the prophecy about the coming Messiah. The eschatological time of the Messiah is here and this is the baby, compelled by the Spirit, Simeon confirms this.

Jesus is literally declared to be filled with the Holy Spirit only when he is coming back from his baptism. The actual *receiving* of this Spirit happens already at Jordan (viz. further). In the case of Jesus, the author does not choose the expected description, such as “*baptized*” or “*filled with*” the Holy Spirit, but rather “*descended upon*”. It can be assumed that the Spirit did not stay “on the surface”, so to say. Jesus, having been baptized, prays; as if he calls the Holy Spirit to come, and it does come on his call. It is the witness of Jesus' special, holy, nature. The heaven opens²⁰⁸ and lays its invisible hands on him in the form of the visible dove. It is to be noticed, that the Holy Spirit in the evangelist's metaphor, is capable of putting on physical nature “σῶματικῶ εἶδει”, or at least an image of it, that can be perceived as such.

207 Fitzmeyer 118 f.: “πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀπ αὐτον” is quite distinctive and probably pre-Lukan. Only here in the infancy narratives is the Holy Spirit not immediately the Spirit of eschatological fulfillment; and Simeon's enduring possession of the Spirit is to be distinguished from the filling of Elisabeth 1,41 and Zechariah. It is doubtful, however, whether Luke makes anything of the distinction.”

208 Heaven opens also at the execution of Stephen.

“Father” is the sender of the Spirit in this narrative, he sends the Spirit as inauguration of his Son and his eschatological time. The Holy Spirit then descends, emanates from and comes out of the Father, in order to witness and proclaim the inauguration of the Son and his age.

The solemn ring of the baptism narrative is almost reminiscent of a liturgy. (3,21f.) “Εγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου ἀνεωχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σῶματικῶς εἶδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ’ αὐτόν, καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.” In the narrative, the time pauses for a moment, the readers imagine heaven opening and the dove descending, not flying down but haltingly gracefully descending, all eyes laid on it. The language is momentous and slow. God is pleased with Jesus, he calls this young man his Son, the one son he loves²⁰⁹. “Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα”. Our biblical text is unfortunately divided by chapters and verses. Were we reading the text without any graphical interruption, it would have been easier to perceive the flow of the narrative of inauguration of Jesus' ministry. The whole Trinity is involved.

After having been acknowledged by both the Holy Spirit and the Father, Jesus is almost ready to go out and minister, he only needs to be tested first (4,1): “Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ ἦγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.” He is leaving Jordan *full of Holy Spirit*, therefore the wording of the previous verses intended to convey that which can be otherwise expressed and is understood as being “filled with the Holy Spirit”. Thus equipped, Jesus is about to face his adversary, as well as himself, now. He is to

209 Like Abraham had the son whom he loved.

be tested. He is given strength, but, at the same time, he is also given at stake²¹⁰ by the very same Spirit²¹¹. The Holy Spirit compelled him there²¹².

Going through the test, Jesus keeps the Spirit. The experience does not steal it from him. The Spirit does not abandon him after the testing, only the devil does “until an opportune time” Verse 14 describes this: “Καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν καθ’ ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ.” In the power of the Spirit, proven to be able to fight the devil himself, Jesus heads to his own destiny, starting in Galilee by preaching in synagogues.

Summary: After this instance in the chapter 4, the collocation “filled with the Holy Spirit” does not appear anymore in the entire Gospel. The people who are endowed with the Spirit are special because of the calling that was upon them, they were chosen. There is no suggestion that they would have earned it. The filling with the Holy Spirit makes these people marked as the people who witness time changing moments. Their lives are changed, they are given power to speak and they are all connected somehow with the holy family.

3.2.1.1.2 The Birth of the Church.

Let us start with an overview of the cases first. In the book of Acts, Holy

210 Plummer, pg. 107: "Christ went into the wilderness to court temptation...He went into the desert in obedience to the Spirit's promptings. That he should be tempted there was the Divine purpose respect in Him, to prepare Him for His work."

211 Nolland, pg. 178: "The temptations are clearly an aftermath to the baptismal identification anointing..."full of the Holy Spirit" anticipates the successful outcome of the encounter."

212 Nolland disagrees (pg. 178): "Jesus is not subject to the Spirit (Conzelmann, Luk 28), but only to God (...a divine passive). Jesus is supernaturally led about in the wilderness... just as God led Israel about in wilderness"

Spirit fills all of the present at the Pentecost meeting. In the form of strong wind, the Holy Spirit filled the whole house. This is reminiscence of several Old Testament topoi, where the glory fills the temple, and thus the holiness, the Holy Spirit, becomes manifest²¹³. As we have seen in the case of the Gospel also in Acts the most important characters in the history of spreading of the Gospel from Jerusalem via Samaria until the ends of the world (1,8) are filled with the Holy Spirit. First, Peter in his temple preaching, then his hearers, Stephen, Paul, Barnabas, Philip are all men who were at the birth of Church. They are all characters with whom something new starts. The gift of the Spirit, which falls on them, makes them special people; special in the sense of particular, extraordinary, set apart (i.e. holy) for their task of preaching the Gospel to the world. The “being filled” can manifest itself with these people by: speaking in foreign tongues (2,4; 10,46) or boldness to speak the Gospel (Peter in 4,8). But even if not always manifested in a supernatural way, these are the people who were chosen to spread the Gospel from Jerusalem to the end of the world. Now we shall go through the specific instances.

Everyone/ Disciples. Acts 2, 4: “καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐδίδου ἀποφθέγγεσθαι αὐτοῖς”. This is the first incidence of the collocation in the book of Acts, the very first moment after the resurrection when the phrase is used. Will it now take on a different meaning from that we encountered in the Gospel? This is the occurrence of “being filled with the Holy Spirit” par excellence; we are discussing the Pentecost, this may be the first historical place of birth of the phrase. All the

213 Dedication of the Temple during Salomon, Glory in Ezekiel, or Isaiah.

disciples obediently gathered in given time and given place and they happened to be filled with Holy Spirit.

They start speaking. They open their mouths and utter mysteries unknown to them before, they probably even do not understand themselves, that is, their own words. It is an external force that fills their mouth with foreign languages and it can be also claimed that their speech is prophetic. It is not the case of pure glossolalia, they are said to speak in some other languages, not in “tongues”. People of manifold regions can understand them. The gift surprises the receivers as well as the audience, it is, again, the beginning of something new. New seed has been planted to grow itself. It is at the sometime that the future Lucan Church has a name for and experience with²¹⁴.

The second case in which “all are filled with the Holy Spirit” is in **Acts 4,31**: “καὶ δεηθέντων αὐτῶν ἐσαλεύθη ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἦσαν συνηγμένοι, καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, καὶ ἐλάλουν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρρησίας.” The context is following: Peter and John heal a lame man and after a tense exchange with the temple establishment, they are released with a little warning not to speak again in Jesus' name. Upon their return back to their community, all the Church prays (verses 24 - 30). During the prayer, the place is shaken and *all* are filled with the Holy Spirit and *speak the word of God with boldness*.

The text is clear that the Holy Spirit is given to all of the present at the common prayer. The only “qualification” of the recipients was their presence at the

214 Fitzmyer, pg. 238: “Being filled with the Holy Spirit is a typically Lucan expression...denoting the empowering gift of God's or prophetic presence; it is an expression Luke derives from LXX (Prov 4,4). So empowered, the early Christians are suited for their ministry if testimony and emboldened to confront the Jews gathered in Jerusalem.” I do not see the connection with the suggested verse in Proverbs and the present text “οἱ ἔλεγον καὶ ἐδίδασκόν με ἐρειδέτω ὁ ἡμέτερος λόγος εἰς σὴν καρδίαν”

prayer. Holy Spirit fills all the people closed in one building while praying²¹⁵. This may be reminiscence of when the glory of God filled the temple in 2 Chronicles 7 and Ezekiel 43. It is a moment of inauguration of the new people of God, the new holy nation, the new holy temple, and it is consecrated. Glory is the manifested holiness of God and it fills the temple. Holy Spirit fills the new temple, the Church.

As we have seen also earlier, one of the outcomes of this is that they all gain boldness to preach the Gospel.

The disciples are filled with the Holy Spirit in the last verse of the chapter **13. (v 52)** “οἱ τε μαθηταὶ ἐπληροῦντο χαρᾶς καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου.” The verse seems to be quite out of place there. The whole chapter speaks about the Church of Antioch and its mission in Pisidian Antioch. The happenings are following the typical course of actions. First Paul and Barnabas arrive to the town, they visit a synagogue where they speak. In the beginning, the listeners are keen on their message, nonetheless, when faced with the popularity of the newcomers, jealousy raises in their hearts and the synagogue establishment starts opposing the Christian preachers. The latter make some symbolical action of parting, here Paul and Barnabas shake off the dust of their feet as a warning to them²¹⁶. When they leave for Iconium our verse comes, saying that the disciples were

215 Pesch qualifies the situation as glossolaly on the pg. 99 "Der Herabkunft des Geistes im "Sturm und Feuer" ist in apokalyptischen Vergleichen beschrieben, die himmlisch Unhörbares und Unsichtbares hörbar (Geräusch wie...) und sichtbar (zeugen wie...) vorstellen; ... Die gemeinsame ekstatische Erfahrung "aller", wird schließlich theologisch gedeutet: als Erfüllung mit dem Heiligen Geist...aus der sie erschlossen und in der apokalyptischen Schilderung zeichenhaft dargestellt worden sein wird genannt: die Glossolie."

216 When Jesus sends the 12 on the first mission trip during his life he instructs them to shake off dust of their feet in the towns where they had not been welcomed. Those cities are predestined to harsh fate at the end of days. Judgment day over Sodom and Gomorrah was nothing compared to what these cities might expect in the future.

glad. The one sentence in Greek text is divided by numbering of verses. Who are the disciples? Christians in Pisidian Antioch, who are left by the missionaries and sign of dust being shook of their feet is crying for the punishment of their very town in the Judgment day? It might still be them, rejoicing over the new life. But why are we told that they were filled with the Holy Spirit? They might be possibly the disciples in Iconium, though it is very unlikely. Or they might be the original disciples of Jesus, who upon hearing what God has done, that so many people became Christians, would logically rejoice. But why, again, should this cause them to be filled with the Holy Spirit²¹⁷? The phrase sounds rather as a “refrain or recurring chorus”²¹⁸.

Peter. After having healed the lame beggar and having preached to the gathered temple crowd, Peter and John are summoned by “*the priests and the captain of the temple guard and the Sadducees.*” One of the problems was, that the disciples were preaching about resurrection of Jesus in the premises of the temple. Another one was, that the Sadducees to whom the temple “belonged”, did not believe in resurrection and had many conflicts with Pharisees on this subject. The disciples are arrested in the evening and put to jail to be heard the following morning by the leaders. First question is: “By what power or what

217 viz Hur, who says that the disciples are filled with the Holy Spirit and joy, there is no glossolalia. Fitzmyer, pg. 522: “Presumably Paul and Barnabas are meant by the “disciples”, even though the term could mean other Christians as well in that region. Their reaction is reminiscent of that of Stephen”, which is not likely, because they did not have much reason to be glad. Were they happy to have shaken the dust from their feet? Pesch 2 quotes Roloff, pg. 210 “Was bleibt, ist eine blühende Gemeinde, welche die Freude der Seligpreisung der Verfolgten erfährt, bzw. die Freude der Verfolgten Apostel teilt.”

218 Not only a single person but also a group of people can be filled with the Spirit. It brings boldness, witness and joy. Witness is empowered by the knowing of languages but also by the semi-realized eschatology. The Church under the influence of the Holy Spirit cannot be told to go home and be silent. Peter and John go back to Church after the prayer they are filled and all get more courage to more witness. And finally Holy Spirit brings about joy, happiness.

name did you do this?" Then, Peter is filled with the Holy Spirit and gives his temple preaching/defense. **Acts 4,8:** „τότε Πέτρος πλησθεὶς πνεύματος ἁγίου εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἄρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ πρεσβύτεροι...” In Lk 12,12, Jesus promises that he would give the Holy Spirit to his disciples, unlearned fishermen, when they are brought on trials to speak in front of learned and important men (τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἃ δεῖ εἰπεῖν), this is the time²¹⁹ the promise finds its fulfillment. The disciples are given possibility to preach the Gospel to the crowds, as well as the leaders. The Holy Spirit gives them eloquence and opens their mouth.

Stephen. In the beginning of the Acts 6 we read about the first division in the early Church between “Hellenistai” (Jewish Christians whose first language is Greek) and “Hebraioi” (Jewish Christians whose first language is Hebrew). The issue needs to be addressed in greater detail later, now let us just focus on what is described here:

Acts 6,1-6: “Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις πληθυνόντων τῶν μαθητῶν ἐγένετο γογγυσμὸς τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους... 2 προσκαλεσάμενοι δὲ οἱ δώδεκα... 3 ἐπισκέψασθε δέ, ἀδελφοί, ἄνδρας ἐξ ὑμῶν μαρτυρουμένους ἑπτὰ πλήρεις πνεύματος καὶ σοφίας, οὓς καταστήσομεν ἐπὶ τῆς χρείας ταύτης... 5 καὶ ἤρεσεν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους, καὶ ἐξελέξαντο Στέφανον, ἄνδρα πλήρης πίστεως καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ Πρόχορον καὶ Νικάνορα καὶ

219 Fitzmyer, pg. 300: "Lk introduces the Spirit in its role of an inspiring prophetic utterance at a crucial moment...which explain the activity of the Sp given on such occasion. ..Pt again as a spokesman and ...treats the Sanhedrin with respect" Pesch, pg. 166: "In dieser Situation des Verhörs redet Petrus, in Erfüllung der Verheißung Jesu, ... erfüllt ... trotz seiner fehlenden Ausbildung mit allem "Freimut" in seiner "Apologie" so, daß die Herren nicht "widersprechen" können"

Τίμωνα καὶ Παρμενᾶν καὶ Νικόλαον προσήλυτον Ἀντιοχέα, ὃ οὐκ ἔστησαν ἐνώπιον
τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας.”

Stephen is not only among the seven chosen men to lead the “Hellenistai”, he is the first and prominent among them. Like the family of Jesus, like the apostles, also the founding fathers of the “Hellenistai” need to possess the same quality, “being filled with the Holy Spirit”. Here, it is rather a personal quality than a sudden gift imparted on specific persons. The chosen ones must already reflect that they had been before chosen by God. The chosen ones are then to be presented to the apostles, who shall lay hands of them. As we shall see later, the act of laying on of hands transfers the power of the Holy Spirit which is then given to the recipient. In these cases the phrase “filled with the Holy Spirit” is not used, though, in majority cases. The fulfillment with the Spirit is not temporary here. Stephen possessed the special quality reflecting his election by God for all the time until his death. He was a man full of faith and Holy Spirit. Faith stands on the same grammatical level as the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is not a person of the Trinity here, it is a quality or a power similar to that of faith that is reflected in specific lifestyle and, maybe also, charisma, it is an abstract power designating piety²²⁰. Few verses later another qualities are ascribed to him, which could be put parallel to the one of being full with the Holy Spirit: v.

220 Fitzmyer, pg. 350: “We are not told how the selection of the seven was made, but it was not by casting of lots, as it had been for Matthias... probably a converted Hellenist, originally a Jewish settler in Jerusalem, coming from somewhere in Diaspora..the 1st to bear witness to the risen Christ by giving up his life... man full of faith in the risen Christ...endowed with Spirit - given force and eloquence (in v. 8 full of grace and power) v.10 speaker of wisdom and Spirit.” Pesch, pg. 229: “...die Reihenfolge - wie die Zusätze zum letzten Namen deutlich zeigen, - auch eine Rangfolge spiegelt. Alle Männer tragen griechischen Namen, was dafür spricht, daß die Sieben unter den Hellenisten ausgewählt wurden....durch die Fühle "Glaubens und heiligen Geist" ausgezeichnet ist, die er in seinem nachfolgend erzählten Martyrium bewährt.”

8 “Στέφανος δὲ πλήρης χάριτος καὶ δυνάμεως ἐποίει τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα ἐν τῷ λαῷ.” He was also full of love/mercy and power.

The typical adversaries of the book of Acts, men of synagogue, seized him, but they are not able to oppose to his wisdom and Spirit, in which he was speaking. “οὐκ ἴσχυον ἀντιστῆναι τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ᾧ ἐλάλει.”, v 10. There is another pair of characteristics here: Stephen was strong in wisdom and again, Spirit. The responsible Jewish sectarians therefore stir up people by raising false witnesses.

The happenings around Stephen's end remind us in many parallels of the fate of Jesus. In the chapter 7, we witness Stephen's final preaching, where he summarizes all the history of the people of Israel. He starts with Abraham and finishes with Moses. He is standing now in front of the trial, because he was falsely accused in 6,13n of speaking constantly against temple (this holy place) and the law. Towards the end of his preaching, Stephen says that Moses prophesied about Jesus, whereby he proves the accusations to be wrong, but by this he makes his accusers even angrier. Consider that at this point a Hellenist is standing in the synagogue speaking to the elders of Israel, accusing them of killing Jesus. The elders were full of rage we read that they were “gnashing their teeth”, which is a description that Jesus used for hell, here, however, it is a sign of anger. Stephen does not look at them, but in the heaven.

Stephen's reaction is the reaction of the first Christian martyr saint (v. 55): “ὑπάρχων δὲ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου ἀτενίσας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἶδεν δόξαν θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦν ἐστῶτα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, ...(v. 60) θείς δὲ τὰ γόνατα ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· Κύριε, μὴ στήσης αὐτοῖς ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν· καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐκοιμήθη.” Ready and full of Holy Spirit, he fixes his eyes on heaven and sees the glory of God and Je-

Jesus sitting on the right hand of God²²¹. Only few people had been allowed to see the glory of God. Moses, of whom Stephen preaches, desired to see the glory of God, but it was not given to him, lest he would die (Ex 33, 12-23). Nobody can see God's face, his glory, his holiness revealed, and live. But Stephen gives testimony that he may die now, having seen that, which Moses could not. "Blessed are of *"pure heart"*, for they shall see God", was a promise given by Jesus, here fulfilled. One of the many parallels with the death of Jesus is also Stephen's prayer for his killers, which reveals his great character of man full of: faith, spirit 2x, love, power, wisdom.

Paul. Stephen is said to be "filled with the Holy Spirit" twice, the same is true about Paul. Surprisingly, both scenes are connected with a loss of sight. First time Paul is said to be filled at his conversion and then while taking away the sight of Elymas.

The first case is in **19, 17 – 19:**

“ἀπήλθεν δὲ Ἀνανίας καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, καὶ ἐπιθεὶς ἐπ’ αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας εἶπεν· Σαοὺλ ἀδελφέ, ὁ κύριος ἀπέσταλκέν με, Ἰησοῦς ὁ ὀφθεῖς σοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἣ ἦρχου, ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃς καὶ πλησθῆῃς πνεύματος ἁγίου. 18 καὶ εὐθέως ἀπέπεσαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ὡς λεπίδες, ἀνέβλεψέν τε καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐβαπτίσθη, 19 καὶ λαβὼν τροφήν ἐνίσχυσεν.”

Ananias is sent to the blinded Saul by an angel. After overcoming fear of Saul, he is able to call him a "brother". Laying hands on him, Ananias shares

221 Fitzmyer, pg. 392: "Stephen is again accorded the assistance of the Spirit, as was Peter in 4,8."

the purpose of his arrival: restoration of Saul's sight²²². We are told that the sight was regained immediately, that he was baptized as soon as he got up. The motif of eating after a fight is common also to e.g. Daniel or Elisha. It seems that Paul was first filled with the Holy Spirit and *then* baptized. The same is also true about the converted Gentiles after Peter's preaching. They were first filled with the Spirit and only then were they baptized. In the v 15, Paul is said to be chosen vessel to “*βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐνώπιον ἐθνῶν τε καὶ βασιλέων υἱῶν τε Ἰσραήλ*”. Let us remember that we are still in the chapter 9, before the story of Cornelius. Again, the Lukan Church and its theology precede the literary course of events described. As the authors of NPP like to stress, at this moment we should not be taking so much about Paul's “conversion” but rather about his “calling”.

Paul is again filled with the Holy Spirit while on his mission trip to Cyprus with Barnabas, sent by the Church of Antioch. The whole process of sending is in hands of the Holy Spirit, who is the agent and the sender in this story, which is stressed in **13,2-4**:

“2 λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ νηστευόντων εἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον·
Ἀφορίσατε δὴ μοι τὸν Βαρναβᾶν καὶ Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς.
3 τότε νηστεύσαντες καὶ προσευξάμενοι καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν.
4 Αὐτοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος κατήλθον εἰς
Σελεύκειαν...”

When they arrive to Cyprus, Paul and Barnabas have to face an opposition; a

222 Fitzmyer, pg. 429: “The imposition of hands takes on a curative aspect. As a gesture of healing, it is unknown in the Old Testament or in the Rabbinic literature”

sorcerer, called Elymas, was trying to keep his proconsul Sergius Paulus away from faith in Christ. Paul's reaction is sudden and unexpected. He looks sternly at the sorcerer and overcomes him. Thus he performs a “higher sorcery”. **13,9** Σαῦλος δέ, ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, πλησθεὶς πνεύματος ἁγίου ἀτενίσας εἰς αὐτὸν 10 εἶπεν· Ὡ πλήρης παντὸς δόλου καὶ πάσης ῥαδιουργίας, ...νῦν ἰδοὺ χεὶρ κυρίου ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ ἔση τυφλὸς μὴ βλέπων τὸν ἥλιον ἄχρι καιροῦ...“ The author stresses here that this was done by the power of the Holy Spirit, exactly because of the possible explanation that Paul used some “higher kind of sorcery”.

We can assume that, according to the author's paradigm, Paul was, in general, “*a man full of Holy Spirit*”, although it is nowhere explicitly voiced. There seem to be two different qualities: one is “*be full of Holy Spirit*” in general as a person who lives spiritually and ethically and then yet another, second expression is used as well: “*to be filled with the Holy Spirit*”. Paul as the hero of the book of Acts is *the man “full of Holy Spirit”*. At these two specific moments he is even “filled” in a special way. He receives momentarily a stronger dose of spiritual power for spiritual fight. In this very case, being filled with the Holy Spirit gives him power, but it does not start anything new.

Summary: The collocation can be used in two different ways. A person can be “full of Holy Spirit”, meaning that they are a holy person of extraordinary character. Then these, but also other people, can be “filled with the Holy Spirit”, in order to gain spiritual strength for a specific and demanding task²²³, probably beyond their own powers. This should be held in memory for the further explanation where we shall talk about such collocations as “Holy Spirit

223 Consider Lk 4,1 when Jesus is going to the desert to be tested.

came/ fell/etc. on...”

Barnabas. After the martyrdom of Stephen, the Church suffers persecution. This results in scattering the believers as far as Phoenicia, Cyprus and Antioch. In the last mentioned city of Antioch, there is double mission at work. Jewish Christians preach in Synagogues, but also “Hellenistai” begin their own mission among the Greeks of the city. The Jerusalem Church now serves as the center, having the highest authority in all Church matters. When the news of the double mission arrives to Jerusalem, they decide to send their own missionary/ inspector in the person of Barnabas. He approves of the accomplished success and starts his own work: (11,23b). In order to show that he is a character approved by the Lukan Church, therefore legitimating the founding of one whole branch of Christianity, Barnabas is characterized in the v 24: “ἦν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ πίστεως.” Not only is he full of Holy Spirit, like Stephen, he is also full of faith. We should understand it in the way, that he was a pious, holy man. Another one standing in the beginning of something new.

Summary: Should we compare the “being filled with Holy Spirit” in both Lk and Ac, it seems that the same notion is applied. There is no linguistically-theological difference between the characters who are filled with the Holy Spirit in the Gospel or in the book of Acts. There are rather some similarities: the people who are said to be filled with the Holy Spirit are standing in both books in the beginning of something new and big and they are given power, in order to be able to accomplish their task. They are the people of special character selected for special task. They are chosen, they do not fill themselves,

they are filled and thus set apart and at the same time empowered to spread the Gospel.

3.2.1.2 Giving and Receiving the Holy Spirit.

Those who are described as “full of Holy Spirit” are the people of some special quality and they were foretold to be founders of something new. But there are cases, in which these very people are also said to be “filled with the Holy Spirit” on some special occasions, in order to perform some important task. Being “filled with the Holy Spirit” happens when one “receives Holy Spirit”. God gives it²²⁴ to his chosen characters. In this sub-chapter we shall also discuss the “baptism in the Holy Spirit”.

The eleventh chapter in the Gospel of Luke starts by his version of the prayer “Our Father”, followed by several sayings, all encouraging the listeners or readers to persevere in asking God for good things, without doubting. The last exhortation is unique to Lk and is added to the well known Matthew's saying: **(Lk 11,13)** “εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ δίδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν.” Most of the text is literally parallel in both versions with few exceptions²²⁵. The “good things” in Matthew are for Luke the “gift of the Holy Spirit”. According to Luke's theology, the Spirit can be given to anyone who asks. The only qualification in this place seems to be just the expressed wish in prayer: “τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν

224 In this case the πνεῦμα means the „spirit“ that is the impersonal power or energy.

225 Lk has the first pair of the desired gifts: ἄρτον – ἰχθύν, which appears at Mt in the second place after ἄρτον – λίθον. Luke's second pair is then ψόν – σκορπίον. Luke's v. 13 copies Matthew's (v 11.) “Father of Heaven”, who will give good things, and adds his own agenda.

αὐτόν”. Therefore, compared with what was said above, all the readers have the possibility at hand to ask the Heavenly Father for the Holy Spirit and it shall be given to them. Also they, therefore, can enter such stories as have been described earlier and perform deeds, that are beyond their own strengths but are available in the Holy Spirit. Like preaching God's word in boldness etc²²⁶.

All the following cases of the collocation appear in the book of Acts, in the post-Resurrection and Pentecost era.

Chapter 1. At the beginning of the second Luke's book, Jesus, being with his disciples, instructs them not to leave Jerusalem. For their question when he would come back and he replies in the Acts 1, v. 7b: “Οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστὶν γινῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς” The disciples are not allowed to know when the time shall be ripe, but he gives the instructions that will help them recognize the *καιρός*. What follows is the preliminary warning, or a prophecy, so that when these things come to pass the disciples would not be alarmed but embrace the gift, recognizing the promised situation²²⁷. According the motto of the **Acts 1,8**, in the power of the Holy Spirit the Gospel is spread in the exo-centric direction: an emana-

226 Nolland, pg.628 discusses the shift that occurred from Mt to Lk. On the pg. 631 he goes on saying that: “The most important change is that from Matthew’s „good things“ to „Holy Spirit“...The mention of the father takes us full circle back to the beginning of the Lord’s Prayer in v.2. On the basis of Acts 2,33 it seems best to speak here of the Holy Spirit given from heaven. There can be little doubt that Mt’s“good things“ is more original (cf. The „good gifts“ which Luke still retains for the parental gifts) ...” and further on the pg. 532 he goes on: “since from the post-Pentecost early Church perspective, the greatest gift that God can bestow is the Spirit, Luke wants it to be seen that God’s parental bounty applies not just to everyday needs..but even reaches so far as to this greatest possible gift... to have Lk introduce here an idea of giving the Holy Spirit to the disciples prior to Easter.”

227 We must also consider the fact, that this is an account of a man, that is already living in the situation at the end of this story. This account is from the retrospective of someone who evaluated the described situation at the correct time when this had had come to pass.

tion from Jerusalem: “ἀλλὰ λήμψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες ἐν τε Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρεία καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς“. Holy Spirit comes as power upon the believers, it is the power²²⁸ to witness to the Word, to preach²²⁹ the Gospel with boldness of martyrs. It starts from Jerusalem. Every step away from Jerusalem must be approved by the mother-Church, most often in the person of Peter or John. Let us have a look now, how also the distribution of the Holy Spirit to the disciples, copies this mission-program. The two motifs connected with the Spirit, that is power and preaching appear also here, it is a recurring motif in both Luke and Paul.

Chapter 2. Holy Spirit is poured on the disciples in the Pentecost. People hear them speaking in their tongues, some interpret it as a sign, others deride the disciples saying that they are drunk. Peter then preaches: he *speaks* in *power*, the promised two-fold sign is being manifested. Towards the end of his powerful speech, Peter addresses the issue of the Holy Spirit. He says that God raised Jesus from the dead and the current happenings are the prove thereof. V. 33: “τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου λαβῶν²³⁰ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο ὃ ὑμεῖς [καὶ] βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε". Not only

228 Fitzmyer, pg. 204 connects this text with the promise of the power in Lk 24,49, which is the sign of the endtime, pg. 206 he says: “...for Luke it is precisely the Spirit that is the "power of the endtime", the gift of the Spirit will inaugurate the endtime and enable its recipients to bear Christian testimony.”

229 Pesch, stresses the connection between the Spirit and the preaching, pg. 69: “Es geht hier...um die Verbindung von Geistempfang und Zeugenamt der Apostel, denen nicht das Wissen um die Fristen der Heilsgeschichte, aber die Kraft zu ihrem Zeugenamt zukommt, durch das Heil zu allen Völkern...gebracht wird...Die Apostel werden den Geist empfangen, wie eine Gabe, die Kraft, die der Geist verleiht, ist die Ausrüstung der Zeugen. Gottes Geist kommt auf die Apostel herab, um sie zu ihrem Wirken auszurüsten, wie Jesus zu Beginn seiner Zeit zu dem seinen ausgerüstet werde.”

230 The subject of the sentence is Jesus, he is himself a receiver of the Holy Spirit.

the present people, but also Jesus received Holy Spirit, i.e. Holy Spirit was given also to Jesus²³¹. It is a new situation, a new gift. The giver of the Spirit is the Father²³².

When Peter says that “this Jesus” who lived among them was the Messiah, and now is living, resurrected Christ, hearers are touched in their hearts and they ask the same question as the crowds who followed John the Baptist: “Brothers, what shall we do?” Peter answers: “Μετανοήσατε, [φησίν,] καὶ βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν, καὶ λήμψεσθε τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.” They are to repent, and be baptized. Until this moment in the story narrated by Luke, the existing baptism is that of John the Baptist, but now, after the resurrection of Jesus, new baptism is introduced. It is not any more a baptism *only* for the forgiveness of sins (though technically, it stays so), it is now baptism *in* the name of *Jesus Christ*.

Peter is here introducing the new formula “*Jesus Christ*” and the possibility to be baptized into this name (*thereby sanctified*), at least in the literary world

231 Consider, though, that earthly Jesus is first conceived by the Holy Spirit, then he is told to be filled with it, further Jesus received it from the Father (viz Lk's version of parable of a good father), and now the resurrected Christ is descending this gift on those, who belong to him. I am then asking when was it exactly that Jesus obtained the Spirit, was it at his birth, his baptism or at his exaltation? The answer would be that it never left Him, but at some times it manifested her power through Son.

232 Should we consider the feminine aspect of the Spirit, in this case, it brings about the image of domination and subordination. Father would be in such case conceived of as the giver the Mother or dispose of Her. However bad it sounds, it should be considered that we are used to the notion of Father giving his Son without being alarmed. Some feminist theologians are against ascribing the feminine aspect to the “third person of the Trinity” altogether exactly because of Her being the “third” person, and because of the notion of subordination. It is possible that Luke did not have any connection with the original notion of Ruach as a feminine, which would make it easier for him to speak about the Spirit in the neuter and therefore conceive of “it” in the sense of power or energy that can be used and disposed of. This is a far more complicated subject than this thesis allows, however, I consider it important to at least raise the issue.

that Luke has created; though he himself is not precise in the usage of language development, and he applies later formula of his Church to the story.

Luke has here also designed what should later be called by some Churches “the way of salvation”, Roman Catholic Church with its succession of sacraments follows the same pattern. First is the repentance, then comes baptism in the name of Jesus the Christ, which then is followed by the receiving of the gift of the Holy Spirit²³³. The baptism joins a person with those who have undergone the same ritual, the community is widened with each new baptized person. Being “baptized in the name of Jesus” sets that person apart for him. They are those, who belong to him, they are in his name, they are Christians.

The baptism has a reason attached to it, the gift of the Holy Spirit does not. It is just a complementary action, maybe a ritual. The only extra information about the Holy Spirit is that She should be received and that the gift is for free. If there is any condition set for the gift, then it would be just that of receiving. How can a person of a Trinity be given as a gift is then another and much more complex problem. It is also disputable to fix the succession of the two: baptism and the gift of the Holy Spirit. The adverb “*δωρεάν*” stresses the notion of unmerited mercy, something which cannot be paid and which is not expected to be paid. That is, no ethical or ascetic perfection is required prior to the gift. *As far as the semantic field of holiness goes, the prerequisite of purification before meeting with the Holy one is abolished.* The Holy Spirit is given “*δωρεάν*”. The only purification which might be required is the baptism, but again, in the

233 Pesch, pg. 125, points to the grammatical structure, where the imperative + *καί* + future tense “...markiert ein konditionales Gefüge. Umkehr und Taufe sind Bedingung des Geistesempfangs.” Pesch says this despite the adverb “*δωρεάν*” which, according to me, proves the opposite.

chapter 10, this “condition” is violated by the Holy Spirit itself, which should be respected.

Chapter 5. *Unlike* in the previous case and also that of Gospel, where the offer of the Spirit is for free - just a prayer away, in the **Acts 5:32**, it seems to be *conditioned by obedience*. After the above mentioned episode of having healed the lame man, disciples were heard by the elders, imprisoned and then set free with a warning. Now, they are summoned again before the Sanhedrin to be questioned by the High Priest himself, in the case of their disobedience to the previous order. Peter's answer is long, he uses the situation to deliver teaching on revelation of Jesus as the promised Messiah. Peter and other apostles stress the subject of obedience, which, in fact, is the reason why they are being in front of Sanhedrin now, they have disobeyed an order voiced by Sanhedrin, in order to obey God; their motivation is clear in the v. 29: “Πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώποις.”

Peter *speaks boldly*²³⁴ and accuses Sanhedrin of killing Jesus. His speech finishes at v 32: “καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν μάρτυρες τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς πειθαρχοῦσιν αὐτῷ.”. Disciples *bear witness* through the Spirit *to risen Jesus*. Holy Spirit was given here by God *to those who obey Him*. This is a *change form the previous case, where the Spirit was given “δωρεάν”*, now, on the other hand, the condition is set: It can only be given to “*πειθαρχοῦσιν*”. Only those who obey God in bearing witness will therefore receive the Holy Spirit. If they make the first step, they will be helped. Therefore, in the eyes of the apostles, the Sanhedrin does not obey God, in fact is in the opposition to Him. The disciples call themselves “witnesses” of the fulfillment

234 This is a sign of empowerment by the Spirit. Powerful bold speech.

of the promise of coming Messiah, the same designation is used to describe the Holy Spirit²³⁵.

The message about the fulfillment is the objective, it is that for which the power is given to the disciples, to which the speech is given. The Spirit is source of both. Hur²³⁶ notes a sociological feature of the Lk-Ac: The author draws clear line between two worlds, that of *insiders* and that of *outsiders*. Those who are *in* are saved those who are *out* are either object of mission or enemies. Those who are *in* are recognized, among other things, also by *having something to do with the Spirit*, they must be *characters acknowledged by the Spirit and the Spirit-favored leaders*. Hur repeats several times that in the very moment, when disciples confess, or bear witness that they have “received the Holy Spirit” they immediately become a reliable trustworthy character. They are not outsiders anymore, they belong to the “saints”. The presence of the Spirit makes them special, set apart, holy.

Chapter 8. We have already mentioned that Stephen is twice said to be “full of Holy Spirit”. After his execution, the disciples leave Jerusalem and flee into all the surrounding areas. Philip leaves for **Samaria** to preach the Gospel there. He does a lot of exorcisms, which raises the attention of a local magician Simon. Many of the sorcerer's followers leave him after having been baptized, and later he himself decides for baptism. He gets jealous²³⁷, when he sees that people receive Holy Spirit after the apostles lay their hands on them. The text

235 Pesch, pg. 217: “...der heilige Geist Zeuge, der durch die Apostel spricht; Gott hat ihm ihnen, ...geschenkt; ihm gehorchen sie. Impliziert ist die Aufforderung auf das Synedrium, nun auch Gott gehorsam zu sein im Gehorsam gegen das Zeugnis des Geistes, das durch die Apostel verlautet.”

236 Hur, Ju. A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts. Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

237 Compare with 1st Clem jealousy theme.

connects power with the Holy Spirit again. And the power is so strong, that it must be also acknowledged by the outsiders. It is power that is attractive and mighty.

The story of Simon is interrupted by the arrival of a delegation from the Church of Jerusalem. As we have seen above in the case of the Church of Antioch, all the existing missions still need to be approved by the Jerusalem Church. Chronologically, the mission in Samaria precedes the one of Antioch, therefore the controlling anxiety of the mother-Church may be explained therewith. The first group outside the Jerusalem to whom the Gospel is preached to, are the Samaritans, people on the border between “the people of God” and Gentiles. Such a novelty as preaching the Gospel not only to the pure-blood requires an inspector-delegation in the person of Peter and John.

Acts 8, 14 – 17: “Ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἀπόστολοι ὅτι δέδεκται ἡ Σαμάρεια τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην, οἵτινες καταβάντες προσηύξαντο περὶ αὐτῶν ὅπως λάβωσιν πνεῦμα ἅγιον· οὐδέπω γὰρ ἦν ἐπ’ οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιπεπτωκός, μόνον δὲ βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. τότε ἐπετίθεσαν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ’ αὐτούς, καὶ ἐλάβανον πνεῦμα ἅγιον.”

When they arrive they *pray* that the new Samaritan disciples might receive the Holy Spirit²³⁸. *The apostles* are not giving them the Spirit, they *are not the source*. Peter and John pray for them and invoke God. Luke says that though there were believers in Samaria, after the mission of Philip²³⁹, though they had

238 Fitzmyer, pg. 406: “Peter and John are the emissaries of the apostles. The presence of God imparted through the Spirit...to these Christians is not accompanied by any external manifestation, as it was on the Pentecost and later.”

239 Pesch, pg. 275: „Das Gebet der Apostel ist als Fürbittgebet gekennzeichnet, denn der Empfang des heiligen Geistes ist unverfügbare "Gabe Gottes" ... Allerdings erscheint

been baptized, they had not received the Holy Spirit. Holy Spirit had not come on any of them yet. These are all parallel phrases meaning the same, none of the new Samaritan believers had been filled with the Holy Spirit yet. It is only after the prayer of John and Peter that they receive the Spirit. It is interesting to note that Philip²⁴⁰ is said to have done many miracles even without the specific ascription of these to the Spirit (v. 7): “πολλοὶ γὰρ τῶν ἐχόντων πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα βοῶντα φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξήρχοντο, πολλοὶ δὲ παραλελυμένοι καὶ χωλοὶ ἐθεραπεύθησαν”. These are miracles usually connected with the power with the Holy Spirit. It seems the most probable that Phillip had received the Holy Spirit without knowing it, without being able to describe what was happening, outside the official established structure of the succession of the “laying of hands”. It is unlikely that Phillip would have been able to face the impure spirits and driven them away by his own power. He obviously had the power of the Spirit in order to do all the miracles. Then why is the Spirit given to the Samaritans only after laying on of hands of the apostles from Jerusalem? It can be a testimony of different streams of movements in the first Church? How far was the Holy Spirit bound to the ritual of hand-laying? Fitzmyer says in the pg. 406:

“Prayer and the imposition of hands denotes the commissioning of the seven in 6,6; now the same double action mentioned in vv. 15 and 17, conveys the gift of the Spirit enabling the baptized to become full Christians”.

die Geistspendung an die Handauflegung der Apostel also an Amt und Ritus gebunden, der Siebenmann Philipus ist den Aposteln untergeordnet...das freie Kommen des Geistes, der offenbar nicht automatisch mit der Taufe vermittelt gedacht ist...Wenn man "nur getauft" existiert, steht der Geistempfang noch aus.“

240 Roloff, pg. 135: "Die neugetauften Samaritaner durch die Sendung des Geistes in die Kontinuität der Kirche hineinzunehmen und damit die Legitimität der Philippus-Mission offiziell anzuerkennen."

My question is exactly: “Were they not “full Christians” even before? And why do they need to be commissioned for every step of the faith, and are there such steps leading into a perfect/”full” Christian life? In the context of Luke's situation, his life and experience with the Church, it must have been so. But obviously, even in the story itself, the Spirit “goes wherever it wishes” and empowers Philip even before he is acknowledged by the Church establishment.

Luke comes back to the story of Simon, the magician. Obviously the gift of the Spirit after laying on of hands is something new for him, that he had not seen before in his life, and he is jealous and wants that power. In v 19 he says: “Δότε καμοι την εξουσιαν ταυτην ινα ὡ ἐὰν ἐπιθῶ τὰς χεῖρας λαμβάνη πνεῦμα ἅγιον.” Peter responds him that since his heart is not right in front of God, he cannot receive it. Peter exhorts him to repentance and Simon agrees and submits. Here the text poses two traps, the first one is that Peter sets the condition for Simon without which the Spirit would be withheld from him, the second one is that Peter seems to be in charge of the Spirit and disposing of it²⁴¹ as he finds fitting.

Summary: This story is in opposition to the claim from Luke 11,13. According to that, it would have been enough for Simon to ask God, but according to the Luke's paradigm, his heart was not obedient and he was not humble enough, he was not right in front of God. Therefore, instead of the Holy Spirit, Simon receives an admonition. This story also forbids believers to deal financially with the power of the Holy Spirit, to handle with it for personal

241 Again, here the feminine would sound terrible here. Is the Spirit a person or an energy? The feminine aspect here would show how easy it becomes to dispose of God if we speak about him in the neuter.

gain.

Chapter 10 shall be discussed in greater detail later, now let us consider only the cases in which the Holy Spirit is “given to” someone, or “comes on” someone. All the occurrences of our interest appear towards the end of the story of the whole chapter, which starts by vision of Cornelius and then Peter's vision. The latter visits the former and has the first Christian preaching to the Gentiles ever.

It can not be claimed that the reaction of the Gentile audience of Peter's preaching would be “positive”, since they, before any possible reaction or evaluation, become themselves objects of the Holy Spirit, who comes on them. We might assume, though, that it was positive. The Holy Spirit comes before any feasible answer on the part of the Gentiles, while Peter is still speaking. In the v 44 we read: *Ἐπι λαλοῦντος τοῦ Πέτρου τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ἐπέπεσε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας τὸν λόγον.*” They are literally assaulted. We have seen that Holy Spirit can “fill” someone, that it can “be given”, it can “fall on” someone. It would be difficult to try to distinguish between the meanings of these phrases. The only line can be drawn between the cases where this endowment happens “accidentally” and when it is “directed” by the laying on of hands.

It was a risky business of Peter to accept the invitation to a Gentile house, as he says in v.28 *ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὡς ἀθέμιτόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ κολλᾶσθαι ἢ προσέρχεσθαι ἀλλοφύλῳ· κάμοι ὁ θεὸς ἔδειξεν μηδένα κοινόν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν ἄνθρωπον*”. Peter understood his mystical experience *as abolishment of ritual impurity of Gentiles*. A vision about impure animals is interpreted as an allowance for the contact with Gentiles without the fear of being contaminated by

their impurity. Based on such a conclusion, Peter is free to go in company of Gentiles into a Gentile house. Peter himself takes company of several Jewish friends to go with him. These men, however, had not received the same vision and therefore the fear of defilement on their part might have been felt stronger than that of Peter himself. When the Holy Spirit comes on the uncircumcised impure fellows, the pure Israelites are more than surprised.

This is the very first moment of fine line between the two lines of Christians: the Gentile and the Jewish one. First contact happens in the name of Jesus, and the Jewish Christians, for the first time, set aside the ritual purity in favor of the Gentiles who want to become Christians. We are here still in the phase of first contact and shock, there are no clear boundaries given, but it is crystal clear who is who, nobody knows what is allowed yet and what is already forbidden. Gentiles and Jewish Christians meet and no defilement occurs. The other way round: *Gentiles come out of the story as the “pure of heart” and “full of Holy Spirit”, that is, not only purified²⁴², but also sanctified*. Also they become a trustworthy characters. The mission-program of 1,8 is being fulfilled.

Those around Peter were astonished that the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out even on Gentiles (v 45): “καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοὶ ὅσοι συνῆλθαν τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐκκέχυται”. There is therefore yet another collocation describing the same experience: the gift of Holy Spirit is “poured”, which is synonymous notion to the Holy Spirit “coming upon” someone. Spirit is “poured” here, like a substance, like water, which is used for baptism. Disciples are like vessels that receive the gift of what is metaphorically poured in them which leads them to being filled. Simil-

242 Pesch, pg. 344: “Der Glaube hat bewirkt, was Almosen, Gottesfurcht und Gerechtigkeit nach jüdischer Tradition bewirken: Reinigung...”

ar metaphor was used in the Gospels, in the Jesus' teaching on the im-/purity. There, people are described with the metaphor of a cup. According to the filling of it one can be either pure or impure. That which decides the *purity* status of a person is, according to Jesus of Mt 15 and Mk 7, not the ritual purity per se, acquired by ritual washing, but the inner purity that which fills their cup, their heart, inner man. Here, the inner man is “flooded” by the Holy Spirit. The notion of pouring connected with the Spirit is also to be found in Paul. According to him the Holy Spirit pours love into the hearts of the believers. Hence the glorifying of God by and in and through Gentiles here.

While Peter is still speaking, Holy Spirit comes on his hearers. How did the Hebrew brothers found out? The Gentiles started speaking “in tongues” and praising God (v 46a) “ἤκουον γὰρ αὐτῶν λαλούντων γλώσσαις καὶ μεγαλυνόντων τὸν θεόν.” In the case of chapter 2, the disciples were speaking with “different languages” (heterolalia), here, on the other hand, it seems to be a case of glosso-lalia. It is interesting that also here, the close experience of the Spirit includes an act of speech.

This is then the proof of God's acceptance, and therefore, that which God claimed pure, none can claim impure and the first Gentiles are baptized. Peter says (v 47b) : “Μήτι τὸ ὕδωρ δύναται κωλύσαι τις τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι τούτους οἵτινες τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔλαβον ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς;” Fitzmyer insists on the succession and meritorious receiving of the Spirit, when he says on the pg. 467: “...the Spirit was received as a result of their faith (implicitly expressed in their acceptance of Pt's message).” And again he speaks about some steps in becoming Christian: “Gentiles are baptized, because that is part of the process by which one becomes a Christian.” This seems to be quite the opposite to what Luke says here.

Luke writes that despite the fact that the Gentiles had not been baptized and *before* they had even any chance to respond to the preaching voluntarily, something happened to them without their merit. Before there would have been even any merit, before they were even able to think it through! The Spirit is given to them²⁴³.

Summary: It is affirmed and approved by the mouth of Peter himself that Gentiles (sic!) were given the Holy Spirit. God's plan that had been revealed to Peter in vision is now made public by God himself, who takes into his own hands the course of action, *changes the new ritual order* and *gives Holy Spirit to the uncircumcised, unclean, unbaptized Gentiles*. Now none of the Jewish Christians can oppose anymore. They have been all given the same Spirit. Therefore they are baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. The character of "God" in the narrative, rebels against all the established orders, be it the ritual laws or even the new Christian laws established by the first generation of Christians. The main heroes of the story of the birth of Church try to keep certain order and succession, but the Spirit does what it wants and acts quite similar to the character of earthly Jesus, who instead of fear of defilement promoted purity, holiness and especially in Luke definitely also unmerited mercy and love.

Chapter 11. In the following chapter, where Peter describes the course of the events to his Jerusalem brothers, he says in **v 15** that the Holy Spirit came on them: "ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀρξασθαί με λαλεῖν ἐπέπεσεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὡσπερ καὶ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀρχῇ". The timing of the imparting of the Spirit is not mentioned.

243 Therefore the "rhetorical question" of Pesch (pg. 345) seems to be more in line with the text here: "...rhetorische Frage...Wenn jemand den Heiden die Taufe und damit in die Aufnahme in die Gemeinde verweigern wollte, so würde er versuchen, nachträglich "Gott zu hindern" (11,17), der diese Aufnahme durch die Ausgiessung des Geistes schon gegen den Normalfall vor der Taufe - vollzogen hatte."

Just that the presence of the Spirit is again starting something new, there was “ἐν ἀρχῇ” of the first Christian believers at the pouring out of the Spirit on Pentecost, now there is new such ἀρχῇ.

Chapter 15 describing the meeting in Jerusalem shall also be discussed in greater detail later later. Now, let us focus on the use of the collocation “given Holy Spirit”. After the events just described, the Jerusalem Church has its doubts. Peter takes his word in order to defend of the Gentiles:

15, 7 - 9: “ἀναστὰς Πέτρος εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἀφ’ ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ πιστεῦσαι, καὶ ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς δόξας τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν, καὶ οὐθὲν διέκρινεν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν, τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν.”

This text is found in the middle of the account of the Jerusalem meeting concerning the problem of sharing the table-fellowship of Christians from Jewish and Hellenistic group. It is to be noted that this “Hellenistic group” is not identical with “Hellenistai”. Both Ἰουδαῖοι and Ἑλληνιστάι are Jewish Christians. Here, however, the situation is new: Actual Gentiles have become members of the Church, and they are not even Proselytes. They are just converted Pagans. As we have seen in the chapter 10, Peter was in person at the birth of this Hellenistic Christianity, he had already been to Jerusalem before, in order to share with the Church and get an approval of what had happened in Cornelius' house.

Several months or years later, the Hellenists are vital part of the Church and

rigid structures start to creep in. Would sharing in the communion with Greeks render some observing Jewish-Christians impure and thus disqualify them from the further worship in the Jerusalem temple? It is important to keep in mind, that the Jewish Christians did not stop worshiping God in the temple²⁴⁴. The other way round, they are said to visit it very often, including Paul, who in the Acts 21 brings sacrifice there.

Peter therefore stands up in the council and speaks in defense of his Gentile brothers and shares his new theology growing out of his personal revelation and approved by the practical course of events. Peter reminds his audience that he was chosen to bring the Gospel to the Gentiles²⁴⁵. He claims that this work is approved from above, since God, the *καρδιογνώστης*, gave them the Holy Spirit, like also to the apostles themselves. They are not in charge of this divine gift, and they are reminded that also to them the Holy Spirit was just given. Maybe they had forgotten this in the course of action, when they send everywhere delegations disposing of the Holy Spirit by laying of their hands. God has stood himself on the side of Gentiles by proving, beyond any doubt, in giving them the Holy Spirit, that they also are his children. Who are then the Jewish Christians to judge whether their Gentile brothers belong to the family, can the first-born sons judge the adoptive ones?

244 But they should have known Jesus' teaching on purification, though they might not have either understood it or accepted it in such a wide span of meaning.

245 It is a paradox. Because the apostle who is usually associated with the mission of the Gentiles is Paul. From the latter's perspective the conflict described in Gal 2 becomes more understandable. If Peter is, in fact, the first Gentile-missionary and then he does not even want to eat together with the Gentiles anymore, by the same table, then something terrible must have happened, especially after such a defense speech as we have here. It seems as if two different characters were described. In the Gospels, it is true that the character of Peter does not belong to the most stable ones and he changes his opinions quite unexpectedly, however, to imagine the same man here boldly opening the way for the Gospel to the Gentiles and later avoiding them altogether for the fear of what his brothers would say, it seems extremely incoherent.

The text is reminiscent of the imperative of the chapter 10: “Do not render impure what God has purified!” Gentiles then (v.9), can be purified. Not by observing the ritual law, but by faith: “τῇ πίστει καθάρσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν”. God now does not make difference in these two types of purification, there is therefore no more difference in the Christians of Jews and/or Gentiles²⁴⁶: “καὶ οὐθὲν διέκρινεν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν”.

Were the ritual laws abolished altogether? If compared to the theology of Paul, he teaches two parallel ways. According to him, if someone is circumcised, they are bound to the law and becoming a Christian does not exempt these from the law. But if the new-Christian comes from the pagan background, they only need to avoid idolatry, including the idol-food and *πορνεία*. Such people, according to Paul, reach the same level of the “ritual” purity that is presentability before God, as a regular observing Jew. This can be even more genuine in the end, for their purification happens inside. Having said that, in Luke the situation is similar. Jewish Christians are not told that they are now allowed to act against the law. But sharing table with Gentiles is not considered defiling according to the Torah. According to the Halakah, “the precepts of men”, viz. the theology of Mt 23, it may be considered defiling, but not according to the Law of God. Whatever origin of the Church members, they are now one family and they should learn to accept one another. That this was not such an easy task which went on for a very long time may be the witness of e.g. Rom 14 etc. The only requirement from the Gentile Christians is that of breaking

246 Fitzmyer, pg. 547: “The fact that the Spirit descended on Gentiles is interpreted by Peter as a form of heavenly testimony to Christians of Jewish background about the acceptability of the Gentiles' share in the divine plan of salvation. God makes no distinction between Jews and Gentiles.”

with the idolatrous past, they are also asked to avoid meat with blood, and πορνεία.

Chapter 19. The whole chapter is dedicated to Paul's troublesome mission in the city of Ephesus. While Apollos preaches the Gospel in Corinth, Paul is in Ephesus, where he meets some disciples. The first thing he asks them is, again, whether they had “received Holy Spirit” when they believed v 2: “Εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες;” We see that the “receiving of the Holy Spirit” has become an important part in becoming Christian. It is interesting, that Paul even asks²⁴⁷.

Obviously, he knows that he is speaking with some sort of disciples, but like the ones who believed through the Philip's mission, also these have never heard of the Holy Spirit (v 2): “Ἄλλ’ οὐδ’ εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἔστιν ἠκούσαμεν”²⁴⁸. In fact, not even about baptism in Jesus' name. They are some forgotten and displaced disciples of John. (v 3): “εἶπέν τε· Εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· Εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα.” Paul goes on in explaining the difference between the baptisms. John's first baptism was for repentance, but even their master said, there would be one coming after him, and now it has been fulfilled and there exists also this baptism. John's disciples are persuaded and receive baptism in “εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ”.

The later account of the receiving Holy Spirit, the more charismatic theology it carries. The first time, the disciples speak *different tongues*, then they

247 No such question would be expected nowadays except for charismatic circles.

248 Fitzmyer, pg. 643: “Reception of the Sp. was the sign of genuine Christian discipleship...not only have not heard about the outpouring of the Spirit, but even that there was such a thing as the Spirit.” It is a very interesting idea, because it points not only to the fact that the followers of John the Baptist formed their own sect, but also that this did not include pneumatology, but expected only christology.

speak *with boldness*, then they *praise God* and here, it is obvious that they exercise the *glossolalia* and they also *prophecy*. Again, speech is affected (v. 6): “καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ Παύλου χειρᾶς ἦλθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ’ αὐτούς, ἐλάλουν τε γλώσσαις καὶ ἐπροφήτευσον.” They are the first Christians reported to have *received Holy Spirit*, after *Paul* had laid hands on them, *not Peter*. Fitzmyer²⁴⁹ qualifies the situation as the “Pentecost” of the Johannine Christians”, after the Pentecost of the Jewish Christians, as well as those of Samaritans and Gentiles.

It is also noteworthy, that *only Paul, beside Peter, in the book of Acts, is the person that serves with the gift of laying hands on others and thus imparting the Holy Spirit*.

The receivers of this blessing given by Paul are called “disciples” and they are twelve (v.7). We are at the beginning of something new again. The founding of the new Church that roots from theology of John the Baptist. Luke builds his narrative in blocks of development. He structures his thinking of around the mission statement “from Jerusalem to the end of the world”. It also seems that the further from Jerusalem the more charismatic: First, one believes and repents, then they receive baptism and in the end, after receiving a blessing given by some apostolic authority, they take/receive the Holy Spirit, which is also immediately visible to the neighborhood. Obviously, “receiving/taking Holy Spirit” is something as important as the “baptism in the name of Jesus”. *One is unthinkable without the other* and both were manifest according to the narrative. The baptism on the part of people, the taking of the Holy Spirit affected the speech and courage for preaching as God's gift.

249 Fitzmyer, pg. 644.

3.2.1.3 The Baptism and the Holy Spirit.

Lk 3,16: Baptism. We have seen earlier, that on the day of the Pentecost, people were asking Peter: “What shall we do?” which is the exact wording of the question given to the Baptist. John is asked this question three times: by crowds (v. 10), tax-collectors (v. 12) and by soldiers (v.14). He encourages them to repent in practical life and to be just in what they do (he does not suggest them to change job). Since he had answer for almost everything, they believed he was the coming Messiah, but in **3,16** he answers them: “*Εγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ.*²⁵⁰”

As we have seen above, there is a clear cut in Luke's theology between baptisms²⁵¹. Baptism of John was important for the time of forerunner, who himself knows that the stronger one is coming after him. Even John himself considers his own baptism as contemporary, he speaks about the future baptism. Surprisingly not about baptism “in the name of Jesus”, but baptism performed by the Messiah himself, where the substance will not be water, but Holy Spirit and fire²⁵². We have encountered and commented the same text already in the previous the Gospels²⁵³, here we shall discuss only the peculiarities of Luke.

The question is, whether we are allowed to attach the “baptism in the Holy Spirit” synonymous meaning as to “being filled with, receive,... Holy Spirit”. If

250 Nolland, pg.151 “It has been maintained that John anticipated a coming of God, and no messianic figure...is...hardly justified....”God's sandals” (pg. 152) the reference to the Spirit here is frequently taken as a Christian gloss....a Spirit-dispensing Messiah is already only a small step from the Old Testament expectation of a Spirit--anointed Messiah...and of the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit.”

251 And Jewish ritual washings and ablutions for that matter, which philologically are exactly the same thing.

252 Again, the best book on the topic is Dunn's monograph.

253 Matthew had both Spirit and Fire, Mark lacks the fire.

both describe the same situation (even ritual), then all the above-mentioned movement of the Holy Spirit should be understood as the power of the Spirit coming from the resurrected Jesus through his apostles. Holy Spirit and fire are juxtaposed, as if they were both of the same importance, some non-personal forces that can be disposed of. But the only one who can handle/distribute them, is Christ. In Luke's writings the Spirit is connected with power and the image of fire is present at the Pentecost. Parallel with fire makes the gift, the baptism, sound more powerful, mysterious, eschatological and dangerous.

Acts 1,5. In the very introduction to his second book, Luke summarizes the last events of the Gospel. He speaks about resurrected Jesus, about how he was eating with his disciples, instructing them not to leave Jerusalem, but to wait for the promised gift. His instructions continue in the v. 5: “ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἀγίῳ οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας.” The message is therefore to wait only a little time for the baptism in Holy Spirit. It is the very baptism predicted by John the Baptist himself²⁵⁴. John's disciples gathered around their master ask, whether now the his kingdom would come? Is the baptism in Spirit not the eschatological time inaugurated? Are they to expect the end of days? Baptist points them to his successor. And in the course of Luke's work, now the resurrected Christ is fulfilling this prophecy. The answer for the previously given question whether the Pentecost could be interpreted as the expected “baptism in the Holy Spirit” is therefore answered here positively.

254 Unlike in Matthew, both the Spirit and the fire arrive. In Mt the fire is rather eschatological. In Luke too, but the eschatology has started on Pentecost.

Chapter 10 describes events of the first mission among Gentiles. Peter arrives at the house of Cornelius, where he had been invited to preach. In the introduction of his preaching he reminds his hearers about recent happenings in the province of Judea and of how “God *anointed* Jesus with Holy Spirit and power” and how he then performed many miracles. **V 38**: “Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει, ὃς διῆλθεν εὐεργετῶν καὶ ἰώμενος πάντας τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἦν μετ’ αὐτοῦ”.

Peter's language is very technical here. He is using theological terms that were established probably much later and combines them with Jewish terminology of ritual practice. Anointing, was the ritual of purifying and setting apart someone for the service of God, in the ancient Israel: *kings* were anointed. With this expression Luke wants to suggest that Jesus is the ultimate king of Israel (i.e. Messiah), anointed not with oil, but with Holy Spirit and with power as well. The doublet poses similar parallel as we have seen earlier in the promised Jesus' baptism with Holy Spirit and fire.

Spirit is here described metaphorically as liquid substance being poured on someone to be set apart. The image conveys a notion very similar to that of baptism with water. In fact, just few verses later, the Spirit is said to have been poured on the Gentiles²⁵⁵ which implies another parallel of baptism. Rather than the material of either water or oil, the metaphor lives from what quality these two have in common, they are liquid. Holy Spirit is likened to a liquid which is used for rituals to symbolically wash away old and flood with “holy”

255 As the story of Lk-Ac unfolds according to the program “from Jerusalem to the ends of the world” the first Gentiles who become Christians are still Proselytes. This means that the shared meal and space are not as threatening as they might have been were Cornelius just a regular pagan. This will then change later, in the story of Acts when also the non-proselyte Gentiles shall become Christians after Paul and his friends are banished from Synagogues of diaspora.

and “pure”, which is also the case at the anointment. Jesus is set apart and anointed by the Holy Spirit as a king of the kingdom of Heaven, breaking into this world through his powerful speech and works.

While Peter is still speaking, the Holy Spirit “falls” on everyone, who is listening. And the wonder spreads in. The faithful ones of the circumcision were ecstatic “ἐξέστησαν” (10, 45) that also the impure Gentiles were poured the free gift of the Holy Spirit: “καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοὶ ὅσοι συνῆλθαν τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐκκέχυται”. Therefore the situation is approved by the trustworthy characters who use the established terms to describe it. Peter says (10, 47) that nothing can hinder now to Gentile water-baptism, since they had already been baptized by the Spirit before. These manifold parallels only prove that all the above-mentioned experience with the Holy Spirit can be called “the baptism in the Holy Spirit”²⁵⁶.

Acts 11,16 is repetitive of the verse 1,5 that describes Jesus instruction, it is Peter's memory of the divine meeting. The context is following: Peter is speaking to his Jerusalem brothers about what had happened in the house of Cornelius. In the chapter 10 the text said that while Peter was still preaching the Gentiles were all filled with the Holy Spirit. Now, as Peter retells the story from his own perspective. While he was still speaking God “sent the Holy Spir-

256 I wonder whether originally the Trinitarian baptism in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit did not convey also some similar experience. That the baptism in the name of the Father would be something like acknowledging that Jahwe of Israel is THE God, and that he Sent Jesus who is THE messiah for all, who has sent THE Holy Spirit (another question is who does really send the son, according to John, it is Jesus, but in Luke it is rather the Father). Whether the importance of being filled with the Spirit and being baptized in it has not been suppressed by time, or whether it was only stressed by the Lukan community. We must bear in mind, though, that at least in the case of Philip's disciples, the time-laps between water baptism and receiving Holy Spirit was considerable. *Is water baptism in the name of Holy Spirit the same thing as baptism in the Holy Spirit?*

it”. This time the Spirit does not “fall” nor “floods”. However, in the v. 16, Luke qualifies the situation as “baptism in the Holy Spirit”:

“15 ἐν δὲ τῷ ἄρξασθαί με λαλεῖν ἐπέπεσεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ὡσπερ καὶ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀρχῇ. 16 ἐμνήσθην δὲ τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς ἔλεγεν· Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.”²⁵⁷“

As we have seen above, there are different terms employed by the author to describe the same experience. John the Baptist promises another kind of baptism which shall be given by his mighty successor. Later in the development of events, in the book of Acts, the events experienced and described as “filling with”, “falling of” the Holy Spirit can be also described as “baptism” in the Holy Spirit. The first Church seemed to have given the same value to the baptism in the name of Jesus and to “taking” of the Holy Spirit. The latter does not involve any water, it is spiritual. The Holy Spirit is described as a liquid which can be poured upon a person, or that can fill a person and ultimately, that can wash, βαπτίζειν, a person's heart clean. It is the inner side of the visible pouring of water. In the time of Luke, however, the Church knows full Trinitarian baptism with water.

3.2.1.4 The Revelatory and Instructive Function of the Holy Spirit.

Beside the role of filling, flooding and baptizing, which all describe similar events and experiences resulting in powerful works and speech, there are cases

257 Pesch, pg. 67: “...schon Johannes aber hatte Jesus als den Geist und Feuertäufer angekündigt. Diese Ankündigung hatten Mk a Mt in ihren Evangelien nicht adäquat als erfüllt darzutun vermocht. Lk vermag die Erfüllung der Verheissung zu zeigen: im Pfingsterbericht”

of the collocation Holy Spirit that stress the role of the Spirit as a teacher, a revealer and an instructor. We shall start with the Gospel again and then move further to the book of Acts.

The first case, where Holy Spirit is said “to instruct” is at the beginning of the Gospel. Jesus, still a little baby, is brought by his parents to the Jerusalem temple. The family meets Simeon there, who has an air of an Old Testament prophet: righteous and devout, Holy Spirit is on him. It must be for the Spirit, that he delivers a prophetic speech over the baby **Luke 2, 26**: “καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον πρὶν ἢ ἂν ἴδῃ τὸν χριστὸν κυρίου.” We have seen that being filled with Holy Spirit gives one boldness to speak. But here, the Holy Spirit is the prophetic spirit, who reveals things otherwise hidden. *Χρηματίζειν* is used not only about revelation, though. The word is also used for education in business, e.g. it is instruction of how to deal with money, public affairs. The word is also used for consultation of an oracle. It is therefore instruction in the way of life, imparting of wisdom. Simeon here says that the baby shall be raised by the Holy Spirit itself, who will take care of his education.

Further, in the **chapter 12**, Jesus encourages his disciples to be strong in face of persecution²⁵⁸. Jesus prophesies to his followers that they, unlearned and poor fishermen, will find themselves against the powerful of this world for his name. They will have to become their own attorneys at the highly intellectual court of Sanhedrin or the Roman court, but the Spirit would speak for and through themselves. The Spirit will instruct them and they will be able to de-

258 Fitzmyer, pg. 681: “The verses in 12,1-12 stress the need for clear public acknowledgment of allegiance to the Son of man...fear of what those who see us will think leads to such insincerity. It is God who should be feared...”

fend themselves. **Luke 12,12** “τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἃ δεῖ εἰπεῖν.” The verb used to collocate with Holy Spirit is literally: to teach. The Holy Spirit teaches to speak, it opens mouths of the disciples to speak boldly the truth which might be otherwise hidden. But the notion of teaching goes deeper, it is not a mere mimesis or acting upon the inner voice. The promise that the unlearned and now weak and defenseless shall be instructed, that they shall eventually acquire the abilities needed in face of difficult situations the life in discipleship brings²⁵⁹.

Whereas in the Gospel the instructive role of the Holy Spirit is rather as a promise of equipping, in the book of Acts, it is described rather as a revealer of the things hidden.

That which is in the first book proclaimed as a prophecy over baby Jesus by an old man is now confirmed by the author in the second book at its outset: the earthly Jesus was the man instructed or rather lead by the Holy Spirit. And the same way he was instructed, he also instructs further his disciples in **Acts 1,2**: “ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὓς ἐξελέξατο ἀνελήμφθη²⁶⁰”; the instruction was a prophecy of what is ahead of them and how they should go through it, Jesus taught them in the Holy Spirit just before he was taken. Here, Luke suggests that the post-Easter Christ communicates with his disciples through Holy Spirit, but it is before the Pentecost and therefore the

259 Especially in this case, the feminist reading of the Holy Spirit is very fitting. Spirit is here as the Mother who gives the children all they need to come around life. She is with them in those situations of testing. She does not teach theoretically and then leaving the children abandoned. She takes care of Her children in the midst of the limit situations.

260 Pesch, pg. 61: “Dem Geisterträger Jesus folgen in der neuen Epoche die Apostel als seine Erwählten und Beauftragten, denen Jesus Vermächtnis anvertraut ist, nach Wiederherstellung ihrer Vollzahl.. und ihrer Ausrüstung mit dem Heiligen Geist werden sie Jesu Auftrag ausführen.”

revelation does not come, at least so it is described, from their inner man, but from the outside revelation of the Resurrected Jesus, the glorified Christ.

Few verses later, still before the Pentecost, Peter, the leading figure of the Twelve, stands up and urges his brothers to replace deceased Judas. He bases this request on Scripture. **Acts 1,16**: “Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἔδει πληρωθῆναι τὴν γραφὴν ἣν προεῖπε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ περὶ Ἰούδα τοῦ γενομένου ὁδηγοῦ τοῖς συλλαβοῦσιν Ἰησοῦν”. The Holy Spirit is here identified as the prophetic Spirit, who inspires divine utterances and sacred Scriptures. Old Testament, or rather Jewish Bible, is hereby accepted as divinely inspired and adopted also by the Gentile-Christian Church of Luke. This is quite common introductory formula to the Old Testament quotations, which betrays that the Church continued to revere the Scriptures as sacred and divinely inspired. The instruction of the Spirit happens here through the means of the written word. Holy Spirit used the mouth of David to share revelation about future Messiah, his descendant king. The word is conserved in the Scriptures, which are now the “word of the Holy Spirit”²⁶¹.

The Spirit of God is in the New Testament writings designated as “holy”. It is such because it belongs to God and is of God, it is *God's* spirit, nobody else's, only his, separated. As such, it shares the quality of holiness with those who belong to God. The notion of holiness, as we have seen, is that of separation somebody or something from the general situation and setting them into the realm of God's reign.

261 The same is also true of Acts 28,25 which uses the same introductory formula “τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησεν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου” before quoting Isa 1,16

Such *sanctification* par excellence, by the hand of the Holy Spirit itself is described by Luke in **Acts 13,2**: "λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ νηστευόντων εἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, Ἀφορίσατε δὴ μοι τὸν Βαρναβᾶν καὶ Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς". The Holy Spirit speaks here and orders separation of two characters²⁶² for the special use of God, for, as Paul calls it, new *λειτουργία* in preaching the Gospel. Also here, the Holy Spirit is teaching, instructing, explaining as well as sanctifying²⁶³. From the literary setting of the scene, the gravity of the situation breathes. The disciples are setting themselves apart, getting ready in prayer and fasting. In the middle of their liturgy something happened: *Holy Spirit spoke*. This is stated as axiomatic fact that does not need to be further explained. In fact *nowhere in the New Testament is it explained what it could exactly mean*. Holy Spirit speaks through prophets both in the Old and New Testament. There is no mention of any prophet here, it is not important who accepted the message and how. An experiential charismatic event is described here as a voice of God, setting apart people responsible for further mission.

The Holy Spirit is said also to “testify”. The verb is used to describe the repetitive “talking” of the Holy Spirit to the receptive characters, preparing Paul for sufferings he would have to endure: **Acts 20,23** "πλὴν ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κατὰ πόλιν διαμαρτύρεταί μοι λέγον ὅτι δεσμὰ καὶ θλίψεις με μένουσιν."

Further in **Acts 21,11** a prophecy is introduced: “Τάδε λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ

262 Similar is true of Acts 20,28 where the Church is encouraged to flock around their instituted presbyters, because also they have been instituted by the Holy Spirit.

263 This situation reminds me of Ex 19, where also the people are told to prepare themselves for encounter with God. They first have to purify, they also have to set apart. To elaborate on the parallels would require more space.

ἄγιον”. This is exactly one of the signs of Holy Spirit testifying of Paul's future sufferings. Prophet Agabus performs a theater prophecy just like his Old Testament predecessors. He even uses something which is reminiscent of the Old Testament introductory prophetic formula “נאם יהוה”, except that in this case it is specified as “נאם רוח יהוה”²⁶⁴.

As far as the instructive function of the Holy Spirit²⁶⁵ in the writings of Luke goes, it is also described in the book of Acts also as the one who *forbids* to preach. This means that first, the Spirit had to speak, second, somebody was receptive enough to receive the message and third, that they were able to evaluate the situation and deliver the unlikely message, or rather not. In general, the Holy Spirit is responsible for sharing God's will with people, communicating it to them, as well as teaching and empowering them to do the same. However, obviously, sometimes it orders silence. There is one case in the book of **Acts** where the preaching of Gospel is literally forbidden by the Spirit in **16,6**. Probably the missionaries encountered some obstacles on the way which made it impossible to continue as they had planned. The situation is evaluated not as failure on the parts of the people, but as the power of the Spirit blocking their way.

Summary: We have therefore seen that the Holy Spirit is often believed to be the source of inspired and powerful prophetic speech. It is the source of power

264 Whether this connection linking the Old Testament prophecies to the Christian Person of Trinity, the Holy Spirit was conscious or not, cannot be decided here, it is much graver problem. The Old Testament knows the Spirit of God, of course, but it was not personified fully in the metaphoric language yet.

265 The Holy Spirit can also function as a restrictive power. When, in the chapter 15, the decision about the four basic requirements is made, it is said to be decision of both the apostles and of the Holy Spirit, in the verse 28. Here, the Holy Spirit plays the role of supporting the restrictive minimum of the holiness code.

for the growing Church also according to **Acts 9,31**. It is the same Spirit, who spoke through the prophets and the Hebrew Scriptures but is also active in the Church among the apostles, preachers and missionaries. The Holy Spirit speaks to the Church, teaching them every step of the way, just as Jesus had promised.

3.2.1.5 The Passive Role of the Holy Spirit

In the following cases the Holy Spirit is a passive recipient of actions performed on it. The spirit can be blasphemed to, resisted to, lied to.

As we have seen also in the previous chapters, it is possible to desecrate God' Name on the level of language, that is, blaspheme him. This is the exact opposite to the sanctification of the Name required in both the Decalogue and the Lord's Prayer. Here the Trinity stays divided, because as we have seen earlier, the blasphemy against the Son is forgivable, unlike the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. **Luke 12,10**: “καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ: τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.” Here, the context plays crucial part. In both Mark and Matthew, the blasphemy was closely connected with exchanging the work of the Spirit for that of Belzebub. Calling the Spirit of ultimate holiness “a demon” is such desecration. Especially the Lukan version stresses the importance of the speech, the level of language. Should Holy Spirit be considered, that is treated in heart and lips, as an impure demon, then there is no forgiveness for such a violator. The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is then something entirely different from human weakness or inability to live sanctified life as is quite often preached. All sins and blasphemies are forgivable, except mingling the impure and holy. The order to

distinguish both from each other from Lev 10,10 still persists. Calling the devilish works the works of God is not as bad as not recognizing the Spirit of God and disregarding its work.

The Holy Spirit can be *resisted*, says Stephen in his speech in **Acts 7,51**: “Σκληροτράχηλοι καὶ ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίαις καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν, ὑμεῖς ἀεὶ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀντιπίπτετε, ὡς οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ ὑμεῖς.” It is the same Spirit that was active in the times of the forefathers. The listeners of *Stephen's message* have hardened their hearts in the same way as those on whose tradition they rely. Thus Stephen puts himself and his new faith in line with the theology of the prophets. The prophets were speaking from the same Spirit. It is the same Spirit, says Stephen. Now active in the hearts of Christians, but not in the heart of Jews, because they had closed and hardened their hearts and did not let it in. Therefore the latter also are not holy. Here, the Holy Spirit results as being limited by people who decide not to let it *in*, who hardened their hearts.

Holy Spirit can also be *lied to*, as is written in the story of Ananias and Saphira in **Acts 5,3**. It seems *as if the Holy Spirit was synonymous with Peter and the Church* in this pericope. It probably was the intention of Luke to show that the Church establishment is so united with the Spirit, that lying to them is lying to the Holy Spirit itself.

3.2.2 The Holy One of God.

Already in the beginning of the chapter on the holiness in Luke, we mentioned the verse **1,35**, the annunciation to Mary, that she would conceive of the Holy Spirit. Now, we are more interested in the second part of the verse, when the angel says that the son shall be called “holy, the son of God”. Jesus is called

“holy” even *before he is born*. People are usually said to be “full of Holy Spirit”, but only Jesus is said to be “*holy*” *himself*: his life as such was separated for the special use of God. The other predicate, “the Son of God” further elaborates on description of the special baby. His holiness also stems from his Father, that is God, who is venerated as “holy” only few verses later in Mary's Magnificat (1,49). God is holy, so is His name and so is His son.

In **Luke 2,23**, there is an interesting reason why Jesus should be holy: “καθώς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι Πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται”. Christians are called “holy” by definition of being *in* Jesus, separated by their alliance with him for God; Jews are “the holy nation” by definition of being born and circumcised and every first-born is holy by definition of opening the mother's womb. Where does this come from? There are several possibilities. First, in the logic of the Old Testament, all the first born are more important and more special than other children, they are the carriers of heritage and blessing. But by that definition, all the first-born would be as holy as first-fruits that are brought to the temple. Yes, they are special, but not in the way of being separated for the special use of God. According to Fitzmyer²⁶⁶, just as all the first-fruits are holy, so are the firstborn children and, analogously, *Jesus is thus holy just for the virtue of being the first son of Mary*.

Holiness of Jesus is again repeated *by the voice of devil*. A demon possessed man in the synagogue of Kapharnaum (// Mk 1,21-28) disturbed service by

266 Fitzmyer locates possible inspiration for the claim in both 2 Chron 31,3 a 35,26 (but not in LXX wording) and Exod 13,12. and further he says (pg. 118) that “the presentation to the Lord of this firstborn as holy according to the law of primogeniture serves also as reminder of the unique holiness of this miraculously provided child.”

shouting out that Jesus is “the holy one of God”. As we have seen better in the chapter on Mark²⁶⁷, the demon shouts, disturbs, scares itself being scared. It reveals the true identity of Jesus prematurely, because it feels threatened by his holy presence. **Luke 4,34b**: “οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.”

In the book of Acts then, Peter in his first preaching in the temple accuses the listeners of being responsible for the death of Jesus. The crowds could have chosen to give him life, but they chose to liberate the murderer Barabas instead. **Acts 3,14**: “ὕμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον ἠρνήσασθε, καὶ ἤτήσασθε ἄνδρα φονέα χάριςθῆναι ὑμῖν”. Peter puts two predicates of Jesus beside each other: He is *both* “*holy*” and “*righteous*”. These two appear often together in Paul as qualities acquired by faith. It is interesting that during the life of Jesus, his holiness is only expressed by an angel and a demon. In his life, at least in the Gospel of Luke, holiness is not a usual quality used to describe him. Only after he is dead, one of his disciples calls him not only a righteous man, which nobody doubted. But he is now also called “holy”, because he belongs to God, and he is the resurrected special Son of God.

He is also the expected *Servant of the Lord*, say both Peter and John in public prayer after they were released from the prison. The motif of the expected chosen servant of God, which at that time was not the same as the expected Messiah, the king, is now connected to the story of Jesus' life. In the prayer it is twice repeated that Jesus is “holy”, first in Acts 4,27 and then in the verse 30. Both times the Isaiah's servant of God is in view. Pilate and Herod, Gentiles

267 Where it was literally an “impure spirit”, i.e. of the opposite provenience to the “holy” spirit.

and Jews, all united against the servant just as was prophesied in Isa 61,1. **Acts 4,27:** “συνήχθησαν γὰρ ἐπ' ἀληθείας ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον παῖδά σου Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ἔχρισας, Ἡρώδης τε καὶ Πόντιος Πιλάτος σὺν ἔθνεσιν καὶ λαοῖς Ἰσραήλ,” Jesus is here not only “God's servant/boy”, he is *also the “holy and anointed one”*. Anointing was associated with the inauguration on the throne of the king of Israel. If the anointing is given by God himself then the anointed must be his promised “King” with the capital “K”, that is, the promised Messiah. Thus the two Old Testament notions are united in one person. In one verse Luke unites several messianic figures, all of whom are united in Jesus and his belonging to God. Jesus is holy, because he is “God's”.

Two verses later, the apostles, who were just forbidden to speak about the Jesus, pray exactly *in* his name *about* his name and *for* his name. They ask God to empower them to carry the message of this name. In other words, that the name would be glorified and sanctified. V 30: “ἐν τῷ τὴν χεῖρά ἐκτείνειν σε εἰς ἴασιν καὶ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἁγίου παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ”. The apostles ask for the kingdom of God to be manifest among them even after Jesus' death exactly *through* his name. It is the name of the incarnated promised Servant of the Lord, Jesus.

Summary: In the Gospel, Jesus is called holy several times, but never during his life, with one exception, a demon possessed man. Even before he is born, he is prophesied by the angel to be called “holy, the son of God”. He is thus called also for the virtue of being the firstborn of Mary, like all the first-fruits. A demon-possessed man calls Jesus as “the holy one of God” and this time not in the sense of firstborn of Mary, but the Firstborn of the new creation as is further explained by apostles in the book of Acts. Peter preaches that Jesus is both

“holy” and “righteous”. Further the apostles connect with Jesus other two titles associated with holiness: The “Servant of the Lord” and the anointed “King, the Messiah”. Jesus is truly special, “holy” in all possible ways acknowledged by beings from all the realms.

3.2.3 The Holy Angels

Beside Jesus, also angels can be called holy. It is regular terminology. Angels belong to God, they are his servants and they are separated for his special use. It is interesting that the collocation “holy angels” appears *most often in the apocalyptic speeches*. **Lk 9,26**: “ὁς γὰρ ἂν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους, τοῦτον ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων.” Jesus shall return from heaven accompanied with holy angels. The only problem is, that at this point of the story, Jesus is very much alive among other people as a normal human and therefore it should not be spoken about his “return”. The earthly Jesus teaches about himself, that he is the Son of Man, that he shall be glorified by Father and so glorified he comes (back from...) accompanied with his holy angels. *The eschatological party appears also elsewhere in the New Testament, as well as outside of it, it was a canonical apocalyptic image.*

Other than that, a holy angel is mentioned in **Acts 10,22** as the one who appeared to Cornelius and ordered him to invite Peter into his house. It is important that *the angel is described as holy, since it makes him into a trustworthy character*. Who would otherwise expect an angel who is holy in the house of impure Gentile.

3.2.4 Holy People

The earliest people who are called “holy” in the Lk-A are the prophets, who, according to Zachary in his canticle (Lk 1,70), were sent by God.

A single individual is never described as “holy”, except for Jesus. It is always the people of God as the group of believers, who are so called. It is also quite natural that this designation is *only used in the book of Acts after the Pentecost*. The same theology appears in Paul, in the epistle of Hebrews, as well as in all the mentioned Apostolic Fathers, the “holy ones” or “saints” are the Church. In this chapter we only shall discuss the specific cases, unlike the chapter on Paul, where the notion is quite crucial. Christians are the new People, separated for God. In baptism, they are washed and set apart by the Holy Spirit and by faith in their hearts. Their consciousness are clean and therefore they are dedicated, clean and God's special and holy people by definition: for free, by grace. They are saints before they are able to do anything to earn such status.

It is not a term that would be reserved only to some special group as suggested by R. Asting²⁶⁸, neither are they called “holy” because of their moral and ascetic life, no, they are holy, because they live in and for Jesus and thus they are separated for God by the virtue of his Son. The ethical side of holiness does not appear in Luke at all. In Paul it is a secondary outcome of being the people of God, who should reflect his holiness according to the appropriated order of the Lord: “be holy as I am holy”.

Church is described as “saints” e.g. by Ananias, who is afraid to take care of blinded Paul for his dangerous fame. In his vision, God sends him to help Paul,

268 R. Asting, *Heiligkeit im Urchristentum*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930.

but Ananias opposes God and says in Acts **9,13**: “...Κύριε, ἤκουσα ἀπὸ πολλῶν περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου, ὅσα κακὰ τοῖς ἁγίοις σου ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ.” The holy ones here are not just the special martyr victims. The whole Church are saints.

Again, further in the same chapter, Peter arrives to Lydda, where he meets “all the saints”. Acts **9,32** “Ἐγένετο δὲ Πέτρον διερχόμενον διὰ πάντων κατελθεῖν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Λύδδα.” Some commentaries tend to say that the “holy ones” are only some special group of Church or that only the Jerusalem believers owned that description, but it is obvious from the text that even the Church in Lydda can be called holy, group of saints. This is the first case the text mentions Lydda²⁶⁹.

And again in Acts **9,41** in the story about resurrection of Tabita after Peter's prayer, “holy ones” as a group of the believers/saints is a designation used for the present Church. Peter ordered Tabita to wake up, she opened her eyes and saw Peter, then he calls them all, the Church, the saints, in: Acts **9,41** “δοὺς δὲ αὐτῇ χεῖρα ἀνέστησεν αὐτήν, φωνήσας δὲ τοὺς ἁγίους καὶ τὰς χήρας παρέστησεν αὐτὴν ζῶσαν.”

Paul at his farewell speech to Ephesian elders says in Acts **20,32** “καὶ τὰ νῦν παρατίθεμαι ὑμᾶς τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, τῷ δυναμένῳ οἰκοδομῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν κληρονομίαν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πᾶσιν”. *Paul wishes the elders that they would have the share among all the sanctified.* Are the elders not “sanctified”? Can someone be “sanctified” more and others less? Is this the proof of certain levels of sanctified life of Christians? Rather than teaching them moral and as-

269 Fitzmyer thus points out at pg. 444: “...by using ἅγιοι...Luke suggests that Christians are already living in Lydda, even though one has learned nothing about missionary activity in that area, unless one is to presume that Philip, the evangelist, has been active there”. However, he further says that (pg. 444) “ἅγιοι ...might denote religious Jews, as in LXX Dan7,18...there is no reason to see this term as a specific reference to Essenes“. Barret says that a Christian writer would hardly use it of others.

cetic perfection in order to “become” saints, Luke's Paul speaks here about the eschatological reward of the saints. In his letters, when Paul speaks about the “inheritance among the saints”, he means joining in the special and holy people of God, the reward of the end of the days²⁷⁰. The passive participle also appears often at the introduction of his letters and it is synonymous with the substantivized adjective “οἱ ἅγιοι”. They are not expected to be first saved and then sanctified, nor even holy and then sanctified little bit more, in order to reach the inheritance. It has already been given to them, they only need to persevere in order to take it. The only pre-requisite for inheritance is to be member of the family, therefore if there is any requirement on the part of believers, it would be to stay in the family.

Another case of the designation of people as holy is when Paul has his hearing with Agrippa and he describes him his pre-Christian life. In **Acts 26,10** he says that he had persecuted many saints: “πολλούς τε τῶν ἁγίων ἐγὼ ἐν φυλακαῖς κατέκλεισα τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἐξουσίαν λαβών”. He does not speak just about the martyrs, because he persecuted all the Church and then turned some into martyrs. Paul did not persecute just some part of Church, he asked to be empowered by the high priest to be able to find and kill whatever Christians, whom he now holds for the saints.

Eight verses later, in the same speech, Paul describes his conversion, or rather calling, the vision of Jesus on his way to Damascus (**Acts 26,18**) God has called him for the following task: “ἀνοίξαι ὀφθαλμούς αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκοτῶν εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κλήρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ.” Paul's calling was: to open the eyes of Gentiles and call them to holiness. That they would ulti-

270 Fitzmyer, pg. 681, speaks about “the destiny of all the saints”

mately reach the same lot among the sanctified, as he also wished to the Ephesian elders. “The inheritance among the saints”, as we can see, is really a chorus of Paul's theology. Paul's calling is revolutionary. By then he had only lived among the pure Jews, but now he is sent to impure Gentiles and preach them free salvation and also sanctification. It is stressed in the calling that the forgiveness of sins and sanctification are reached only by faith in the revealed resurrected Christ, that which Paul preaches in all his letters.

Summary: In the writings of Luke the designation “holy” is only used of the group of post-Pentecostal Christians, never about an individual, except for Jesus. A single individual is never described as “holy”, except for Jesus. The ethical side of holiness does not appear in Luke at all. The term is universal for the Church, it is not reserved to only some group special for their place of origin (Jerusalem), or for their exceptional moral profile, or death of martyr. Though already called “saints”, Christians expect their final sanctification, “the inheritance of the saints”. Paul's calling is then also to call Gentiles to holiness.

3.2.5 The Holy Place

“The holy place” appears three times in the book of Acts and twice it describes the Jerusalem Temple. Also, in Acts 7,33, in his final speech, Stephen preaches about Moses and how God spoke to him in the burning bush, instructing him about how to behave in that special holy place.

In **Acts 6,13** Stephen is accused of speaking against “this holy place”, that is the Jerusalem temple: “ἔστησάν τε μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς λέγοντας· Ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος οὐ παύεται λαλῶν ῥήματα κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ τοῦ νόμου”. The indictment is

the same as the one against Jesus, except that Stephen is also accused of teaching against the law. For Jews both the temple and the law were the two most sacred values, identity markers. Jerusalem temple, host of the Holy of Holies and the ark of covenant, was axis mundi, the place of ultimate holiness where the heaven touched the ground. It was the “tent of meeting” where one could approach God in prayer. Speaking against it would be considered threatening and desecrating. Also the law was sacred, because it gave the people of God special status and set them apart for Lord, their God. Was Stephen blasphemous and really teaching against the two pillars of Jewish faith?

It is very likely that his call for reformation, as that of prophets and that of Jesus, was perceived as threatening. It is true that Jesus' teaching was disturbing for the temple establishment. If Stephen was teaching that Jesus had built a new temple in three days in his resurrection and that now through him the way to God is open, Jews must have been alarmed, because he was touching their sacred values. While the temple had its standing, it was the place of holiness. After the resurrection there are no places that would be called holy for Christians. The only holy place that appears in Christian theology of Paul would be the new temple, which is not place, but hearts of believers. If this was the message of Stephen, that the temple has lost its monopoly on providing access to God, then no wonder they called false witnesses, they would need to do everything to stop such teaching.

Very similar indictment is also raised by crowds against Paul in **Acts 21,28**.
“κράζοντες· Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, βοηθεῖτε· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ κατὰ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τοῦ τόπου τούτου πάντα πανταχῇ διδάσκων, ἔτι τε καὶ Ἕλληνας

εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν καὶ κεκοίνωκεν τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον.” Paul is said to have spoken against the nation of Israel, against the law as well as against the temple. In addition to this, he is accused of bringing Greeks to the temple, and thus he desecrating, defiling, the holy place. In general, the accusations speak of disrespect to the traditions.

Paul had just arrived to Jerusalem to give account of how many people he won for Jesus and the group around James rejoices, they even witness that **(21,20b)**: “Θεωρεῖς, ἀδελφέ, πόσαι μυριάδες εἰσὶν ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τῶν πεπιστευκότων, καὶ πάντες ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου ὑπάρχουσιν:” The Church leaders give different account of Paul's work. But the rumors that Paul discourages Proselytes from pursuing the Jewish way have reached Jerusalem and therefore Paul should prove himself, paying for himself and four other men purification temple ritual. He does so, but before he is able to finish, he is indicted as we have seen in the v 28.

The decided minimum for Gentile Christians is then the often repeated: “φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτοὺς τό τε εἰδωλόθυτον καὶ αἷμα καὶ πνικτὸν καὶ πορνείαν”. The whole problem can be summed in the fight for the Proselytes. They were the primary missionary aim, since every place where Paul went, he always first visited the synagogue. But then he also turned to Gentiles. And those who believed he warned from circumcision and taught freedom of the law through the law of the Spirit. Therefore the Jerusalem establishment, seeing this former zealous Jew now stealing the Proselytes from temple for Jesus, they are offended and they look for opportunities how to trap him. It is unlikely that Paul would recklessly introduce Gentiles into the temple, since he was well aware this would result in immediate death penalty, as was well known from the warning sign in several languages. So either Paul entered the temple with a

Proselyte, or they saw him with some Greeks in the city, or they heard him preach on new temple of God in the hearts of believers, even the Gentiles. Whichever form these, or even any other explanation we find, the important information here is, that the temple is considered a place that is holy.

Summary: The Holy Place describes the Jerusalem Temple (And in Stephen's speech also the area around the burning bush). It is a designation coming out of the mouths of the Christian enemies. They felt threatened by both Stephen and Paul, by their teachings which allegedly attacked their identity markers. Though the Christian theology does operate with the only sacred space, which is the heavenly temple connected with the hearts of believers, neither Paul nor Stephen would disregard the Jerusalem temple by blasphemous speech or action.

3.2.6 Holy, “ἅγιος”

There are also three cases of the adjective “ἅγιος” in the book Acts and one case of noun *δοσιότης* in the Gospel. The “δοσιότης” is rather human response to God's calling. In the same way as “ἅγιος” does not carry any ethical connotations, “δοσιότης” describes exactly these. It is virtuous life lived in response to the encountered with holy God.

In the Zachariah's canticle in **Luke 1,72** it is in parallel with *δικαιοσύνη*. Both of these qualities, “δοσιότης” and “δικαιοσύνη” are here the desired qualities for dignified worship of God.

Also in Acts the word describes rather the human side of holy life. It appears in the quote of Psalm 16 in **Acts 2,27**: “ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἄδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὁσίόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.” David expresses the belief in his prayer that God will not forget his “saint” in distress. Here, the holiness of the subject is also his exemplary living in front of God. The same text is then quoted again in the **chapter 13, v 35**. In both quotations, “the holy one” is said about Jesus. The adjective ὁσίος appears in this and also the preceding verse. “ὅτι δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθοράν, οὕτως εἶρηκεν ὅτι Δώσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά.” The promises to king David of the future Messiah, are “holy”.

Summary: Unlike “ἅγιος”, the “ὁσίος” describes holiness as exemplary living in front of God, it is the human side of holy life, human response to God's calling. It is used three times, twice in a quotation and twice used of Jesus.

3.2.7 Summary of Holiness in the Writings of Luke

Holiness is described by two terms in both the Gospel and the book of Acts. The first one, “ἅγιος”, appears mostly in the collocation Holy Spirit. Rather than a person of a Trinity, the Spirit is understood as an impersonal fluid power, that can fill a person. Those who are so filled are usually at the beginning of something new, in the Gospel, they are the members of Jesus' family, in the book of Acts, they are the personalities at the birth of the Churches spreading according to the mission program “from Jerusalem to the ends of the world”. Those who are filled with the Spirit usually start speaking (also things they do not understand) and they do so in power. The Holy Spirit can be either given or received.

Only God is in charge of this process as the sender, people are then recipients. Surprisingly, also impure Gentiles are given the Holy Spirit, by whom they are sanctified. Holy Spirit, when present in or near a person, unfolds God's mysteries and can reveal things otherwise hidden. The Spirit can be also a passive recipient of human action, it can be blasphemed, even lied to.

Other collocations with the adjective holy are “the Holy One of God” which is a title ascribed to Jesus by an angel and a demon in the Gospel, in the book of Acts then also by the apostles. Second, by the adjective can be also named “holy angels”; in the apocalyptic discourses, they are holy, because they are God's. Finally also people can be “holy people”, but, unlike Jesus, never in singular. Christians are the new saints. Finally, Jerusalem temple is “the Holy Place”. Since Christians transferred their focus from the physical Jerusalem temple to the spiritual one, their actions and words are understood by the temple establishment as blasphemous, however, they are mostly false indictments.

Finally, there is also the word “ὅσιος”, which describes the perfect human conduct in response to God, in this case a person can be designed as holy, however, it is anyway used only of Jesus.

3.3 Purity

In the Gospel of Luke, there are seven cases of the verb “καθαρίζειν” in different forms: twice it is used of purification and once of the adjective pure. There are several parallels with other Synoptics, which have already been explained and we will mention them only briefly, unless there is some significant

change in wording of the story. The classic stories that include purity are: the healed leper, response to John the Baptist and discourse with Pharisees on the ritual washing. In addition, there are several other occasions to speak about purity. Such as Mary's days of purification²⁷¹ and some more cases of leprosy, which all point in the author's general interest in healing stories.

3.3.1 The Cleansed Lepers

The first of our interest shall be stories of healed lepers. We have already encountered the story of a healed leper in both Matthew (8,1-4) and Mark (1,40-45). In the former, the stress was on the reverse of the flow of holiness and mercy, in the latter on the exchange of roles because of breaking of the messianic secret. In Luke, the man receives his healing right after Jesus touches him, however, there is a slight but an important detail: in the previous two versions, there was always information added, that the was also “purified”. In the Luke's version, he is only healed. The disease literally “went away” from him v 13 “ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ”. The rest of the accounts is more or less the same, with no deviations that would affect the way we should understand the purity. It is obvious that *Luke is more interested in the medical than ritual result of the situation, he is interested in the healing, not the purification.*

Healing of lepers by Jesus appears again in in the chapter **17, 11 – 19**, the verb “καθαρίζειν” appears in **verses 14 and 17**. This time, there are *ten impure men*. Nine of them are Jewish and one is a Samaritan. Compared to the previous leper, these know how to behave. They do not come near, that cry from far. When Jesus sees them, he does not touch them, this time, he only sends them to

271 This case in Luke 2,22 does not need further theological explanation. It only shows that Mary was a good Jew and followed the prescribed rituals.

show themselves to priests. They are purified in their obedience, unlike the leper form chapter 5.

Purification in connection with leprosy is then mentioned yet twice. In the **Luke 7,22** it is listed as one of the signs showing that Jesus is Messiah in a *message to John the Baptist*, who has a moment of weakness in the prison “τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται, καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται”. All these are signs of the coming Messiah. All of them are in plural, which is interesting when compared yet with one last case of purification from leprosy in the Gospel **4,27**: “πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ Ἐλισαίου τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐκαθαρίσθη εἰ μὴ Ναϊμάν ὁ Σύρος.” Even during the time of Elisha there were many lepers, just one was purified. Jesus, on the other hand, brings purity to many.

In Matthew 15 and Mark 7 we have read about the discussion between Jesus and Pharisees regarding the ritual hand-washing²⁷². In Luke, the narrative is much more concise. The whole episode is told in just two verses in **Luke 11**. In the **v. 39**, Jesus, here called “Lord”, says: “εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν· Νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος **καθαρίζετε**, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας.” Whereas the two previous Synoptics had multi-layered discussion, here Luke left only the gist of the discourse. The change of the stream of contagiousness can be also found here, but it is not that important. What rather matters is merciful sharing and giving. *The ritual aspect is minimal here. The motif of the direction from inside out is immediately translated into giving.* Therefore the ritual is not so much internalized as it is rather

272 Sanders in “The Jews in Luke-Acts” (1987). makes good point in saying that the Pharisee inviting Jesus to his house is a good sign of friendliness. Jesus on the other hand is very insensitive towards the Jewish traditions throughout the chapter.

transformed into new practical and material action. Luke's Jesus then teaches that *if Christians give to the poor, everything shall be pure to them*, this principle appears as well in Paul's teaching that to the pure ones, everything is pure. *Other Synoptics speak only figuratively, Luke is specific and unique in the connection with the alms-giving.* It seems from the text, as if giving alms could now purify the inside of a person.

In the same episode, Jesus also speaks about another giving-issue: the Korban practice. The idea behind the Korban is to give alms to the temple out of solidarity. However, some people use these contributions to “earn” salvation and favor with God and at the same time, as we have seen also in the parallel Gospels, they are then able to rob their parents, who are needy. *Turning the temple tax into a pious excuse is like putting an unmarked grave in the street*, says Jesus in a woe: “οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐστὲ ὡς τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἀδηλα, καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ περιπατοῦντες ἐπάνω οὐκ οἴδασιν”. Graves, for their content, were ritually impure, they were “the father of impurities”, and it was therefore imperative to mark them with white color, so that nobody would get accidentally ritually defiled. Pharisees are like unmarked graves, says Jesus, people walk on them without knowing it and thus defile themselves. *Those who were supposed to be the markers of the purity, should be painted like the graves instead, for the warning of the impurity that is inside, contact with which would defile. Pharisees should scream “impure!”, but they are silent.*

There are three cases of purity in **the book of Acts**. Twice it describes a person, once it is in the form of verb, describing the change from the state of defiling impurity into that of acceptability for God, with which we shall start.

The most interesting and more crucial than usually acknowledged, is a little note in the middle of the account of apostolic council in **Acts 15**. In the **verses 8 and 9** the text describes how the Gentiles became Christians: “καὶ ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς δούς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν, καὶ οὐθὲν διέκρινεν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν, τῇ πίστει καθάρισας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν.” In the book of Acts and its description of the events of meeting between Peter and Cornelius in the chapter 10, it is obvious that the Holy Spirit is in charge of all the process of the first Gentile mission. *God sends first visions, then people and in the end also the Holy Spirit.* Peter does not even finish his first preaching to the Gentiles, when they show all the signs of “being filled with the Holy Spirit”. They speak in tongues. Peter's reaction to this is that he baptizes them. But do they need to be circumcised as well? Are they pure enough now to be called Christians? Do they need to participate in some purification ritual? In general, Gentiles are ritually impure, contact with them is defiling for Jews. In order to have their defiling force neutralized, they need to keep some basic rules. However, even so, Gentiles were never considered actually *pure*. In one inconspicuous sentence it is claimed that Gentiles *have* been purified in their hearts (therefore we are talking about the inner purity stressed by Jesus). And all they need to do to acquire such purity is to believe. *Faith is said to purify them effectively and therefore also they can now be acceptable members of the Christian family, the new people of God and it is important that nobody judges them anymore. No need for ritual washing or any other rituals is mentioned. Faith is enough.*

The two remaining cases of purity in the book of Acts are adjectives and they are *used in the sense of innocence*. The first one is used in the moment,

when Paul leaves Synagogue in Corinth, in order to preach to the Gentiles. He says: **Acts 18,6b** “...Τὸ αἶμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν· καθαρὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πορεύσομαι.” *Paul's reaction to the raging, blaspheming crowd is that of withdrawal. His conscience is pure, he did what he could and now he can turn to Gentiles without any regret. Two chapters later in 20,26 Paul is leaving Ephesian elders and also here, he says that he has clear conscience: “διότι μαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ ὅτι καθαρὸς εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος πάντων”.* He has done everything he could also here. He preached the Gospel and now that he is ready to go further, he is certain, that it was enough.

Summary: In both of the books we have observed great range of semantics of purity. On one hand there is still existent ritual purity in the case of Mary's ritual. But there are also purifications, one semi-ritual, semi-medicinal, as in the case of all the lepers, then the existential one, in the case of the Gentiles purified by faith. There is the same reversal of the flow of purity as we witnessed in both Mt and Mk, but in Luke also giving alms makes one pure. Pure can also be conscience in the same way we use the notion today.

3.3.2 Impurity

There are four cases of the collocation “πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον”. It is used in the same way as we have seen earlier in the case of other Gospels. The first impure spirit is mentioned in the story of the possessed man in Kapharnaum, which has been discussed. There is no new information that would help us understand impurity as such. The spirit is impure, it is a demon, it possess a man, cries out suddenly and loudly, thus revealing the true identity of Jesus. It does not want

to leave the man, it needs to be forced out and before it leaves it physically assaults its carrier. Interestingly, in Luke's version it is stressed that the possessed man ended unharmed. First, it is called “πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου” in the **v. 33** and then the rumors spread about Jesus, viz **v. 36**: “Τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν, καὶ ἐξέρχονται”

Luke also adds Jesus' preaching on the impure spirits, who wander in desert places and after some time they attempt to come back to the person they were driven away from, in much bigger company. **Lk 11,24** “Ὅταν τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διέρχεται δι' ἀνδρῶν τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν, καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκον λέγει· Ὑποστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον.”

The power of the early Church is shown when also the apostles have the ἐξουσία to drive away impure spirits, which is also the case of Philip in **Acts 8,7**: “πολλοὶ γὰρ τῶν ἐχόντων πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα βοῶντα φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξήρχοντο, πολλοὶ δὲ παραλελυμένοι καὶ χωλοὶ ἐθεραπεύθησαν.”

The three²⁷³ last cases of the impurity are connected with food and inner man. All have been already explained before. Just for completeness, in his vision of **Acts 10**, Peter responds (**v 14**) to God that nothing impure had ever touched his mouth “κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον οὐδέποτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ στόμα μου”. This experience Peter further processes into acknowledging that he is not allowed calling any person impure in the verse 28 “κάμοι ὁ θεὸς ἔδειξεν μηδένα κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν ἄνθρωπον”. No one is defiling, no one is dirty. No racial, national or ritual barriers are allowed in the access to God. God, who is merciful seeks and finds what was lost. This is the end of the ritual divisive wall and the

273 The third case appears in the chapter 11, where Peter repeats happenings here described.

eschatological promised inclusion of the whole world into the embrace of the Lord.

Summary: The language of impurity of Luke is the traditional one. It is a power opposing God, it is the other extreme to “holy”, as is the case of the impure spirits. It can be said of ritually inappropriate food, which Peter is ordered to eat. It is, however, forbidden to use this name of people, no person should be called impure.

3.4 Conclusion

The semantic field of holiness and purity does not shift much in the writings of Luke. The extremes remain “holy” and “impure”. The former is mostly used of the Holy Spirit. That which is “holy”, is of God's provenience: God's Spirit, Place, people, angels, Messiah. Holiness of people is usually derivative of allegiance with Christ and the Holy Spirit and a matter of the group. However, there are very few cases where the holiness is described by the not so common word ἅγιος, designating holy conduct. Nonetheless, in singular, this is only used for Jesus. The purity is both ritual and ethical. When speaking about the pre-Christian faith it is connected with the ritual, and, when applied to Christian life, it is usually connected with purification of the inner man either by faith or by alms-giving. The messianic age of Jesus is heralded by the massive outburst of the purified lepers. Also conscience can be pure. The semantic field tends to shift more towards the ethical, Luke is much less interested in the abandonment of the ritual law, in favor of focus on those who are lost, needy and poor. Therefrom also stems the prohibition of calling any person impure. The true

holiness then comes from the Holy Spirit making its new temple in the hearts of believers, who are flooded by its presence, leading to their powerful proclamation and change of life.

Chapter 4: Hebrews

4.1 Holiness

4.1.1 The Holy Spirit

The epistle does not possess developed pneumatology. There are only five cases of the collocation “πνεῦμα ἅγιον”. Twice it is used as an introductory formula to an Old Testament quotation, which considers the Holy Spirit to be the author or an inspirer of the old Scriptures. The two introductory formulas (3,7²⁷⁴ and 10, 15²⁷⁵), share some common points. In both of them, the Holy Spirit speaks through the Scripture²⁷⁶, and it speaks now²⁷⁷.

In the rest of the cases, the Holy Spirit is put in the role of a witness: In 2,4²⁷⁸, it is described as a „συνεπιμαρτυρ“, that is co-witness. He testifies that God, exalted in heavens, mighty and transcendent, has been disciplining his people justly, because without Jesus, people are not able to reach the salvation.

274 Lane, pg. 84: „The formula of introduction „as the Holy Spirit is saying“ is one found elsewhere in Jewish sources.“

275 Lane 2, pg. 268 “Holy Spirit bears witness is significant; it indicates that through the quotation of the prophetic oracle the Holy Spirit is speaking now. The Spirit brings the detail of the text from the past into the present and makes it contemporary with the experience of the readers.”

276 Attridge, pg. 114: „The text is then introduced as something said by „the Holy Spirit“, whom Hebrews occasionally identifies as the ultimate source of the Scriptures“ And then speaking about v 10,15: pg. 281: „that Christ's sacrifice provides perfection and sanctification is confirmed by Scripture, whose author, the „Holy Spirit“, speaking through Jeremiah, „bears witness - μαρτυρει.“

277 Lane, pg. 85: „The present tense of the verb λεγει is important; through the quotation of Scripture the Holy Spirit is speaking now.“

278 Attridge, pg. 67: The author claims that “*The reference to „Holy Spirit“ in this verse is hardly evidence of Trinitarian speculation.*” In fact, Holy Spirit is in this epistle not described so much as one of the persons of Trinity, it is rather instrumental inspiring Spirit. pg. 68: „*Hebrews will describe the „Holy Spirit“ as speaking through the Scriptures*“

Holy Spirit then testifies by powerful deeds that God is exalted, by distributing his gifts. The Holy Spirit is here rather a power or might. It is distributed by the Father and the recipients of it have become partakers of the Holy Spirit.

Those, however, who have been so blessed, who have been enlightened and tasted the powers of the coming age (6,4)²⁷⁹, are not allowed to be literally “renewed in their repentance”: “Αδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσασμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου καὶ μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου.” In my opinion, this text speaks about the impossibility of renewal of baptism, not about the failure and impossibility to be forgiven. It would be against the original Gospel to claim that there can be such a sin or state, which would be bigger than God's forgiveness in Jesus.

Since the epistle was written to a persecuted Church, the community is under constant pressure of giving up their faith, to deny Jesus. If such people would publicly deny being Christians, it is impossible to re-baptize them. In that very situation, it was also probably impossible to take them back in the community of Church. The epistle is warning people strictly to be brave, endure everything and never to give up. From the point of view of the group dynamics, in that Church, giving up was really costly.

Further, the epistle also speaks about the impossibility of re-crucifixion of Christ. He is of the heavenly realm of singularity as opposed to the earthly realm of plurality. So much stressed word “ἐφάπαξ” expresses that it is basically impossible to repeat the sacrifice of Jesus. There is only one such sacrifice and

279 Lane, pg. 141: “The Holy Spirit had not only formed the community but was bringing it to eschatological fulfillment.” Attridge, pg. 170 „The „heavenly gift“ is best understood as a general image for the gracious bestowal of salvation, with all that entails - the spirit, forgiveness, and sanctification.”

it is for all, and it is efficient.

In the verse 4, there is the following collocation: “μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου”, it says that people take part on the Holy Spirit²⁸⁰. Christians and Holy Spirit belong together, they are one family. The motif of the shared heritage, being μετοχοι, appears often in Paul, where he uses it to invite the Gentiles into the “holy family”. Here, the family is united by the Spirit, understood as something that can be received and possessed rather than a person of the Trinity. At the same time, the Spirit is here the giver and the source of the powers belonging to the heavenly realm, which is the true home of the believers.

In 9,8²⁸¹ the Holy Spirit is revealing through the Scriptures of the Old Testament that the way to heaven was not open yet, when the first law was still

280 The word occurs only in this epistle and then Gospel of Luke 5,7 and as a verb only in 1 Cor (more than 4x). In the epistle it appears more than 5times (1,9; 3,1; 2,14; 5,13; 6,4; 7,13). Except for 5,13, where it speaks about taking part on milk, i.e. drinking it, it is used to say that somebody belongs somewhere, that they literally have in common something. In all the cases the heavenly realm somehow opens for the normal humans who are allowed to take part on their heavenly heritage. Those who are of one family also share the heritage. It is already present but people will enter in that reality in the future. Nonetheless by being μετοχοι, they already are part of the family.

281 Lane 2, pg. 223. “The deeper significance of the disposition of the tabernacle into two parts ... has been disclosed by the Holy Spirit. The phrase “The Holy Spirit showing by this” ... constitutes a claim to special insight which was not previously available to the readers of the Old Testament but which has clarified the meaning and purpose of the cultic provisions for Israel in the light of the fulfillment in Christ. The Holy Spirit disclosed to the writer that, so long as the front compartment of the tabernacle enjoyed cultic status, access to the presence of God was not yet available to the congregation”

in power²⁸²: “τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν,” The true meaning of the old ritual is symbolic, nothing more and nothing less, pointing beyond itself. The Holy Spirit is then the ultimate exegete of this symbolism²⁸³. By pointing at the loophole in the old system, by even creating it, he sent a subtle symbolic message: that the Levitical sacrificial system is not the end in itself.

Summary: In the epistle Holy Spirit is not primarily understood as a person of the Trinity, yet still it has personal overtones; it is rather a revelatory and exegetical Spirit on whom the Christians can take part, the Spirit who makes old truths alive for them.

4.1.2 Christians as “ἅγιοι”

The noun “ἅγιοι” appears three times in the epistle and always Christians are meant. This is very small number of cases, but they all betray certain familiarity with the expression and its synonymous use to “brethren” or “Christians”.

282 Attridge, *Hermeneia* pg. 240 „The arrangements of the old cult signify ultimately its own inadequacy... It is significant that the previous reference to the Holy Spirit as the source of scripture 3,7 appeared in connection with a text that was similarly exploited for its meaning for „today“...What the spirit reveals is the lack of access to the true presence of God. Under the old covenant there has not been a decisive revelation of the means of approach to God, the „way into the sanctuary“..What is revealed and opened by Christ is the way into the true, heavenly sanctuary, the path to glory..The point then is that as long as the cultic system connected with the outer portion of the earthly tabernacle „has standing,“ the way to both the earthly and heavenly hagia is blocked“

283 However, this revelation was quite a cryptic one. Similarly Jesus in the Gospels says that he speaks so that they would not understand. This is also not so far from the way the Barnabas' epistle argues, that the old covenant was never to be meant literally. Here the author says that the function of the law was to show that this is not *the* way.

The first case in **3,1** “ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι” is self-explanatory²⁸⁴: “Ὁθεν, ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι, κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν,” The subject of the sentence, the “brethren”, is defined by two (rhyming!²⁸⁵) attributes. They are holy and they are partakers of the heavenly calling. Their holiness and belonging to the heavenly realm are due to the work of Jesus, who is their apostle and High priest. Note also the unusual epithets for Jesus: he is apostle, the one sent from the Father and he is the founder. The high priest Jesus is then the true and ultimate mediator bringing people from the realm of unclean to the realm of holiness. He is the sanctifier. Holiness of the people then logically does not stem from the people's ability to sanctify themselves, but on the quality of the priest and priesthood. Christians are therefore ἅγιοι by definition²⁸⁶ independent of their own works, based only on the sanctification achieved by their high priest²⁸⁷. They are partakers of heavenly calling²⁸⁸.

The second case in the v. **6,10** is sometimes translated “brethren”: “οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης ἧς ἐνεδείξασθε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες.” “The holy ones” here are Christians in general, not just some special elite group of the “saints”²⁸⁹. God is not ἄδικος, he will not forget what believers had done for his Name, serving τοῖς

284 Remember also the equivalent of Paul's use of saints for Christians

285 Ἅγιοι ... μέτοχοι, consider also the rhythm.

286 WBC, Lane, pg74: „The brothers are holy because they have been consecrated to the service of God by Jesus in his priestly role as the consecrator of the people of God.“

287 Attridge, Hermeneia pg. 106: „The addressees are called..adelphoi, as they were by Christ in the preceding pericope and will be later by the author. They are, moreover, „holy“, ἅγιοι, made such by the Christ „the sanctifier“.“

288 For the partakers see above in 6,4. Again the // with Paul's introductory letter formula: κλητοὶς ἁγίοις.

289 Parallel with Mt's 25, 40 service to the “little ones” yet “holy ones” will not be forgotten, in this is revealed God's justice.

ἁγίοις²⁹⁰. The simple acts of love and mercy towards individuals and to the new people of God will not go unrewarded.

This is in accord with the last occurrence of the ἅγιοι in **13,24**, where “the holy ones in the Church” are mentioned beside all the leaders²⁹¹. We can assume that if there was such a group in the Church, they would have somehow been included in its leadership and it is also very unlikely that the author would greet only some part of the mentioned Church, he was speaking to the whole community²⁹².

Summary: In line with the rest of the New Testament writings, the Christians are called “saints”. The author himself does not stop only at the sanctification, he even speaks about their perfection. Christians are not only the “holy ones” but also the “perfect ones”. The answer to “How have they become holy?” can be found in 10,10 and 14 which shall be discussed in greater detail further. For now, let us just observe how both verses connect holiness and perfection. V 10 says that the sanctification comes from the will of God and that it was enabled by Jesus' sacrifice of his body. This one sacrifice, says v 14, has brought to perfection those who are in the process of being sanctified. It is clearly defined here, that the Christians may be called “holy ones” or “sanctified” only on the

290 NIV : „as you have helped his people “, also Czech Ecumenical Translation uses “brethren”

291 Attridge, pg. 409: „Such a distinction cannot be made here and the designation of the recipients of the greetings, the „leaders“ and „all the saints“, is simply a comprehensive way of referring to the whole community“

292 Lane, pg. 570: “The members of the community are also to extend the writer's greetings to “all the saints”. The repetition of the word “all” reflects the situation of the house Church...It was of vital importance that the greetings of the writer be conveyed to all the saints. (Filson, Yesterday, 76). The purpose of the directive in v 24a appears to have been to reinforce a sense of unity with the larger group of Christians in that locale, at a time when the members of the house Church would have preferred to isolate themselves from the other groups in the city”

basis of the work of Christ, not on the basis of their goodwill or good works or their perfect asceticism. Christians are holy, because Christ has sanctified them. Also the grammatical aspect points in this direction, the author and his readers are in passive voice, whereas God and the Son are in the active voice in these two places.

4.1.3 Sanctify as a Verb

Let us now proceed to explanation of the expression describing the process in which something or someone becomes holy, i.e. the sanctification. It is the transition from the realm of unclean and defiled to that of purity and holiness. In the text of the epistle, the agent of such a transition includes the whole Trinity in all the three persons. The movement of sanctification departs from the Father (sender) of the Son through the Holy Spirit and this movement replaces the old sacrifices.

The subject of the verb “ἀγιάζειν” is, in majority of the cases, Jesus. He sanctifies through the sacrifice he brings, which is similar to that of red heifer (Num 16²⁹³). God is the agent of sanctification in all of the cases. Before sending Jesus, He had enabled people to achieve purification and sanctification by giving the possibility of bringing sacrifice, which is the means of drawing near to God, established by himself. Bringing a sacrifice is only required of the people as thankful response to the act of God in providing the means of reconciliation, it is not an act to earn God's favor. Either earthly or heavenly, a sacrifice is a means by which God invites his people to meet him. Only God is

293 The same metaphor is used also in the epistle of Barnabas.

said to be holy *per se*, but people can be sanctified by him, by being in relationship or nearness to him. It is thus his provision of purification in preparation for such meeting. The original Old Testament rituals transferred people from the realm of general purity to that of sanctity, the realm of God's dwelling. One had to be ritually pure in order to take part on earthly old cult. Text of the epistle actually imputes to the first law certain degree of efficiency²⁹⁴ by claiming that the ashes of the red heifer *can* effect sanctification (9,13).

According to the author of the epistle, there are two types of cult: Moses' earthly priesthood²⁹⁵ and the original heavenly priesthood, described in Heb 7 as the priesthood according to the order of Melchizedek (of which the Moses' priesthood with its temple services is only a copy). A body of *θυσία* has to be brought for sanctification according to both laws. The realms of holiness and impurity are so distant that blood needs to be shed, in order to enable the transition between them in whatever plane of existence. In the Old Testament times, the ashes of the red heifer, mixed with water, were used for purification rituals, also the blood was used for sprinkling. In the heavenly priesthood the priest sacrifices himself. Jesus' death is thus the means of transition from the unholy to the realm of holy in the same way a sacrificial animal had to suffer and lay down its own life.

Jesus is “ἀρχηγός”, the one who leads the way, i.e. the one who sacrifices his flesh to bridge the gap between the realms of unclean and holy, granting the access to those who do not deserve it. Jesus' death is interpreted in sacrificial

294 Which is not the case in the epistle of Barnabas, where the author says that there was no hope in it and that it was not supposed to be even followed literally (speaking obviously about the ritual law).

295 Itself such a designation is pejorative. For Israelites, it was, of course the heavenly law. To call it “earthly” would be considered as a blasphemy by them.

terms by the paradigm of temple cult. Since blood of bulls and goats is not enough, the need to repeat sacrifices pointed to the inability of the cult to deal with impurity once for all. Repetitiveness was symbolical, it was supposed to be the lead towards the future priesthood that would deal with the subject definitively. In the epistle of Hebrews, death of Jesus is interpreted ritually, Jesus is understood as the perfect priest who sacrificed himself (thus entering the heavenly sanctuary) and whose blood effectively cleans not only body but is able to cleanse also the inner man, their *συνειδησις*. We shall first go through the specific occurrences of sanctification in the epistle and then we will draw some more general conclusions.

The first case of sanctification in the epistle can be found in **2,11**: “ὁ τε γὰρ ἀγιάζων²⁹⁶ καὶ οἱ ἀγιαζόμενοι ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες· δι’ ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται ἀδελφούς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν”. It says that the sanctification is a family matter. The recipient of the sacrifice and the giver are of the same family²⁹⁷. Becoming the family member, which itself produces sanctity, happens by the call of God and work of his Son. Father provides sanctification for his family via his eldest Son. There is clear flow of holiness from the giver (older brother) who provides for their deficient partner²⁹⁸. Jesus first needed to be perfected, in order that the

296 Lane, pg. 58 says that “ὁ ἀγιάζων” „seems to reflect the concept of God in the Pentateuch, where he identifies himself with the formula „I am the Lord who consecrates you, Exod 31,13, Lv 20,8 etc“. Lane goes on saying that here the agens is Jesus. And later that „Cleansing from defilement is the necessary corollary to the concept of sanctification as consecration, and in Hebrews references to the sanctification are regularly coupled to a statement about the offering of the blood of Jesus. “

297 Moffatt, pg. 32 „Christ's common tie with mankind goes back to the pre-incarnate period...till 9,13 where we see that to be „sanctified“ is to be brought into the presence of God through the self-sacrifice of Christ...// Nu 16,5“

298 Lane, pg. 58 also points out the „radical difference between the transcendent Son of God and those who are „sons“.“ Yes, they are one family, nonetheless there is difference between them.

sacrifice, by which he introduces Christians to the family, be perfect²⁹⁹. For that reason is Christ not ashamed to call Christians his brothers, because they are one and because in his self-sacrifice he makes them ready for the encounter with their common Father.

9,13: “εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα τράγων καὶ ταύρων καὶ σποδὸς δαμάλεως ῥαντίζουσα τοὺς κεκοινωνημένους ἀγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα,” This verse seems to be presented as a universally acknowledged rule, it is a given axiom in the mathematics of holiness. There are three expressions of the semantic field put in an explanatory positions. The original standing is “defiled”, the final outcome is “purity of flesh” the process is called not “purification” but directly “sanctification” here. The means of this process is a blood of a sacrificial animal sprinkled on the recipient of such process. The premise is that the blood of sacrificial animals actually *does* provide *sanctification* for those who are being sprinkled with it. Also the ashes of red heifer. These purificatory means *do* have the power. The author of this epistle does not deprive the ritual law of its plausibility³⁰⁰. The purificatory means are applied to „κεκοινωνημένους“, in order to factually reverse their state and to trans-locate them into the state of holiness, that is acceptability to God and separateness for Him. These ritual means *do* have the purificatory effect on *σὰρξ*, making it ritually pure, and therefore acceptable to God. Purification of body, according to this verse, leads to sanctification. The blood of sacrifice suffices not only for the ritual

299 Attridge, pg. 88: „...the remark that „sanctifier and sanctified“ are from single source. The cultic language of sanctification gives hint of the High-priestly status that results from Christ's „perfection“ 2,17...true sanctification involves primarily the cleansing of conscience from sin, foreshadowed in the words of exordium“ Attridge, Hermeneia ad 2,10n 2,10: pg. 83: „In bringing about salvation, God fittingly perfects through the suffering the agent of redemption...As the perfected High Priest, Christ offers a sacrifice in a way that the institutions of the old covenant could not do“

300 Unlike the author of the epistle of Barnabas.

purification, it is also able to move the object to an actual state of holiness³⁰¹.

The following verse draws conclusion: how much more can the blood of Jesus achieve? It is not just blood of a man, it is the blood of the Son of God incarnated, blood of Christ. The first sacrifice of the animals regards the bodily realm, the perfect sacrifice regards the realm of the spirit.

In 10,10³⁰² the carnality of the sacrifice is stressed again: „ἐν ᾧ θελήματι ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμὲν διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ.“ Jesus', originally political, death is interpreted sacrificially and brought to the parallel with death of the sacrificial animals. This verse comes at the end of an exposition on insufficiency of the sacrificial system³⁰³. The recurrent idea, also mentioned above, is that the old system of sacrifices was insufficient for its plurality and repetitiveness. Leaning upon the text of Psalm 40, 7 – 9, the author stresses that in the mind of God it was not the suffering and blood of animals that he was interested in, it was rather obedience³⁰⁴. It is impossible to do away with the sins by the blood of animals according to the verse 10,4. But in 9,13, the sanctification is achieved by sprinkling with animals' blood.

301 Gräber, pg. 156: „Chattah Nim 19,9. Diese Kennzeichnung läßt darauf schließen, daß Sünde und Unreinheit so eng beiander gesehen wurden, „daß sie durch den gleichen Lustrationsakt gesühnt werden können“. Gräber pg. 157: „Der alttestamentliche Kult erreicht lediglich die *κεκοιμενοι* v 13, die levitisch Unreinen, die Verunreinigten im kultischen Sinn; er „macht sie heilig zur Reinheit des Fleisches“ ... „*ἀγιάζειν* wird gebraucht, weil *ἅγιος* in kultischen Zusammenhängen der Kontrastbegriff zu *κοινός* Unrein ist und weil das Verb hier wie 2,11 und 10,14 Vorhergehendes *τελειουν* aufnimmt 9,9. „Heiligen“ heißt demnach „kultischen Charakter verleihen“, weihen, zielt also auf die Wiederherstellung der Kultfähigkeit, die der Hebr. relativierend als *καθαροτης της σαρκος* bezeichnet. Dem *ἀγιασμός* in den kultischen Ritualen des alten Bundes eignet demnach tatsächlich keine sündentilgende Kraft; sie erwirken, weil mit kosmischen Mitteln und Möglichkeiten unternommen, nur die sarkische Reinigung, nicht die grundlegende *λυτρωσις* im *καθαρισμος των αμαρτιων*, die Christus vorbehalten blieb“

302 Attridge, pg. 277 „Christ's offering is not purely an interior affair..his sacrifice involves his „body“ (*σῶμα*)“

303 The author explains the Psalm 40, 7 - 9

304 Lane, pg.265: “The old sacrifices were deficient because they did not entail the genuine consecration of the one who offered them.”

Summary: The sanctification in view differs in each of the cases. In chapter 9 it is not ethical but ritual. However, it is dubious whether the author really intended to divide these so strictly. The point of the sacrifices was (10,10) not to restore the original balance after breaking the law, but to prevent transgressions altogether before they would even happen. They were supposed to encourage people to keep the law, not to break it.

The question is: “What is the will of God?” It is sanctification³⁰⁵ of “us”³⁰⁶, the recipients. How does it happen? The will of God is carried out upon Jesus' body³⁰⁷. It is not a purely spiritual sacrifice, it concerns Jesus' carnality, as if he were a sacrificial animal. God had prepared a σῶμα (v.5) for Jesus³⁰⁸, in order to be able to bring the last ultimate and perfect offering³⁰⁹. Thus, saturating the means, he abolishes (v.9) the whole system. As if the whole system in the history had been waiting for the ultimate moment of the perfect sacrifice. Incarnation is explained through this lens. The only reason why the Son put on the human flesh was, that he would also be able to dispose of it in a sacrificial manner. Thus he achieves sanctification for his people, transferring them from

305 Lane, pg. 266: “The verb ἀγιάζειν denotes a definitive consecration expressed in heart-obedience toward God. The periphrastic participle ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμεν, we have been consecrated, anticipates the description of the new people of God in v 14 as τοὺς ἁγιασμενοὺς, those who are being consecrated. Cf 2,11”.

306 Lane, pg. 265: “The shift from the use of the third person singular in v 9b to the first person plural (“we have been consecrated”) lends the formulation of v 10 a confessional quality...the writer defines the means and the ultimate source of consecration.”

307 Lane, pg. 265 “The immediate ground of consecration is the totally new offering of the body of Jesus Christ as the inaugural act of the new covenant. The ultimate source is the will of God”

308 If we were strictly following the new context, that is the context of the writer of Hb, we must claim that if God does not wish προσφορά, than why should Jesus' own προσφορά be viewed as doing God's will? The answer is directly in the verse 5: “σῶμα ΔΕ”, “but a body you have prepared for me”.

309 In 10, 9 he abolishes the first to stabilize the second. Does he abolish the ritual laws? Does Jesus abolish the ritual laws by their saturation?

the realm of defilement into that of purity, sanctity and vicinity to God. The sanctification happens here only through Jesus. There is no room to explain sanctification as a personal achievement by ascetic means of individuals. The sanctification³¹⁰ is given to the whole group for free independent of their personal achievements in spirituality or in fulfillment of the laws.

That just one sacrifice suffices, is repeated again in v 10,14: “*μῖα γὰρ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἀγιαζομένους.*” This one sacrifice “*προσφορᾷ*” was efficient not only as to sanctification but it was also able to achieve perfection. In the earthly cult, perfection was required of the people who approached God in the temple bringing sacrifice. It was the requirement already expected of the coming participants, who had to get ready by a ritual purification. The animal sacrifice was supposed to be as perfect, as well as the ritual status of temple visitors. It was deepened by the sacrifice in sanctification as the response; that which is laid on the altar is sanctified by it. However, the sanctification and perfection achieved by such sacrifice very soon wears off. But in 10,14 we read about a sacrifice which is³¹¹ so efficient that the perfection is its lasting³¹² outcome, valid for the whole community of the

310 Attridge, pg. 276: „This motif is but another way of referring to the perfection and the cleansing of conscience that the sacrifice effected. Cleansing, the imagery of the Yom Kippur and purification rituals, had been described in terms of Christ's blood, and „sanctification“ will later (10,29) be associated with the same „blood“. That the „sanctification“ now takes place by the divine will embodied by Christ finally clarifies part of the symbolic significance of „blood“.

311 Attridge, pg. 281 „present tense...the appropriation of the enduring effects of Christ's act is an ongoing present reality“ for the following verses he says: „that Christ's sacrifice provides perpetual perfection and sanctification is confirmed by by scripture, whose author, the „Holy Spirit“, speaking through Jeremiah, „bears witness“.

312 Lane, pg. 268: “*If the pres. Ptc. thous hagianous is a timeless designation of the community of faith, it describes the result of Christ's sacrifice, which confers on his people definitive consecration, qualifying them for fellowship with God. Correspondingly, Christ is the consecrator, ο ἀγιάζων 2,11 par excellence by virtue of his atoning death*”.

recipients. It has reached its potential forever³¹³.

A new discourse starts in 10,21. With great gift, in receiving such a high priest who sacrifices himself for all, redeeming them forever, comes also great responsibility. Readers should *come* in front of God through the work of this priest, and they should *hold on* to the hope he brings. They should also *take care* of one another by encouraging good works and by warning each other not to go astray. The exhortation moves then towards more negative note starting from the verse 25. The exhortations are motivated by the approaching of the day of His return. The speech is addressed to Christians who had experienced the truth. If they continue to sin willingly, there is no more sin offering they might rely on, there is only hell for such people, says the context opening verse.

10, 29: “πόσω δοκεῖτε χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγισάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας;” In the same way there was no mercy for those who were sinning against the Law, the deliberate “trampling the son of God underfoot” in disregarding Jesus' sacrifice will be treated even more severely. In this verse, it is again stressed that the new sanctifying medium is, in fact, the blood of Jesus. It is blood of the new covenant. If it were disregarded by unbelief, not considered holy but κοινὸν, defiling³¹⁴, then there is no hope for such a person.

313 Fitting example might be taken from the world of the computer games, in which when an avatar is able to finish a given task, it is allowed to the further, higher plane of the game. In this analogy Jesus would be the avatar who reaches his game potential and allows access to the heavenly sanctuary to the men who belong to him.

314 Lane, pg. 294: “the apostate “has treated the blood of the covenant, by which he was consecrated (to the service of God) as defiled”...the words “the blood of the covenant” are taken from Ex 24,8 LXX cited on 9,20. Here they clearly refer to Christ's sacrificial death on the cross viewed from the perspective of covenant inauguration.” ...“The blood of Christ seals and activates the new, eternal covenant, cf 13,20. The phrase ἐν ᾧ

The author is playing here with the ambivalent notion of blood. On one hand it is the purifying agent in the sacrifices, but on the other hand the human blood is the source of defilement. Human blood is ritually impure according to the Mosaic law and contact with it is potentially defiling; blood of an executed human, who has died in this way, would be the “father of impurities”. Only those, who can read the symbolical meaning of Jesus' death as a sacrifice and who understand Jesus' body as the parallel to the body of a sacrificial animal, can also consider the blood as not only not “κοινόν” but also sanctifying. It is very new, uncommon and at the same time horrifying argumentation for the original readers, unless they be introduced into the mystery of interpretation of the Jesus' death. To the outsiders this blood is abomination and it defiles, to those who believe in Jesus as their Savior and the High priest of the heavenly order who sacrificed himself, it is the source of sanctification and perfection. Sprinkling by the blood of the covenant then happens also metaphorically for the recipients of baptism, which is the new ritual of entering the community of the people of God, the new ritual of entering the covenant, the new circumcision.

Considering that the author is writing to the community that is already aware of the sanctifying properties of the blood of Jesus, and looking several verses back, it is obvious that the author is warning the Christians from falling away from this mercy. In the context of persecuted Church, this may take on yet another significant meaning. The author is warning readers that they would not come back into denying the sanctity of the blood. Especially in front of their possible Roman interrogators, for whom to worship blood of a convicted

ἁγίαση – by means of which he consecrated resumes 10,10.14 where the subjective blessing secured by Christ's sufficient sacrifice is defined as consecration to *God*”

criminal is defiling. The persecuted Christians should not give up, they should not give in denying Jesus, denying their faith. They should withstand whatever is ahead of them and not succumb into declaring that Moses law is “atheistic” and they should not blaspheme Jesus, and deny the sanctity³¹⁵ of his sacrifice, the sanctity of his holy blood. Because if they did, what sacrifice, *θυσία*, would then be left for them? (v 26). Would a *θυσία* to the emperor really save them?

After these warnings, the chapter 10 is closed with an exhortation to look to the heavenly sphere which bears different logic than the earthly one and to be brave. Audience is encouraged not to give in to the seemingly clear things and not to give up on faith in face of persecution. Everything has already been done by Jesus, the way to salvation is just to see the reality of the parallel dimension where the original sanctuary is. The sanctification or perfection is not the outcome of good deeds, it is the outcome of the heavenly temple service, the sacrifice has been brought. And therefore those who live from it are encouraged to be brave and to do good works as the sacrifice of praise. Most of all, not to deny it. The sanctification and perfection in the epistle to Hebrews is therefore a gift of Jesus who made the way for all the others who want to embrace it.

Jesus is the source of sanctification also in the (13,12): “διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα ἀγιάσῃ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν λαόν, ἔξω τῆς πύλης ἔπαθεν.” The author develops two parallel notions of the earthly and heavenly sanctuary. Only once a year a high priest was allowed to enter into the earthly Holy of Holies, otherwise the inner sanctuary was closed, and that day of his entrance was the Day of Atonement, Yom Kippur. The High Priest had to be himself purified, and thus

315 Attridge, pg. 294: „The apostate's mistake is to treat this blood as unclean or „profane“ (koinon). He or she does so by not recognizing its sacral quality, referred to in its following description as that „by which (the Christian) was sanctified“

he was covered in blood of the sacrificial animals. It is the earthly sacred sacrificial blood. But only the blood is the sanctifying and purifying agent. The body is burned outside the camp “ἐξω τῆς πύλης”.

In the heavenly realm, as described in the epistle, the liturgy is analogical³¹⁶. Jesus also enters the heavenly sanctuary, to the true and *original* Holy of Holies, in front of the face of God, “covered” with his own sacrificial blood. But the body, after having been drained of all the blood, with its life-force and soul, is “burned” outside the camp. Jesus' suffering and sacrificing happened behind the city, in the place of wilderness, chaos and uncleanness. His body (Heb 10,5) is destroyed there where the Azazel was sent.

It is not clear at the first sight that Jesus' blood is purifying and sanctifying agent, enabling access to the living God, not something that defiles. It is also not clear to all, it is not obvious that the man who was suffering outside city gate, outside the realm of holiness, was perfecting the means of sanctification for everyone (consider the concentric spectrum of the holiness emanating from the Holy of Holies through temple to of Jerusalem). Readers are therefore encouraged not to be ashamed of the seemingly dishonoring picture, but instead to bravely embrace the true meaning of the happenings as explained by the author. The reason for Jesus suffering was sanctification of his people.

Summary: To sum up our findings about the process of sanctification in the epistle of Hebrews we conclude that it is achieved by what seems the upgraded,

316 Attridge, pg. 398 „The affirmation that Christians have an „altar“ has been restated as an affirmation about Christ's sacrificial death. That, above all, is what Christians „have“. The typological argument that has led to this point has suggested numerous inferences that could be drawn from the character of Christ's death and that could be relevant to the problem of strange teachings and foods, but Hebrews avoids any further polemical argument and moves instead to paraenesis“.

but is rather the original sacrifice. In the same way the earthly Moses' cult achieved sanctification by sprinkling of blood of the sacrificed animals, the heavenly cult achieved by one perfect sacrifice sanctification of those who are sprinkled. Red heifer's ashes and blood of goats and bulls sanctify *τους κεκοιμενους* by sprinkling. The blood of the man Jesus is interpreted as the blood of Christ, Messiah, the priest who sacrifices his own body prepared for him by his heavenly Father. God through Jesus, or Jesus himself, sanctifies Christians. Their only way to sanctification is through accepting the offering of his body. In order to bring this sanctification to people, Jesus had to suffer like a sacrificial animal. The earthly sacrifices of animals had to be repeated, since humans, after having been sanctified, sinned again. However, the heavenly sacrifice perfects those who accept it. It does not mean that they would not sin anymore, it means that the sacrifice purifies their conscience, cleaning their inner man, it is able to purify people despite their sinfulness. Those who are sanctified are also perfected by this one sacrifice. Christians are sanctified, not defiled, in the blood. The only way one can lose their sanctification, but then forever, is the same thing that is described in other writing of the New Testament as "sin against the Holy Spirit". It is the ultimate blasphemy, if someone, after having seen the truth, later labels the sanctifying blood as "defiling". One who calls "white" the "black". One who is willing to desecrate their own consciousness in claiming that Jesus is servant of devil and defilement. Given the context of our epistle, I believe the author is warning Christians in yet another way not to give in to the temptation to deny Christ in face of persecution.

Verse 10,19 must be mentioned here, despite the fact that it does not contain any word of holiness group. It summarizes well the achievement of

sanctification by Christ's sacrificial blood: "We have therefore free access to the sanctuary".

4.1.4 Holiness as a Noun

Holiness as such is not much described in Hebrews, there is no clear definition of it. There are two cases of the noun holiness (*ἀγιότης, ἁγιασμός*), both appear in the chapter 12, verses 10 and 14. The chapter starts with reminding readers of the bravery of the witnesses of faith and also Jesus, of what he had to endure. The author encourages the audience not to be afraid of suffering inflicted by the unbelieving opposition and rather to consider it heavenly Father's discipline. Life's hardships should not be viewed as hopeless but rather as a challenge, where one can be approved and learn to be perfected through the suffering. Holiness is then required from believers if they want to see God. What is it without which one cannot see God?

The question itself involves the answer. If one considers Jesus as a man who was killed under the Roman Empire, they probably will not share in his "holiness", in his being special, different, set apart for God. On the other hand those, who are his, who are separated by him and for him, for whom he is heavenly High Priest pointing the way to holiness, they already are walking in it. How one can receive such holiness has been already suggested above, it is not by personal achievement, but by the sprinkling of the holy blood of covenant.

However, it does not mean that Christians would have easy lives, that their sanctification would rip them away from this world (in separation for God) or

that the sanctification would bring the heaven on earth for them and save them from the troubles as if the eschaton has arrived, no. They have a long way to go and while tested here in this world through manifold sufferings in their perfect perseverance they inherit the sanctification, of which the ultimate goal is to see God (12,10): “οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς ἐπαιδεύουν, ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἀγιότητος αὐτοῦ.” The author opens this section by quoting Proverbs 3, where the Wisdom invites people to follow her. The chapter starts developing, again, a universe divided into two worlds of existence. On one plane, it speaks about the earthly fathers, who discipline their children. To this earthly imprint, there is heavenly original, Father of the spirits, that is the Heavenly Father. Also he does discipline his children. Such discipline is good for a person later in their adulthood. It is also good in the spiritual sense, and thus the author encourages his readers to be brave in their struggles, because they will be rewarded by holiness. An undisciplined child grows into a rude person, in the same way a person needs to be disciplined by God. Sometimes the discipline may seem too harsh, however, the author says, that the readers still have not been tested so far as to lay down their life³¹⁷. Jesus, on the other hand, was tested till death and was faithful until the end. He did spill his blood and by what he suffered he has been perfected. Christians should follow his example.

Without such perfection and holiness nobody can see the God according to the 12,14: “Εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων καὶ τὸν ἀγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον”. Holiness is here again being set apart for God to his special use. Being perfected in it, means do not serve anybody else, not to serve the Roman

317 Obviously. If they had, they would not have been present to hear the preaching.

Empire and to be brave in face of required enforcement to compromise this unique loyalty. Yes, Christians are sanctified by Jesus' blood, but they also need to set themselves apart for him. In this verse, unlike all the other cases, the stress *is* on the human achievement. What is required, though, is not ascetic fulfillment of the law in personal moral life. It is rather acting upon the knowledge whom the person belongs, whose they are. The readers are encouraged to actively pursue holiness, they are to keep themselves separated for the special use of God.

Christian life then should consist of the following tasks: In the first place it is not to *fall away from the mercy*, it is the key to the following ones. God is jealous and he does not want to share what is his with anyone, not even Roman emperors. Suffering, probably connected to being Christian, is understood as God's discipline. The audience need to remind themselves that such suffering is good for them and they need to rely on the mercy of God in order not to *let any bitter root grow* in their heart, which is the second task. The third requirement is canonical for any list of vices, the readers are supposed to avoid whatever *porneia*. The word can be either understood sexually or in line with the Old Testament, where it is used for unification with idols. Israel was the special people of God and they were forbidden to defile themselves in “prostituting themselves” with idols. In this specific case in Hebrews, I understand the text in the same lines. The author warns his readers not to prostitute themselves in the same way as Esau, who sold himself, his right of firstborn, for a bowl of lentils. In the last place of the list is then *deseccration*. All four warnings have the same goal, not to fall away from the mercy but to persevere in the faith. All four have in common one thing: not to give up on the great gift. Again, the context of persecuted Church gives us good perspective to these exhortations.

Summary: The requirement of holiness on the part of believers is following: God is holy, his holiness is dangerous in its glory and power. People are not able to watch God's face nor glory without being threatened on life. This holiness is a matter of gift in the first place³¹⁸. Those who accept Jesus as their high priest of the higher plane of existence (according to the order of Melchizedek), who perceive how he was perfected in suffering, can also view their own sufferings as discipline, or rather preparation for the encounter with holy God face to face³¹⁹. Sufferings threaten with bitterness. Believers, therefore, should not give in to it, but rely on the mercy of God. They should rely on the fact they will not be sanctified nor perfected by their own good works, but only by handling the lessons God sends them. By perseverance in faith in face of persecution, thus perfected, believers will not be destroyed upon the heavenly encounter, in the heavenly Holy of Holies, for which they are now being trained, perfected by their suffering.

4.2 Purity

There are six cases of purity in the epistle, four of which are verbs “to purify”, to transform from defilement into purity, a state acceptable for God.

318 Attridge, pg. 363, : „God does not act on the basis of an arbitrary subjective judgment, but with a view to what is objectively „beneficial“. That beneficial result is now specified. It consists in „obtaining a share“(metalabein) in God's gift...here the object of the Son's sharing is more valuable, the „sanctity“ (hagiotetos) of God“ !!!“

319 Attridge, pg. 367: “While one strand of the Old Testament thought held God to be invisible, many texts referred to the vision of God in various circumstances such as the cult, in God's eschatological manifestation, or upon death. Among Jews operating with the categories of Hellenistic mysticism, the intellectual vision of God becomes the ultimate good of religious life. Expectations of an ultimate vision of God were also current in early Christianity and appear in the beatitudes (Mat 5,9), in Paul's hope to see God „face to face“ after death (1 Cor 13,12) and in various eschatological tabelaux.“

Mostly, they are connected with the Old Testament concept of the ritual purity. All the occurrences have some link to either blood or sacrificial sprinkling or sacrifice proper, that is also the reason why, in the end of the chapter, we shall make such a long excurs on the ritual language.

The epistle works with two planes of existence. First, it is the human earthly existence, where we speak about ritually „clean“ person in flesh. The second one is concerned with the purity of one's conscience. Blood stays as the purification agent in both, however, the blood of animals is only good for the ritual purification of a body. The blood of Christ, on the other hand, is able to clean one's inner man. What does it clean them from, what is the impurity? The defilement was caused by “dead works”, which is the antonym to the “service of the living God”.

Majority of the cases have already been thoroughly discussed in the previous section, we shall therefore not go into great lengths to exegete them. Let us first have a look at the first verse: **9,14** “*πόσω μᾶλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ, καθαρῶς τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι.*” The author starts from the Old Testament ceremonial concept of purity. According to the laws of priesthood, the means of ceremonial washing was either blood or water enriched of the ashes of the red heifer. Just symbolic sprinkling (no need of bath), was enough to literally sanctify, i.e. to bring people from one realm to another, to that of uncleanness to that of holiness and adequacy to approach the living God.

The next case is in **9,22**: “*καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις*”. Blood is the purifying element. Christ does not sacrifice animals, but he sheds his own blood. The blood is the key, how much more worthy is the blood of Son of God than the blood of animals.

The more precious the more effective. There is no purification without bloodshed. And the following verse (9,23) then continues in the explanation saying: “*Ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι, αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια κρείττοσιν θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας.*” If we are in the realm of earth and bodily impurities, just an animal blood is efficient purifying agent. But as long as we move to the realm of the heavenly sphere, nearer to God, stricter measures need to be taken and higher goals need to be met. In fact, they are so high that their reaching is humanly impossible, they need to be more than perfectly met. The Old Testament does not make difference between the ritual and ethical notion of purity. It was the message of prophets to prevent such a divorce which caused moral laxity and further defilement. Therefore the author of the epistle can say that forgiveness of sins is linked to the bloodshed, because sin defiles person also ritually³²⁰. A man can only be transferred from the realm of defiled into that of presence of God by sacrificial blood; it is an issue of life and death. And the only blood able to purify all at once, is the blood of Christ.

The sacrifices of the old system were only able to deal with the physical part of the defilement, they were not able to clean conscience, the inner man. Verse 10,2 says: “*ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ἔτι συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας ἅπαξ κεκαθαρισμένους;*” The purity starts with the ritual and finishes with ethical notion. It starts with the purification of flesh, finishes with servants of God with having clean conscience (consider the perfect tense).

And then, at the end of the chapter, the verb “purify” appears again in the

320 The text does not say: “apart from the “good works” or “proper behavior”, there is no forgiveness”. It says that without “bloodshed” there is no forgiveness. In order to procure the desired purity somebody has to die. Without holiness no one can see God, but it can not be reached by ethical perfection. The “purification of conscience” is not about how far can each person purify themselves in their deeds or heart, it is about accepting and owning the metaphorically understood sacrificial bloodshed.

verse **22**: “προσερχώμεθα μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως ῥεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς καὶ λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ.” By Jesus' death metaphorically explained as the self-sacrifice of the high priest offering himself on the cosmic Yom Kippur, the confidence of those who take refuge in him can be built in faith. The confidence is strong, because it is not based on Christians' achievements of pure sanctified or holy life, it is based on the self-sacrificing act of Jesus. Because of him, the readers can be encouraged and invited to draw near to God, before his face. The hearts are sprinkled, the conscience is washed in the new ceremonial washing of the **clean water**, the baptism.

Having reached all this for his people, *having cleansed people from their sins*, the savior High Priest, has sat down on the right hand of the Lord. The coronation of Jesus, high Christology, appears in **1,3**: “ὁς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, καθαρισμόν ³²¹τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς.” The only possible purification of sins has been accomplished not by people but by the heavenly being, the Christ, who, higher than angels, has received a body in order to give it up in a sacrifice.

Im purity that which is “κοινός”, appears twice **9,13** an **10,22**. In both cases, it is the inner impurity of a man reflected in the ritual perception. It is more important whether a person has impure inner man, *συνειδήσις*, than impure hands or body. The good news is that both impurities, originating in the moral and out-

321 The noun, “purity” appears then again in the 9,13: “εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα τράγων καὶ ταύρων καὶ σποδὸς δαμάλεως ῥαντίζουσα τοὺς κεκοινωμένους ἀγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα.” The verse has been already explained before.

come in the ritual, can be dealt with by metaphorically understood and appropriated sacrifice of Jesus as the Christ.

Summary: The author, when speaking about purity, always starts from the original notion of ritual purity found in the Old Testament. In this pattern he then sets Jesus. The ritual purity was originally achieved by sprinkling of blood of sacrificial animals. The blood of Christ is more powerful than that of animals and therefore can achieve more: that, which would have been even unthinkable with normal sacrifices, the purification from *sins* and *conscience* once for all. Those who are „purified by sprinkling of his blood“ symbolically in the baptism, are „covered in his blood“ in the same way as those who brought the sacrifices in the Jerusalem temple were „covered in the blood“ of the sacrificial animals. This blood, that Christians hide in, is the blood of Jesus. He is then understood at the same time as High priest and the sacrificial animal. His death is explained as sacrifice. His resurrection is understood as a priestly service. God accepted his offering on the heavenly Yom Kippur, the ultimate Day of Atonement, with the ultimate oath, recognizing Jesus as the priest according to the order of Melchizedek. Therefore, there is no notion of purity as something to be achieved by good behavior of Christians, it is a pure gift provided by God through Jesus. On the other hand, it is still true impurity is created by immoral behavior, however, purity can not be earned back by the good behavior. In the epistle there are no collocations of purity that would suggest any moral requirements as to the purity. The only possible warning is not to fall away from this mercy.

4.3 Other cases

4.3.1 Temple and its ritual

The concept of priesthood and its temple is more important in Hebrews than in any other writing of the New Testament or Apostolic Fathers. It is connected to the notion of holiness by the factual, as well as linguistic links. Let us first consider the words describing sanctuary, and later we shall proceed to the priesthood.

It has been already suggested above, that the epistle works with the idea of two realms. This is truth in the case of the “sanctuary” as well as with other notions in the writing. The motif of sanctuary unfolds slowly under the pen of the writer. With rhetorical efficiency, the sanctuary is first mentioned in **8,2**: “τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος”. This is the introduction to the problem, and the author sets beside each other the key terms. “τῶν ἁγίων” and “τῆς σκηνῆς”. The latter is the broader term, of which το ἅγιον is just one part. Gräber³²² and Attridge³²³ agree on this, unlike Lane³²⁴, who claims that the two terms describe the same entity. In my opinion, there is no ground for putting them beside each other, if they were synonyms. The poetical reason does not fit here and therefore I agree with the former two.

322 Gräber, pg. 82: „...ta hagia und he skeene verhalten sich demnach wie teil und Ganzes, Inneres und Äußeres, sancta sanctorum und sancta.“

323 Compare with Attridge, pg.217: „The locus of his priestly ministry is specified as „the sanctuary and the tabernacle.“ (218): „the distinction between the inner sanctuary, labeled ta hagia, and the tabernacle as a whole, labeled he skene, has precedents in the LXX. Hebrews generally observe the distinction, reserving ta hagia for the inner sanctuary that the earthly high priest and their heavenly counterpart enter, while using skene for the entire tabernacle, either earthly or heavenly.“

324 Lane, pg. 205: „The expression το ἅγιον is used, as often in the LXX, to refer to the sanctuary in general, without any reference to the distinction between the inner and outer shrines.“

Let us first have a look at the **chapter 9**, which summarizes the problem of the sanctuary. The term “τό ἅγιον”³²⁵ is one of the key terms in that chapter, it occurs six times there³²⁶, but also the term “σκηνη” is used four times, as well as other semantically connected words, such as “ἀρχιερεύς”, “λατρεύειν”, “αἷμα”. The words of entering, perfection and forgiveness of sins repeat often on the small space of the entire chapter.

The chapter is built carefully, slowly unwinding concepts, repeatedly using the same words. The two planes of existence are represented by specific terms. One is the original and outside time – that is „ἀντίτυπον“. The other is „ὑπόδειγμα“. Each of them has their own rules, but in general, since the originator of the rules is one, they do not differ much. The largest difference is in singularity or plurality of happenings granting near access to the holy God. The point of the institution as such, is to enable encounter with God, which is the salvation. In order to achieve it, one has to be purified or sanctified. That which hinders access to God's presence is sin, even if it is committed in the ignorance. There are some general rules about the sanctuaries whatever their place of origin, be it in heaven or on the earth. In order to enter, blood is needed because it is considered a means of cleansing or sanctifying – it transports one from the realm of uncleanness to that of holiness.

325 N. H. Young, *The Gospel According to Hebrews 9*, NTS 27/2, 1981, 198 – 210. (pg. 198,9): “Although there is considerable confusion among the translations as to the rendering of ἅγια in Heb 9, 8..., the commentators are in general agreement concerning its reference to the Holy of Holies. The preferred translations are “holy place” (or “Holy Place”) and “sanctuary”. These are fairly imprecise terms if, as most commentators affirm, τα ἅγια is correct despite isolated support (viz. Westcott) for the idea that τα ἅγια refers to the sanctuary as a whole”

326 Young, pg.198 “There are four verses in Heb 9 which particularly invite our attention in connection with the significance of Hebrews' usage of τα ἅγια: vv, 8,12,24 and 25. το ἅγιον v 1, ἅγια v 2, ἅγια ἁγίων v 3.”

The author proceeds from describing the earthly sanctuary, parting from the temple with its two parts, The Holy place and the Holy of Holies. But the term “σκηνή” is used often throughout the chapter.

In the beginning of the **chapter 9**, the author starts with the “ἅγιον κοσμικόν”, the earthly sanctuary. Considering the shift of the semantic field, to describe the holy Temple in Jerusalem built according to the holy Torah given to Moses on the Mount Sinai as a “worldly” in the sense of coming from our human world is an offense to every Jew. Despite the pejorative ring of the adjective “κοσμικόν”, though, the author of Hebrews says that also the earthly cult had its significance and actual relevance for the overall realm, it was not just a void sanctuary, it was the symbol of the heavenly one.

Verses 2 – 5 describe in detail the earthly place of worship. Verse 2 describes the outer parts of the temple and we are invited further and further towards the places of elevated holiness in the following verses. Whether earthly or heavenly, each temple has its own rules, its diverse places that are available to different personnel at different times with different level of ritual purity, each with appropriate rituals. Verse 2 describes the entrance to the earthly sanctuary and the objects that could be found there. The first part, where the lamp stand and the table with the bread were, was called “ἅγια”. This part is already separated, but it is not the place of the ultimate holiness yet. Should we set the text into the context of the writer and the possible purpose of the letter/homily, the author seems to be describing how he remembers the Jerusalem Temple from his own autopsy. It is also worth considering if the readers had possibly visited it themselves, or whether the author is speaking to people for whom the information is new, such as for nowadays' readers.

Going beyond the public places in the temple, verse 3 introduces the readers

to the “ἅγια ἅγιων”, the most holy place. It is separated from this world by “καταπέτασμα”. Its function is to separate, but it is not a rigid wall³²⁷, it is a veil separating two places with different level of ritual purity and holiness³²⁸. There was set of steps that gradually lead from the outer court to the Holy of Holies, each step separated from each other different personnel in different times according to where they were allowed³²⁹. This ultimate veil leading to the Holy of Holies was breached only once a year on Yom Kippur by a perfectly prepared High priest. It *was* possible to go through, the separation was not definitive and its transitivity is symbol to its temporality³³⁰. Also the twofold division of the earthly temple is symbolical to the existence of the two realms that also are separated by certain veil³³¹. The author of the epistle is leading the readers there, where none of them had ever entered. The insides of this forbidden place, the inner part of the σκηνή is then described in verses 3-5 in greater detail.

The above mentioned collocation “πρώτη σκηνή” can be understood both spatially and theologically. In the verse 2 it is the outer part before the Holy of Holies but further in the chapter, it is used rather for the earthly temple in

327 Compare Mat 27,51. The fact that it is not a rigid wall, but a veil that can be easily overcome could be also viewed as a fore-picture of the future reverse of holiness

328 Entire monograph by O. Hoffius, *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes*, 1972 is dedicated to the theological meaning of the veil.

329 Jenson, *Graded Holiness*.

330 Gräßer, pg. 118: „Die Vorhang ist Trennwand. Und so gemäß der Symbolik des Hebr. Irdisches und Himmlisches voneinander trennt, isoliert sie nicht nur, sondern disqualifiziert auch religiös das sanctum, hagia, und seinen Kult.”

331 Käsemann, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk*, pg. 135 speaks about apparent speculation “wonach Himmel und Erde durch ein analoges katapetasma voneinander geschieden werden”. I disagree with the claim, that the veil is not archetype but the border between Earth and Heaven. Käsemann understands the text of Hebrews reflecting the original gnostic speculation of aeons, which is secondary to the text. It is Eisegesis.

contrast to the heavenly one³³². The spatial distinction between the two parts of the earthly temple is a “*παραβολή*” of the temporal distinction between the two “*διαθήκη*” and also between the two aeons.

The sole existence of the *ἅγιον κοσμικόν*, though symbolic, had been the only way to God (*τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσις*). The way lead only through sacrificial blood³³³. The existence of the first and the second sanctuary are mutually exclusive; the first has been overcome by the second. The first one was, as Holy Spirit reveals, symbolical, pointing to the real one. The “*ἅγιον κοσμικόν*” was in certain sense a detour which blotted out the real way³³⁴. But the truth has been revealed by the Holy Spirit. The reason for the „parabolic“ first sanctuary, was to show the uselessness or rather ineffectiveness of the number of the sacrifices and dead animals that had to be slain in order to clean conscience. And still they could only sanctify the body

332 Young, pg. 200: “The opinions divide over whether the *prote skene* in v 8 refers to the whole of the Mosaic tabernacle (i.e. both the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies) in which case the phrase will be rendered “former” or “earlier” tent; or whether it is limited to the first part of the earthly structure, in which case it will be translated “outer” tent (i.e. the Holy Place alone)...Yet a temporal significance is drawn to the reference to the outer tent in v 8 as is made clear by the use of *eti*.”

333 Here the symbol of the veil gains another dimension: in dividing two spaces it was not impenetrable. Heb 12, 4 reads (NIV): “In your struggle against sin, you have not yet resisted to the point of shedding your blood”. Though the context of this verse is warning Christians from denying Christ in face of the persecution, we are interested in its sacrificial language and the motive of the entrance nearness of God. In order to enter, there is always the need for blood. In the same way as the *ἀρχιερεῖς* were entering by blood of animals, Christians are entering on behalf of the blood of Jesus.

334 Gräßer, pg. 131: “Christus ist das Ende des Kultes als Heilsweg“ (133) “Es gibt keinen freien, allgemeinen Zugang zu Gott. „Das Vorderzelt ist ein verkörpertes Verbot“ Hofius, Vorhang, pg. 64: „Was die Opfer des Alten Bundes nicht vermochten, das wirkt das Selbstopfer des wahren Hohenpriesters Jesus: sein Blut schafft eine vollkommene Reinigung (9,14), die den Volk Gottes des eschatologischen Eintritt „durch den Vorhang hindurch“ in das himmlische Sanctissimum ermöglicht (10,19) und ihm jetzt schon die Antizipation dieses Eintritts erlaubt“.

for the proper “λατρεία”, they could not grant forgiveness to the inner man, their heart and conscience³³⁵. They were outward purificatory washings. They were concerned with the outward, with the “σάρξ”, with food and washings, but this was only for the time being „μέχρι καιροῦ“.

The ritual law is not able to perfectly purify the “συνείδησις”. All the ritual law had its place before, and only before, the door to the heavenly sanctuary opened. It was only a testimony, only a preparation. Now that the real thing is available people should not settle for less, for the substitute, maquette. The whole sacred ritual law, so precious and holy for Rabbinic Judaism, with all its kashrut, washings etc. *had been*, according to the author of Hebrews, *μεχρι καιρου*. Jesus did not pass through this temporary sanctuary, the visible hand-made temple. Now the author is moving to the invisible nonperishable realm of singularity and timelessness. Here, the heavenly High priest Jesus has entered through the courtyard of the heavenly temple³³⁶ to the heavenly inner sanctuary by his own blood on the day of the heavenly Yom Kippur³³⁷, thus bringing salvation to all the people 9,12³³⁸.

335 The conscience is also the main matter in the question in Paul 1 Cor 8, but not in Rom 14.

336 Hofius, Vorhang, pg. 65: “9,11 wird von den Auslegern weithin so verstanden, als sei die σκηνή hier nicht das Ziel des Weges Jesu, sondern eine von der τα ἅγια genannten Stätte unterschiedene Durchgangssphäre”

337 Thompson prefers to speak about *exaltation*. Viz J.W. Tompson: Hebrews 9 and Hellenistic Concepts of Sacrifice JBL 98/4, 1979 (567 – 578). pg. 569: “The event...is the exaltation of Christ. Παραγενομενος is reminiscent of γενομενος elsewhere in Hebrews, for the event of Christ's exaltation and installation as high priest. The exaltation is frequently described as an entry into the heavenly sanctuary (6,19-20; 9,24-25)”

338 Attridge, pg. 248: „That Christ did not enter with the blood of „goats and calves“ is the first of several references to the Yom Kippur sacrifices that appear throughout the chapters 9 and 10“...“Christ, on the other hand, entered „with his own blood“. On the level of the Yom Kippur imagery the prepositional *dia* obviously means „with“, thus indicating a shift in sense from its use in the preceding verse. ...That blood is being used in metaphorical way is clear, but the precise metaphorical significance is not immediately

Several verses further the author comes back to the same point. By entering once for all, Jesus is now in the presence of God, in front of his face³³⁹ where he can bring the atonement, reconciliation between God and men. This was Jesus' final act. As heavenly high priest he offers himself not only on the earth but this blood of the human flesh paid him a cleansing valid even for the heavenly sanctuary, in face of God. When there in the heavenly Holy of Holies God accepted his sacrifice, He pronounced him the “ἀρχιερεύς”. This happened just once. This was the Christ's final act, once for all, “ἐφάπαξ”³⁴⁰, there is no need for another sacrifice. As a death of man is final, also this is this sacrifice. The heavenly day of atonement that is now in duration.

Exactly the same notion appears again in **10,19**: “Ἐχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ”. Where in the earthly Yom Kippur the “ἀρχιερεύς” entered the sanctuary by the blood of animals, Jesus entered by his own blood and also opened the way for his followers. In the same way as all the people of Israel were symbolically entering the sanctuary in their priest, also all the new Israel, the Church, enters³⁴¹ the heavenly sanctuary in their heavenly priest, through the blood of Jesus³⁴². With this blood, there is

apparent and debates about the relationship between heavenly and earthly, between the exaltation and the cross, In Hb often play off one or another blood metaphor.“

339 Le panim v 24.

340 Gräßer, pg. 193: „Aber will Priester un Opfer sarkisch sind 7,23; 9,10, müssen es viele und oftmals wiederholte sein – Menge als Komepnsation unzureichende Qualität und Wirkung.“

341 Attridge, pg. 263: „That entry indicates that his sacrifice has its results in the ideal of spiritual realm where it effects the cleansing of the spiritual reality (conscience) for which the cult of the old covenant could only provide a physical or worldly image“

342 Compare with 13,11. What happens with the sacrificed animals? Their blood enters the sanctuary, their bodies are burned outside the camp. It is the humiliating place of Jesus' execution. The readers, supposedly the persecuted Christians, are then encouraged to share in this seeming humiliation, which is in fact, seen by the eyes of the realm of the real sanctuary, the *αχειροποιητον*, of singularity and no time, parallel to the purificatory ashes of the red heifer. Jesus is outside, in the place of uncleanness and unholiness, he

no veil dividing the different parts of sanctuaries, the access is free the door is open wide.

4.3.2 Jesus, the *Ἀρχιερεύς*

Now, let us focus at the function of Jesus as the “*ἀρχιερεύς*”. The word interests us especially because of the root *-ιερ-*, which carries the notion of holiness. In the same way as there are two types of sanctuaries, there are also adequate two types of priesthood. The human type is based in the first place on the genealogy. The second type, priesthood in the order of Melchizedek, is based on God's oath.

There are two main parts of the epistle describing Jesus as a high priest of the higher order. In the same way as the author had dealt with the notion of the temple, also the ideal of Jesus' high priestly office unfolds slowly throughout the epistle. There are two larger sections speaking expressly of Jesus' high priesthood, however, the notion is inseparable from the above-mentioned temple, as we have already seen. The two larger wholes are in 4, 14 – 5,10, where the idea is introduced, and then more elaborate explanation follows two chapters further, that is chapter 7, nonetheless, the occurrence of this word is by far not limited only to these two segments.

The first continuous exposition of the notion of Jesus as a high priest starts, quite suddenly, in 4,14. It is the first time the author starts revealing his two-fold world-view. Just the first verse is a very strong statement. After being warned to persevere in face of persecution, the readers are told that they have a powerful high priest. Thinking about the recipients and the date of the epistle,

seems to be forgotten and humiliated, when it is in fact his victory and pioneering. Christians should therefore brace themselves and join in this way, of perfection in suffering.

whether before or after 70CE, the statement strikes either way. If the temple had its standing at this point, the first intention of the listeners wandered to the existing high priest. On the other hand in case of late date of the epistle, this statement might have raised curiosity: no temple, no priests: *What high priest do we have?* One who enters heaven. The idea of high priest entering heaven is associated with death, no one goes to heaven unless they die, the priest in question should be deceased. But this one was also resurrected and thus his sacrifice was accepted. The recipients were probably Christians of the second generation, nonetheless, we can not claim with certainty that they had known of the teaching on the “priestly office of Jesus”.

The author starts with explaining the need for certain qualities in such a perfect heavenly ἀρχιερεύς compared to the earthly office. The usual high priest needs to offer first also for his own sins, he is not humanly perfect, even if they need to succumb to much stricter rules than any other person. More is required of them and therefore they might be more humble and aware of human weaknesses and therefore being more empathetic. Jesus, the author says, has learned this empathy and reached his fullness or rather perfection, by the human suffering.

An ἀρχιερεύς does not decide himself to become one, he cannot claim or usurp the position. This is true also of Jesus. The genealogical qualification is not important in his case as in the earthly priesthood, for he is not from Levites. He has only become the high priest upon the God's calling. When did this calling or inauguration happen? When God pronounced Jesus as his own ἀρχιερεύς, in the acceptance of his offering.

The verse 5,7 portrays Jesus as a priest who is standing in front of God in the intercession for his people, priest who supplicates for mercy. The saving act

is in this moment in the hands of God, He is the one who can, who is the powerful (*δυναμένο*s) one. Jesus stands by the heavenly altar as a helpless high priest hoping that God would mercifully look down upon the gift. Death was the sacrificial gift and Jesus supplicates mighty God to accept his sacrifice, to save him and all his people from the death. The moment in which this happens, when Jesus *is* saved from the death, is the very moment in which God says his “yes”. The moment when God makes his oath, and by the power of the indestructible life (*//* 7,21) accepts the sacrifice, brings Jesus back from the death and acknowledges his sacrifice as well as his priesthood. That is the moment of God's oath and inauguration of Jesus. Through the suffering, he has been perfected and achieved eternal salvation for those who belong to him, then God has pronounced him “*ἀρχιερεύς*”.

Here is then the answer for the 4,14, by what right can Jesus be called a high priest? “By the right of God's Son”, answers the verse 5,8, who has become the High priest of the higher priesthood according to the order of Melchizedek (5,10). At this point, the author leaves the subject aside in order to return to it and specify the notion of Melchizedek's priesthood in the chapter 7.

The second segment describing Jesus' priesthood speaks at great lengths about the heavenly cult. The exposition starts, however, already at the end of chapter 6, which reminds the readers that they have access to the heavenly sanctuary, access to which has been provided by Jesus 6,20: “*ὅπου πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ ἀρχιερεύς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.*” The question is again: at which point has Jesus become (*γενόμενος*) this type of *ἀρχιερεύς*?

First, the author presents his own, surprisingly selective, exegesis of the story of Genesis 14,17-24, where Abram meets Melchizedek. He is concerned with several points: Melchizedek was without genealogy, but also without time and he was even higher than Abraham. He is similar to the Son of God and he is a priest forever³⁴³. There are many discrepancies between the two texts, I would like to mention just two that consider the holiness idea the most.

The first one considers the name of Abram. In Genesis he is Abram at this point, in Hebrews the name reads Abraham. In Genesis the meeting between Melchizedek and Abram happened a point in which there had not yet been any ritual law whatsoever. The meeting had happened before the circumcision was introduced and even before the prophetic and priestly sacrifice performed by Abram, described in the chapter 15. The author of Hebrews reflects that there had not yet been Aaronite priesthood, that at this point Aaron was still in the loins of Abram, nonetheless, it is interesting that this meeting happens at the life-point of Abraham in which the only priesthood there is is the one of Melchizedek. We read of several sacrifices before this point, but they are scarce and there is not any Yahweh priesthood yet. The only priest, the only ritual law there is, is the ultimate and original one. By using already the name Abraham, the author of Hebrews shifts slightly the meaning of the meeting. If not uncircumcised Abram, but circumcised Abraham is bowing down in front of this mysterious priest, then the circumcision bows down in front of the eternal heavenly priesthood.

I would like to draw a parallel with the theology of Paul here. He uses the figure Abraham as the person of the original order of salvation as well. In Paul

343 For the Jewish apocalyptic and also Qumran the person of Melchizedek and his priesthood was a very popular field of study and discussions.

(Rom 4//Gal 3), the same notion as “the order of Melchizedek” in Hebrews, can also be called “the order of faith”. One can either be in or under faith, like Abram was, or one can be under the Law, in Moses. It seems to be quite a common motif of early Christians to come back before Moses. Jesus returns his people, the new people of God, before circumcision beyond Moses back to Abram, his faith and his archetypal encounter with Melchizedek.

The second discrepancy, relevant for the holiness issue, is the choice of the author of the epistle to leave out the mention of the sacrificial gifts that Melchizedek brought, which is bread and wine (Gn 14,18). This could have been fabulously used to speak about the new ritual of the communion and its possible connection to the original priesthood and its access to God, however, there no such a thing and the author leaves the elements unfortunately out.

In the v 11 the author presents the opening key thesis about the insufficiency of the Levitical priesthood. Through the first priesthood with its laws the τέλειος could not be reached and that is also the reason for the plurality of priests and sacrifices, it led nowhere. It is a paradox, because perfection is that which was the goal of the ritual system: thorough purification, in order to be able to face God. Unfortunately, the writer says that this system was not perfect. Imperfections were incompatible with the cult, however, the author calls the Levitical system precisely imperfect. It was not efficient enough. Sacrifices needed to be repeated, though some efficiency of the ritual blood of animals is acknowledged at some point of the epistle, it is dismissed elsewhere. It was not able to clean the συνείδησις, it needed to be repeated. On the other hand there was the well known and popular story of Melchizedek, that the

author of the epistle to Hebrews used to prove his point.

The imperfection itself in combination with the existence of the story was a *sign* pointing to the existence of more perfect way to God. Melchizedek was a fore-picture of the other-worldly priesthood, appearing not on the basis of genealogy (14) but on the basis of indestructible life (16). This was shown at the resurrection. The God's oath was His “yes” to the offering (the author is coming back here to the exposition in v 6,13 - 17), in reviving Jesus to eternity, making him, according to the psalm 110, the priest forever (v 24). He is now the perfect priest and perfect offering at the same time, having all the purity qualities: one who is holy, blameless, pure and set apart from sinners. The extreme requirements for the life of the High Priest are even exceeded by the perfection of Jesus. The notion of imperfection of the Levitical priesthood (v 16.) in this epistle is very much connected to the Greek idea of *τέλειοσις*, that is reaching of one's potential, fulfillment and singularity. The old system is imperfect because it is repetitive, it never reaches its goal, cleansing only body, it is infested with plurality and there has always been a better one. The one based upon God's oath (21).

However, the true change appeared when Christ became *ἀρχιερεύς*. Now the high priest's task was to enter the Holy of Holies. It is not anymore earthly Jesus, it is Christ, who is the new priest of the new age. His priesthood was out of this world, he was the one “not of this world“ who came in. His priesthood is not genealogically based, and its sanctuary is “*σκηνή*” which is even more perfect that could be found on the Earth. He entered into the real heavenly “*ἅγια*” not through the blood of animals, but through his own blood. Earthly *ἀρχιερεῖς* entered once a year, but he entered once. His entrance to this sanctuary was the *καιρός* of the heavenly Yom Kippur, the Day of the Atonement of

humans with God and Christ found the way. In the old system the sheep used for sacrifice needed to be “τέλειος”: perfect, without blemish and most of all, it needed have reached the proper age, it needed to be mature time to grow, mature, reach one year. Also the Christ had to mature and be prepared, perfected. He had to come to his full potential to be the perfect offering, to spill his holy blood. All these qualities are listed in the verse 7,26. In the list, there is also the only appearance of the synonym to “ἅγιος”. That is the adjective “ἁσπιος”, here used for Jesus as the perfect High priest.

4.4 Conclusion

Holiness and Purity in the epistle of Hebrews has kept its ritualistic ring, language and context, however, the meaning of the words are shifted toward the spiritual interpretation of all the holiness system, starting from the sacrifice finishing with the purity. The author divides universe into two realms, the earthly realm has only temporary cult, reflection of the eternal one, where the high priest of the order of Malchizedek and sacrifice at the same time is Jesus, who sacrifices himself and thus breaks the repetitive imperfect system. His sacrifice purifies (not only body, but also heart and conscience), sanctifies, the only action on the part of people is then acceptance of these and resistance in face of persecution.

Chapter 5: Pauline literature

5.1 Holiness

5.1.1 The Adjective “ἅγιος”

5.1.1.1 “Saints” or “the Holy ones”

It is the usus of the ancient epistolography, to introduce letters by mentioning something special about the addressees. Majority of the Pauline epistles add the dative predicate „ἅγιοις”, “to the saints”³⁴⁴. The letters are intended for the Churches, which, in the eyes of the author, comprise of „saints“, or should we rather say “the holy ones”. The substantivized adjective „ἅγιοι” can be easily translated by both. However, many commentators are reluctant to use the designation of “saints”. Why?

Given the long history of the notion of “saints” within the Church, it may carry certain ring of ethical achievement. The “saints” of both the Catholic and the Orthodox Church are the people who earned such designation by living exemplary and virtuous lives; people who were martyred and performed some miracles. It is because of this semantics that many translations prefer to avoid the predicate “saints” and use “the holy ones”; some English and Czech translations then avoid it completely by using “brethren” etc. instead.

It will be argued in this chapter, that Paul did not have in mind any special group of extremely virtuous people as his addressees. Whenever he uses this designation, he is not addressing anyone holier than the rest of the Church. It is

344 Ironically, the inscription „the saints“ misses e.g. In the epistle to the Galatians. Given the situation there, and Paul's ambivalent relationship with them I consider important to note it.

his name for the Church and its members in general, which is often stressed by the use of “*παν*”, “all”. As we shall see further in the specific cases, *ἅγιοι* are the members of the Church. By the sole virtue of having believed, the Christians have been given the Spirit as a token. It purifies their consciousness and makes them separated for God. In the baptism then, the Christians are set apart for God as his new special holy, chosen people, called out from disbelieve to life. Such holiness has nothing to do with ethical achievement. Hence the addressees are not special people by the virtue of their merit, but by the virtue of the external calling. I will therefore use both terms “the saints” as well as “the holy ones” in this thesis interchangeably to imply the notion of holiness as an external quality imposed on the believers by the sole virtue of being set apart by God for his special use.

In all the prescripts of Pauline epistles the *ἅγιοι* are therefore Christians. Paul, right at the beginnings of his letters, wants to stress this fact, that all the members of the Churches, even the ones who may be considered weak or strong or somehow broken are “saints”³⁴⁵; so that from the beginning until the end of the letters, the recipients would be assured about their *new identity*. Be it Christians from Jews, Proselytes or even Gentiles, they are now new people, they are now one, they are saints. The only prerequisite, according to Paul, is to “call on the name of the Lord”, “to be in Christ” and to be the “Church”.

Also, in all of the prescripts, Paul describes them as “*ἅγιοι*”, that is, he speaks to them in plural. In his epistles the holiness is far from individualistic reaching for perfection; holiness for Paul is corporate. The Church, *ἐκκλησία*, is

345 Similar logic is also used in 1 Clem.

the new ἁγία . It is the new and eschatological holy nation, united and called out from manifold backgrounds. Everyone is saint and all are saints, together they form eschatological holy society with new laws.

Prescripts

There are several variants of how the prescripts embed the predicate “ ἅγιοις ”. On the most elementary level, a letter is intended either just for the simply-put „ ἅγιοις ” (2 Cor, Phil,³⁴⁶), or this can be further elaborated on by added emphatic „ κλητοῖς ” (Rom, 1 Cor³⁴⁷). The second version stresses the passive factor of the recipients of this quality. They are holy, because they have been called out of the majority, selected, they are special. Further, there are also some prescripts that elaborate further on the concept of the holiness of the Church, we shall now discuss them in detail.

One of the simplest versions of the prescript is in **Rom 1,7** “ $\text{ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἅγιοις}$ ”. The members of Roman Churches are holy, called so, and called out of the general population, because God loves them. They are loved by God and therefore he set them apart for himself. Especially with the view of the development of the semantic field of holiness, we shall spot a significant detail which can hardly stay underestimated. Paul is writing to a community of Churches in Rome, majority of whom comprised of the converts from the Jews of synagogues in the city's ghetto, minority of which, however, comprised of regular Roman citizens, that is Gentiles.

The original semantics of holiness in Paul's life is the Jewish one. The “holy

346 2 Cor 1,1; Phil 1,1; Also in Col 1,2.

347 Rom 1,7; 1 Cor 1,2.

ones” are those who belong to the special people of God, who follow his Laws, and who worship in the Jerusalem temple. According to the Old Testament, Gentiles are not only defiled, mostly by their idololatri, but also defiling by definition. Gentiles were not allowed into the temple and their touch was defiling³⁴⁸.

However, as we have seen in the chapter on Luke-Acts, after the Pentecost, the Gospel was preached also to Gentiles. Acts 11 e.g. describes how the first Gentiles became Christians and how their “hearts were purified by faith”. This also resonates with the notion found in the epistle to Hebrews that sacrificially explained death of the Christ is able to purify the conscience of his people. Therefore the Christians, even if they are of Gentile origin, are rendered pure by faith, by the sacrifice of Christ and by the gift of the Holy Spirit. So much have both the Gospel and calling changed Paul, that now he is able to call Gentiles the “saints”.

Paul is writing to the Church in Corinth and, as usual, right at the beginning of the epistle, he reminds is readers of their true identity (**1 Cor 1,2**): “ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις.” In the 1 Cor 1,2 the holiness of the recipients appears twice and thus it stresses two pieces of information. For one, that the Church can truly be called holy, despite its national origin, that it is, in fact, holy, beyond any doubt. Second, it is holy not by its own virtue³⁴⁹, but by grace, by the divine call. The Church has been sanctified „ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ

348 Dunn, pg. 20: “...the fact that Gentiles should count themselves *hagioi* when they offered no sacrifices, called no man “priest”, practiced no rite of circumcision, must have been puzzling to most pagans and offensive to most Jews.”

349 Schrage, pg. 103: „Christen sind in und durch Jesus Christus heilig, nicht durch und in sich selbst...Christen gewinnen ihren Heiligkeit allein durch Christus Jesus und sein heilschaffendes handeln, und sie bewahren sie allein in Christus Jesus, d.h. In dem von ihm und seiner heilstat bestimmten Heils- und herrschaftsbereich.“

Ἱεροῦ³⁵⁰“ in Jesus³⁵¹. Though internalized, the holiness comes from an external source, it is given by God in Jesus. In Him God has set apart his new people, he made them special by the virtue belonging to him. Despite being Gentiles³⁵², their sanctification, and thus the core of their holiness, rests in Jesus, who is the Christ³⁵³. The phrase can be understood in instrumental way, that is: they are “sanctified through Christ”, through what he did. The locative notion cannot be completely denied³⁵⁴, however, rather than in the sense of mystical union, Christians were baptized into Jesus³⁵⁵. Here the external quality of the holiness is stressed by first, the passive, and second by the notion of calling. Corinthian Christians are the holy ones, separated by calling, called out of the general population³⁵⁶, “from the Roman colony in which they were living for the cultic service of God” as Fitzmyer³⁵⁷ points out, “This dedicated service echoes the role of ancient Israel called to be holy...precisely as God's people”.

Beside calling the Church³⁵⁸ „the saints“, the verse also speaks about what

-
- 350 Schrage, pg. 104: „Der Unterschied zur jüdischen Konzeption besteht vorallem darin, daß die Heiligkeit der Christen nun als „in Christus Jesus“ bestimmt...und mit der Taufe verbunden wird, das Paulus bereits übernimmt..., darum hier aber keineswegs eo ipso auf die Taufe zu beziehen ist.“
- 351 It has not sanctified by itself. Its sanctity therefore stems out of its affiliation to Jesus, the Christ.
- 352 Barnett, pg. 61: “His deliberate application of the term to include Gentiles may be pointed, given the judaizing thrust in Corinth at that time...in Paul's mind the Churches of God were the inheritors of Israel's sacred vocation as God's holy ones”
- 353 The holiness is external to them, it is appropriated only by being in Christ. I disagree with Fee that in this verse the holiness “has clearly ethical implications”. He is right in saying that “Paul's concept of holiness regularly entails observable behavior” as we shall also see later, but it is definitely not true in this verse.
- 354 Against Fee, pg. 32.
- 355 Conzelmann, pg. 21 Writes about the doubled holiness in the second verse: “ἡγιασμένοις...gives expression to the character of sanctification as being a matter of grace. Holiness is received, not achieved”.
- 356 Conzelmann, pg. 22: ““called” has the same eschatological sense as “holy”, which in the Old Testament Jewish tradition is a cultic -eschatological concept”
- 357 Fitzmyer, pg. 126.
- 358 Schrage, pg. 102, 3: „Paulus übernimmt diesen universalen und eschatologischen Horizont des Kirchenbegriffs. Darum kann ἐκκλησίᾳ nicht nur...die Einzelgemeinde

might seem another group of people³⁵⁹: “Those who call on the name of the Lord³⁶⁰“. Now, all those who “call on the name” not only of “God”, but also specifically, of “Jesus”, that is, those who seek refuge in him and cry for help, those who belong to him, are the Church. Therefore the “σὺν” should not be understood in the exclusive sense, rather, as van Unnik³⁶¹ suggests, in the inclusive sense: including both, those who cry to heaven for salvation as well as those who are the special set apart ones. They are really just one group, the Church.

The inscription of the second letter to the Corinthians also uses the “σὺν” in accumulative sense: **2 Cor 1,1**: „...τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆ οὔσης ἐν Κορίνθῳ σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὔσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ³⁶²“. There is a Church in Corinth, which is part of the Church in the whole Achaia. Paul does not want to suggest that the Corinthian Churches would not be holy, he rather uses the synonymous

bezeichnen, sondern auch die Gesamtkirche“

- 359 Fee, pg. 33: „The pneumatikoi in Corinth seem to have struck an independent course, both from Paul and therefore also from the rest of the Churches...So Paul starts by giving them a gentle nudge to remind them that their own calling to be God's people belongs to a much larger picture.“ Here, I disagree. If this was really a „gentle nudge“ it might also have been understood in a way, that there are the saints, that is the pneumatikoi, and that then there is the rest of the Christians and that the letter is addressed to both. I would rather agree with Schrage, pg. 105: „In bestimmter Hinsicht gibt die Wendung durchaus passenden Sinn, wenn sie nämlich die pneumatisch auftrumpfenden, in Gruppen zerspaltenen und sich zugleich individualistisch isolierenden Gemeindeglieder schon zu Anfang des Briefes daran erinnert, daß sie alle denselben Namen anrufen und Korinth nicht die einzige Gemeinde ist, die das tut.“
- 360 Fitzmyer, pg. 126: „It is best understood as modifying „the Church ..that is in Corinth. Ever since the time of J. Weiss, however, commentators have queried whether this clause .. is actually a generalizing post-Pauline interpolation, because the greeting strangely associates with the Corinthians, to whom the letter is addressed, „all“ other Christians „in every place“.
- 361 Van Unnik, “With all those who call upon the name of the Lord” IN ed. Weinrich, The New Testament Age, vol II.
- 362 Barnett, pg. 61: “The first letter implied the existence of believers outside Corinth, the second letter is explicit”. He further suggests growing of the Churches so that “the Gospel had spread to some of the towns adjacent to the great...Corinth....some lines of communication existed”.

expression. Those in Corinth, as well as those in Achaia, are *all* the Church and therefore they are all holy. The Corinthians are by no means holier than the other Churches. This is the same notion also in **1 Cor 14,33**: „οὐ γάρ ἐστὶν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεὸς ἀλλὰ εἰρήνης. Ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἁγίων.“. All the Churches are holy, and all the groups and fighting factions within those Churches are also holy. The same is the also true about the prescript of Phil³⁶³.

Summary: We have seen that in all the addresses of Paul's letters where he chooses to designate Christians as “ἅγιοι”. This term was not thus used for either a special group or to convey a notion of ethical achievement. Holiness of the Church is external. They are all holy, because they have been called and because they have been sanctified in Jesus. In the same way as in the prescripts, also the final greetings often mention other “saints” as recipients or authors of further greetings This is true of Rom 16,15; 2 Cor 13,12; Phil 4,21.22³⁶⁴.

363 The Church is not holy of itself, it is holy in Jesus Christ¹. Hawthorne, pg.7: “Paul was led to conceive of Christ as any theist conceives God: personal, indeed, but transcending the individual category. Christ is like the omnipresent deity...” Also here the “σὺν” is accumulative, not exclusive. There are not two or three groups: “holy” and then group of “ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνους”, they are all saints. The letter is written to all of them: “πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις”. Hawthorne (pg. 5): “The startling frequency of the expression, “all of you,” with which Paul continually addresses the Philippian Christians...indicates that he is subtly but forcefully calling them to unity, assuring them of all of his love and prayers, and telling them that he was writing not only to those who continually brought him joy, but also those whose actions tended to fracture the Church. None was excluded.”

364 **“Love for the saints”** also appears at the beginning of the epistle to Philemon, verse 5. It first mentions both „love and faith“ and then both „Jesus and all the saints“ Phlm 5: „ἀκούων σου τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν, ἣν ἔχεις πρὸς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους.“ The faith means here faithfulness to both Jesus and the Church. There are two parallel text at the beginnings the epistles Col and Eph. According to some commentators the different regrouping of the members of the sentence also carries difference in meaning. Bruce, e.g. says (pg. 208): „The difference in construction between these words and those in Col 1,4 and Eph 1,15 ...involves a difference in meaning. Love and loyalty to the people of Christ provide visible evidence of love and loyalty to the unseen Christ provide visible evidence of love and loyalty to the unseen Christ.“ I think that it is too bold a statement and would rather see the rewording as a matter of stylistics. Viz further.

Acceptable and unacceptable of the saints

The new society of the saints, despite being reached by grace, requires certain behavior of its members. Like a child when adopted to a family needs to find its way in it, also the Christians must respect the new family rules. There are things which are worthy of the saints, that are acceptable for them. Hospitality is one of such highly admired features. There are, however some things, that one should put away completely, such as e.g. *πορνεία* and *ἀκαθαρσία*, impurity in the ethical sense. Moreover, the Church should be able to deal with their own problems alone and inside. Christians should not ask the outsiders to resolve their internal matters, in the same way a family handles with children itself.

What is then utterly unacceptable, that Christians, society of the invisible parallel dimension living in this world with its own logic and rules, should look for the people from this world to decide their inner private matters: **1 Cor 6,1.2:** „Τολμᾷ τις ὑμῶν πρᾶγμα ἔχων πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων καὶ οὐχὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγίων; ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι οἱ ἅγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινοῦσιν; καὶ εἰ ἐν ὑμῖν κρίνεται ὁ κόσμος, ἀνάξιοί ἐστε κριτηρίων ἐλαχίστων;“ Coming from Jewish background, Paul was probably used to appealing mostly to the Jewish court, as Jews had their own separate body of courts. Not that Paul would consider Roman juridical system incapable of just decision, he himself appealed to Roman court in his own case. But when he did, it was not a case against one of his brothers. If people in the Church quarrel among each other, they should be able to deal with the struggles within the borders of the Church. Since they are the special elect people of God of the last days, how could possibly someone with the logic of this world be able to decide their quarrel.

In the verse **6,1** Paul clearly poses *ἀδικοὶ* and *ἅγιοι* against each other. He

employs strong language of exclusion. Like in the case of Israel, where outsiders were in general impure, everyone who is outside the borders of the Church, the holy society, is “ἀδίκος”. They are not “unjust” in the secular sense. They are “from this world” which itself will be subject to the judgment by the saints. The designation should be read through the theological qualitative “ἀπιστοι”. that appears a verse before.

The notion of judgment here is important but a thorough study is outside the limits of this work. However, a short comment is necessary. Should we compare the situation in Corinth to that of Rome, we would see that there Paul was openly teaching against judging one another, saying that the action of „κρίνειν“ would bring about unfortunate blasphemy on the Church. Similar factionalism was tearing apart the Corinthian Church as well. In short, the Corinthian Christians consider themselves competent, they think they are able to judge what is right and wrong. They quarrel and one group judges the other, however, they are not able to judge basic cases, like an incestuous person inside the Church on one hand and then using the Roman courts to settle inner problems of the holy society. They think to be experts, but they should rather separate themselves and judge according to the God’s laws, since, says Paul, the saints are in this world for its judgment.

When it comes to the matters of unacceptable/criminal behavior, Christians *should* judge. Like in the case of the incestuous brother: He should be sent outside the “city walls” of the “holy city”/i.e. the Church, “in the wilderness”, in order to protect the Church. Also, in order to take away from him the protection of the Spirit, for the Church is the place of its operation. Now, why should the brothers go outside these boundaries dividing holy and unjust themselves, free-willingly? Do they not know that the holy ones will judge the

world? (6,2)

“Holy ones judging the world” is an old Jewish image that Paul uses to show the readers who they really are and the dignity of their calling. The new people of God, the new *holy ones*, are eschatological community in contrariety with this world. This group has its specific life, its specific rules, it is holy by being set apart from this world for the service of their God. Its logic is not understandable to this unbelieving world. In the language of the epistle of the 1st Corinthians, those who are clever and powerful in this world have little value in the eyes of God and vice versa. What matters, according to the author of the epistle, is this set-apartness, looking upon God, looking for his logic, his cleverness, boasting in him. Through this people God will judge the world³⁶⁵.

Eschatological party

“Saints” as angels and ancient fathers who will come to judge the world on the day of the Lord when his Messiah comes, is an old Jewish image³⁶⁶. Paul uses it in 1. Cor 6,2 with the shifted semantics, where “the holy ones” are the Church and “the Messiah” is returning Jesus. Paul also uses the same notion in First and Second letter to the Thessalonians. The Church described as an eschatological party accompanying Jesus upon his return appears twice in the letters to Thessalonians. Some commentaries prefer to translate the two cases

365 1 Cor 6,2b says that God will judge the world through his "saints". Beside the traditional Jewish eschatological interpretation of the notion of final court, in which all the angels and dead ancestors sit as a grand jury, it can also be understood as Church bringing Mishpat to this world, that is: taking care of orphans, widows. It is holy society separated by God and for God to bring about justice by its mere presence in this world as the Temple of Jerusalem did. In its tasks of bringing about God's presence in this world, being the eschatological temple of living God, the Church's task is to mediate God's love and healing..

366 J. Holleman, Resurrection and Parousia: lists on the page 81 e.g. 1 Enoch 51,4; 104,6; 2 Apoc. Bar 51,5 etc.

of “ἅγιοι” with “angels”³⁶⁷. Can we insist on the explanation that angels³⁶⁸ are implicitly meant even if the noun itself is missing?

“The holy ones” as a group returning from heaven is described in **1 Tes 3,12f.**: “εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἀγιωσύνη ³⁶⁹ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ. [ἀμὴν.]”. Let us first consider the possibility that the holy ones were angels, as suggests e.g. Witherington³⁷⁰, keeping in mind that we are in the field of pure speculation and language games, since we are in the genre of apocalypics.

In the beginning of the first letter, Paul praises the faith of the Thessalonians and describes it as spiritual and focused to the near future of Christ's return. What does the Church expect? In 1,10 Paul speaks only about awaiting of the Son. Further, at the apocalyptic description in the chapter 4, there is one mention of an angel, v. 16 speaking about an archangel sounding the trumpet. The humans shall be risen from the dead here on the Earth, they will be risen

367 Similarly also Col 1,12

368 On one hand, it can be argued, that e.g. in the apocalyptic parts of the Gospels, the return of Jesus, the exalted Christ, is always in the party of his holy angels; they canonically do belong to the glorious group accompanying Jesus. On the other hand, this glorious group is usually described with collocation “ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι”, and therefore the text knows both: “ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι” and “ἅγιοι”.

369 Malherbe, pg. 213, “The Lord's gift of increasing the Thessalonians' love has an eschatological goal..., the establishing of their hearts. Here, Paul draws attention to the Thessalonians' holiness, as is also the case in 5,23, which similarly has an eschatological perspective. This reference to holiness anticipates the application of the idea to the moral life in 4,3-8.”

370 Ben Witherington III, 1 and 2Thessalonians A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary, pg. 104: “The idea is that those who meet Christ when he returns need to be in the same state of holiness as those who are returning from heaven with Christ (probably angels – 2 Thess 1,7..). the problem with arguing that saints are meant by holy ones here (cf 2 Thess 1,10, Didache 16,7...) is that the saints will reunite with Jesus when he comes, not before, according to 1 Thess 4,16-17. It seems likely that Zech 14,5 underlies our text here. The language previously applied to the Yom Yahweh and the theophanies of Yahweh in general are now being applied to the Jesus. What all these Old Testament texts have in common is that the theophany and judgment both occur on earth, not in heaven”

from where they are resting.

Their return is not described in the spatial terms, but in the temporal one. We are not told where but when. In this theology, “the holy ones”/Christians are not in the heaven with Christ, but they are in limbus waiting for his return. Time-wise, they precede the living ones in the party. Another problem trying to explain the party in 3,12 as the angels only, is that there, Jesus returns from heaven and in chapter 4, the Church is taken on the clouds up to the heaven. Considering the genre, I would therefore argue that the most elegant way of explaining this is pointing to the “μετὰ πάντων”. Be it angels, archangels, Israelite patriarchs and deceased members of the new holy society, the Church, they are all accompanying Jesus upon his return. He is not leaving out anyone who can be called “saint”, that is, the “saints” here designate all those who are His.

Witherington further writes “those who meet Christ when he returns need to be in the same state of holiness as those who are returning from heaven with Christ”³⁷¹. The “pure hearts in holiness”, required of the believers in the first part of the verse, should not be understood as personal or Church achievement. The hearts of the believers are purified by faith and by being in Christ. Being set apart by him and for him, then, sanctifies them. There are no comparative levels in the holiness, because it is not an ascetic achievement, it is a gift of belonging to the Savior³⁷². This meeting is not earned, holiness is not earned. It

371 Pg. 104.

372 Therefore, I also disagree with Bruce: “If the readers receive this ethical stability within, they need have no fear of the outcome on the day when the Lord returns.” To my knowledge, there are not even two levels of holiness, that is one attained by grace and one secondary required of the people, which is often used by many commentators and will be discussed later. It is all the time the one same holiness.

is not moral holiness, it is spiritually-ritual holiness³⁷³. If Christians can be described as “the holy ones” already on earth by the virtue of Jesus' sanctification, they certainly could be “holy enough” for the return. They have already been called holy, they cannot attain any more holiness themselves in the holy future, they do not earn it. They only shall be transformed.

I therefore agree with Morris, who writes “Believers do not simply live uprightly; they belong to God and thus are set apart entirely for God's service. Paul's prayer is that this may be fully realized among the Thessalonians³⁷⁴” He also stresses the universality of the returning party³⁷⁵.

Also the 2nd Thessalonians speaks about return of Jesus with “the saints”. In prayer at the beginning of the letter, Paul mentions the eschatological return of the Lord of the Glory (**2 Thess 1,10**): „ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐνδοξασθῆναι ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ καὶ θαυμασθῆναι ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ.“ This time the overshadowing „παν“ is missing. In v. 7.b the author says, that Jesus would return with his mighty angels to repay to those

373 I therefore also disagree with Witherington, pg. 112 „In light of what follows in v 3, it is perfectly clear that Paul is not talking about ritual purity but about moral purity.“ By spiritually-ritual holiness I mean, that is is not earned, but granted. The semantic field has not shifted from ritual to ethics of work, but from ritual to spiritual owning of the Jesus' works.

374 L. Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, Revised edition. United States: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2009., pg. 110.

375 Morris, pg. 111: “He [Paul] is distinguishing between believers on earth and the “holy ones” who will come with the Lord...an expression that lends itself to other meanings...angels or saints who have departed this life.” and further he writes: „It is clear that in the Judaism of the post-OT period “holy ones” was an accepted designation of angels. Against this identification....angels never seem to be called simply “holy ones” in the New Testament . . pg.112 “It is clear from the New Testament that both angels and the departed saints will be associated with the Lord when he returns. There seems to be no reason why Paul should be intending to eliminate one of these classes at this point. It is best understand the “holy ones” as all those beings who will make up his train, be they angels or the saints who have gone before.“

who were torturing the Church in this world. The picture of returning Jesus here is that of a mighty, powerful, glorious avenger of his people. The text is full of the notions of power. It was especially in the case the writings of Luke that “being filled with the Holy Spirit” brought about powerful speech and courage. It is also reminiscent of the Old Testament notion of glory³⁷⁶ as visibly manifested holiness. The Church is the new temple and therefore the glory can be manifested upon them. The idea is a common one, given e.g. the similar text in the Psalm 89,7 which expects the Lord being “glorified in his saints”. In the same way it had filled the Temple of Jerusalem before, the glory of the Lord is now expected to be manifested in all his company, in his saints. Upon his return, the text says, Jesus shall come in glory, with his holiness manifested in his holy ones³⁷⁷. These “holy ones” are rather believers than angels.

The final and the most obvious point to consideration is presence of the parallelism of the two parts of the verse: “ἐνδοξασθῆναι – ἁγίοις” and “θυμασθῆναι – πιστεύσασιν” where the 'saints' stay in explicative parallel to “believers”. Therefore the risen victorious avenger Jesus Christ is likely expected to return surrounded by all the heavenly hosts, including angels as well as deceased saints.

Spirit intercedes for the saints:

It has been repeatedly stressed above, that the right of the believers for the

376 Malherbe, pg. 404: „The compound infinitive ἐνδοξασθῆναι is used only here and in v 12 in the New Testament, but LXX. Ex 14,4 and Isa 14,25 the saints could be the angels..., but since they are parallel to the believers in the next member of parallelism, they must be Christians.“

377 Bruce, pg. 153: „Parallel: Psa 89,7 (LXX 88,8) “ὁ θεὸς ἐνδοξαζόμενος ἐν βουλῇ ἁγίων”, but there the “ἅγιοι” are the heavenly members of Yahweh's council...Those who have believed the Gospel have taken the opposite decision to those who disobey it v 8.“

claim to be called “the saints” is purely external to them, they only are “saints”, because God first loved them. This is further stressed in the pneumatologic section of the epistle to Romans, where one of the offices of the Spirit is that of continuous intercession on behalf of the so called “saints”.

Rom 8,26f.: „Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα συναντιλαμβάνεται τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν: τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὼ δεῖ οὐκ οἶδαμεν, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις: 27 ὁ δὲ ἐραυνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδεν τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων.“

I would like to point out here the linguistically obvious connection between the “Holy Spirit” and the “holy ones”. This verse has only “πνεῦμα” but still it is clear that the “Holy Spirit” is meant here, as the “big spirit”, or rather “counterpart Spirit” who searches the “human spirit”. There is no holiness apart from the Spirit of Holiness. It is its proper holiness which is then infused, imposed or given to the believer, to those who belong to it. Without the Spirit, without its help, all the claims of holiness on the side of believers are void. Because ethical behavior is not holiness *per se*. Holiness of the saints is derivative. The movement goes both ways, they are holy because the Spirit dwells in them. And it dwells in them, because they are set apart for God through their faith in Him.

The heavenly Spirit helps to carry the load of life's hardships by searching the human spirit³⁷⁸. Like is known by like. The Spirit then intercedes for its

378 Dunn, Commentary, pg. 479 “...he who searches hearts. Characteristically Jewish is the description of God as the one who alone knows the hearts of individuals...and who tries the (mind and) heart...The thought is intended here to be one of comfort rather than of warning or caution..“

“saints” with unutterable cries. That is not glossolalia³⁷⁹, because it can be presumed, that the Spirit, who gives the interpretation to glossolalia, would have no need for it. Spirit knows how and what to pray, but it does not need words. Its intercession is sincere and deep from heart to heart within the Trinity.

Fitzmyer says that “nowhere in the Old Testament or in pre-Christian Jewish writings does one find the idea of the Holy Spirit as an intercessor. It is, then, a Pauline novelty”. In his article “The Origins of the Spirit Intercession Motif in Paul.³⁸⁰” Obeng first discusses the Jewish theology of intercession, which never has Spirit as the intercessor, but rather ancestors and some divine beings. He concludes that “it would have been easy for Paul to link the Spirit, a heavenly being, to intercession³⁸¹”.

Serving to the Needs of / Ministry to - Saints, The Collection

There is a series of verses in the letters of Paul, especially in the Rom, 1 and 2 Cor, where he speaks about „serving to the needs of saints“, or „ministry to the poor among the saints“. In these verses there are usually words like “διακονία”, “κοινωνία”, “ἅγιοι”, “πτωχοὶ”. It is canonically explained as Paul's reference to the collection. We can not afford to spend much time and space on discussing

379 Fitzmyer, pg. 519: “The “sighs” are those of the Spirit and cannot be expressed in human terms. The “us” designates all Christians, not simply so-called charismatics, for the intercession of the Spirit with ineffable sighs is not to be confused with so-called glossolalia or speaking in tongues”

380 Fitzmyer, pg. 518.

381 Obeng, E.A. The origins of the Spirit Intercession Motif in Paul NTS 32 (1986) 621-32. (pg. 622) : “Thus there is no direct root of the Spirit intercession in the Old Testament and the Jewish writings. But the Jewish doctrine of intercession is relevant to the emergence of the Spirit intercessor motif in two ways. First,...Paul was possibly merely adding a new dimension to an already known doctrine of intercession. 2,...in the Jewish concept of intercession, heavenly beings were considered effective intercessors”. “The Spirit is the spirit of God. Heaven is his dwelling place prior to the Pentecost....it would have been easy for Paul to link the Spirit, a heavenly being, to intercession.”

the subject of the collection more deeply as it would deserve, because our concern is solely on the fact that in all the following cases Paul calls the Church in general “saints”. We are going to search the answer to the following question: In what way is the holiness of the Church connected to the money?

The first case is **Rom 12,13**: „ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες, τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες.“ Paul calls for solidarity. Hospitality is to be pursued. Holiness of the saints does not mean that they will all live “happily ever after” in financial and emotional prosperity. Church, as an organic body, has also members that need special attention, that need help in every respect where they lack³⁸². It is therefore imperative not to ignore the needs of the Church members, it is a “family business” again. You need to take care of your family.

Further in the **chapter 15**, Paul speaks about his plans to go to Jerusalem and to bring the collection with him.

As J. Knox puts it “...the Apostle Paul, at the end of an extended stay in Corinth, sent to the Church of Rome...the longest of his surviving letters. He hopes now to make Rome, where Christianity obviously had already been established, a kind of base for missionary activity even further west – indeed, as far as Spain, the western limit of the Mediterranean world. First, however, ...he must put a “seal” so to speak, on his work thus far by taking to Jerusalem the offering of money which the largely Gentile Churches of Asia Minor and Greece

382 Dunn, Commentary, pg. 743: „*χρεία* can mean „need“ in general...but here personal difficulties, particularly financial and daily necessities are probably in view...Paul's talk later and elsewhere of a „sharing“...in the sense of „gift or contribution“ for the saints...suggests strongly that Paul has the collection particularly in mind., but that would be a particular example of a more general involvement in common concern for the bodily needs of one another...The first Christians carried on the strong social concern of Jewish provision for widows, orphans, strangers, and the community's poor in general“

have, for the last several years, been engaged in getting ready”³⁸³.

This quote shows that we are approaching the letters in historically reversed order. We shall therefore start from the point when Paul after having collected all the money, he is ready to carry it with him to Jerusalem. And then we shall observe how he was raising them. Why was he putting the money together? J.M. Ogereau for his article in NTS points out four main traditional possible explanations³⁸⁴:

“The collection has been traditionally understood along four main lines of interpretations (which are not necessarily mutually exclusive): 1, the fulfillment of an eschatological event, 2, the expression of the Gentiles' moral and/or social obligation towards the Jews³⁸⁵, 3, an ecumenical offering, 4, a charitable act in the form of material relief.”

There have also been voices, such as that of Holl³⁸⁶, who wrote that the collection served a special group or sect within the Jerusalem congregation which called itself “πτωχοὶ” that is “the poor”. This designation, he says, was synonymous with other self-designations such as “the saints”. These were the people who at the Pentecost gave up all the possession in order to live in the community in ascetic life.

L.E. Keck wrote an answer to this in his article “The Poor Among the Saints

383 J. Knox, “Romans 15,14 – 33 and Paul’s Conception of his Apostolic Mission,” JBL, vol. 83, no. 1, pp. 1 – 11, 1964., quote from the pg. 1.

384 NTS 58/3 2012 J. M. Ogereau: “The Jerusalem Collection as κοινονία: Paul's Global Politics of Socio-Economic Equality and Solidarity” (pg. 362)

385 As a payment of the temple tax or as showing regard for “the root of the olive”

386 K. Holl, “Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem Urgemeinde”, Sitzungsbericht der Berliner Akademie, 1921,920-47.

in the New Testament”, where he refutes point by point such a claim. Keck shows how the call for “the collection for the poor” was motivated by Paul's concern for truly “economically poor” people. Paul called for the solidarity³⁸⁷.

In **Rom 15,25** the discourse on the collection starts: „*νυνὶ δὲ πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ διακονῶν τοῖς ἁγίοις.*“ Everything is ready. Paul had spent last several years in fund-raising relief for the poor in Jerusalem, and now, he is setting on the way. He explains his travel there as mainly motivated by “serving the saints”. This might as well had been the motto of his campaign for all this time³⁸⁸.

Rom 15,26: „*εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθαι εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ.*“ We have already mentioned the article written by Keck in attempt to refute Holl's thesis, that the “*εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς*” is synonymous to “*τῶν ἁγίων*”. Here the genitive of the latter is therefore not to be translated as „the poor who are the saints“. It does not make much sense nor grammatically nor theologically. It should rather be translated “the poor from the saints of Jerusalem”³⁸⁹, since probably a lot of Christians

387 L. E. Keck, “The Poor Among the Saints in the New Testament,” ZNW, vol. 56, pp. 100 – 129, 1965.

388 The explanation depends on the author : Dunn 837 e.g. writes: “*διακονεω...*is not specifically Christian. Paul uses the verb much less frequently than the correlative nouns, but the range of potential meaning is the same. Apart from reference to his own ministry.., the word group is most frequently used with reference to the collection (15,31; 2 Cor 8,4. 9 -12; similar use in Ac 11,29, and 12,25), but the variation in Paul's usage hardly supports Betz's suggestion that he *διακονία εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους* ...is „the official name for the collection“ {2 cor 8 – 9, pg. 90}. The participle is usually taken as expressing purpose...”

389 Then, as Dunn suggests, pg. 876: “...the poverty of (many of) the Jerusalem Christians was also, in economic terms, a consequence in large part of the overenthusiastic re-sourcing of the common fund by means of realizing capital in the earliest days of the new movement (Ac 2,44,) is very probable “And again Fitzmyer says that the poor ones (pg.722) „denotes, rather, the real needy among those who were Jerusalem Christians, whom Paul otherwise calls „saints““ Then there are commentaries like that of Ogereau,

got poor there after the first wave of exhilarated communism.

As some authors have shown, there is not a specific term that Paul would consistently use for the collection and therefore it may be confusing. He uses terms like “κοινωνία”, favorite “διακονία”, “λογεία” in the verses that we shall discuss, but in other places he uses also other terms such as: “χάρις”, “ἀδρότης” and “εὐλογία”. For Paul the collection is somehow a theological gesture. That is why he calls it “service”. Here it is the service of sharing³⁹⁰.

The brothers in Achaia and Macedonia have decided that they would not idly stand by and look at the poverty of the first Church, they wanted to share with them what they had. Even the members of the first ideal and holy Church of Jerusalem were in need of help, even if they were saints, they were poor. This fact should be clear enough in order to prevent the teaching of realized eschatology in the form of theology of prosperity. Thanks to Paul's work, money to to poor saints in Jerusalem was collected.

If they really received the money in the end, unfortunately, we do not know. The book of Acts is silent on that matter, which is bizarre. Paul actually had had his doubt and suspicion that it might not be accepted when he says in **Rom 15,31**: „ἵνα ῥυσθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθούντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ ἡ διακονία³⁹¹ μου ἢ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ εὐπρόσδεκτος τοῖς ἀγίοις γένηται“ Paul asks for the intercession of the

which deny that the phrase “κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθαι” is used by Paul “to refer to a financial contribution per se. It is indeed more probable that they understood it to be describing some kind of partnership or association with socio-political ramifications, which Paul envisaged between the Gentile Churches and their Judean counterparts, and which would ultimately manifest itself in the form of a concrete monetary gift. (pg. 371)”.

390 As Keck says, pg.129 “there was no fixed, technical terminology for the money itself” and further he says “Paul chose such terms not because he was embarrassed and needed to “talk around the point” but because he saw the fund as an occasion for the grace of God to do his work in particular acts”

391 Some Greek MSS (B,D*, F,G) have “δωροφορία“, „gift bringing“. This reminds me of the Ignatian letters where he describes himself as θεοφορος. Here is Paul δωροφορος.

Church of Rome, that the collecta would be accepted by the brothers in Jerusalem and that he be protected on the way to Judea. This all is then in order that the “service” would be considered “worthy of the saints”. The silence about the fate of the money can be explained in favor almost to whatever theory³⁹².

Before the money was raised, in the time of collecting the money, when Paul was writing the letter to the Corinthians, it is first mentioned in **1 Cor 16,1**: „Περὶ δὲ τῆς λογείας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους ὡσπερ διέταξα ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιήσατε.“ Here, the noun “λογεία” is used. The same way as Paul arranged for the “λογεία” in Galatia, also the recipients of this letter decided that they want to join in. The word is understood this way considering the context and parallel occurrences. Again, the saints are the Church. Paul was, according to Gal 2,10, sent by the “columns of the Church” to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, but he was also asked, together with Barnabas “μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν,” to remember the poor. He therefore arranged the collection first there in Galatia and now he is writing about it to the Church of Corinth. In the whole paragraph is Paul preparing the ground for his planned visit. When he comes, he wants everything ready. People should give every week a bit of money apart for the poor and have it ready for when Paul will come to collect it and then to go on in his above mentioned travels³⁹³.

392 I would favor the explanation of Dunn who writes (pg. 883) that “Paul's breach of traditional ethnic and culturally marked boundaries” are in the end understood the way he feared “as traitorous and heretical”.

393 Diakonia to the saints in the verse 15 then is not considered the collection 1 Cor 16,15: „Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί· οἴδατε τὴν οἰκίαν Στεφανᾶ, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας καὶ εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς.“ It is at the closing of the epistle that we read about a family who after having believed, have given themselves to the service of the saints. Paul encourages the Church to submit to such people like this family who gave

The second letter to the Corinthians deals with the money more than the first one. Paul reports, in the chapter 8, of the dedicated generosity of the Churches in Macedonia, where the members gave even more than they could have afforded. They did so, because they considered their contribution as taking part on the “service of the saints”. **2 Cor 8,4**: „μετὰ πολλῆς παρακλήσεως δεόμενοι ἡμῶν τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους,“ From their own suffering grew great solidarity and the eagerness to join in. Again, the „holy ones“ are not some special saints who would accumulate the property, it is the impoverished Churches in Jerusalem. The collection served not only the financial relief³⁹⁴, but also it was building unity among the saints³⁹⁵. Truth, Paul was rather surprised by their willingness, so much, that now he writes to the Corinthians not to give more than they actually are able to.

After some practicalities, Paul moves to the closing of the discourse on the diakonia in **2 Cor 9,1**: „Περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους περισσὸν μοι ἔστιν τὸ γράφειν ὑμῖν.“ The fervency with which the Churches in Achaia wanted

up everything in order to serve to the Church. The family was exemplary, it set itself apart for the service of the saints. In the same way, the Church members should follow their example and give up themselves and spare some of their money for the poor in Jerusalem.

394 Ogereau writes, pg.377: “His [Paul's] intentions seem to have extended beyond the mere alleviation of poverty by means of charitable giving. Indeed, he appears to have aimed at reforming the structural inequalities of Graeco-Roman society that were also becoming apparent in the early Church, by fostering socio-economic *ισοτις* between Jews and Gentiles and by establishing a global, socially and ethnically inclusive *κοινωνία* among them”

395 Ogereau: The Jerusalem Collection as *κοινωνία*, pg. 363: “The Jerusalem collection was thus the practical expression of *κοινωνία* across socio-cultural and ethnic boundaries. It was a manifestation of a persistent concern for socio-economic equality and solidarity within the Christ-centered *ἐκκλησία*.”. pg. 373: “When *κοινωνία* is thus associated with *ισοτις*, the socio-economic dimension of Paul's collection becomes even more evident. It evokes a certain sense of political unity and socio-economic equality within the (global) community of Christ-followers to an extent that is observed nowhere else in the New Testament except perhaps in Luke's summary depiction of the original Jerusalem community. The linguistic and conceptual similarities are striking.”

to help with the collection was inspiring for the above mentioned brothers in Macedonia. Again, the fund was called “service to the saints”, that is support of other Church members in need.

It is worth mentioning that towards the end of the chapter 9 Paul adds new notions and metaphors to the discourse. **2 Cor 9,12**: „ὅτι ἡ διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας ταύτης οὐ μόνον ἐστὶν προσαναπληροῦσα τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν ἁγίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ περισσεύουσα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχάριστιῶν τῷ θεῷ.“ Paul explains the reason for the collection, which refutes all the attempts to explain it as temple tax or similar. Paul himself writes that he has done the fund-raising for the poor parts of the Church, in order they may have more now and also to boost the *thankfulness* of Church members. Serving others in providing for them makes the former more devout and the latter more grateful.

Paul uses metaphorical language: serving to the Church, is like the service in the temple. The parallel is made just on the level of language. The same word that is used for the worship in the temple, „λειτουργία“, is used here of supporting other members of the Church. so that everyone would have enough and be equipped for the work of the Church. Serving by sharing money with the poor ones has two outcomes, it satisfies the needs of the saints, and glory to the God.

5.1.1.2 The Holy Spirit

In the beginning of the epistle to Romans, Paul speaks about the spirit of Holiness. Rom 1,4 “τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν”. The form uses noun instead

of the more usual adjective when describing the Spirit of God. This is thought to be a Hebraism³⁹⁶ in Paul's Greek³⁹⁷. The different wording helps us remember that beside being the person of Trinity and divine power, the Spirit is connected with the holiness, foremost attribute of God, mercifully granted to those, who belong to it. Its presence is the presence of the "holy", the same is true of its effects and actions done inspired by it.

The verse of Rom 6,23 has already been mentioned earlier in connection with the intercession "the holy ones". In the whole Pauline corpus there are only other 9 occurrences of the collocation "πνεῦμα ἅγιον" in different grammatical forms³⁹⁸. These are by no means all the cases of the "πνεῦμα", nonetheless, it is virtually impossible to elaborate sufficiently on Pauline pneumatology as such within this thesis³⁹⁹. Our main concern is to observe the semantic field of "ἅγιος". It would have been interesting to compare all the occurrences of "πνεῦμα" with other collocations and then conclude if the collocation with the adjective ἅγιος bears some special significance, but unfortunately it is virtually impossible within the scope of this thesis. The occurrences of the collocation "πνεῦμα ἅγιον" do not share any common pattern

396 B. Schneider, "Κατα πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης (Romans 1,4)," *Biblica*, vol. 48, pp. 359 – 387, 1967. W rites the following (pg. 379): "πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης..may well be the relic of an older, more literal rendering of the Hebrew Ruach Kodes,or its Aramaic equivalent, reflecting the Semitic flavor of the primitive Palestinian kerygma on which the credal formula underlying Rom1,3-4 may well have been based although this term had long since been replaced in general usage throughout the Greek-speaking early Church by the LXX form πνεῦμα ἅγιον"

397 Ibid. pg. 379: "For Paul, then, πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης would be a uniquely specific and nostalgic at Rome for designating the "Spirit of holiness" received and poured forth by the risen exalted Lord and Messiah on all those who believe in and invoke his name."

398 That is with and without articles

399 I would like to discourage from reading Schrage's book on sanctification and pneumatology in Paul. Unfortunately in all the sections it promises to elaborate on holiness and sanctification, it only speaks about the justification.

which would enable to divide them into some logical groups. We shall therefore list them as they appear in the Bible.

Chapter 5 of the epistle to **Romans** opens by saying that, having been justified by faith, Christians have now peace with God through Jesus Christ. Faith is the door that gives access to grace. And therefore Christians can boast not only in this grace but also in sufferings, that lead through perseverance to hope, not to despair. This hope is not vain. It is based not in something accidental, but on something as solid as God's love.

Or should we rather say liquid. It was shown in the chapter on holiness in Luke, that the early Christian theology used an image of water, oil or even general property of liquidity to describe the Holy Spirit. Paul uses the image of engulfing to describe God's love that is poured out into the hearts of the believers through the Holy Spirit. **Rom 5,5**: “ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς οὐ καταισχύνει, ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν.” Holy Spirit is here the carrier or medium of God's love, personified God's love itself is not intended. God's Spirit is so near to humans that it has access to their inner hearts. Spirit knows man's heart and therefore it can intercede and pour love.

The notion of Spirit being poured out is by no means new to Paul. He used already established prophecy from Joel 2,29 about the last days and day of the Lord. In using this metaphor, Paul shows his understanding of the present time as the time of the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit who gives prophecies⁴⁰⁰. The prophecy that the Spirit carries in this verse is that God

400 Dunn, pg.252: “Paul has in mind the experience of hope, rather than the thing hoped for...God's love not simply as something believed in on the basis of the Gospel or the testimony of the cross..., not simply the certainty of God's love (Kuss), but God's love itself (Althaus) experienced in rich measure.”

loves those, who believe in him despite their national and ritual place of origin⁴⁰¹.

Interestingly enough, in the whole chapter 8 of the letter to Romans there is not a single case of “Holy Spirit”, though, of course, it is implied⁴⁰². In this chapter, Paul develops his theology of Spirit, he speaks about the new law of the Spirit which leads to life, not to condemnation (as opposed to the written law). The Spirit lives inside believers and through this presence testifies of the belonging to God. This inner presence is the beginning of the eschatology.

In the following chapter 9, Paul gives background for his ministry of preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles by explaining the relationship between them and the Israel: **Rom 9,1**: “*Ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι, συμμαρτυρούσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*”. His service is not the service of the dead law leading to condemnation, it is lead by the Holy Spirit, i.e. the Spirit of God, not his human, fleshly one. It renders Paul's service spiritual. In the same way the Holy Spirit purifies the *συνείδησις* of the Gentiles and thus makes them acceptable for God: Paul's *συνείδησις* is the co-martyr in

401 Fitzmyer, pg. 398: life-giving water being poured out: “Paul applies it to God's love, i.e., to the divine energy manifesting itself in an overwhelming embrace of once godless creatures who are smothered with his openness and concern for them. It is the manifestation of God's giving of himself without restraint, in a way unparalleled by any human love. It is impossible for a human being to imagine the dimensions or bounds of divine love; humanity knows of it only because God has graciously willed to pour it out and make it known.”

402 This is the point which shows the weakness of the choice of method. In a summary like this, one may easily lose the overall theological picture. I have restricted myself to the lexical analysis with sight to the theological conclusions. However, I am well aware how difficult it is to build a theology on single words.

the same Holy Spirit⁴⁰³. Paul is the first recipient of the message and of the testimony and then he testifies further.

Chapter 14 deals with the topic of **purity** and sufficiency of faith, as we shall see further. In the polemic about freedom of one's food choices, as concerns the measure to which the ritual food-laws can be abandoned, there is the statement that the kingdom of God actually does not deal with food and drink. Matters of ritual purity including food-laws are not the point of the Gospel. The Gospel is spiritual and therefore the matters of keeping one's body ritually pure are indifferent⁴⁰⁴.

Rom 14,17 : “οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρώσις καὶ πόσις ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.” Rather than about food, the Gospel is about what the Church receives in the Holy Spirit. The Spirit who is holy, brings about the eschatological Shalom to those who are justified and who therefore give thanks for the joy of the redemption. The whole new spiritual life of the Church happens in the Spirit and it is founded on the work of the savior Jesus⁴⁰⁵. That the Spirit is called here “holy”, may carry the meaning that the

403 Dunn explains the preposition “εν” in the following way: Dunn 523: “In the “εν” phrases the “εν” does not have quite the same force, the former being more local (Adam Christology), the latter more instrumental (inspired by). An equivalent of “Christ” and “Spirit” should therefore not be derived from this verse (cf. Leitzmann), though, of course, the two phrases are two aspects of the basic condition of the believer for Paul – the being IN Christ, sustained BY the Spirit.”

404 The body as such does matter, but not as much as it did in the Jewish law. On one hand, Paul does not abandon ritual law, on the other hand he teaches more freedom. But never absolute freedom. Paul never says that body would be indifferent. Some of his followers obviously embraced the new freedom too far. In the 1 Corinthians Paul has to give them some boundaries, as to their sexuality and also in the matter of food. In the epistle to Romans his concern is to show freedom from the food-laws. In the epistle to Corinthians he gives a barrier in forbidding the food offered to idols.

405 Fitzmyer, pg. 697: “Three qualities two of which echo key ideas of the doctrinal section of Romans, uprightness (chaps 1-4) and peace (5,1 a 8,6), proceed from the Spirit's promptings and are conditions of Christian conduct in the Kingdom or, better, are

sanctification cannot be procured by obeying food-laws, but by adherence to the Spirit of holiness who sanctifies, despite the subject's eating “whatever is found in the meat shops”, that is, even potentially defiling stuff.

Paul thus continues in the internalizing line of purity laws (Mt15, Mk7). The previously outward requirements are replaced with ethical maxims. What matters is not that which enters a person from outside, but that which comes out, defilement does not threaten the body, but the heart, not hands but the consciousness.

The following occurrence appears at the closings of the letter. Paul has finished the main body of teaching and is slowly moving to the final discourse on the collection and to final greetings. In **Rom 15,13**: he writes: “ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος πληρώσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν, εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου.” Paul asks that God would fill the Roman Christians with joy and peace in faith. This should happen through the Holy Spirit. The sending Father is “God of hope”, the Spirit operates likewise on *hope and power*. Calling the Spirit in this verse “holy” does not add any extra information to the text. Associating the power to the Spirit is parallel with all the other uses in the New Testament, especially the Lukan literature, where all the important people who started something new were filled with the Holy Spirit and started speaking boldly in power. This is also the same notion described in **1 Cor 12,3**: Nobody can say Jesus is the Lord, except through the Holy Spirit. Here, however, towards the end of Romans, Paul's blessing stresses the hope. This Spirit of God, active in this world, is reliable, one can hope in it to empower and flood with all good things. The Holy Spirit is the one in whom

eschatological gifts that characterize the kingdom”

the empowerment happens, who fills the believers with all the above mentioned good things.

The next case of the collocation “*πνευα ἅγιον*” appears just few verses further in the discourse on Paul's ministry. This specific verse, however, requires a lot more attention than just explaining the role of the adjective “holy” in the collocation. Paul uses sacrificial language of holiness in building his metaphor describing his own ministry. He says that his mission to serve to Jesus the Christ among the Gentiles, is God's mercy. Further, he qualifies this service as a priestly ministry, where the sacrifice⁴⁰⁶ are Gentiles, sanctified by the Holy Spirit.

Rom 15,16: “*ν 15b: [διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ] εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.*” In respect to the holiness in the collocation “*πνεῦμα ἅγιον*” it is the work of the Holy Spirit to sanctify the metaphorical sacrifice, that is the Gentiles. This is very unusual. More popular among the first Christians when speaking about the sacrifice, was to point to the sacrificially explained death of Jesus⁴⁰⁷, who is also believed to be the metaphorical Priest. Here, however, the author takes for himself the role of the priest and for the Gentiles the role of sacrifice. Gentiles - called pure and laid at the holy altar of God?

We need to untangle first the main layers of the metaphor Paul is using. The original language of the metaphor is that of the priests in the Jerusalem temple,

406 In this case as in that of Rom 12,1 the sacrifice is not expected to be slayed. It is supposed to be living.

407 Viz all the previous chapters. Especially, the language is strong in the epistle to Hebrews. Heb 7 most of all.

the new setting is Paul's ministry of Gospel: The Jerusalem temple was run by the priests, *λειτουργοι*, who were separated for the service of God since their birth into the noble family. They had special law only for themselves that bound them to be set apart even stricter than the whole holy nation. The purity laws were much more rigorous for them, because they had the contact with the holiness of the temple. Nothing defiling could touch the temple, therefore these people were what we could call "holiness elite". Or, at least, were supposed to be. In the period of our interest the Sadducees, the priestly temple establishment, were so corrupted and so repulsive to the believers that whole host of purity sects emerged, among which also the purity sect of Pharisees, Paul's original background. To describe himself as a server at the temple⁴⁰⁸, he is referring to both the original ideal of the temple-service and the rabbinic idea of spiritual service by fulfillment of the law, as well as to the Christian idea of spiritual service by obedience in faith⁴⁰⁹.

The task of a priest is to mediate between God and his people. It is a person who can enter so holy a place that would be dangerous for anybody else. At the same time, he is a human being, and therefore can listen to troubles of the believers and carry the supplications to the heaven. In the case of the Jerusalem temple, this happened also by the means of sacrificially butchering the

408 Dunn, pg. 859: "Although *λειτουργος* can mean merely a servant, as most often in LXX..., almost certainly Paul has in mind here the more specific cultic sense ("priest"), This is not to say, however, that Paul thought of his own ministry as involving literal cultic activity. The cultic language is transformed (not merely spiritualized) by an (pg. 860) eschatological fulfillment ... that is to say, the division between cultic and secular (together between sacred and profane, clean and unclean – 14,14,20) has been broken down and abolished (see also 12,1) as part of the breaking down of the (in large part cultically determined) distinction between Jew and Gentile..."

409 Fitzmyer, pg. 711: "*If clement of Rome 1 Clem 8,1 can look on Old Testament prophets as cultic ministers of God's grace "οι λειτουργοι της χαριτος του θεου", this term can be applied even more to the apostles, prophets, and teachers of the New Testament"* Compare with the chapter on holiness in 1 Clem.

sacrifice. The sacrifice had to be ritually pure and perfect, without blemish, its purpose was to open a channel between God and the believer. Priest entered the temple covered by the blood of the sacrifice and brought the believer's issues before God⁴¹⁰.

Paul, knew of “spiritual sacrifice”⁴¹¹ of prayers and studying Torah etc. from his rabbinic background (viz. further). The cult is internalized and all the people of God should be able to live on the same level of purity level that is required of the priest themselves. But nowhere in this original life of the metaphor fit Gentiles. They are the source of defilement, they are the ones who the temple must be protected from. They are the destruction and defilement of the temple. How could they be “acceptable” in the eyes of God, “εὐπρόσδεκτος”? For Jews it is abomination to even say that a gift, “ἡ προσφορὰ”, concerning Gentiles “τῶν ἐθνῶν”, would be acceptable “εὐπρόσδεκτος”.

Paul says here, however, that this repulsion has been overcome. Gentiles have not only been purified by the faith, they also have been sanctified. Their sanctification happened in the Spirit, when the it adopted them, accepted them, included them. They are now brought by Paul, through his work of preaching of the Gospel, at the altar of God, in front of God's face. And Paul is not afraid of the Lord's wrath of such possible abomination, he is persuaded that even Gentiles can be worthy of His presence when made acceptable by the Spirit.

410 Though not all sacrifices were necessarily bloody. For the poor people, e.g. , there was a possibility to present just the plants.

411 Walter Radl in his article “Kult und Evangelium bei Paulus” is against calling the process “Spiritualisierung” and he prefers rather “Somatisierung” but in the case of Rom 15,16 he comes up with yet another designation, i.e. “Verbalisierung bzw. Kerygmatisierung” pg. 66: “Das “Scheriben” an die Römer (im doppelten Sinn des Wortes) ist selbst als Verkündigung des Evangeliums – Teil von Paulus beschriebenen Liturgie”. In *Biblische Zeitschrift* 31 (1987), 58 – 75.

God himself sends Paul. It is the promised⁴¹² eschatological time when even Gentiles are invited to worship the Lord God. Paul's task is that of mediating this encounter, that is the work of the priest, “ἱεουργοῦνται”⁴¹³. He preaches the Gospel and he calls the Gentiles to Jesus. In their faith, their hearts and consciousness are purified and they are sanctified by the Spirit. Now they are ready to be presented before the Lord God Almighty of Israel as a gift, pleasing, pure, perfect, sanctified. It is this transformation of the Gentiles into saints that the Spirit does. It is the Spirit who is holy and who imparts this holiness also on those, who believe. In this case the adjective “ἅγιος” in the collocation “πνεῦμα ἅγιον” is therefore crucial, for it is the Spirit, who imparts this quality on those who belong to it.

The cultic language continues also in the next case of the collocation “πνεῦμα ἅγιον”. In **1 Cor 6,19**: Paul describes bodies of Christians as the new temple of the Holy Spirit. “ἡ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός ἐστιν οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἑαυτῶν;”. In the chapter 3 of the same epistle, Paul uses the notion of the temple to describe the community. There, in the v 16., he says only: “ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν”. Of course, that the Holy Spirit is intended also there, but for some reason⁴¹⁴ the author decided to use the adjective Scriptures only in the case, where he describes Christian's body as the temple and not when he thus describes the whole Church. As we have seen earlier, the Holy Spirit knows the

412 Ezk 34

413 Dunn, pg. 860: “...the word does not occur in LXX nor elsewhere in the New Testament. But in Philo and Josephus it consistently denotes the priestly offering of sacrifice, though it should be noted that in [both]...it..is something the whole people can do.”

414 Probably this would be just involuntary. Paul was not writing a theological tractate with focus of clear-cut language precision.

spirit of every individual. Every human has a physical body, but they also have a spirit which is metaphorically located in heart. If this human spirit is known and touched by the Holy Spirit, if the latter is invited to be active in the believer's life, then this particular believer in his bodily form does exactly the same thing as the actual building of the Jerusalem temple did: It is the place of meeting.

To look deeper into the metaphor of the temple, it is necessary to explain its original life. *Ναός* is the term describing the *inner* sanctuary of the temple, the place restricted to the priests. It was first built for the Ark of Covenant and because of it, and around it, the glory of God dwelt in Jerusalem. It was the place where God had his home among his people and made them special. From the ark, Holy of Holies, and the whole Temple, holiness, manifested as glory of God, was emanating, making the Jerusalem holy city and Israel holy nation, selected, set apart for the use of God. Both cases of the metaphor in the 1st Cor, describing saints as *ναός*, speak about the sanctuary rather than the whole complex of the temple, which is rather a more intimate language. Again, the believers in focus are most likely of Gentile origin.

In the chapter 6 of the 1st letter to Corinthians, it is twice repeated (v 13 - 18) that a body is *from* God and *for* God, not for food nor for *πορνεία*, which are the two most important remaining purity issues for Paul. It is important not to damage the bodily temple by defilement⁴¹⁵. The body, says Paul in 1st Cor, can be

415 Y. Liu: Temple Purity in 1 -2 Cor, pg. 145: "Sexual sins like defilement of the individual body exert a severe impact on the spiritual body of Jesus Christ and destroy the worthiness of one's body as the limb of Jesus Christ." and again in pg. 173: "...Paul associated temple purity with corporeal holiness. The physical body is connected with Christ in a spiritual dimension, and sexual misconduct is a violation of Christ's body and endangers the purity of the temple-community."

either united spiritually with other Christians and God in a spiritual way and thus creating purity by the indwelling Spirit, or it can be used for the physical unity with a prostitute. In the same way as the body benefits from Lord, it is destroyed by the illicit union, as Paul later uses the *lex talionis*, saying that who destroys the temple of God, shall be destroyed by Himself⁴¹⁶. Each person has been given a body and the way they treat it does matter. If they miss the goal and they use their body for illicit unions, such as being with a prostitute or eating idol food (viz further when discussing the purity of foods in 1 Cor 8 -10), they are sinning against their own body, defiling it. The original purpose of body, however, is to use it for the glory of God (v.20). Each of the members of the “body of Christ”, of the “Holy Spiritual temple”, have to keep their own bodies, building blocks, in the same purity. It does matter how each member lives their life of faith and what building block they are offering.

Therefore, to come back to our original focus, the bodies of the believers are now the new sanctuary for God, place of dwelling of the Holy Spirit. The same Spirit that filled the Jerusalem Temple with the Glory of God in its inauguration, is now active in the bodies of Christians of both Jewish *and* Gentile origin. It is therefore an imperative, not to defile this dwelling place by the things that repel God, that cause his wrath. Body of each believer is to be set apart for

416 Ivarson says, that such behavior is against what he calls “the second protocol of masculine behavior” that is to show weakness in not being able to control one's passions. (Identity Formation in the New Testament. Ed. by Bengt Holmberg and Mikael Winninge 2008. WUNT I 22, Fredrik Ivarsson: A Man Has To Do What A Man Has To Do. Protocols of Masculine Sexual Behaviour and 1 Corinthians 5-7) However, in the same way as in the pagan world body is grave of soul, Paul says it is the temple not only of a human soul, but that of the Holy Spirit.

God from every defilement. The indwelling Holy Spirit is holy. The Spirit sanctifies them, but they should not defile its dwelling place.⁴¹⁷

In the Second epistle to the Corinthians, at the beginning of chapter 6, there is a list of sufferings Paul and his fellows had to go through. It is very well literately structured. First, there are three triplets of different types of suffering, starting from general ones, such as tribulations etc, moving to more specified, such as imprisonment etc. Following this list, there is a catalog of qualities that the believers show in all these sufferings. Among other things, Paul also says that he and his fellows commend themselves to God in sufferings **2 Cor 6,6** : “ἐν ἀγνότητι, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν χρηστότητι, ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀνυποκρίτῳ,” What strikes us at the first reading is that he lists Holy Spirit side by side human bravery in the sufferings. Why would Paul put in one list the Holy Spirit beside “purity”, “wisdom”, “endurance” and “kindness” and “perfect love”? We do not know. The most plausible answer is that he understands all these as “fruit” of the Spirit. All these qualities that the believers are able to show in the tribulation are granted by the power and help of the Spirit⁴¹⁸ who is holy and therefore imparts its qualities also on others⁴¹⁹.

The second case of “πνεῦμα ἅγιον” in the 2 Cor is one of the few text concerning the Trinity. **2 Cor 13,13**: “Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡ

417 Next occurrence of the collocation “Holy Spirit” is the v 12,13 which says that No one can say Jesus is Lord unless in the Holy Spirit and which is mentioned in the discourse on Rom 15,13

418 Barnett, pg. 329: “The Holy Spirit being both personal and powerful, is the agency by whom Paul is enabled to fulfill his ministry”

419 Martin, pg. 177: “...we conclude that when Paul writes πνεῦμα ἅγιον he means or implies a reference to the “Holy Spirit” ...but with the emphasis on the “power” that derives from him...therefore whether planned or spontaneously, the person of the Holy Spirit fits in (at least in Paul's mind) with the list of these positive attributes, and in fact gives a rationale to that list by showing that divine power-in-the-Spirit matches the apostle's too human weakness, the point under discussion at Corinth”

ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.” Here, Paul has brought together balanced formulation ascribing each person of the Trinity their attribute. Holy Spirit is here set beside Christ Jesus and God. To the three persons of the Trinity three shared qualities are added: to Jesus the grace, to God the love and to Holy Spirit the communion, “κοινωνία”⁴²⁰. The Holy Spirit creates platform, it is the soul of the Church, the personified unifier. Curiously, “κοινός” means “common” and can also be translated as “defiling”, but the “κοινωνία” of the Spirit is creating new platform, where the common is not opposite to holy, but is marked by it. The adjective “holy” in the collocation does not add any further value or information than that the subject is the person of the Trinity.

The Holy Spirit is also mentioned at the opening of the 1st epistle to the Thessalonians. Paul reminds the readers that when he had been there, his preaching was in the Holy Spirit, which manifested itself the same way as we have observed also in the Luke, not only in word but also in power and joy. **1 Thess 1,5n:** “ὅτι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγενήθη εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν λόγῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πληροφορία πολλῇ, καθὼς οἴδατε οἳ ἐγενήθημεν ὑμῖν δι’ ὑμᾶς. καὶ ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ ἡμῶν ἐγενήθητε καὶ τοῦ κυρίου, δεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ μετὰ χαρᾶς πνεύματος ἁγίου.” The Spirit here adds power and gravity to the apostolic speech and at the same time joy to the hearers of the message. And again from the other perspective, the preaching and hearing are happening on the platform prepared by the Spirit. It is not some humanly speech; preaching of the Gospel happens within the sphere of the spirit and is inspired

420 J.Y. Campbell compares the New Testament use of the word with the secular Graeco-Roman use in the article “κοινωνία and its Cognates in the New Testament” in JBL, 51 (1932) pg. 352 – 380.

and empowered by it. In the previous case, we saw that the personified Holy Spirit can be grieved, here the it “gives joy” despite hopeless situation of life and sufferings. The language connected with the Spirit here is that of lavishing of good things which are brought about through the service of the Gospel.

Four chapters later, Paul reminds the Church that they were called not to the *impurity* but to *sanctification*. The verse **4,7** shall be yet discussed in the section about sanctification, however, here it needs to be mentioned that the sanctification is said to happen by and through the Holy Spirit.

The two extremes of the semantic field of holiness stay the same, impurity and holiness. Through faith in the preached Gospel, the Christians are living in sanctification. But their sanctification should be visible, especially in abstinence from *πορνεία*, as suggested earlier in the chapter 4 of 1 Thess. Should anyone disregard the gift of sanctification by leading a laid-back life full of impurity, then such a person is said to be loathing not the people who preach, but God himself, who gives the Holy Spirit: **1 Thess 4,8**: “τοιγαροῦν ὁ ἀθετῶν οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀθετεῖ ἀλλὰ τὸν θεὸν τὸν δίδόντα τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τὸ ἅγιον εἰς ὑμᾶς. “ It is clear, that the Spirit is provided by God and that it lives now in the Christians. It is then implicit that by its indwelling, the Spirit sanctifies the recipients. Living immoral life is then not considered as the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, but against God who is the donor. In living non-sanctified life, one turns the spiritual message and life into pure works without life. Such behavior desecrates, literally “de-gods”, “ἀθετεῖν” God, it robs God of his holiness, transcendence and spirituality, blasphemes his Name.

Summary: In all these cases we have observed that the Holy Spirit dwells in

the hearts of believers, coming from manifold backgrounds, thus turning them into sanctified building blocks of the new society. As each believer is its temple, so is the group. The Spirit is sent by God. It can be grieved, it can fill with glory, power and joy. It seals the believers for God and transforms them. In it, the old Scriptures were written and in it, preaching of the Gospel happens: the powerful speech, in the same lines as we have also seen earlier in the Lk-Ac. If there is any sanctification, it comes from the *Holy Spirit*, since it has the quality of transcendent power and beauty and holiness. It sets apart for God, it pours out the love of God into the hearts of everyone and thus turns them into “sanctified”. But this gift is not given, in order to relax the Christians from doing good and living ethically. Since the bodies are thus sanctified, it is important to consider what the believers do with their bodies. There are two illicit unions. One is sexual union with a prostitute or in adultery or incest, the second is sharing in the meals offered to idols. These two imperatives have nothing to do with reaching sanctification. They are required secondary laws which show what it means to belong to God.

5.1.1.3 Other Collocations with the Adjective “ἅγιος”

There are fifteen cases collocations of the adjective “ἅγιος”, other than the “πνεῦμα ἅγιον”. In the epistle of Romans, all the occurrences have something to do with Israel: Scriptures of the Old Testament are holy (1,2), the Old Testament law is holy (2x in 7,12), Israel is the “holy root” (2x in 11,16), and Christians should present themselves as “holy sacrifice” (12,1). In the end of the epistle, the exceptional case of “holy kiss” appears, which is then repeated in the end of other two epistles (1st and 2nd Corinthians). In the 1st Corinthians

there are three more cases (except for the holy kiss in 16,20), they all carry slight ethical ring: Christians are holy temple (3,16) and then Christian children (7,14) and women (7,34) are both holy as well. It is difficult to look for any clusters of meaning-related groups. It is obvious that the epistle of Romans is mostly concerned with the Hebrew images of the holiness and uses them metaphorically and that the other epistles move from the spiritual explanation of the cult towards ethical requirement of “holy” living. All the cases shall be now interpreted in the suggested order.

Holy Scripture.

All of the early Christian authors considered the text of the Old Testament as divinely inspired and sacred. The obligatory introductory quotation formula usually mentions the Holy Spirit, who says something through the given author. In the beginning of the epistle of Romans, Paul says the same in different words: **Rom 1,2**: “ὁ προεπηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις”⁴²¹. The Jewish Scriptures are not abandoned as overcome, they are not dismissed, on the other hand they are accepted and embraced as holy.

Holy Law.

The same is repeated in other words in **Rom 7,12**: “ὥστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή.” Here the “νόμος” and “ἐντολή” are synonymous; in both cases the set of the Scriptures of the Old Testament is meant. They are holy because they were inspired by the Spirit who spoke

421 Dunn, pg.11, notes that this is “the only time this phrase (holy Scriptures) as such occurs in the New Testament”. He further notes yet one synonymous occurrence of “ἱερὰ γράμματα” in 2 Tim 3,15.

through the authors. But they are also called “holy” because they reveal God's will as shown to his chosen nation. In repeating ἅγιος twice so near to each other⁴²², Paul stresses that he had no intention in calling it abandoned⁴²³, overcome or dismissed. Paul is full Jew who honors law with all his life and he is submitted as the holy will of God thereby declared. He agrees in his heart and mind that law is valid. But further in the chapter he says that it is not the way or rather means to salvation.

Holy Root.

In the chapter 11 of the epistle to Romans, Paul is in the midst of his discourse on the validity of the revelation of God's will to Israel, on them being the truly holy nation. It is the fight against the abandonment of the law, against antisemitism in Church. How far are Christians just a Jewish sect? Paul is himself Jewish and his encounter on the way to Damascus was rather a call than a conversion. He never turns back on his Jewishness⁴²⁴. But in the eschatological moment when the Holy Spirit has been poured out on everyone and young ones prophecy, he is the messenger of the good news to the nations, so that they too would bow down before the creator. Their way has been paved

422 Consider two things, first, that in Hebrew such repetitiveness is sometimes used to express superlative and second, that the same information is repeated twice, which makes it a sort of superlative parallelism. It is important for Paul to show the holiness of law.

423 Dunn, Commentary, pg. 385 „Paul could only speak as positively of the law as he does here if he thought that his critique was directed against an abuse of the law – by sin, and most manifestly (to his Christian eyes) in the pride and presumption of his own people...Thus the holy although broadened out from the more restricted sphere of cultic purity (1,7), still embraces the law.“

424 W. D. Davies, “Paul and the People of Israel” NTS 24, pg. 4 – 39. pg. 13: “Paul presents the quintessence of his Gospel at the very beginning” of Rom, in 1,16 “it is the power of salvation for everyone – Jew and Greek – who should believe” ... pg. 14: “...there are those among the Jews who hear and accept the Gospel, and those who do not... A remnant has believed and it remains true that the nucleus of the people of God, the Church, is still Jewish – as Jewish as Paul himself!”

and enabled by the Messiah, Jesus from Nazareth. Also they can now join in the eschatological worship⁴²⁵ of the Lord God of Israel, the creator. And therefore it is important not to forget the roots. Not to cut the faith in Jesus from his and its Jewishness.

In the chapters 9 – 11 of Romans Paul explains the need of appreciation for the Jewish background of the Christian faith. In the verse 16 of the chapter 11, he uses two metaphorical images to explain better in what way is Israel “holy”.

Rom 11,16: “εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα· καὶ εἰ ἡ ῥίζα ἁγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι.”

Both images⁴²⁶ are at the beginning of something new, they are the sources: *firstfruits* are the holy first produces of the harvest, that are presented as the “thanksgiving offering” to the Lord and *root* is a source of the life-force for a plant. Israel is not holy for being the guardian of the Law, but for being the first fruit, the oldest child, the carrier of the first revelation of God. Just because they were the first heralds does not mean that they would lose their holiness when all the rest of the harvest arrives, they remain special and they sanctify the rest of it.

The second image, the root, conveys very similar notion. If the Church wants to live, they cannot cut themselves away from the roots. Israel is sucking its life-force from God's holiness. Should Christians cut themselves from Israel, they would end up cutting themselves away from the life-giving source. The roots of Jewish faith are drinking holiness and the Christians should tap in rather than cut off. This does not mean that they should seek their salvation in

425 W. D. Davies, “Paul and the People of Israel”, pg. 16: “This enigmatic phrase (πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται) must not be diluted to mean the greatest and spiritual blessings in a general way: it denotes rather the inauguration of the End (11,15).”

426 Fitzmyer, pg. 614: Lists possible explanations: “Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia, the first handful of dough and the root are Christ, whose holiness guarantees blessings for all humanity... Barrett and Weiss – the converted remnant, the “elect”...etc”

the law⁴²⁷, but that they need to embrace the roots, because therefrom flows the revelation and holiness⁴²⁸.

Holy Sacrifice.

After the discourse on importance of Israel, Paul opens (οὖν) new chapter using the cultic language. Christians of both Jewish and Gentile origin should not bring animal sacrifices in temple anymore. **Rom 12,1**: “Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ παραστῆσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν.” What they should do is to bring themselves as the sacrifices. Not like dead animals or Jesus, giving their blood in the altar, but in *living* every day the life worthy of his servants. Paul does not want to imply that Christians should make a new cult or a new ritual that should be repeated every day⁴²⁹. Neither does he say that the Jerusalem cult has been “developed” or “upgraded” to a new, better, level. He does not say that in bringing the “λογικὴ λατρεία” Christians would somehow earn God's favor⁴³⁰

427 Dunn, commentary, pg. 659: “...the Pharisees, or at least a significant portion of them, evidently saw it as their objective to extend the holiness of the temple throughout the land, at least in that they observed in daily life the level of purity/holiness required in the last only in relation to the temple... there is no reason why the two halves of v 16 should be synonymous rather than complementary... on the contrary, Paul probably intended to bring both ideas together in this verse (early converts, including Gentiles, as promise of the complete harvest, including Jews; promise to patriarchs as assurance that God is still faithful to Israel as a whole).”

428 Dunn, commentary, pg. 660: “How much “theology of sanctification” can be drawn from this verse is unclear. It is hardly likely that the metaphors should be pressed to give and allegorical meaning – holiness transmitted from first offering/ patriarchs to eschatological believers in the same way as it is transmitted from offering the whole lump or from root to branches...any doctrine of sanctification drawing on this verse must observe the tension in Paul's thought regarding the promise which is to Israel... but which also comes to expression through grace.”

429 In the Patristic literature we see quite common explanation of this verse in line with the Eucharist, which is heterogeneous to Paul.

430 Dunn, commentary, pg. 710: „The figurative use of sacrificial language is widely attested, both in Jewish and wider Hellenistic literature, often in criticism, implicit or explicit, of reliance on a superficial ritual performance.“ But there is difference “...in Jewish critique of a false reliance on sacrifice it was assumed that ritual sacrifice was still

either. No. He only uses the language that is associated with the ritual practice of the Jerusalem cult, in order to use it for his metaphor.⁴³¹

Christians' task is not to die, but to live. Every day. In their bodies. It is exactly this everyday physical body-bound life that should, according to Paul, become *holy* *θυσία*. In the Graeco-Roman world, “*θυσία*” is the technical term for the sacrifice to deities of day, life and the world as opposed to the chthonic deities of the death and night. The LXX uses this text to convey sacrifice brought at the altar. But in both worlds, “*θυσία*” is the animal that is slain at the altar. It is from the altar that it receives the quality of holiness. The animal is usually set apart, it should be beautiful and healthy and then it is ritually prepared and ritually slain at the altar. Its blood has cleansing effect. Once the animal is so prepared, perfectly cleansed, lying at the altar, it is holy.

What does Paul expect from his readers? Note that in contrast to what was previously said about holiness, that it is a gift of God, here Paul expects holiness from the believers. He wants them to present themselves at the altar⁴³². The altar may be invisible and spiritual, that is, figurative place of reconciliation between God and men, but the sacrifice is to be physical, bodily. One layer of the meaning can be parallel to the theology of the body in 1

necessary“

431 Dunn, pg. 709, notes that we usually talk about the “spiritual” sacrifice, however, the text uses adjective *λογικη* and also the body is needed for it, he speaks of “somatizing” rather than a spiritualizing ... the physical embodiment of the individual's consecration in the concrete realities of daily life”. Compare also with the article of Davies, where he also brackets the designation „spiritualization“. Also in the epistle of Hebrews it was stressed “somatizingly” that Jesus obtained body, in order that he might have it slain in the sacrificially interpreted death on the cross.

432 Fitzmyer, pg. 640: “Paul implicitly compares Christians with animals slaughtered in Jewish or pagan cults, but he corrects the comparison by adding “living” and the following phrases. It is not a cult that offers dead animals to God; Christians who strive to do what is right give a cultic or sacrificial sense to their lives, as they offer themselves and their conduct to him.”

Corinthians, where Paul warns that the body is the temple and it is important to keep it separate for God, that is holy. It is not to be used for illicit union either in the idol worship or in sexual union with a prostitute. This is one way to put it. Another way is, of course, the requirement on Christians to live a life worthy of God, to honor him in every day of their life, in whatever they do, this would point to the the adverb “εὐάρεστον”.

Paul does not require ritual purity of the Roman Christians (compare with Rom 14), but independent of their origin, whether Jewish or Gentile Christians, whether “weak” or “strong”, they all should keep their bodies in such a state as worthy of God, as if they were themselves the sacrificial animals. This does not mean that they should ritually wash themselves or that they should circumcise, but, as Paul explains later at the end of the following verse: “to do the will of God, everything that is good and perfect”.

Despite being called “bodily”, it is not ritual worship⁴³³ (concerning washing hands, cutting body), it is “λογική” worship. Paul is balancing here with the Graeco-Roman imagery of the world divided into the apathetic spiritual world of the νοῦς and then the experiential changeable bodily world. In the world where the temple worship was still practiced, but was also subject to a great critique from prophets in Israel and from philosophers in the Graeco-Roman world, Paul uses their modern word, “reasonable”, “λογική”⁴³⁴. That is the type

433 Walter, Nikolaus. "Christusglaube und heidnische Religiosität in paulinischen Gemeinden," NTS 25 (1978-79), pg. 437: “Mit der eindeutig von kultischer Terminologie geprägten Aussage von Röm 12,1 wendet sich Paulus nicht in polemischer Kritik gegen irgendeine bestimmte Form von Kultübung....So sagt er: Auch für uns Christen gibt es eine Form von λατρεία....Unser „sinnvoller Gottesdienst“ (pg.438)...vollzieht sich nicht an ausgesinderten kultischen Orten und Zeiten und durch die Hand von Priestern, sondern durch uns alle „im Alltag der Welt““ here he quotes Käsemann “Gottesdiensts im Alltag der Welt” (1960) in Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, II (Göttingen, 1964),198-204.

434 More on the adjective Dunn , pg. 710, especially the quote from Epictetus.

of worship that was desirable everywhere, beyond the temples. Paul therefore combines at least three worlds together and balances carefully with words in order to invite everyone to praise God in good life.

Holiness in this verse has been taken from the sacrificial world of the Old Testament and used in the new context, applied on wisdom of daily life in the presence of God. This holiness does come out of belonging to God, however, a requirement is attached to it. God has separated his people and made them holy, and they should now live accordingly.

Holy Temple.

The image of the temple has already been mentioned above when speaking about the Holy Spirit and body of every individual Christian. Here, the image is used for the whole group. They all form together the new temple, the one that Jesus promised to build in three days. It would also be the temple where the “spiritual” sacrifice of just discussed verse of 12,1 would proceed, metaphorically speaking.

The Church is the new temple, the new sanctuary, the new Holy of Holies, place of dwelling of the Spirit of God. It is to be kept sacred and guarded from every defilement and destruction⁴³⁵, otherwise the threat accompanying the Jerusalem temple would also qualify for the spiritual temple. **1 Cor 3,16:** “οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; v.17: “εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός· ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός.” Both cases describing saints as *ναός* in the 1 Cor speak about the sanctuary rather than the whole complex of the temple, which is rather more intimate language. Already in the

435 It is interesting that Paul still uses this image even after Jesus reversed the flow of holiness especially on the level of the human interchange. Jesus was embracing the impure, can not Church embrace them?

second temple period, as Liu clearly shows, there have been prophetic voices understanding the community itself as a dwelling place of God, i.e. a temple. The Qumran community, believing the official cult of Jerusalem to be compromised, understood itself as the new eschatological temple⁴³⁶ Also, as we have already seen in the Gospels, Jesus himself said, that he would build a new temple, using figurative language. Therefore, the metaphor of temple used for a community was not a new idea of Paul.

First, Paul says in **3,17** to the whole community that they are the temple of God 3,17b “ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, οἳτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς”. Despite their factional fights in the Church of Corinth, they are one, singular Temple of God, dwelling place of the Spirit. Now, who would dare to destroy or desecrate the Jerusalem Temple? Would they not be afraid of the consequences? Who would dare? In the same vein, destroying the community of the New Temple bears the same consequences.

In **Romans 14,16**, Paul wrote that the fights about who is better (in keeping ritual food-laws) bring about the blasphemy, here Paul says that the fights about who is better (in wisdom) have the same effect. In his stern warning he makes use of the *lex talionis*: If you destroy, you will be destroyed “εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φθειρεί, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός”. Why not mercy?

Paul shows the importance of holiness of the Church, as we shall also see later. It is not just a community, it is not just AN ἐκκλησία, it is THE temple. It is not ready yet, it is not perfect yet, it has not reached its τέλος, it is being worked on⁴³⁷. Jesus is the cornerstone and Paul is the master workman. Everyone is responsible for what they bring on the building. Whether they choose some

436 Liu lists e.g. the following (pg. 58): 4Q174 I, 2-7; 4Q177 III, 5 -5-7; 1QS VIII,5 – 9; IX, 3 - 6

437 Consider Shep. Herm. Images of building.

cheap material or they give it everything they have. In such a teamwork there is no need for boasting. There is need for unity and dedication. Human independent wisdom is opposes the wisdom of God. The Church is a different world with different laws and different logic. Human wisdom is not a building block, it is a box of paper, and as such destroys the stability, destroys the temple. Church is therefore holy and out of this fact grows responsibility to hold it in high esteem, and to treat it with highest respect. It is the new eschatological temple of God.

Holy Children.

The verse in discussion is **1 Cor 7,14⁴³⁸**. : “*ἡγιασται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί καὶ ἡγιασται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ· ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστιν, νῦν δὲ ἅγια ἐστιν.*” The context is Paul's own opinion on whether the mixed marriages should be kept or dismissed. This is by no means romantic discourse on “pure soul” of children undefiled with this dirty world. Especially in the Corinthian community, burdened with spiritual and ethical rivalry, it is possible that the Church members from the mixed families had hard time, that they were probably taken as a second-class citizens of the Church⁴³⁹. Earlier in this chapter on holiness in Paul, it has been mentioned that belonging to Church is based on the baptism, which is, in turn, based on the work of Christ. It is also important notion that the Church is the new society, they are those separated for God, indwelled by the Holy Spirit, they are the members of the new eschatological family of God, where also Gentiles join in.

438 The following verse is subject to a lot of weird attempts for explanation some of which shall be mentioned here. It may be the fact there does not exist by this day any larger study on holiness in Paul compared with the general notion of holiness in the New Testament which would enable the larger focus. The explanation seems to be quite simple and basic. I will therefore offer my own exegesis.

439 Contra O'Connor.

Paul encourages his readers not to dismiss the mixed marriages, once united. The reason is that *affiliation with the "holy ones"/"saints" sanctifies*. Therefore, the reason for discouragement from divorce of the mixed marriages is exactly sanctification. The believers' sanctity does not depend on themselves, in their ethical excellence or personal ascetic achievement, it is derivative of God. In the same way it is derivative for the unbelieving spouses and the children. It is the affiliation that is the vehicle of the sanctification. In the scenario where the children and unbelieving spouse live without the believing spouse, they are impure. What is the difference? The faith. It is *the faith* that purifies the heart or consciousness, it is also the factor which decides if someone is holy or impure. In both Old and New Testament, it is true in general, and here specifically stylistically verified, that "unbelieving/unfaithful" is "impure" and the "believing/faithful" is "holy". The difference is the faith/dedication. The two extremes copy the scale of the semantic field of holiness.

If, according to the recurring theme in the New Testament, Gentiles are purified by faith, than a Gentile without faith is generally impure. This explains the worries on the part of the divided Church, especially if it included some Jewish Christians. They now had to be in contact with people who lived with non-believing, defiling, Gentiles. Could they sit by the same table? And who had to leave?

Paul stands up for the mixed marriages with yet another possible widening of the concept of sanctification, which is, in the end, the same just from another angle. The point of sanctification on the most basic level is to choose someone from the crowd or something from all the vessels for the special use of God. Secondly, then, it is also the extra added transcendental quality when the

holiness of God touches such person or object and in revealing the manifest holiness, in glory, renders them also transcendently touched, that is holy (e.g. Moses' shining face, untouchable ark of the covenant). God so chooses and touches his Church. But members of the Church also can choose and so touch someone and take them out of the general population. The marriage in the New Testament times among the Jews had also the notion of setting each other of the spouses apart, for the special and exclusive life together. They were holy for one another (viz the language factor, read further).

There is yet another level to it: *the reverse flow of holiness*. Jesus taught that nothing entering a person from outside can defile them, but only the dirt of their hearts, which leaks in the form of unethical behavior. Again, Peter in describing his encounter with Cornelius says that God has shown him that he should not “consider anyone defiling or impure”. When we combine these two notions, we see that the believing spouse should not be afraid of defilement, because by choosing the other person from the crowd, they sanctify them in this choice and then in connecting these two lives together. The holiness in them is more powerful than the defiling disbelief and non-faith, or even idol-worship on the part of the unbelieving spouses.

It is often argued that the sanctification in question also happened at the ethical level, when the unbelieving spouses attended possibly the meetings, or even that they were baptized together, but then there would not be the fight for their saving and they would not be called “unbelievers”. I strongly doubt that the first Church would baptize anyone who did not believe, because it was a matter of life and death and the accounts of all the households baptized in the Acts should be understood as a holy glorious and almost too sweet exception, rather than an example.

The reverse flow of the holiness is also the reason behind the sanctity of the children. For the time being, when they are still in the house of the parents, the holiness in the believing parent is stronger than the defilement through the unbelieving parent. Therefore the children from the mixed marriages are no less holy than the children of the “pure blood”.

Will the holy one become defiled by the nonexistent faith of their spouse? No, says Paul. As we have seen in the Gospel of Matthew, that which is laid at the altar, is sanctified by that contact. Also in all the Synoptic Gospels we have seen the “contagious holiness” of Jesus. In this case the marital unity does not create defilement like in the case of union with prostitute (1 Cor 6), it promotes holiness. In the Jewish betrothal tradition, the future spouses set each other apart in qiddush blessing. Because the spouse is set apart from the world by the calling of their believing “half”, they also are sanctified, called out of the world. by their humanly contact they catch something of the special holiness and blessing. Not only are they Gentiles, they are also unbelieving, yet they partake of the special blessing, by virtue of calling. Also, we should take into account the social feature of Roman “familia” which included the whole house-group of the people. One believer is enough to bring about the blessing upon the whole house (one light shining in the darkness, one grain of salt making the family tasty, one stain of blood on the door).

The sanctification happens again in someone, as we have seen also in v **1,2** (ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), and as is the case in **6,11** (ἀλλὰ ἡγιασθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Rather than locative, it is meant in instrumental way, *through*. Sanctification in the 1. Corinthians happens by a contact with someone holy: either with the source of holiness himself, that is Christ, his name, or his people. Sanctification is the transition

from being of this world to being a member of the holy people, and it requires help of some insider. Sanctification cannot happen by exercising asceticism, it is not an achievable goal. Sanctification is transfer from one realm (the old, “ἄπιστος”, “ἄδικος”) to another (the new, “ἅγιος”, “δίκαιος”), it only can be received as a result of genuine contact with someone or something holy. Note that the extremes are “holy” and “non-believing” as the new element in place of “impure”. It is a gift imparted by the stronger “holy” member of the contact. However, this transfer happens only in some unions, only in literally legitimate unions, unions that are set apart as such. In the mixed family, therefore, the believer sanctifies the unbelieving spouse, as well as the children involved. Children of the mixed marriages are not “defiled”, they are not second class Christians, they are “pure”, they are holy themselves. Mixed families are not any worse, they are full-right pure Christian families⁴⁴⁰.

Holy Woman.

Belonging to the same letter and also to the discourse on the holiness in family (house-orders) the verse in **1 Cor 7, 34** says: “καὶ μεμέρισται. καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ᾗ ἅγια καὶ τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι· ἡ δὲ γαμήσασα μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῷ ἀνδρὶ.” Young woman, not married, busies herself only with the things of God, but the married cares only how to make her husband have pleasure in her. The difference is,

440 Further reading, except for the standard commentaries: Especially Delling, G “Nun aber sind sie heilig”, in *Gott und die Götter*, Berlin 1958, 257 – 260 where he lists eight possible ways to exegete the text, Murphy O'Connor, *Works Without Faith in 1 Cor 7,14*, in *RevB84*,1977, pelagianistic in nature is still a lot better and advisable than quite erroneous attempt of E. Best in *IBC 11/12*(1989-90 pg. 158 -165). I would need the whole new thesis to enter the discussion with them, therefore I decided to present my opinions without further dialogue, because otherwise I would have to write a note for every sentence.

that the first one is separated “for the Lord” and the second one “for her husband”. Is the first one more saint than the other, does she earn sanctity by being single?

This is one of the few places in the Bible where the holiness is clearly connected with conduct. There is difference between ascetic striving and ethical living. The holiness of a single woman has two sources. The first one is the classic one, that has been discussed throughout this thesis, she is holy by definition, because she is a Christian. The second source of holiness is derivative of the first one. She is holy, because also in her live, she is separated for God in the sense that she has all her time in her own hands and thus is separated for the special use of God, investing all her time and money to the service. Therefore her sanctity it is not about keeping herself sexually pure or not being engaged in the sexual activities *per se*. It is about time and attention.

Therefore the text does not exhort to asceticism, but to life dedicated to God. For one thing, the starting point of that exemplary young woman, a virgin, “παρθένος”, is already holiness. She does not want to achieve entrance to the eschatological society by her asceticism. She had already been set apart, she is already a member of the eschatological holy people, she is already holy. But for her love for Christ, she is ascetic, in order to dedicate herself fully to the Lord. When she marries, she needs to give some portion of her attention to the marriage and therefore she is not fully immersed and separated for God.

Holy Kiss.

The last case of collocation of the adjective ἅγιος with a substantive appears four times in Pauline corpus. **Rom 16,16** (Ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι

ἀγίω.); 1 Cor 16,20 (Ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίω.), 2 Cor 13,12 (ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν ἀγίῳ φιλήματι.) and 1 Thess 5,26 (Ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς πάντας ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίω.). Since Church is the holy society, set apart from this world for the Lord, when they meet, maybe as a part of a liturgy, maybe to show their purity, they should kiss one another with a holy kiss. Their goodbyes are also holy⁴⁴¹. Also in the Graeco-Roman society public kiss was not so common, it was acceptable within family⁴⁴². The original impetus for kissing is to be sought in Jesus himself. Paul, unlike the usual ethical teachers of his time, urged people to kiss. The fact, that he uses imperative and adds this formula to many of his letters then suggest, according to Klassen “*that his new practice needs encouragement*”⁴⁴³. In conclusion of his article he presents very plausible proposition, which is in accord also with my conclusions about holiness in Paul and early Church in general. It was one of the key messages of the Gospel that the differences are overcome. In Christ we are all one, there is no Greek nor Jew no man or woman, no master nor slave. A kiss added to a greeting after a shared meal just seals the new-found intimacy of a holy family.

Summary: The adjective “holy” collocates with an incoherent variation of subjects. There is no clear notion. Holy can be everything touched by God, belonging to him.

441 W. Klassen wrote 1993 an excellent article on this topic in NTS, called “The Sacred Kiss in the New Testament”. He summarizes the phenomenon of kiss in Judaism and Graeco-Roman society. “In Judaism three types of kisses were apparently considered valid: the kiss of reverence, the kiss of reunion...and the kiss of farewell” and further he notes that “The highly symbolical use of kiss in Philo cannot lead to the conclusion that the kiss of peace was predicted as a “formal and ceremonial institution of the Jewish synagogue”. IN W. Klassen, “The Sacred Kiss in the New Testament: An Example of Social Boundary Lines,” *New Testament Studies*, vol. 39, no. 01, pp. 122–135, Jan. 1993.

442 Klassen summarizes: “Whatever the Graeco-Roman world did to encourage or discourage kissing, it can't be described as a source of Paul's admonition”.

443 Ibid.

5.1.1.4 Sanctification

As far as the problem of “sanctification” goes, this is the most tricky of all the forms in which the root *αγι-* appears. Sanctification is a process of transferring one or something from the place of neutral general purity into that of holiness. Is it a state that can be reached by human effort by consistent ethical behavior, or is it only the process itself? Do people have the quality of sanctity at their disposal at all? Are they able to win and therefore impart holiness on someone else? We shall attempt to answer these questions along the way describing the single occurrences.

The entire chapter 6 of the epistle of Romans deals with the notion of separation and submission. A person is viewed as *always* submitted to some ruler, servanthip to one implies the freedom from the other. Therefore the main focus of sanctification is not in the first plane on *ethics*, but on that of *belonging*. In the verse 19 the substantive “*sanctification*” appears as the result of righteousness, it is not end in itself, it is rather a by-product⁴⁴⁴ of following the righteousness. **Rom 6,19**: “ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν. ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν

444 Dunn, commentary, pg. 347: “What Paul looks for in his converts is what the law looked for – holiness, *hagiasmos*, where the word is best understood as the end result of an act (*hagiazein*) or process (*eis hagiasmon*) so consecration, or dedicated state (hence “holy”) though a firm line between end result and process into cannot be clearly drawn. Cranfield thinks *agiasmos* denotes process rather than state...In the three correlatives, *hagiazein*, (usually used in the aorist), *hagios* and *hagiasmos*, the eschatological tension is clearly expressed as the dedication of conversion-initiation and Spirit's anointing, to be lived out with deliberate decision in daily life (which is a reaffirmation in desacralized ethical terms of the Pharisaic ideal of conducting daily life as though a priest in the temple, with a view to the completed consecration “without which no one will see the Lord. The power by which this end is achieved is *dikaiosyne*, meaning god's gracious, sustaining power.)”

ἀνομίαν, οὕτως νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δίκαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν.”

Based on consistency of the author, it is preferable to consider this righteousness not as the one earned by either keeping the law or being under the law as the special nation of Israel, but that it is the imputed righteousness, as well as righteousness that comes with the conscience cleansed through the Holy Spirit in faith.

There are two ways of existence, both of them described as slavery⁴⁴⁵. Each person can be slave either to “impurity” or to “righteousness”. The first one leads to lawlessness and the latter to holiness. This is not as logically coherent connection as would be the chiasmatic one. It would be more logical to put *righteousness* against *lawlessness* and *holiness* against *impurity*. But there seems to be a kind of development hidden in the chiasmatic structure. This verse mixes both ritual and lawful parallel of what is desirable and what is not. Instead of usual place of general “purity” on the scale of holiness, there is the “righteousness”. Lawlessness is here the outcome of both “impurity” and “lawlessness” itself. “Sanctification” then is outcome of “righteousness”. Being focused on sin leads to death, focus on righteousness of faith leads to holiness and life.

In this very complex verse, which keeps the scale of the semantic field of holiness as it is in the Old Testament, there are two layers of the distinction between good and bad. One is the *holiness* scale and the other is the *righteousness* scale. The former deals with the ritual and the latter concerns the law. There are almost deuteronomistically two ways set before the people to choose form, either that of death or that of life. Way to death leads through

445 Dunn, commentary, pg. 345: „Paul was no doubt well aware that the metaphor of slavery, so antithetical to Greek ideals, is an adequate one for talk of their relation with God the weakness of flesh characterizes Paul's understanding of the human condition.“

giving oneself over to the forces of impurity and lawlessness, life is then reached on the path of righteousness and holiness. Both realms, ritual and ethical are set beside each other.

Holiness and impurity are in the Old Testament connected mostly with the ritual. In the New Testament, however, as we have seen throughout this thesis, these ties loosen as the ritual approach to God loses its relevance, especially for the Gentile Christian. Is the withdrawal away from the “ritual” in favor of the “ethical”? Not necessarily only ethical. The notion of ritual purity is internalized and, especially in connection with the righteousness in the v. 19, it is rather spiritualized. Righteousness is not achieved by following the Law but by acting in trust and faith in the resurrected Christ.

The previously ritual requirements are then transferred on this level of discourse. One is purified by faith and by the indwelled Holy Spirit, who sanctifies by its presence in the hearts of believers. This is “the way of life⁴⁴⁶”. The “life of death” is in the permanent focus on sins, on failing to achieve the Law and therefore “lawlessness” which leads only to the “impurity”, lack of faith and then also lack of life of life. Now that the “way to purity” is not through “washing of hands” but “washing of heart through faith”, also the sanctification is a by-product of this righteousness. Therefore trying to ascribe the sanctification as a result of human ethical effort does not seem to be correct.

This can be also supported by the following context of our verse, which comes back to the concept of sanctification again in the **Rom 6,22**: “*νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον.*” Being set free from the *servanthood of sin* to that of righteousness and therefore all the fruit growing from this fact, which is

446 Also consider the Tractate of the Two Ways found in Apostolic Fathers.

“sanctification and life”, is expressed in the passive voice. People have been freed by God in Christ.

Again, as usually happens with Paul's use of the language of holiness, the sanctification is not understood in our Western individualistic way, but in the way of the people of God as a whole. The Church, as a whole, has been set free from their previous master, in order to become “slaves”, set apart for God, therefore his, therefore righteous and therefore sanctified. The fruit of all this process is consumed by the Church, now that they are sanctified, they can expect everlasting life.

Not even here is the sanctification the ultimate goal in itself, so that people could compare and ascetically strive for perfection. The ultimate goal is eternal life with God, the means is God's freeing act of Christians and the by-product is the sanctification. The only part humans have in this process is that of serving. Out of themselves, they are only capable of serving as “slaves of sin”. But they have been freed from this by God, whereby they become his own slaves, set apart for Him they become His, the saints. It is the parallel notion to Christians being “branded” by the Holy Spirit for holiness. They were slaves before and now they also are slaves, they should therefore serve their new master well and not to “betray” the new master by serving the previous one. Just by behaving accordingly to whom they belong, according to their new master, Christians seal that they are truly His, their fruit betrays their master, either life or death. Life is however not earned by good behavior, it is given as the gift of freedom of the new master.

Sanctification is fully recognized as the work and achievement of Christ in 1 Cor 1,30 alongside with justification and redemption. **1 Cor 1,30**: “ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ

ὁμοίως ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ, δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμὸς καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις,” The discourse starts in 1 Cor 1,26 and goes on until the verse 31. The main theme is not holiness or sanctification but “wisdom”. That which this world considers as wisdom: power and high birth, is, according to God, nothing. In order to reveal his own intentions, will and character, God has repeatedly chosen otherwise. The discourse is packed with terms describing choice. In the Church, which consists of the chosen ones, there are not many wise, powerful or noble by birth, but God has chosen to turn these qualities upside down and disregard them in order to reveal what he considers wise, powerful and noble.

The only legitimate boasting before God and Church can only come from God, from his work and from his perspective. This discourse is concluded by paraphrase of Jeremiah 9,22 LXX where there is the boasting mentioned in connection with the triad of “wisdom”, “power” and “richness”. In v 23 then God says that in Him, there is mercy, judgment (mishpat) and justice. The original text has very strong social justice ties. The Pauline text continues in the same line and translates the notion into the post-Christ situation of Church fighting within itself with pride⁴⁴⁷.

Boasting can be put away, says Paul. God's choice is indifferent to the human presumptions of importance. Human wisdom⁴⁴⁸ is turned into naught when God chooses to show His wisdom in His crucified Son. Human power is disabled in comparison with the justification achieved by Christ for those who

447 Fee, pg. 87: “In community where “wisdom” was a part of higher spirituality divorced from ethical consequences, Paul says that God has made him to become for us the one who redeems from sin and leads to holiness – ethical behavior that is consonant with the Gospel.”

448 Conzelmann, pg. 53: “we possess God's wisdom “in Christ” i.e. as an “alien” wisdom. The three soteriological concepts are not systematically arranged... hagiasmos is explained by the verbal paraphrase in 6,11.”

rely on Him. The human nobility is humbled when the forgiveness and holiness is given for free, when God in Christ offers his nearness to those whose only virtue is that they are “in Christ”⁴⁴⁹. There is therefore no room for boasting in one's own achievements, good works, and asceticism. The righteousness is not achieved by ethical life and sanctification⁴⁵⁰ is not achieved by moral perfection on one side and ritual washings on the other side. No one can boast. No one can claim righteousness, holiness or redemption as a result of their own struggles⁴⁵¹. These are given by God to those who are in Christ.

Very similar notion is repeated also in the verse 6,11. There the sanctification is not reported in the form of a noun but the passive participle of the verb. This form shall be discussed later but I find it very important to discuss these two verses of 1 Cor, that is 1,30 and 6,11 beside each other for their great similarities: **1 Cor 6,11**: “και ταυτα τινες ητε· αλλα απελουσασθε, αλλα ηγιασθητε, αλλα εδικαιωθητε εν τω ονοματι του κυριου Ιησου Χριστου και εν τω πνευματι του θεου ημων.” The first part of the verse refers to the previous list of vices. Paul goes on contrasting the previous lives of the Corinthian Christians with their present state. Again, Paul makes sure they understand that this transferring from death to life was unmerited.

Fee writes in his commentary: “These things are what you were...the previous

449 Fitzmyer, pg. 104: “To be “in Christ” is a Pauline way of expressing the essential Christian mode of existence”

450 Fitzmyer, pg. 164: “Sanctification is also an abstract way of expressing the dedication of Christians to God and his cultic service that is derived from the crucified Christ ... in 6,11 Paul will again link justification and sanctification as effects of the Christ event.”

451 Fee, pg. 86: “...Paul is not suggesting, as the KJV implies, that Christ has been made these 4 things for believers. Rather, God has made him to become wisdom – but not the kind with which the Corinthians are now enamored. True wisdom is to be understood in terms of the three illustrative metaphors, which refer to the saving event of Christ.” “...the same event...each taken from a different sphere and each emphasizing a different aspect of the one reality (cf 6,11)”

list is what the wicked are like still, and because of that they will not inherit the kingdom.... Now in Christ you are something different, so live like it”⁴⁵². I am not sure that it can be claimed so sharply. For sure, those who do not bear fruit of the Spirit do not belong to it. But Paul does not want to start a new law according to which one should compare and measure whether they are still saved, he does not build way of salvation, but contrasts between the life with and without Christ.

The ethics grows out of thankfulness, not out of fear. God has not entered the life of believer so that they would relax ethically and instead of freedom they would enjoy anarchy. Christians have not been bought for impurity. Exactly how Fee writes: “they should live like it”. They have been saved from the master of sin into the new slavery of righteousness. They have been set free for the real freedom. The slaving to righteousness does not equal asceticism or neurotic strife for ethical and moral perfection with constant fear of eternal damnation. It leads to reliance on God.

Christians have been washed. This is to be read as a passive, the meaning is baptism. In baptism one is ritually washed. The old man is put off, repentance is sealed and the water symbolizes the blood of Christ in the line with the blood of sacrificial animals. The water of baptism has both purifying and sanctifying effect, as is also confirmed by the present verse. First, one is *washed* from the previous sinful way of life as presented in the previous verses. Second, one is *sanctified*. This is not a second step further to the perfection of individualistic sanctity. Sanctification is included in the symbol of baptism. The sanctification is granted thereby, when the baptized person claims that now they are set apart for God. In sprinkling by the blood of the Lamb, they are not only purified, but

452 Fee, pg. 245.

also branded for God, set apart for him as his special people. This is also the ground on which Paul starts majority of his letters by the address “to the holy ones”. In the washing, they are set apart, they are sanctified. Third, Christians have been *justified*. This is not the “righteousness of the Law” but the “righteousness of faith”. On one hand, the faith that was considered to trustful Abram as righteousness, on the other hand the imputed righteousness of Christ.

By no means is any of these three qualities (washing/baptism, sanctification, justification) anyhow more important than the other two, they do not trace any steps of development on the way to perfection⁴⁵³. They are all given for free, as is also stressed in the hidden Trinitary formula, in which all the three persons of the Trinity are the agents who impart the qualities on believers.

In **1 Thess 3,13** a verse which has already been discussed, Paul is praying that the hearts of the believers would be established in blamelessness and holiness. This happens again through the external work of Christ appropriated in faith. God is invoked to do this for his people.

In 1 Thess 4, there are on very limited space three cases of sanctification and one case of the Holy Spirit. We shall discuss the three relevant verses (3,4,7) in detail. The noun sanctification, as we have seen, it very rare, and it is therefore interesting to see such a sudden high concentration of the expression. These cases are unique in many ways. First, the noun describing transition from the defiled state to that of holiness seems to be a requirement posed on humans, and therefore it would be beside 1 Cor 7,14 the only discourse where the ability

453 Fitzmyer, pg. 258: „Three effects of the Christ-event... the Christian rite by which the sinful status of the vices mentioned in v 9- 10 is washed away...The three are simply mentioned with no chronological or logical order among them“

of sanctification would be ascribed to people, not to God. Second, it is only place where the holiness is connected only to certain individuals. This may well be one of the very few cases where the holiness is not corporeal, used to describe the community, but individuals. Third, as we have already mentioned, the noun itself, sanctification, is very rare.

1 Thess 4,3a “τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἁγιασμός ὑμῶν”. The first problem that needs to be addressed is the question the „obvious“ reading of this text, since ὁ ἁγιασμός in the v. 3 has double possibility of the reading. First one, most common⁴⁵⁴, is the reading that the sanctification is required of the people. Sanctification is a noun describing a process.

I would like to offer yet another perspective. I suggest that there are two equal possibilities of reading this text, each of which is neither possible to be confirmed neither refuted⁴⁵⁵. The two possible readings are following: Either God's will is a “sanctification” that is required of the believers, it is sanctification *of the people by the people*. It is *their* action, their responsibility. But I think, that there is equally possible reading, that the holiness is *God's will for the people* in the sense that it is God's wish for his people. It is *God's* sanctification for the people and *his* provision. It is God's will/wish that his people would be sanctified and lived accordingly. It would then happen by the empowering power of the Holy Spirit, which is later mentioned further in the verse 8.

1 Thess 4,3b-4: “ἀπέχεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς πορνείας, εἰδέναι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὸ

454 Thus e.g. Malherbe, pg. 225 writes that the sanctification „is a noun describing action, not a state or condition...The action required by the readers is further detailed in the infinitives that follow.“ . Also e.g. Bruce, pg. 82., Witherington, Morris.

455 This could only be done after a thorough study of the use of the noun „sanctification“ in the same context in another texts, which, as to my knowledge, is nonexistent.

ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι ἐν ἀγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ”. The will of God for his people is “ἀγιασμός”, further explained by two infinitives expressing abandonment and understanding. It is desirable to abandon “πορνεία”, that is twisted sexual behavior, mostly adultery, sex with a prostitute or incest. Second infinitive attached to the noun sanctification is infinitive “to know”, expressing ability to be able to live with one's “σκεῦος” in sanctification (again “ἐν ἀγιασμῷ”) and honor. The main problem is the noun “σκεῦος”. In Greek, it is usually used in the sense of “a vessel”. In majority of translations and commentaries it is understood as “wife”. Why would Paul call a wife “σκεῦος”, that is “a vessel”? I prefer the explanation of Bruce, who on the page 82 speaks rather of the “sexual organ” of each man. Bruce writes: „This is the power of “σκεῦος” here: that each of you learn to gain control over his own „vessel“.”⁴⁵⁶. Each man should be able to live sexually in accordance with sanctification and honor, the source of this life is then the source of all the sanctification, that is Holy Spirit (v.8). The sanctification occurs here, as well as in the v. 7 with the preposition “ἐν”, meaning the end of desired behavior.

The problem of sanctification occurs again few verses later in **1 Thess 4,7**: “οὐ γὰρ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσία ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγιασμῷ.” The semantic field of holiness as we encounter it in the Old Testament is reflected here. Impurity is set in contrast with holiness. Not “*profane*”, as we would expect according to the semantic field of holiness used nowadays, but *holiness* and *impurity*. Again, I would stress the “God element” in this discourse. Sanctification is God's will and God's calling. To disagree with his teaching does not offend humans, says Paul, but is against God. The thesis that “God's calling and will is life in sanctification, abandonment of porneia”, those who disregard it are accused of

456 Bruce, pg. 82.

being “atheists”; of stripping the sanctification of the element of God, the giver of the Holy Spirit. God not only wills and calls to sanctification, it is also God who gives his Spirit in aid. Those who disregard this, disregard the Holy Spirit given exactly by the One who desires sanctification for his people and calls to it. The Holy Spirit was given to the community in order that they may live free of the wanton of their bodily desires, as Gentiles are told to live. The Christians have been sanctified and therefore they should live accordingly. Not harming the Church relationships by adultery, but happily living within their own households.

R. Hodgson⁴⁵⁷ compares 1 Thess 4, 1 - 12 with the holiness tradition of Lv 17 – 26. In both cases he observes similar tradition that follows the same literary pattern of first dealing with *foundational statements*, then elaborating on *concrete demands* and closing with *motivation*. Hodgson then offers three possibilities, all of which come out of the assumption, that Paul used an already existing tradition implemented into his flow of teaching. Hodgson points to the following: A, the sudden change of mood between the v. 2 and 3.. B, the introductory “λιπονον”, which usually introduces an already existing tradition in Paul. C, remembrance of the impurity laws. But could not this just reflect the language of Paul? Sometimes he does use sudden change of mood. On the other hand, the similarities with the Levitical tradition are very plausible. Because even the book of Leviticus deals with the same sins that are encountered also in 1 Thess 4: sexual, business and social delicts. Paul warns Christians to live according to what they have been called to, i.e.: not to

457 R. Hodgson, J., 1 Thess 4,1 – 12 and the Holiness tradition, SBL Seminar papers,1982, pgs 199 -215

commit adultery, which damages all three suggested areas.

Therefore, whether Paul was implementing an already existing tradition or not, the imperative is to “live from the Holy Spirit”, according to the baptismal calling to sanctification; to live in accord with what they have become: „the saints of God“. Adultery, using one's *σκευος* improperly, leads to damage on the level of sexual purity, business relationships, as well as social relationships within the new society of the “holy ones”. Within the borders of this holy society of saints, they should let the sanctification, brought about the indwelled Holy Spirit, grow. They should nurture the sanctification, which is the will and calling of God. The sanctification is here not so much the correct conduct, it is rather precedent to it. The desired behavior then grows out of it and finds its source in the Holy Spirit.

2 Thess 2,13: “Ἡμεῖς δὲ ὀφείλομεν εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου, ὅτι εἴλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀπαρχὴν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας,” God has chosen “us” to be the first fruit of the salvation. “The first fruit” was always set apart for God and it is given in offering to him. This is the first fruit of salvation in sanctification. Here, the two members stand beside each other and they are both a gift. Being sanctified, one can withstand the nearness of God and therefore be saved on eternity with him. The preparation and purification, therefore sanctification, setting apart for him, happens by the indwelled Holy Spirit. Here, the Spirit is only described in genitive, without the usual adjective attached to it. But here the predicate is stressed by the given substantive.

Why is the Holy Spirit “holy”? As we have seen in Romans 1,4 it is holy: on one hand, because it is the Spirit *of God*, but on the other hand because it

sanctifies by its presence, it marks those who are also thereby set apart. In the same way as that which is laid on the altar is sanctified thereby also the people who are touched by the Spirit are sanctified herewith, just by the contact, which further marks them as God's property. This is another aspect of the “contagious holiness” as we encountered it in the Gospel of Mark. The other member: “belief, or “reliance on truth”, also brings about the salvation. It is in the reliance on the truth and the Spirit, which resembles Abram's step of faith outside of his comfort zone relying only on God's promise, when the salvation and sanctification comes, which leads to salvation.

Summary: Sanctification in Paul is therefore a process directed by the will and power of God through his Spirit. People only play that part of not staying in the way and remaining in this gift. Their sanctification is not in order to live in anarchy, but in order to live a life which would reflect the giver thereof.

5.1.1.5 Sanctified

The past participle of the verb “ἀγιάζειν” is very near to the substantive “ἀγιασμός”. “ἡγιασμένοι” are those with whom the process of sanctification found its end. At the same time, it is the beginning of the new life. The *agens* of the sanctification is God, those who receive it are the Christians, his people. The notion is the same as we observed at the beginning of the chapter. It is yet another way to convey the notion of unmerited sanctification. The cases are explained elsewhere in this chapter (1 Cor 1,2 and 6,11).

5.1.1.6 Holiness

“ἁγιοσυνη” and “ἁγιότης” are not the same as “ἁγιασμός”⁴⁵⁸. The latter describes the process which leads to the former. Holiness is foremost the quality of God, who is perfect in every good thing. Whichever predicate of excellence we would like to attach to God, it would still be a metaphor. God is different, magnificent, ultimately good and beautiful⁴⁵⁹. Sum of these positive qualities is described as holiness. Holiness of people is only derivative, they do not possess these inherent qualities, but they can be “infected” by dwelling in the presence of God. Holiness of people is never in the New Testament, not even in Paul, ascribed to an individual, it is a mark of special group of people, the people God.

The only case in Paul where this substantive appears is in the end of a very complex discourse in the **2 Cor 7,1**: “ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀγαπητοί, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ.” Also this verse shall be further discussed under the

458 There is also the noun ἁγιότης, which possibly appears in Paul only in two cases, first of which is in 2 Cor 1,12: “Ἡ γὰρ καύχησις ἡμῶν αὕτη ἐστίν, τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐν ἀπλότητι καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, [καὶ] οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκικῇ ἀλλ’ ἐν χάριτι θεοῦ, ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, περισσοτέρως δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς.” The text has, however, another possible reading (so BGT), where the holiness disappears in favor of “united mind”, reading “ἐν ἀπλοτητι”. Thrall prefers to read “ἁγιοτητι”: “Paul may have had reason to assert his ἁγιότης, since he was accused of corrupt practice in the matter of the collection.” Margaret E. Thrall: 2 Corinthians 1,12 ΑΓΙΟΤΗΤΙ or ΑΠΛΟΤΗΤΙ ? IN Studies in the New Testament Language and Text ed J.K. Elliot, NovT Sup 44, Leiden-Brill, 1976 pg. 366 – 372, here pg. 366. She opens her article, where she compares the two readings, by saying that “The first reading (ἁγιοτητι) appears to have superior attestation, but the second has attracted some support.” Her conclusion is following: “The evidence remains finely balanced...the more solid arguments seem to favor ἁγιοτητι” (372) This explanation suggests that Paul's holiness is the safeguard that the money is in good hands of a saintly character. Though I would like to read “holiness”, I disagree with the reasoning. Nowhere else is holiness ascribed to a single person in such a distinct way, therefore it is unlikely, in my opinion, that Paul would describe himself “holy”. I rather understand holiness and sincerity/purity to be hidden in God. Both nouns in the verse are followed by genitive του θεου. It is not their holiness, rather they preach: not the humanly wisdom but holiness and sincerity of God. Here, the reading of “ἀπλότητι” makes more sense.

459 Viz H. Harrington's introduction to her book.

topic of purification. It should only be noted here, that holiness has here ethical connotations. On one hand it is connected with the reliance on God “in fear of him”, but at the same time it seems to be a desirable behavior. Nearness to God has an effect on the ethical lives of believers. The holiness shows in changed lives, where the believers live out the Levitical commandment “be holy as I am holy”.

Rom 1,4: “τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν”⁴⁶⁰. Apostle Paul is set apart for service to the Gospel. And the Gospel, according to this verse, is about the son of David. About Jesus it is said in the verse 4 in several ways, from different points of view, that Jesus is holy. First is in calling him the Son of David, which implies the messiahship, which suggests the notion of holiness⁴⁶¹. Second is, that he is set apart for this task. Being only son of David is not enough, he was not an ordinary “son of David” moreover was he further separated by God for his own Son. This separation happened according to the Holy Spirit⁴⁶². We have seen before that when the Holy Spirit falls on someone

460 Dunn 15: “NJB’s „in terms of the Spirit and holiness” is inadmissible. ... clearly Semitic in character, ...It would almost certainly be understood by Paul and the first Christians as denoting the Holy Spirit, the spirit which is characterized by holiness, partaker of God’s holiness, but these looser phrases remind us that the conceptuality of God’s power active upon humankind and creation was not yet so sharply defined as in later Christian thought... spirit as heavenly power.”

461 By anointment, the Messiah, the anointed, is separated for God; he is God’s special property, special servant with special task. All thesis “specialness” makes him holy, separated for the special use of God.

462 B. Schneider, *Κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης*, pg. 362: “Boismard argues well in the case of Rom 1,4, as has Paul Lamarche more recently in the case of Phil 2,5- 11, that these two texts do not consider Christ in his preexistence as the Eternal Word of God, but rather Christ from the first moment of ...his existence in time...the “pre-theological text” of Rom 1,2 seems to envisage the constitution of Christ as son of God simpliciter... pg. 363.. by his being raised and seated at the right hand of the Father and functionally given the power fitting to that position, plainly absent during his time of weakness in the flesh”

or appoints them, they speak in power. Also here the power is associated with the Spirit. Jesus is powerfully set apart by the Spirit in order to become who he is, the Son of God, the one accepted by God in His resurrection. Out of this happening grows, in line with the verse 5, preaching, according to which living faith of trusting God opens the door to all the nations, all the Gentiles. The holiness of the Spirit in this verse is just another, more Semitic, way of expressing the notion of the Holy Spirit. It is possible that the wording remained so from the previously taken pre-Pauline text (B. Schneider⁴⁶³).

Summary: Holiness in Paul is therefore the quality of transcendence, that in the first plane belongs to God as summum bonum and in the second plane as the quality that His people “catch” from this affiliation.

5.1.1.7 To Sanctify.

The verb “ἀγιάζειν” describes the process of transferring the subject from the realm of “impurity” or general purity into that of “sanctity”. We have encountered one case already before in **1 Cor 7,14** where a believing spouse sanctifies the unbelieving one. All the other cases are in 1 Thess.⁴⁶⁴

1 Thess 5,23 is an exceptional instance: “Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἀγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὀλοτελεῖς, καὶ ὀλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ

463 Bernardin Schneider, O.F.M. - Tokyo: „Κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης (Romans 1,4)“, Biblica 48 (1967) pg. 359 – 387. Further Procksch, Kuss and Schweitzer point out that the wording is clearer translation of Ruach ha kodesh.

464 The occurrences were discussed before and therefore shall not be explained here anymore. In 1 Thess 4, there is the highest frequency of the notion of sanctification. Four cases in this chapter can be understood as the only examples ascribing the power of this transforming process into the hands of the believers. In 1 Thess 5,23 then, God is called upon to sanctify fully his people. The notion of sanctification is important for the epistle, since it appears twice: in 3,13 and then again in 4,3,.

παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τηρηθείη.” This is a prayer at the end of the epistle, the blessing invokes God to sanctify the Church. It deviates from the usual epistolary conclusions, where the holiness language does not normally occur. It is often put in the connection with the verse 3,13. The outcome of such sanctification is the holistic health and ritual purity, readiness to face the second coming of the Lord. There is no area which should escape God's attention, all of them and all of each members is prayed for.

Both, **1 Thess 5,23** and **1 Cor 7,14**, combine the notion of sanctification, transfer from the realm of defilement to that of holiness and purity, with the eschatological expectation of *παρουσία*. The setting apart can only be accepted (also by the practice of the ritual of baptism) and nothing more is required of the passive recipients. They are sanctified as well as purified, made ready for the eschatological encounter with their creator and the Father of their Groom.

Summary of αγι- : In all the previous cases considering the root of αγι-, the primary holiness is that transcendent quality given to people as the group separated for God for free. The following use of “*ῥσιος*” is the only case of a synonym.

5.1.2 Holy - “*ῥσιος*”

The only instance of holiness word-group in Paul's writings is in **1 Thess 2,10**. It is used of the Church, who are supposed to be “martyrs”, witnesses of the Gospel. They should be “holy”, but also “righteous and blameless”, that is, in fact, “pure”. The adjective may carry also the features of purity.

5.2 Purity

Is purity in Paul's writings connected with holiness as it is in his theology of origin, almost to the point of synonymity? Or is the purity a presupposition of meeting with the Lord in the new temple? Is there a semantic shift? Is the purity understood in a ritual way? Can it be achieved by people, is it expected of them? What are the purity concerns in the writings of Paul? Are the ritual-purity requirements kept or are they abandoned and for whom are they still valid? We shall seek the answers in the following list of the cases.

5.2.1 Pure, “καθαρός”

The adjective “καθαρός” is used in all the epistles ascribed to Paul six times. Twice it collocates with the quantifier “everything” and four times with the nouns describing the inner man: twice “συνείδησις” and twice “καρδία”. The adjective does not anymore collocate with hands or body parts, nor objects or houses. The purity is moved into the inner space of a man⁴⁶⁵.

5.2.1.1 Everything Is Pure.

465 Michael Newton in his book „The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul“ writes on the page 8 the following: „...the idea of purity persisted in some of the earliest Christian communities. Paul, in fact, used this concept to elucidate some of the central tenets of his belief...while Paul argued that the Jewish cult was no longer valid as means of salvation he did not completely reject the cultic concerns of the temple but used some of them to interpret his own understanding of the Christ event and in doing so he was heavily influenced by his Jewish heritage.“ I would make even one step further. Despite himself being submitted to majority of the ritual laws, Paul discouraged his Gentile believers from engaging in the ritual practices, for the blood of Christ and faith in it are sufficient means for purification. In this we can see that, in fact, what rests from the Old Testament concept of purity is just the language. Paul uses the words connected with the issues of purity, he also uses the concepts, but only in illustrative and metaphorical way.

Similarly to Mark's remark of 7,19 “καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα” on Jesus' teaching that (Mt15,11) “οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦτο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον⁴⁶⁶”, also Paul comes up with his own version of the rule, that everything is pure. All these texts have in common liberation of the strict purity rules. It is difficult to trace back the history of this teaching and what could even be called movement. It seems most likely that the Synoptic parallel somehow traces the teaching of Jesus. These probably included the motto: „*that which enters from the outside is incapable of defiling*“, only „*that which comes out of the heart of man*“ can defile them this speaks of the reverse flow of holiness.

But there is yet another important step to be taken before one can say that „everything is pure“, which practically abolishes ritual purity laws, and that is the fact of *purification of συνειδήσεις* through faith and through spiritualized sprinkling of the blood of the Savior. Here we meet the same tradition shown from another angle. Paul learns about Jesus from second hand, therefore the same teaching about the „reversal of the flow of holiness“ reaches him at some stage. I am not at any point willing to attempt to reconstruct the original teachings, we shall rather focus how his own use of language betrays him. First of all, purity for Paul is not a theoretical issue. He does not ponder purity much *per se*, but he deals with it practically in each and every of his letters.

First case of the rule that „everything is pure“ appears in **Rom 14,20** in the middle of discourse on what can be eaten and how the Church, divided between the „weak“ and „strong“, can keep the table-fellowship without ruining their

466 Or Luke's version attaching the purity to almsgiving in Luke 11, 41.

name and bringing about blasphemy on „their good“, the Gospel. The „weak“⁴⁶⁷ were most likely the group of Christians who were of *weak faith/trust*. As we have seen earlier, faith/trust is the source of purity and the new life. The „weak“ kept close to the ritual purity, which manifested itself in this particular case as ritual vegetarianism. For fear that eating improper meat, they would defile themselves, the „weak“ rather gave up all the meat. The „strong“, on the other hand, were of *strong faith*, they believed that they can eat whatever meat they find in butcher shops. They believed that Jesus has superseded the purity laws and that this faith is now able to purify the *συνείδησις*, the inner man. They had faith/trust that „not that which enters can defile“ a man and therefore they eat everything.

From the faction-struggles stemmed blasphemy of the outsider world, these inner struggles were ridiculous from the outside and thus their „good“ might be called a „superstition“⁴⁶⁸. **Rom 14,20:** “μη̄ ἕνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ. πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ, ἀλλὰ κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίοντι.” This is one of the very rare cases of the New Testament which uncover the curtain over the abolishing of the purity food-laws. Paul stresses that the food is not more important than brotherly love and mutual acceptance. What matters is the inner man. In itself, everything is pure. Paul dismisses any suspicion of existence of inherent impurity. There is no such thing, he says. The judgement of im-purity happens not *outside*, but *inside a man*. If a person is literally „evil“, they will stumble over what others eat. These words are tough. Paul is implicitly naming the „weak“ „evil“. They are without faith and without it, they

467 In April 2014, I presented paper on EABS Graduate Symposium discussing this passage; in studying the pericope, I leaned the most on the analysis of Mark Reasoner. I come out of his socio-rhetoric analysis also here.

468 Viz Reasoner's socio-rhetorical analysis.

fall into judgment; exactly that was forbidden to Peter on his way to Cornelius in Acts 10. Judging destroys faith, it destroys the trust that now we can eat everything without defiling ourselves in the process.

5.2.1.2 The Verb, “καθαρίζειν”

There are only five cases of the verb “καθαρίζειν”. Despite the relatively small number, they appear in such complex and mysterious contexts that some of them had several monographs written on them. We are especially speaking about **1 Cor 5,7** and **2 Cor 7,1** but also the rest is very well covered, yet very little explained. All the cases are discussed vividly, still there is significant lack of unity or clarity. “Purification” is the process of eliminating impurity. What type of impurity? Who is the agent and who is the recipient?

Purify the Church

The next case, **1 Cor 5,7**, is, according to me, one of the toughest places in the whole New Testament corpus. The problem is, that it seems to go directly against the teaching of Jesus of Gospels. Jesus accepts everyone, touches lepers and eats with impure. His approach is extremely *inclusive*. On the other hand, Paul seems to be here severely *exclusive*. The image of the temple, that he employs, suggests very restrictive approach to the holy things. Holiness is not poured out, purifying everything in contact, on the other hand, it is kept apart in a secluded metaphorical space of Church and the fear of defilement sets in⁴⁶⁹.

He writes in 1 Cor 5,7: „ἐκκαθάρατε τὴν παλαιὰν ζύμην, ἵνα ᾗτε νέον φύραμα,

469 This case is very similar to that of Rom 14 where Paul is guarding the name of the Church against blasphemy, should they be known for their inner fights. Paul is afraid that the Christianity be called „superstitio“ and therefore he presses the importance of the outward appearance of the Church.

καθώς ἐστε ἄζυμοι. καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός...“ He is writing to the Church in the metaphorical language of Passover. His readers must have included some Jews, but there were certainly not only them. Therefore, there were also some parts of the Church to whom the original life of this metaphor must have been not so familiar. Before each Passover, the people were required to get ready and to purify. The main imperative was to eliminate everything that includes yeast from the house as a symbol of uncontrollable swarming growth of something rotten.

Paul uses this image in order to describe the complicated situation within the Church. In his view, the Church is now celebrating Easter. Jesus represents the Paschal lamb, who is sacrificed at home for the family, whose blood is the sign for the angel of death to „pass over“ the given house and whose flesh is eaten in hurry, while being ready to go. Paul does not explain how long this metaphorical Pascha has been going on, but we may assume he means the time between Jesus' first and second arrival.

In the Passover, the same level of holiness usually required of the temple, is now spread and required of everyone in their place of dwelling. Paul is writing to his family of faith. Also their door is metaphorically sprinkled by the blood of the lamb-Jesus. According to Paul, this comes with a price. And the price is the purify of “leaven”. Leaven is made of rotten fruit mixed with water and flour and therefore, it is usually symbol of impurity. The covenant seems to be that on one side people get ready, according to the given instructions, including getting rid of the leaven, and on the other side, there is the protection of the family by the blood above the metaphorical door. As long as the “family”, understand the family of faith, wants to call on the blood of the Lamb, understand the blood of Jesus, wants to hide under the sign of his blood, they

must keep clean and may not allow any yeast in the house. It seems logic. But it also sounds incredibly harsh, when talking about people.

Paul is calling to excommunication and possibly also to cursing of the person he designates as “leaven”, or is it their sin that he describes so? This text is very vulnerable and incredibly prone to abuse. Because Paul is here openly against liberalism within Church walls. Of course, nowadays conservative Churches tend to read the text as a proof against “softness on sin”. I would like to start from this perspective.

Paul does say that the sin of the man is *πορνεία*. We have encountered this problem before. It is usually translated into English and explained as “illicit sexual behavior”. In very conservative Churches the “*πορνεία*” would be equaled to every extra-martial sexual relation and all homosexual relations. There has been a vivid debate on the meaning of the noun. It definitely carries the notion of the illicit sexual relations, the word has always described something rather negative.

In the first place, it describes sexual relation with a prostitute, but does it also include e.g. pre-martial sex, asks Bruce Malina in his article “Does Porneia Mean Fornication?”. He comes to the conclusion, that it does not⁴⁷⁰. He even says: “Pre-betrothal, pre-martial, non-commercial sexual intercourse between man and a woman is nowhere considered a moral crime in the Torah.”. In reaction to this, another article was written in the same periodical by J.

470 pg. 17: “Porneia means unlawful sexual conduct, or unlawful conduct in general. What makes a particular line of conduct unlawful is that it is prohibited by the Torah, written and/or oral. Pre-betrothal, pre-martial, non-commercial sexual intercourse between man and a woman is nowhere considered a moral crime in the Torah. Aside from R. Eliezer, there is no evidence in traditional or contemporary usage of the word porneia that takes it to mean pre-betrothal, pre-martial, heterosexual intercourse of a non-cultic or non-commercial nature, i.e. what we call “fornication” today” B.Malina, Does proneia Mean Fornication? NovT 14 (1972) pg. 10 - 18

Jensen six years later⁴⁷¹. He corrects Malina especially in his description of the Rabbinic approach and he then comes up with four ways how we should understand the word in the New Testament. First as “prostitution”, second as a “marriage within forbidden degrees of kinship”, third, “figuratively for idolatry” and fourth, “wanton behavior, including fornication”. The main problem is, however, that the fornication in question was not contemplated so much from the *moral or ritual point of view*, but its use rather stemmed from the culture where marriage was foremost *a business contract* and women were treated as *goods*, which, if “touched”, lost its value.

Now, even if “*πορνεία*” *did* mean fornication in the strictest sense, does then 1 Cor 5 give the Church possibility or even command to not only *excommunicate* but also *curse* the trespassers? What should be done with such people? They should be “given to Satan for the destruction of the body so that their spirit would be saved”⁴⁷². Even if it was this way “fornication”, there is no right to excuse such either physical or mental/emotional violence⁴⁷³.

For what Paul calls “leaven” in this very case, is not just a “*πορνεία*”, but such a “*πορνεία*” that goes far beyond the limits of that designation, in fact, it is indescribable. Corinthian society in the first century AD was far more “lose” than even the 1960s. Into this situation of people who laugh at their moralists and are sexually more than free, Paul is horrified and looks for words, because he has encountered in the Church a “type of *πορνεία*” that he *had never even heard about*. And he is very specific. It is both incest and adultery at the same

471 J.Jensen: “Does Porneia Mean Fornication? A Critique of Bruce Malina” Nov T 20/3 (1978), pg. 161 – 85.

472 This, I believe, was the fire under the burning bodies of the “witches” in the medieval ages.

473 Paradoxically, Churches tend to harbor the criminals within the “city walls”, based on the 1 Cor 6,11 and they excommunicate very easily based on the strict sexual ethics.

time. However loose according to our nowadays standards the Greek society was, incest was something that was not tolerated (unless you were royal). It was a sin that brought about curse and therefore it was punishable according to the secular law, usually exile. Now, if in the general society this sin was not tolerated, should the Church harbor such people? No, says Paul. Paul is very much concerned with keeping the good name of the Church. And keeping such a person within the Church is the same as agreeing with their sin.

In other words, Jesus did touch lepers, but thus he healed them. There is one thing to accept within the Church a person who has a criminal past, but it is another thing to keep embracing a criminal, while they are still being harmful to the secular society⁴⁷⁴. It is not just some fornication. Paul, a Roman citizen, is disgusted at the Church just liberally standing by, being friendly to a criminal. Not fornicator, a man who deserves to be incarcerated or exiled because, according to the laws of the given society, they are harmful for them. Even the secular society can send such person to exile, and so should do also the Church. It is an imperative that the family of faith, “covered under the blood of the Lamb” keeps clean of the criminals⁴⁷⁵. It could easily become a group of criminals where everyone is accepted as they are, where everyone does as they wish and they will be accepted anyway. Paul says this can defile the Church also because this spreads⁴⁷⁶. The Church is to step aside and against those who harm it from the inside by sins punishable by the secular society.

What is then fate of this person? He is not supposed to be executed. There

474 I think that the harboring pedophiles within the Church and hiding them from judgment, and thus allowing them to come to contact with another children would be in the same line.

475 On the other hand, the tax-collectors befriended by Jesus were criminals themselves.

476 In the same way as these days general Muslims are asked to speak against the Muslim terrorists.

should be a meeting of the congregation and the person should be officially ceremonially excommunicated. Two images are employed here. First, that of the Jerusalem and second, that of the house with blood on it. In the first plane, we have already discussed that the Church is like the new Israel, they are the new people of God, the holy ones. Within the Church is the operational space of the Holy Spirit, like in the Jerusalem, where the Holy Spirit was emanating from the temple, only with that difference that in the Church the Holy Spirit emanates from each “temple”, that is, from each heart of the believer. The Church is the new city of God of saints. Outside the city walls there is the domain of chaos, Satan, of defiled lepers, it is the wilderness, where Azazel is sent and were demon possessed people roam.

In the second plane of the meaning, more fitting to our context, is the image of a family hiding in the house at the original Passover in Egypt. On the door, there is the blood of the lamb and death is circulating around the huts of the people of God. In this moment, if the family finds whatever yeast, they need to throw it away immediately. The yeast in this metaphor is the sin carried by the person, who does not turn away from their criminal behavior. But being thrown away, this man finds himself face to face to the angel of death in the case of Passover, face to face to Satan in the case of 1 Cor 5. The person is to be handed over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, by which usually a curse was meant. The notion is that of sudden death or sickness which comes along with the curse.

The ultimate desire of Paul, is not, however, the utter destruction of such person. Paul is not calling for eternal damnation, but for eternal salvation. He still has hope for the soul of such criminal. The purity he requires is the purity of the Church. He warns them that in the all-embracing love towards the

broken and their very liberal approach, they need to eventually draw a line especially in the cases that could bring about harm and blasphemy, as in Rom 14. Paul is not calling to elite society of perfect, he is afraid that the Church would embrace harmful people. Church can and must be loving, but they need to protect themselves. Therefore they should know that they are the saints, not by their own merit, but by mercy. Being the saints, they can not go against the mishpat, the judgment of Lord, which hears the oppressed, they cannot harbor criminals, they should not be on the side of the criminals.

Purify oneself

In his book “Holiness and the Community in 2 Cor 6,14-7,1” (2001) J.A. Adewuya operates with three terms: relational holiness, communal holiness and ethical holiness. They all have been already touched upon also in this thesis. The first one describes the derivative holiness of belonging to God and “being his”. The second one stresses the fact that the holiness is never individualistic achievement, but is rather the quality of the new people of God. And the third one includes the ethical consequences stemming from the first two⁴⁷⁷. We shall keep this in mind in the following text.

In **2 Cor 7,1**, at the closing of the discourse, Paul writes the following: “ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀγαπητοί, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἀγιωσύνην ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ.” Since the

477 The author summarizes the existing research on the text, giving Paul's background and the socio-historical context and then moves to the exegesis proper. He writes (pg.119): “Paul's injunction..for separation in 2 Cor 6,14 [is] now formulated in terms of cleansing from defilement of both flesh and spirit”. J. A. Adewuya, *Holiness and Community in 2 Cor 6:14- 7:1: Paul's View of Communal Holiness in the Corinthian Correspondence*. Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2011. He goes on saying on the page120, that the sins Paul is usually concerned with “are not primarily physical or spiritual sins, but are rather attitudinal or spiritual sins”, these then have “devastating effects” not only on the individual but also “on the community as a whole”

Church is the new society of the saints, they should purify themselves. The purification required is to be complete, stemming from the underlying layers, reflecting on the surface. The flesh, as we have seen, can be defiled by illicit union with either “πορνεία” or “εἰδωλόθυτα”⁴⁷⁸. As suggested elsewhere, the sanctification and purification was not granted in order to live in anarchy and paradigm “anything goes”. The core is about who Christians unite with, the same notion is that of Apostolic fathers' stressed affiliation “Κολλᾶσθε τοῖς ἁγίοις” and elsewhere in Paul “bad relations damage morality”. The problem is not simply mixed marriages, it also includes business and other areas of life.

Christians should be separated away from defiling sources, which are not primarily people, but their inner philosophies directing their lives. These philosophies Corinthians are encouraged to purify themselves from. Also here, also the connection of purity and holiness is proved. The purification is "separation from", which is the first step to the second one, i.e. to the "separation for". It is the movement of humans, meeting the opposite movement of God in Jesus. Humans separate themselves from defiling sources for God, thus they purify themselves. But precedent to this movement is God separating them for himself and giving them the transcendent quality of being his, being infected with his transcendental otherness.

Summary: Purity and purification in Paul is then very closely connected with the notion of holiness. It is not understood ritually, but the language remains.

478 For the sake of limited space I shall only summarize the relevant readings here. The most important and interesting are two articles in NTS: Fee's article in NTS 23 (1977), pgs 140-161 “2 Corinthians 6,14 – 7,1 And Food Offered to Idols”, where I have some objections and Thrall's article in the same periodical, NTS 24, pg. 132 – 148 (1978) “The Problem of 2 Cor 6,14 – 7,1 In Some Recent Discussion” which is a good summary from that year. However the Adewuya's monograph mentions both and more others.

The terms are used in slightly shifted meaning. Two defiling sources are common with the Old Testament, “πορνεία” and “εἰδωλολατρία”. But even in the Old Testament the underlying problem of these is the ultimate defiling source, sin. Christians are sanctified by God, it is his first move, but the people are still asked to keep themselves purified from the mentioned defiling sources. The purity, unlike the holiness, is then expected and required of the people. Purity and holiness go hand in hand as mutual movements towards each other from the side of people and their God.

5.2.2 The Words of Purity, “ἀγνός” and “σεμνός”

The adjective “ἀγνός” does not stress the actual purity, but rather the socially praised ethical living. The word usually appears in the lists of the virtues. Such is the case in **2 Cor 6,6**; **Phil 4,8**, where it also occurs beside the noun *σεμνοτης*. The rest of the cases appears within the genre of house orders. The last but not least case of desired of purity of the woman is required behavior of the Church. As we have seen earlier, Paul wants to present the Church to Jesus as a pure bride in **2 Cor 11,2**.

5.2.3 Defilement

5.2.3.1 Defiled, “κοινός”

Majority of the cases of the word stem „κοιν-“, describing the transfer from the realm of holiness into that of impurity, i.e. antonym notion of sanctification, appear in the **Romans** chapter **14,14** “οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ ὅτι οὐδὲν

κοινόν δι' ἑαυτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινόν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινόν⁴⁷⁹. Here, in Romans, it appears three times in the middle of the discourse on „what“ defiles „who“. Also, this text is one of those that move the holiness language from *ritual* understanding towards the *ethical* one. The text has at least two layers of meaning. The surface layer is the discourse about ritual vegetarianism. In the Church of Rome, probably divided into several house Churches, dominantly Jewish-Christian, there are two factions that go across the ethnicity, „the weak“ and „the strong“⁴⁸⁰. The „weak“ in the case of Roman situation are those of „weak faith“. They are afraid that „having faith“ only, is not enough for salvation and therefore they also keep preserving diet food-laws including entire abstinence from meat for the fear of possible defilement. This would not be a problem. From the context it is, however, obvious that they were also judgmental of the other part of the Church, that is the „strong“ ones. The „strong“ were strong in faith, they had freedom to eat whatever they found on markets. It seems that they often made fun of the „weak“ ones and that they invited them to their homes for the common meals only in order to tease them.

The surface level of the text is the discussion about defiling force of meat and ritual vegetarianism. But this is only beginning for Paul. He says that these divisions and inner fights bring about rumors on the Church. Paul is very much concerned with the fame and name of the Church but should they be known for their inner fights they might be called a „superstitio“ which would bring about blasphemy, defilement, the true defilement on the level of language. The holy society, its holy name, would be defiled, ridiculed and „their good“, the Gospel:

479 This verse is, again parallel to the logion we have encountered in the Gospels, first in the Mk 7, then Mt 16 and finally Lk 11.

480 The same two groups appear in 1 Cor 8 - 10, but there they have different meaning and different context and therefore it is more than bold to merge these groups from different cities.

love and faith, would be desecrated. Therefore, on one hand Paul encourages the „strong“ ones to be tolerant. At the same time, on the other hand, he teaches the „weak“ that they will not lose salvation if they eat freely, disregarding the food-laws.

He draws on the teaching of Jesus that „nothing entering a person defiles“ and repeats it in his own way three times in one sentence to make himself clear. There is nothing defiling, says Paul three times in **Rom 14,14**. The fight for the purity is not on the level of *actual food* but on the level of *the inner man*. Their heart and, as we have seen already so many times, in the conscience is the main battlefield. If the *συνειδησις* is clean (which is the main concern also in 1 Cor 8 -10), then the food is just a secondary matter that does not have the defiling force upon entering a person. *Nothing entering a person can defile them*, only the inner defiling thought coming out of the heart of man can occur. Nothing that is accepted with thankfulness is to be considered defiling. Nothing is created as defiling, the creation is good. This is great shift of the semantic field of holiness away from the literal reading from the food-laws.

5.2.3.2 “Impurity” and “Impure”, “ἀκαθαρσία” and “ἀκαθαρτός”

All the following cases are the opposites of the above mentioned word “καθαρτός”. When the alpha privativum is added to the former, then antonym is formed. “Ακάθαρτος” is on the very opposite extreme of the holiness scale. In the paradigm of all the writings of the Old Testament, the “ἀκαθαρσία” repels holiness and causes wrath of God. In some cases it is then God himself who

can also send ἀκαθαρσία on his very own people, in order to punish them⁴⁸¹.

Thus also God is capable of defilement. This is exactly what the first case of the noun says in **Rom 1,24**: „Διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς.“ In the beginning of his epistle, Paul presents his own understanding of history of salvation. People have decided to go against God and he did not stop them from that. He further decided that he would not guard them against their will and therefore he gave them up, or gave them over, or even, *sacrificed* them, to their own free will, run by „desired of their hearts“. This is another case that shows how important for Paul the purity of heart and conscience was.

2 Corinthians 12,21⁴⁸²: “μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντος μου ταπεινώσῃ με ὁ θεὸς μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ πενήσω πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ ἀσελγείᾳ ἧ ἔπραξαν.” Here Paul again puts into contrast impurity (noun) as the sphere of pre-conversion life, which was also marked with porneia and lasciviousness. All three mentioned impurities have in common some sexual overtone connected with lack of self-restraint. These used to be practiced before. The verb used is „ἔπραξαν“. It is therefore imperative that these practices are abandoned. Paul is afraid that if the Corinthian believers slid back to their old habits in the time of his absence, he might find them in such a pitiful state and this might in turn lead to faction fights within the Church. The impurity here is therefore set side by side vices describing, and I would also say, judging, the pre-conversion life. In the epistle

481 The case of Rom 6,19 has already been touched upon before under the heading of sanctification. It should only be remembered that the impurity is set here in the stark contrast with the holiness in line with the semantic field of the Old Testament.

482 μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντος μου ταπεινώσῃ με ὁ θεὸς μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ πενήσω πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ ἀσελγείᾳ ἧ ἔπραξαν.

to the **Galatians 5,19** impurity appears again inside of list of vices called „work of flesh“. It repeatedly appears sandwiched between the same vices that have been just mentioned in **1 Cor 12,21**, that is *πορνεία*, and *ἀσέλγεια*. Again, it describes the pre-conversion life, the life without Spirit.

World outside the Church walls is driven by impurity, unlike the holy congregation with its leaders. The Christian preaching grows from clean conscience and heart. **1 Thess 2,3**: “*ἡ γὰρ παράκλησις ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ*”. Motivation of encouragement and exhortation given by Paul is not the same as that of the world. Preaching of the Gospel is not done for one's own enrichment, for power or glory, it is not a manipulative trick, the intentions of Paul are not impure, he says in his defense. Therefore the calling is also not that to impurity, but that to sanctification.

The *adjective* „impure“ has been already mentioned under the section of „Holy Children“ of the case of **1 Cor 7,14**. Paul says that the children of mixed marriages are not „impure“, but that they are „holy“. That is, unlike in the case of Ezra, in the new people of God the unbelieving spouses do not pose a threat and so the children of such marriages. In the same way as the believing spouse sanctifies the unbelieving one by the virtue of the separateness at the same time for God and for them, the children are fruit of this separateness and the holiness is stronger in them than the impurity.

5.3 Conclusion

In the epistles of Paul holiness and purity are intertwined in very much same

way as they are in the Old Testament. The language stays the same, but the meaning is shifted in the metaphorical way. The signified moves towards the inner man. What matters is not the ritual purity as the precondition of meeting holy God in temple anymore. It is rather secondary outcome expected of the believers as their reaction to the sanctification given for free to the special people of God, the Church, the new temple of God, place of operation of the Holy Spirit.

Chapter 6: The Epistles to Ephesians and Colossians

6.1. Holiness

Holiness in these two epistles is mostly expressed by the *αγι-* word group. In most cases, it is used in plural for Church as the group of saints, as we have seen in the previous chapter. There is also one occurrence of “*ὅσιος*”.

6.1.1 Holy, “*ἅγιος*”

Vast majority of the occurrences describes the Church and where it does not, it anyway has very strong ecclesiological context. It is particularly used in the epistle to Ephesians.

6.1.1.1 The Saints

Praescrpts and a Final Greeting

Both of the epistles are addressed to the saints. **Eph 1,1**: “...*τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι*ν [ἐν Ἐφέσῳ] *καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*”. Has just a simple address, it is sent to “the holy ones” and “faithful”⁴⁸³.

Epistle to the Colossians adds to the holiness of the Church also their faith/faithfulness to Christ. “*τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς ἁγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν*”. This time the prescript is aimed at the Church as a group of specific brothers. Their brotherhood⁴⁸⁴, faith-fulness and

483 (or rather “believing?”)

484 E. Schweitzer, pg. 33: “Doch läßt sich im Kolosserbrief öfters feststellen, daß gewohnte Wendungen durch Synonyme ergänzt werden...da der Artikel nicht wiederholt wird, müßte man eigentlich „heilig“ als Adjektive auffassen, da aber Paulus immer substantivisch von den Glaubenden als den „Heiligen“ spricht, ist eher nachlässiger Sprachgebrauch anzunehmen. „Heilige“ ist dann gewissermaßen ihr Ehrenname, während „Brüder“ sie mit dem Apostel zusammenschließt”

holiness stems from Christ. Further in the letter, they are also designated as holy keepers of the mystery of Jesus: **Col 1,26**: „τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν- νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ,“.

At the closing of the Ephesians the author calls them saints again (6,18). Thus the whole epistle is enveloped by a reminder to the recipients of who they are.

Church as the new society of saints.

In the previous chapter we learned that the Church is an eschatological society of new people of God. According to the witness of the writings of the Old Testament, Israel understood itself the only holy nation, separated for God, carrier of his holy Law. All the surrounding Gentiles of the world were considered impure, because they did not follow this special Law. Nonetheless throughout the Scriptures and also other Jewish literature, there were prophecies about Gentiles joining in the celebration of the Lord God. In believing Jesus to be the promised Messiah, Son of Yahweh, himself the Lord, the first Christians started also spreading the new faith among the Gentiles, obeying the Great Commission of the resurrected Lord to preach the Gospel to all the people. Now, the Churches were mostly embracing both the converted Jews as well as converted Gentiles. The latter were not considered defiling anymore in quite short time-span. They too, are now joined in the special people of God. In the following cases we shall see: First, the cases where the Church is explicitly described as a society of saints, second, the outcome of such description. What is acceptable for the saints? and what is not? How should a Church behave in this world and within itself?

Eph 3,8: “ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων ἁγίων ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη, τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ”. The author here speaks of himself as the smallest of the holy ones. However, some papyri omit the “ἁγίων”⁴⁸⁵. He is the smallest of the smallest, the text uses double superlative. This language of self-contempt probably comes from his regret of his pre-conversion life. But now the call to evangelize Gentiles was given to him and he is well aware of the mercy. Paul has not earned this task by good behavior. Depending on the variant, he either considers himself the smallest of all the saints or of all the men. Again, the saints are not a special group of elders or preachers, but the Church in general.

Eph 3,18: “ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβέσθαι σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος,” The “ἅγιοι” collocates with “παν”, a phenomenon we have observed before. The recipients of the letter are now object of the intercession. The author prays that they would be strengthened and built by God's glory and the indwelling Spirit. His prayer is that the recipients, together with “all the saints” would grasp all the dimensions of God's love. To be Christian and to belong among the holy ones means to let God work through his love, it means to be dedicated to him and thus set apart for him. Again, the focus is Church of both Jews and Gentiles. They are all beloved people, recipients of heavenly love which has set them apart and also pervades them. They are set apart by it, they live in it, it lives through them. This love is beyond knowledge, it is experiential and it embraces all of the saints, all of the

485 M. Barth, pg. 340 “The Chester Beatty papyrus (P 46, third century) omits the word “saints” . This reading is probably due to an error called “homoioteleuton”. Since the Greek words for “all” and “saints” have the same ending, the copyist eye may have skipped from the first to the second. If this papyrus had the more original reading, Paul would have thus declared himself the lowest among all “men” - whether Jews, Gentiles, or Christians – or the least among the collegium of apostles and prophets....the more restricted comparison of 1 Cor 15,9 may be a closer parallel to...Ef 3,8 than 1 Tim 1,15.”

Christians, not only “followers of the solitary life”⁴⁸⁶.

At the end of the epistle, the author imposes on the recipients to pray in Spirit without ceasing, interceding for all the “brothers” as some translate, but I prefer the literal for “all the saints”. **Eph 6,18:** “διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς καὶ δεήσεως προσευχόμενοι ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἐν πνεύματι⁴⁸⁷, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ ἀγρυπνοῦντες ἐν πάσῃ προσκατερήσει καὶ δεήσει περὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων” Again, the author is standing by the side of *all* the saints. So far in the epistle, he has lauded the congregation for their love for all the saints, he called himself the smallest of all the saints and now he prays that together with all the saints, the Ephesians would grasp all dimensions of God's love for them. Now, at the end of the epistle, he urges them to continue in this love for the saints in the practical way, in interceding for them.

It is impressive to see that the holy ones are not perfect yet, otherwise they would not be in need of prayer or intercession. In their holiness, that is separateness for God, Christians cannot complacently rest assured of their holiness. Their holiness is not an individual/-istic achievement, merited moral perfection, it is rather their affinity with God. They need prayers, because they are not perfect, they are just his. In the same way they were mercifully called out of the world of impurity and made holy by grace, they need this grace continuously.

486 Bruce, pg. 328: “Nor is it only the immediate circle of his own converts and friends that he has in view: he prays that his readers may have strength to grasp the eternal mystery in common with all the saints. The disclosure of this mystery is the heritage of all the people of God; ...the idea that spiritual illumination is most likely to be received by followers of the solitary life has been widely held: Paul does not appear to have favored it either for himself for his Christian friends.”

487 Bruce, pg. 411: „Praying in the spirit means praying under the Spirit's influence and with his assistance. It is no criterion of the power of the Spirit that the person praying does not understand his own prayer. On the other hand there are prayers and aspirations of the heart that cannot well be articulated”

Summary: Throughout the Epistle of Ephesians the Christians are often called “holy” or “saints”. The holy ones are those who live from the love of Christ, in it they are rooted, out of it they grow, without it they die.

love for the saints

The collocation “love for the saints“ appears always at the beginning of the letters of Col (1,4), Eph (1,15), right after the greeting⁴⁸⁸. First, the author mentions what he heard: rumors of both „love“ of the believers to „all the saints“ and about their „faith“.

Col 1,4: “ἀκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην⁴⁸⁹ ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους”⁴⁹⁰. The Churches have such faith and love for the saints,

488 For the formal structure of the thanksgivings in general I would recommend J.T. Sanders' article in JBL 81/1962 „The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letters of the Pauline Corpus“ (pg348 -362) and the article of O'Brien in NTS 21/ 1974-5 „Thanksgiving in the Gospel of Paul“ (pg. 144 – 155). The main problem is that in the parallel thanksgiving in Phlm, the wording changes slightly. According to some commentators the different regrouping of the members of the sentence also carries difference in meaning. Bruce, e.g. says (pg. 208): „The difference in construction between these words and those in Col 1,4 and Eph 1,15 ...involves a difference in meaning. Love and loyalty to the people of Christ provide visible evidence of love and loyalty to the unseen Christ provide visible evidence of love and loyalty to the unseen Christ.“ I think that it is too bold a statement and would rather see the rewording as a matter of stylistics.

489 There are several textual variants in this verse, when some omit the second „τὴν“ and some omit „ἀγάπην τὴν“. Lincoln pg. 47 „ It would mean that the recipients' faith or faithfulness is either found in the sphere of the Lord Jesus or placed in him but at the same time is directed toward all the saints. This would also make it the most difficult reading and the others could be explained as attempts to conform it more to the wording of Col 1,4.“

490 O'Brien, Colossians, pg. 10: „ ... (Paul) had received news about them via Epaphras who had referred to their „love in the Spirit“, v 8. The familiar Christian triad of faith-love-hope occurs within the causal clause“ pg. 11 It seems to have been a sort of compendium of the Christian life current in early apostolic Church, and according to A.M. Hunter's suggestion (in „Paul and his Predecessors pg.“ 33) may have derived from Jesus himself.“

that they have become famous for it. „The holy ones“, object of the love of the Churches, are the believers. The quantifier “πάντας” shows the quality and undividedness of the love. This can also point to subtle information that these Churches do not have any problems with factionism and therefore they love really „all“.

In **Eph 1,15**: „ Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γὰρ ἀκούσας τὴν καθ’ ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους“ the faith is anchored „in“ Lord Jesus and love is „to all the saints“, that is, fellow-Christians. There is no need for seeing in the „all the saints“ any special group⁴⁹¹. M. Barth then adds that even though the „all“ may sound inclusive, Paul's command to love is restrictive to all the other neighbors. „Paul mentions only faithfulness (and love) shown to the saints, not to the whole of humanity.⁴⁹²“.

Saints by grace:

It has already been repeated many times that the holiness of the Church and its members is not to be understood in the sense of personal achievement, but rather as a pure gift of grace. Now, we shall proceed to the specific cases where it is somehow stressed, that the holiness is given to the Church by sheer grace. Three of them are in the letter to the Colossians (1,12.22; 3,12) and two in Ephesians (1,4.18). They will not be discussed in chronological order but rather in the order following the similarities

491 Viz R. Asting, Heiligkeit im Urchristentum. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930. who claims that in Ephesians Paul speaks only about some group of better Christians.

492 M. Barth, pg.147 and further he adds „,Each Israelite is to love God with his whole heart and his „brother“ or „neighbor“ (including the resident alien) as himself. The distant Egyptians and the hostile Amalekites are not mentioned; and total humanity, e.g. „all flesh“, is never called the object of this love. Eph 1,15 contains the same factual limitation. Nobody can love everybody. Christians cannot love (or be faithful to) people whom they don't know or whom God has not joined to them by a special event“

Col 1, 12 specifically says that it was *God's decision* that the recipients of the letter should be counted among the saints⁴⁹³: “εὐχάριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἱκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί”. In the beginning of the epistle, after the above mentioned appreciation for the Church's love for all the saints, Paul now intercedes for the Church. In his intercession he asks God that they would be able to get to know his will and thus bear fruit worthy of their calling. God himself has transferred the Colossians, that is Gentiles, from the realm of darkness into the realm of light. This means that the promised eschatological time when the Gentiles should be united to the holy nation of God is here.

They have all been considered worthy of this transfer, because God, the Father⁴⁹⁴, has chosen them and he himself made them ready⁴⁹⁵, definitely not because they would merit it. The aorist suggests an already finished action. Everything has already been done. God has *already* qualified, delivered and transferred them. God renders them worthy of the inheritance of the saints. What is this inheritance? O'Brien suggests the Abrahamic promise of holy land in the first plane of the meaning and then heavenly holy land in the secondary metaphorical meaning of this phrase. Mentioning Abraham, I would rather stress the inheritance of being counted among *the family of the holy nation*. The concept of family is suggested in the choice of the word “inheritance”.

Next, the notion of light indicating the otherworldly existence has led some

493 This is another set of reasons to disagree with Asting who saves the designation „saints“ for some special part of the Church, i.e. Elders, diacons etc.

494 O'Brien, pg. 25: “Here the Father is praised because he has effected salvation and redemption in Christ.”

495 Compare with Col 1,22, where it is again the Father who reconciles his Church to himself through his Son.

commentators to read the “holy ones” as “angels”, however, given the standard use of the “ἅγιοι”, there is no need to search for such an anomaly⁴⁹⁶. The main focus is on the residing in the presence of God, which is here expressed by the image of light.

The plural “ὡμᾶς” can be understood in two different ways: First, that each person in this specific Church has been counted among the saints, worthy of that calling. Second, that all the Christians as a group continue in the line of the special selected people of God, the holy nation.

The element of sharing in the future inheritance is also expressed in **Eph 1,18**: “πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας [ὡμᾶν] εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὡμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις”. The verse is in the beginning of the epistle right after the above-mentioned thanksgiving. It is a part of intercessory prayer, in which the author prays that the Church would be able to see how much they had been given. The wording “τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις” conveys at least two messages: First, that inheritance is something mercifully given, something that the recipient did not earn. Second, the only qualification by which a recipient might have earned to get such gift of inheritance is family affiliation. They have to be somebody close to that person whose inheritance they receive. The Christians, whom this letter is addressed, belong to this special family. They have been adopted, they have been made worthy of the inheritance. They shall be among the holy ancestors, because they have been added to the will of the family when they joined it. God himself has called

496 Even if we did proceed in this line, the inheritance of the angels and of the holy ones is, after all, not that different, since they both expect to be in the future in the same place together.

them to join in.

The gracious element in achieving, or, should we rather say *receiving* holiness is mentioned also in the **Col 1:22**: „γυνὴ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν⁴⁹⁷ ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ“. The addressees are the Gentile Congregation. These Christians owe their purity and holiness not to their own efforts, not to themselves, nor to anything or anybody else but God, who is the *agens*. The text shows the economy of the Trinity: Father sends Jesus, who does everything for his Church, he makes it pure, spotless and holy. The sanctification is “family business” among the Trinity⁴⁹⁸, and the people who are called out to become the new people of God, the Church, are just accidental. The death of Jesus in his physical body⁴⁹⁹ is explained theologically as a death in the obedience to the sending Father. Death that has not only expiatory, but also justifying, purifying and sanctifying effect.

The sanctification is not the ultimate goal in itself though. According to the text, the salvation, purification and sanctification have been given to the Church in order to make it worthy of meeting with the Lord God himself⁵⁰⁰, the sender in the great narrative. He is the one who examines the sacrifice whether it is ready and worthy. I would like to keep both, the judicial and the ritual overtone in the explanation⁵⁰¹.

497 Schweitzer, pg. 75, stresses the difference between before and after the baptism.

498 The Holy Spirit is not mentioned here, but the sanctification is implied.

499 „Body of the flesh“ reminds of the Hebrews text which says that Jesus has been given his physical body in order that he might die in it and thus bring the sacrifice.

500 Unlike Schweitzer pg. 77: “Jedenfalls erscheint als das eigentliche Ziel des Versöhnungshandelns Christi wiederum Christus selbst. Ihm sollen die Gemeindeglieder versöhnt werden. Er ist der Sinn und Ziel alles Geschehens.”

501 In order that the Church be able to stand side by side Jesus in front of the himself, in order to withstand the presence of the Lord. Lightfoot's conclusion (pg. 160, 161), is that

Allow me an explanatory excurs, in attempt to expose this text on the background of the story of the healed leper in the Gospel of Matthew: There Jesus sends the healed man to present himself to a priest, in order to receive the ritual that would slowly reintroduce him into the holy people of God, the ritual of gradual sanctification (Lv 14). This man is given health, he is a passive recipient of it. However, he could have been also given ritual purity, and sanctification, also passively. The ritual part is in the repeated sacrifice, the judicial one in the priest's examining the patient. In the same way Christians are sanctified. They are like a healed leper who should have received the ritual of sanctification by the hands of the Priest. Jesus is then, in the eyes of the early Church, the High Priest who heals, as well as offers sacrifice, and sprinkles his people with his own blood. Accordingly, he also introduces the previously impure idolaters and Gentiles among the spotless, pure and holy people of God. They are purified by oil and blood and introduced to the new fellowship of the holy people, holy nation of God: no more dependent on the national affiliation, but by the affiliation of faith.

That the sanctification is not the end in itself is also the idea in the **Col 3,12**: „Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι, σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ χρηστότητα ταπεινοφροσύνην πραΰτητα μακροθυμίαν“. Holiness does not finish in being sanctified by God, it has, as we have just seen, also other purposes. First, the Church is sanctified for God, second, it is sanctified for the world. For the love of God, the Church has been chosen to practical/ethical holiness: in order

the holiness language “pointed to the bringing of the Colossians in the here and now as sacrifices into God's presence for approval. God is thus regarded not as a judge but as the “examiner” who inspects the sacrifices to make sure they are unblemished.” O'Brien disagrees saying, pg. 68: that “it is doubtful...whether thoughts of sacrifice are really present in this clause at all” and understands the text rather as having judicial overtones.

to reflect the holiness of their master in this world. As Israel was a holy nation by virtue of being set apart by God for the sake of reflecting his holiness (be holy as I am holy), also the Church should reflect his holiness by behaving as his special people. The inner change of affiliation should be reflected in the uniqueness and separateness as God's new people. Their holiness is not achieved by fulfillment of the new law expressed in the list of virtues in these verses. The other way round. The recipients of the letter already are new people, and therefore their holiness should be visible in embracing virtuous and ethical life. Because they already are saints, they should also clothe in holiness of deeds⁵⁰².

Last, but not least, in **Eph 1,4** it is, again, literally emphasized that the Church has been set apart as saints by God's own will, mercy and action. This has been done, says the author of the letter “πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου”, before the founding of the universe. No cooperation or synergism can be therefore nor required nor claimed on the part of Church or individuals. Also here the sanctification is not considered an reason for itself. It is rather a means to a greater end; preparation for meeting with God. He has prepared his people for himself⁵⁰³.

Summary: “ἅγιοι” is a name for Church, always in plural. It is external, given to the beforehand-elected people. Ethics does not precede the holiness but

502 As O'Brien puts it, pg. 197: “As God's chosen ones who have already put on the new man (v.10) they must don the graces which are characteristic of him.”

503 Viz the ep. of Barnabas chapter 8 speaking about the eschatological Sabbath. People, according to the author, are *not able to sanctify* Sabbath or anything else, simply for that reason, that they do not have *the sanctification* in their hands. In order to be able to sanctify something, he says, one must possess holiness. This will be true of the Church in the time when it will finally be sanctified.

should follow. The Church is the new Gentile-encompassing holy nation promised to Abraham and therefore the same rules follow also for them. They should be holy as God is holy. The Gentile Churches have also become adoptive children through Jesus. The affiliation through the Son of God gives them full status of children, worthy of the inheritance of such family. The holiness is then not the end in itself, it is rather means for the meeting with the heavenly Father.

Acceptable and unacceptable of the saints

The new society of the saints, despite being reached by grace, requires certain behavior of its members. Like a child when adopted to a family needs to find its way in it, also the Christians must respect the new family rules. There are things which are worthy of the saints, that are acceptable for them. Hospitality is one of such highly admired features. There are, however some things, that one should put away completely, such as e.g. “πορνεία” and “ἀκαθαρσία”, impurity in the ethical sense. Moreover, the Church should be able to deal with their own problems alone and inside. Christians should not ask the outsiders to resolve their internal matters, in the same way a family handles with children itself.

The whole requirement for behavior acceptable of the saints stems from what has been discussed so far, from the indicative that happened in Jesus, who called out his Church. **Eph 2,19:** “ἄρα οὖν οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι ἀλλὰ ἐστὲ συμπολίται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ”. Gentiles are told that through Christ, they have been added to the holy nation. Something that would have been unimaginable before. The Gentiles were defiling for the separate nation by

definition⁵⁰⁴. It was crucial for Israel, in order to keep this separateness, holiness, to *divide* between *holy* and *impure*, the whole scale of the semantic field of their understanding to holiness. In respect to this, Paul writes here very revolutionary, yes, an outrageous statement. That Gentiles can be called „saints“.

It can not be stressed enough how radical this subtle connection is. Before Jesus, the best chance of the Gentiles coming near to the temple in order to meet with Yahweh, was to become Proselytes. Never were they considered the actual members of the pure-blood Israelites, though. But now, „in Jesus“, the people, who were before considered defiling, have been called *saints* by a Pharisee, who had been a religious zealot, fundamentalist, killing in the name of keeping the holy nation⁵⁰⁵ and their message pure.

The author says that these Christians have been literally sanctified, raised to the status of the holy ones of God despite their background and without the condition of circumcision. Now, after they have accepted Jesus, and they have been accepted by him, they are *συν-πολιται*. They share the invisible *πόλις* of those who live in the presence of God.

In his life, Jesus did overstep some impenetrable boundaries of ritual purity, when he touched and healed ritually impure people. But he did not deal with Gentiles, he avoided them when he could. The resurrected Christ of the Church, however, sends his disciples to preach the Gospel to all, even Gentiles. Remember Peter's story in Acts, when he says that the hearts of the Gentiles

504 Lincoln points to the double negative designation of Gentiles 150 „... two terms are used, where one would have sufficed, in order to emphasize the Gentiles' previous “outsider“ status...the readers are no longer completely without homeland...no longer second class citizens They now have full citizenship..they are fellow citizens with the holy ones.“

505 Or rather, somebody from his school.

have been *purified by faith*. Through Jesus they have been also sanctified and raised to *the same status*⁵⁰⁶ as their Israelite brothers. The Gentiles are now called not only saints they are living by God. Like the ancient people of Israel⁵⁰⁷.

This new πόλις has its own rules. It does not teach that “anything goes.” As we shall see in the section on purity, there is stress on internalizing the purity into ethical requirements. Majority of the restrictions are connected in Pauline complex with idolatry and sex and excess in general. In **Eph 5,3** the main points are summarized at the paraenetic part of the epistle to the Ephesians: “πορνεία δὲ καὶ ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα ἢ πλεονεξία μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς πρέπει ἀγίοις”. The “saints” should be able stand up to their name. There are some things that are worthy of that calling and those that are not. The *holiness* should be emanating from the saints, *not impurity*. Two verses before, in **5,1** the author speaks to “loved children of God”. The “saints” belong to the “family”. Since they thus belong to God, there are some things that are not suitable for them

506 Bruce, pg. 302: “The first Gentile believers who were admitted to a Church comprising Jewish Christians could well have felt at ease; it was desirable that they should be made feel completely at home. The Church had Jewish base; its members had Jewish presuppositions, and it would have been to easy for Gentile Christians to do or to say something which was felt to be out of place. In a crisis like that which arose in Antioch when Peter and others abandoned the practice of table-fellowship with Gentile Christians, the latter must have got the impression that they were at best second-rate citizens. Against this apparent demotion of Gentile Christians Paul protested vigorously at Antioch Gal 2,11-14 and it is Paul's attitude that finds uncompromising expression here. Gentile Christians are not adherents or visitors or second-rate citizens in the believing *community; they are full members...*”

507 As Lincoln writes, pg. 151: “In the creation of the one new person Jew-Gentile distinctions have been overcome” and further (pg. 152): “there is move here from the political imagery of the state of commonwealth to the more intimate picture of a family”. The concept of the family is also used by Bruce (pg. 303) “...not household servants but sons and daughters, with all the rights of inheritance that sons... enjoy the Father to whom they have access is the same Father as he to whom their brothers and sisters of Jewish origin have access – it is by the same Spirit that his Gentile and Jewish children are alike acknowledge him as their father”

anymore. If someone belongs to the high-class-society family, there are certain patterns of behavior that are not fitting. Likewise, in the family of the saints, it should be well divided between the holy and the impure. But not in the ritual sense anymore.

“Πορνεία”, “ἀκαθαρσία” and “πλεονεξία”⁵⁰⁸ are things that in the classical diagram of holiness semantic field are opposing and repelling holiness⁵⁰⁹. Therefore, since the Gentile believers are now in the family of holiness, they have nothing in common with these.

Note that the typical distinction between holiness and impurity is kept. It is still preserved even if we are already under the new covenant. The language stays the same, the *signified* changes and thus we witness the *semantic shift*. Not in the “πορνεία”, but in the “ἀκαθαρσία”. Because majority of the impurity is connected with improper sexuality also in the Old Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, the addition of “πορνεία” is not new. “Πορνεία”, usually translated “fornication”⁵¹⁰, covers all the sexual sins in general, all the sexual behavior.

The discussed verse is followed by a list of vices in the **v5b** “πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὃ ἐστὶν εἰδωλολάτρης, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.” The members of the Church did not earn to become members of the “πόλις of the saints” by avoiding “πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, πλεονεξία” and “εἰδωλολατρία”, but vice versa. They used to be such. Not now, since, they are the adoptive children of the high class “family of holiness”, they should

508 Lincoln, pg. 321 “Fornication of various sorts is condemned in the Old Testament and in Hellenistic Judaism...the exhortation here in Ephesians has no specific situation in view but generalizes about “all impurity”. ἀκαθαρσία is usually associated with sexual sin. 322 πλεονεξία covetousness...should also be taken as the sort of unrestrained sexual greed whereby a person assumes that others exist for his or her gratification.”

509 Viz the closing of this chapter where the same verse appears discussing impurity.

510 Viz further.

abandon their old life of impurity and live a life that is worthy of the new family. The new life should be free of the new impurities: sexual immorality and idolatry, which are both signs of immodesty. The holiness is not achieved by purity of these, it is given despite these. But in order to keep up with the new family, one should strive for ethical purity.

The verse 5,3 exhorts to live the new life “καθώς πρέπει ἁγίοις⁵¹¹”, it does not give an exhaustive new law of new purity rules. Therefore even the curious discussions⁵¹² about “who did what where” are to be avoided, not because it is feared or forbidden, but because it brings in existence something that should not be⁵¹³. In connection with this verse we than cannot tell that there would be some new clearly given law that would “πρέπει ἁγίοις”. It is rather question of what comes of relationship with God and one another naturally⁵¹⁴.

6.1.1.2 The Holy Spirit

First chapter of the letter to Ephesians is interwoven with the Trinitarian theology in long praise of God, who is the subject of all the verses from 3 to 13. The author writes that in God the recipients have been “sealed” by the Holy

511 M Barth vol 2, pg. 560 : “.the term “fitting” shows that voluntary obedience was expected of the saints to a standard that could not be legalistically codified. Those raised to new life, enthroned in heaven, adopted to be children of God, are treated as princess or noblemen.”

512 Lincoln 322 “*Presumably, the assumption behind this prohibition is that thinking and talking about sexual sins creates an atmosphere in which they are tolerated and which can indirectly even promote their practice.*”

513 As Lincoln puts it (pg. 322) ...“thinking and talking about sexual sins creates an atmosphere in which they are tolerated and which can indirectly even promote their practice”.

514 This is also visible in the end of the epistle of Romans, where Paul asks that Phoebe should be accepted as is suitable for the saints. Rom 16,2: „ἵνα αὐτὴν προσδέξησθε ἐν κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων καὶ παραστήτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῆζῃ πράγματι· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ.“ There are things that are then suitable and worthy of the saints and one of such behaviors that stands to its name is the hospitality.

Spirit, which has been given to them as a token of the eschatological promise.

Eph 1,13: “ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσφραγίσθητε τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἀγίῳ,...” The believers have been branded with holiness. If holiness means to be set apart, then this is a very strong metaphor. Seals were used by farmers, as well as slave-owners, to brand their property. Once a slave or a cow belonged to one owner, it was set apart for that very person and they got a mark burned to their skin, which could not be removed and thus set apart. Presence of the Holy Spirit in heart and conscience of a believer, sets them apart for God in such a way as if they were so branded⁵¹⁵.

Ephesians 4,30 ascribes to the Spirit ability to feel emotion, unlike the apathetic Greek gods, the inspiration of the author is in the Old Testament. The Spirit can be grieved: **Eph 4,30:** “καὶ μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως.” The readers are reminded that they were sealed in the Holy Spirit for the future glory, however, they should not start misbehaving, considering their salvation sure. The notion of “grieving the Holy Spirit” is not new. In the Old Testament, it is used on several occasions, usually in parallel for “make bitter”. Lincoln⁵¹⁶ suggests, among other cases, Isa 63,10

515 Lincoln, pg. 39 “They belong to him [God] now, but they are also protected until he takes complete possession of them. The spirit is an eschatological seal who marks believers out as a people who will be protected through the testings, the battles, and the sufferings of end-time, which are already upon them (6,10-18).” Bruce reminds of the connection with Acts 10 when he says (pg. 264): “The Gentiles, on believing the Gospel, were “sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise”.”

516 Lincoln, pg. 306: “The language of grieving the Holy Spirit is found later in Herm. Man. 10.2.4.; 10.3.2; T. Isaac 4.40. ”But you shall take care and be alert that you do not grieve the Spirit of the Lord” .Ps Cyprian De Aleat 3 “Do not grieve the Holy Spirit who is in you, and do not extinguish the light which has been lit in you” not only does the language of saddening or disappointing the spirit by one's wayward actions provide a powerful personal metaphor (pg. 307), but the identity of the one offended is also underlined forcefully.“

and 2 Sam 13,21 as the points of reference. Christians, even though they have been sealed, branded and set apart, that is sanctified for God by the Spirit for free, should care about their “ἀναστροφή”: They should not lie, in anger they should not sin, they should not steal or speak evil. In case they would not live according to the new way of life, the Holy Spirit would be sad. In the past life of the people of God, whenever Israel disappointed God, the outcome was never good, and therefore the new people should be able to embrace the warning and learn the lesson and live in love with one another.

6.1.1.3 The Holy Church.

Holy “ἐκκλησία” is mentioned in the chapter 5, within the marriage discourse. Spouses are instructed on how to love and respect each other as shown on the example of the relationship between Jesus and his Church. **Eph 5,27**: “ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἑνδοξὸν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μὴ ἔχουσαν σπίλον ἢ ῥυτίδα ἢ τι τῶν τοιούτων, ἀλλ’ ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ ἄμωμος.” In the real life the grooms did not prepare their own brides, they were never held responsible for their bride's purity. It is usually the domain of the bride to keep herself pure and to make herself beautiful, or the friend of the spouse as the legal witness. Therefore, more than about marriage, this very verse, despite being in such context, reminds the readers again, that unlike in the case of bride, their beauty, purity and holiness are derivative. The purity of Church is reached by Christ and in marriage with him, in accepting this gift, the Church accepts him and thus receives his gift of holiness in separation from this world for the Christ, the groom. The purpose of such sanctification and purification is nearness of the spouse and the bride. Jesus here presents the bride as if she was an offering or

sacrifice.

Lincoln⁵¹⁷ says that the holiness of the verse 27 is both moral and ethical. It is true that the other expressions used beside “ἅγιος” can appear in both ritual and ethical sense, but not here. And if, then the ethical conduct is secondary, emanating as the result of Christ's work. There are two reasons why it is impossible to agree with Lincoln. First, as we have already seen many times in this chapter and outside of it, it is difficult that any ethical notion would be attached to the adjective ἅγιος, which is translation of the Hebrew שָׁדֵךְ. There is adjective ὁσιος which is exactly used for the human side of holiness. Second, all the given beauty, glory and purity is pointed to the goal of holiness which is, in turn, the means of the metaphorical marriage-intimacy, nearness of Christ and his bride. Moreover, the previous verse stresses again the imputative and gratuitous gift of holiness. In the verse 26, it is Jesus who sanctified and purified his Church, it did not do anything, everything has been done for it. Therefore, it is important that the Church, the bride, does not defile herself, but for the time being, she has been purified and sanctified by her spouse, not by her ethical perfection. The maxim that can be expected of the Church is to purify itself, but the sanctification is beyond its capacity⁵¹⁸.

Eph 4,12: “πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων εἰς ἔργον διακονίας, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ

517 Lincoln, pg. 377: “...it then becomes crystal clear from the final hina clause that this bride's beauty is moral. She is to be holy and blameless, the two terms found so frequently in Old Testament contexts of cultic and ethical purity used with the language of presentation in Col 1,22, and already taken up earlier in this letter in 1,4, where the display of such holiness and blamelessness is seen as the purpose of God's election of believers from before the foundation of the world. Impurity is what characterizes the out-sides, purity is what the distinguishing mark of Christ's Church.”

518 Therefore, I find it plausible to agree rather with Bruce, who stresses the impurity of the Church (pg.390). “Spots, wrinkles, and the like are physical blemishes which might make an earthly bride distasteful to her bridegroom: here they are spiritual and ethical defect, which have been removed by the Lord's sanctifying and cleansing act.”

σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ,” The Ephesians 4 is similar to Romans 12, it also deals with the practicalities of the new life. There are different gifts: apostleship, prophets, preachers of the Gospel and pastors and teachers; all these gifts were given to build the body of Christ, that is Church. All these offices have been given for the equipping of the saints. They are the “holy ones“, but still, they need to be taken care of. The holy ones are not only those who teach and prophecy and lead, the holy ones are also the recipients of these, the ordinary Church members. The ultimate goal is the unity of the Church. The holy ones are so equipped in order to be able to love one another and be a unified perfect and holy body of Christ. Beside the whole group, also the leaders responsible for this holy society, apostles and prophets are holy, confirms also Eph 3,5.

Holy Church - Holy Temple

We have already met the image of the holy temple used for Church. This a typical example shift of the semantic field. The original life of the metaphor is Jerusalem Temple that is now used for the community of Christians. The word starts in the realm of the ritual use and is transformed into the new notion of metaphorical sacred space, which is not understood spatially anymore. It is understood socially. Christians, both from Jewish and Gentile background are now one family in Christ, they are being built into one building, the temple⁵¹⁹. **Eph 2,21**: 'ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὖξει εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ'. It is stressed here that the builder is God and that he has been preparing the whole history in order to build this temple. The community of Church with its past and present is the successor of the Jerusalem temple in providing God's

519 Not the heavenly temple of Hebrews, but temple as a community, which we encountered in Paul.

presence.

6.1.1.4 To Sanctify

The context of **Eph 5,26**, where God sanctifies his Church has just been explained. The text is following: “ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσῃ καθάρισας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι”. Jesus is told to have given himself up for the Church. The word used, *παρεδωκεν*, is very strong and it describes his sacrificially understood death. In general, when thinking about the sacrifice of Christ, it is usually connected with the whole world, but here the author says that the sacrifice was for the Church only, that is for those, who accept it. Jesus is described as eschatological Christ who is betrothed to his people⁵²⁰. The sanctification of the Church is then only in his hands.

There are at least two possible ways to explain it. First, the plain and obvious one, is the directly soteriological one. Jesus is setting his people apart for the special service of God and thus they are set apart and also sanctified, because they are thereby his. Should we, on the other hand, stay in the life of the metaphor of the marriage, it is interesting to find out that the office of marriage was preceded in the ancient Israel by the office of betrothal.

This is described, among others, by Williams⁵²¹, who connects our verse

520 I.A. Muirhead, *The Bride of Christ* in *SJT* 5 (1952), 175 – 187, pg. 184: “The Bride of Christ is pre-eminently, essentially an eschatological idea. We cannot speak correctly of the Church being now the Bride, rather it is what she shall be...It is only in the end that the Church becomes the Bride.” And again in the following page “To speak of the Church as the Bride of Christ is to look to the future, the end of history. She becomes the Bride as glorified.”

521 Pg. 53 and 54 in David J. Williams, *Paul's Metaphors, Their Context and Character*, 1999.

with 2 Cor 11,2, where the one who is betrothing the Church is, however, Paul himself, as the *friend of the groom*. The office of betrothal is about promise of future bond and that of already established exclusivity. It is this exclusivity, where the setting apart meets the holiness language⁵²². In the period of betrothal, full fidelity was required of both spouses and they thus sanctified⁵²³ one for another. Westcott fittingly adds that Christ loved the Church not because it was perfectly lovable, but in order to make it such⁵²⁴.

Jesus does everything: not only does he choose his bride and sets her apart, thereby he sanctifies her, he also *cleanses* her. The cleansing happens through washing. It is the metaphorically understood “ritual washing”, rather than an erotic image of spouse giving his future wife a bath⁵²⁵. The cleansing element is twofold. Beside water, the word is mentioned and that is why it is quite obvious that the purification and sanctification are given through the baptism⁵²⁶.

Therefore, the previous assumption that the sanctification and purification of the Church, the group of the saints/ the “holy ones” is based in the work of Christ, proves correct. It is the office of baptism, through which the Church accepts the gift of life and they decides to be set apart for the Lord. To accept the purificatory sprinkling of his blood and to be ritually purified and made

522 Lincoln 375: “...the purpose of that love is seen as the Church's sanctification...OT cultic background involves a setting apart to effect a state and condition of moral purity. Through Christ's death on their behalf, believers have been separated from the sinful world and transferred to the sphere of God's holiness.”

523 Qadash, viz. Sampley and Bruce pg. 387

524 Westcott, pg. 85.

525 As Lincoln says on the pg. 375: “Sanctification is explained as a cleansing that takes place through washing with water”.

526 Lincoln, pg. 375: “But here, the explicit mention of water suggest not simply an extended metaphor for salvation but a direct reference to water baptism, not to baptism by the spirit. Sanctification and cleansing had also been linked with ritual washing at Qumran. Again, in line with the writer's perspective in this passage, the Church as a whole, and not merely individual believers, can be seen as having been sanctified through baptism as washing.”

ready for the encounter of the Holy One, the Father, at the eschatological wedding.

The language of holiness is here closely connected with that of purity, they are still indivisibly united. Access to holiness is provided through purification. Interestingly, the purification is still achieved by a ritual of washing. But this ritual purity requires only *one* ritual bath. And it is not only the element which would purify the body, it is also the word which purifies the “συνείδησις”. The word in connection with the element of water than symbolizes the self-sacrificially understood death of Jesus, eschatological Christ who chooses his bride and lays his everything down for her, in order to make her ready for the encounter with holiness itself.

6.1.3 Holy - “ὅσιος”

Hands, if risen in prayer, as well as the heart, usually collocate with “pure”, which is the notion also in **Eph 4,24**, where the word appears as noun⁵²⁷: “καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δίκαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.” Lincoln (pg. 287) notes that “*the notion of the new person has both corporate and individual connotations*”. That is, this word is lot more individual than ἀγιότης. The new person, “a new man” is stressed here. The renewal achieved by Jesus imparts new creation marked with righteousness and holiness of truth. The “sacredness” or “holiness” appears here with the genitive “of truth”, it can also be explained in such a way that truth is “sacred”.

527 There is only another one of this noun in the New Testament, in Lk 1,75.

6.1.4. Summary

Majority of the cases of holiness appear in the Epistle of Ephesians. Christians are saints by grace. Though mostly coming from Gentile background, the recipients have been fully sanctified and make now part of the holy nation, the new holy society. This privilege carries also some duties. It should lead to the change of way of life, abandoning porneia, greediness and excess in favor of loving and caring attitude, which the Churches have already been known for. The sanctification, setting apart, has been described by several metaphors such as that of adopting into a new family thus accessing the inheritance, of marriage and betrothal, new nation etc. They are ekklesia, which is holy, their lives should reflect that. They have been given the token of the Holy Spirit, they have been sealed by it, thus separated as God's property. Holiness in these epistles is connected with both soteriology and ecclesiology. It is given by Jesus for the group which should shine his character. There is also stress that the leaders of this community would lead seemly life. The language does not deviate from the usual use in other New Testament writings. Holiness is primary being God's special people and property which shows itself in good conduct. There are also several ritual notions, but the author prefers a practically-ethical sense of good conduct. The antonym of "holiness" is the notion of "bad behavior". There has not been observed connection with any sentiment of ritual impurity in the epistle so far.

6.2 Purity

In the two epistles the language of purity is scarce. The pre-conversion Gentile life is marked by paganism including the *impurity* also in **Eph 4,19**: “οἵτινες ἀπηλγηκότες ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ εἰς ἔργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ”. The author of the epistle strongly urges the readers to abandon their old life, which is marked by the list of vices, that can be summarized under the “πᾶσα ἀκαθαρσία”. The subject of the sentence is from the v. 17, surprisingly, “τὰ ἔθνη”. Are not the readers themselves Gentiles? Yes and no. Yes, as far as the ethnicity goes. No, as far as the conduct goes. “Τὰ ἔθνη” stands here for those who live outside the walls of the city of God, that is outside of Church. They are the people who are filled with impurity and yet have never enough of it. Therefore here the stress is on the uncontrolled desire and wanton. The Church is the place of the operation of the Holy Spirit. They are the saints. Whoever is outside the city walls, belongs to impurity⁵²⁸ and is, paradoxically, true Gentile.

We have encountered earlier the case of Eph 5,3 where even talks of *impurity* are forbidden in the new people of God. Since the Church is the society of the „holy ones“, the new nation of God, the place of operation of the Holy Spirit, their bodies are ritually purified by the symbolic sprinkling of the blood of the sacrificially understood blood of Jesus in baptism. Therefore, spiritually, their hearts and consciences are „purified by the faith“, they are now not only „saints“, but they are also „pure“.

They are the heirs of the Kingdom of God. The epistle to **Ephesians** stresses this factor of the new pure community of saints, and therefore the author

528 In the introduction to this chapter we have encountered the case of Eph 5,3 where even talks of impurity are forbidden in the new people of God.

written in **5,5** that no impure person shall inherit the Kingdom of God: „τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες, ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὃ ἐστὶν εἰδωλολάτρης, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ“. What follows is another list of vices. The Christians have been sanctified and therefore they should live according to that⁵²⁹. The Spirit, active among the new society, grants them the purity. Being Christian means leaving behind what is elsewhere described as „fruit of the flesh“. Nobody impure, greedy wanting more and more, never satisfied, engaging in idolatry, shall inherit the Kingdom.

The greediness, wanton, idolatry is then mentioned in another list of vices which mentions also the impurity is in **Col 3,5**. Christians are to die to these vices and they are to life from their faith and according to their faith which excludes these.

Summary: The purity language of these two epistles restricts itself only to the impurity. “ἀκαθαρσία” is the immoral way of life of Gentiles. Even if of Gentile origin, the believers of this Church should not live according to their old ways, they are now part of the holy nation. The impurity is the antonym of rather “good way of life” than purity or holiness, though it also carries these traditional overtones.

529 Note, however, that it is nowhere is suggested, that they should earn the inheritance.

Chapter 7: Pastoral Epistles

7.1 Holiness

In the Pastoral Epistles, holiness is mostly expressed by “ἅγιος”. There are also three cases of “ὅσιος”, usually in connection with “δίκαιος”.

7.1.1 Holy – “ἅγιος”

The adjective is found in the epistles in the usual collocations of “πνεῦμα” and “κλήσεις”. There are also the verbal forms of “ἀγιάζειν” and “ἡγιασμένος”.

7.1.1.1 The Holy Spirit, “πνεῦμα ἅγιον”

Timothy is admonished at the beginning of the epistle “to guard the treasure of the Gospel not by his own strength, but to rely on the power of the Holy Spirit”⁵³⁰. **2 Tim 1,14:** “τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος ἐν ἡμῖν.” There are several recurrent notions in this sentence regarding both holiness and the Holy Spirit itself. First one is that the Spirit is again associated with power, it is able to protect what needs to stay safe. Second, that the preaching of the Gospel itself is directed by the Spirit. Third, the Spirit is indwelled and thus helping human from within. To be precise to the group of people, to “us”. Last, but not least, the Spirit is a gift as well as guardian and a seal. The Gospel is in the fragile hands of people, but since they

530 Mounce, pg. 490: “...this is another reminder that the power to live out God's call on a believer's life does not come through human means but is only possible through the God who gives “you the will and the power to achieve his purpose” Phil 3,13 When the Spirit calls believers to minister, the call is accompanied by supernatural empowerment.”

are not left alone and abandoned, but the Spirit is with them, it is well protected.

7.1.1.2 Holy Calling

In the same way that many of the Pauline epistles start with the address to Christian “called saints”, the holy calling appears also in the **2 Tim 1,9** “*τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγία, οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν, τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνιων,*” Christians are those who were called by holy calling. Why “holy”? Because of the one who calls them and what he calls them to. The calling, choosing, is here “before all the time”, before anyone could do anything to deserve it. It is not based on human conduct, but on God's choice: *ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν*. The calling is holy because it sets them apart for the special use of God.

7.1.1.3 Sanctification

“*ἁγιασμός*” as holiness in the practical life appears in very enigmatic verse **1 Tim 2,15**: “*σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, ἐὰν μείνωσιν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ καὶ ἁγιασμῷ μετὰ σωφροσύνης.*” The best explanation I have encountered is the article of E.P. Porter⁵³¹, who first summarizes the state of research in the time of writing (1993) dividing two groups of commentators, those who marginalize the verse, dismissing it as later interpolation or unauthentic and those who, on the other hand over-theologize. He then goes word after word of the verse demonstrating all possible explanations.

531 S. E. Porter, “What does it Mean to Be ‘Saved by Childbirth’ (1 Timothy 2.15)?,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, vol. 15, no. 49, pp. 87–102, 1993.

In the end he shows that, given the historical context of the epistle, there is likelihood that the situation in the Timothy's Church was against procreation, in connection with the false teaching of a divine sparkle imprisoned in a body, which could cause people abstain sexually. In response to this situation then Paul, according to Porter, encourages the Christian couples to have children, stressing the traditional role of a woman as a mother. Independent of giving birth⁵³², a woman can also be saved in her goodness and holiness. Porter writes: "It is easy to conclude that the encouraging of ascetic practices, combined with shunning of the women's domestic roles, resulted in sexual abstinence or similar practices, which were considered by the author to have missed the mark."⁵³³

In the second part of the verse, there are three plus one parallel members: "staying in faith", "love" and "sanctification" with "wisdom". What is the meaning of the sanctification here? It is a state, or process, in which a woman should remain. Sanctification is here not connected with the childbearing⁵³⁴. Moreover, it is interesting that Paul did not choose the noun "*holiness*" but the "*sanctification*"⁵³⁵, as if it was some long-term procedure.

532 Thereby creating more bodies which Greeks and Gnostics considered the grave of soul.

533 Pg. 102

534 At least not in such a way, that even if she had children, she would not threaten her own salvation thereby, or sanctification for that matter.

535 The article of Falconer in JBL 60 (1941) pg. 372 -379 is exactly one of those described by Porter. But there is very fitting definition of the sanctification (pg. 377): "*Agiasmos*...is the process of separating the believer from contamination by the world and his pagan past into the life consecrated to God in Christ Jesus. It involves a struggle against *akatharsia*, to keep the body in holiness and honor against fornication and to avoid defrauding one's neighbor. Only the sanctified can see God, and this state is the work of the Holy Spirit. In its final issue sanctification is the realization of Christian salvation" It is not without problems. Separating from contamination is rather purification and we must be reminded that this world is not defiling. It may be lost, but it is created as good and on several occasions in the New Testament and Paul himself it is clearly stated that everything is pure per se. it is only the perception that renders things defiling. Also the narrowing of the *akatharsia* only to two sins is not doing justice to the notion

Faith, love, sanctification and wisdom are here on one line, beside each other, they do not explain each other, one is not more important than the other. The list of virtues is rather random and cumulative. In the end, to be precise, it is not even a true list of virtues, it is rather list of gifts in which, one only needs to *remain*. These virtues/gifts are not specific only to women, they are given to both sexes. Maybe Paul wanted to stress that also women are partakers of these.

7.1.1.4 Sanctified

In **2 Tim 2,21** sanctification is a result of human action of separation from the false teachings: “ἐὰν οὖν τις ἐκκαθάρη ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων, ἔσται σκεῦος εἰς τιμὴν, ἡγιασμένον, εὐχρηστον τῷ δεσπότῃ, εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἡτοιμασμένον.” In the same way as people in the Old Testament were urged to separate themselves ritually from certain foods, places and stuff, to keep ritually pure and to prove to be “the holy nation”, here the language of ritual separation remained but the meaning shifted towards ethical. Though e.g. Mounce⁵³⁶ says that the sanctification also here is God's work, I disagree. It is true, that a cup usually does not wash itself, but this is exactly what the author of the verse is saying here. The house-master wants his utensils clean, if they are not so, they will not be worthy of him. But since humans are not utensils and therefore capable of action of separation, the sanctification is here used exactly in the singular way. Here Christians do sanctify themselves by separating themselves from heresies. If they did not, they would not be worthy of their master

which is much wider concept of everything that is desecrating and defiling, destructive towards love. The struggle against the impurity is rightly said to be in the hands of the indwelled Spirit. The realization of salvation is even more problematic. In case it is meant ascetic earning, then no. If it is just the Spirit emanating and shining through the life of the person, than yes.

536 Mounce, pg. 532: “God is effecting the sanctification...”

7.1.1.5 Sanctify

The last occurrence is the verb “ἀγιάζειν” is in the **1 Tim 4,5**: “ἀγιάζεται γὰρ διὰ λόγου θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως.” What is sanctified? The context suggests that everything that is received with thanksgiving, that is food (mostly). The verse is in the middle of discourse fighting false teachers, who are described in the beginning of the chapter 4 as those who lurk Christians away with the demonic teachings, who are hypocrites and liars, whose *συνείδησεις* are tainted. They forbid marriages and certain foods. Against this stands the Christian theology teaching that neither getting married nor eating food of free choice makes one doomed nor defiled. What might seem to be as sanctification of food by humans is in fact sanctification by Gods word⁵³⁷. It is the pronouncement of freedom over the impurity rules.

7.1.2 Holy – “ὅσιος”

The adjective “ὅσιος” describes mostly the human side of holiness. In the writings of the New Testament it is not as frequent as “ἅγιος”. It is unusually frequent in Pastoral Epistles and then also, as we shall see later, in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers.

In **Tit 1,8**: “ἀλλὰ φιλόξενον φιλάγαθον σώφρονα δίκαιον ὅσιον ἐγκρατῆ...” it is put side by side self-restraint, describing a quality sought in a presbyter. The second case, in **1 Thess 2,10**⁵³⁸, it is used of the Church, who are supposed to be “martyrs”, witnesses of the Gospel. “ὁμοίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐγενήθημεν...”. It is already a second time that

537 Viz Rom 14 //1 Cor 8, those who believe and live from their trust in God that his mercy is sufficient for salvation, have their *συνειδήσεις* purified by this faith/trust.

538

the word appears in the same sentence as *δίκαιος*, which is not surprising, since they are quite synonymous. The Church should be “holy”, but also “righteous and blameless”, that is, in fact, “pure”. But despite stress of these ethical qualities, their source is not sought in the subjects themselves. Also here the qualities are granted by God. The adjective may carry also the features of purity, such as in **1 Tim 2,8**, where the author encourages to pray with “holy” hands raised to the sky: “Βούλομαι οὖν προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ.”

7.2 Purity

In connection with our topic, the most specific feature about these writings is their use of the purity words that are usually not used in the New Testament and that are more frequent in the later Apostolic Fathers: “*ἄγνός*” and “*σεμνός*”.

7.2.1 Pure - “*καθαρός*”

The use of this word is quite frequent for the little span in question⁵³⁹. It is used in the usual collocation with “heart” and “conscience”, but we shall also encounter the purification of “everything”, which was important especially in the fight with different purity sects.

7.2.1.1 Everything is Pure

Literal general pardon of the impurity in the bold statement that „everything is pure“ is found in Tit 1,15 „*πάντα καθαρά τοῖς καθαροῖς· τοῖς δὲ μεμιαμμένοις καὶ*

539 Quinn, pg. 101 counts that the PE contain 7 of 26 New Testament uses of clean.

ἀπίστοις οὐδὲν καθαρὸν, ἀλλὰ μεμίανται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις“.

It is either everything or nothing. Here the stress is again on the inner perception of the purity status. Rather than objective quality of purity⁵⁴⁰, the question in view is the inner world of a man. Despite universal and „objective“ purity of “everything”, the inner perception is capable of changing the purity status of the thing itself for the receptor. The purity status is created in the inner man, in “συνείδησις”. The evaluation of the purity status grows from the inside out. If the “συνείδησις” is pure then everything is pure. If it is tainted, then it is impossible to experience freedom. Mounce adds⁵⁴¹ that those whose conscience is not pure, it is so for their moral failures. “...those who are morally defiled and do not believe cannot be made acceptable to God even by ritual purity because everything about them is unclean.” This corresponds to Jesus' urge of cleaning the inside first.

How can one have their “συνείδησις” purified? By faith and spiritually understood sprinkling of the blood of Jesus (Heb 9). We have encountered the same program in Gospels as well as the writings of Paul and “purification of conscience” was in the epistle of Hebrews. The same theology that we have seen in other chapters is reflected also here. If someone is defiled and „non-believer“, or rather „faith/trust-less“, then nothing can be „pure“ to them, because their perception is biased⁵⁴². If your conscience is pure, then nothing can defile you.

‘This is similar to the notion of righteousness in Paul. One is either slaving to sin, looking at the world through the glasses of sin, comparing everything ac-

540 Mounce, pg.401 divides two ways Paul uses the adjective. The verse than, according to him, in the universality of the purity combines both features of the word. “all things are (ritually) pure to (morally) pure”,since “not all things are morally pure.”

541 Ibid. pg. 401.

542 Mounce would probably disagree. His focus is on the moral purification and my view would be understood as mixing ritual and moral together. And that is exactly what I am doing, since the two notions can never be so clear-cut divided as he does.

according to measure of sinfulness thinking that thus they serve the law when they actually mutilate it this way. The other option is to look at the reality through the glasses of faith and trust in God. In that case, one's heart is purified, one dares to come near to God despite imperfections, without pondering the sin, in the childlike openness and trust. To such naive person nothing is impure, they live like Adam and Eve before „their eyes were opened”, before they „knew they were naked“. Those, however, who enjoy judging „κρίνειν” (Acts 10), those, whose hearts were not purified by faith, they perceive everything as defiled and defiling and from their hearts come impure thoughts. Either everything is pure, then there is faith and purified “συνείδησις”, or nothing is pure, everything is defiling and defiled, then there is judgment and lack of trust/faith.

7.2.1.2 Pure Heart, Conscience

The notion of purity coming out of the inner man is then very frequent in the both letters to Timothy, where the notion appears four times. Twice the noun collocating with the adjective “pure” is “συνείδησις” and twice it is “καρδία”. Each of the writings has both cases. It is noteworthy that all the cases are within the Pastoral Epistles, where Paul gives advice to young Timothy about the practical pastoral life. First we shall comment on the cases of pure heart and then we shall proceed to the “συνείδησις”.

Both of the cases of the “pure heart” do not speak about ritually transferred purity in the sense we have encountered in Mk7 or Mt15. These two cases are rather to be understood in the sense of “ἀπλότης”, that is undividedness and single-heartedness.

The first occurrence describes the goal of preaching, which is love. This

love is then qualified by three predicates: **1 Tim 1,5** „τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου,“ The purity of the heart can have two meanings. The first one is the undividedness of heart. The second one could be summarized by a motto: “Who is forgiven a lot, loves a lot”. This is the message, the “*παραγγελία*”, that true faith/trust does not need to be hypocritical. If it is, then it is not the faith Paul speaks about elsewhere. Faith is the justifying power, response to the heavenly calling. It is not just logical agreement to the set of dogmas⁵⁴³, it is trustful reliance on God for salvation, purification and sanctification; it is letting one's own fate into the hands of God. God purifies the consciousness and the hearts⁵⁴⁴ of believers through faith. Those who used to be sinful but who accepted mercy and thus were forgiven, have been pronounced “justified and sanctified”. These people, whose hearts have been purified, they love a lot. This is then the goal of preaching the Gospel. Love gushing from the heart purified, not by ritual washing or performing some cultic deed, and not even by earning salvation in good deeds, behavior prescribed by some elders, but *heart purified by faith*. The notion of purity of heart is well known in the Old Testament, where it describes the wholeness of a person. “The pure heart is open and free⁵⁴⁵” as well as “upright, honest, sincere”, “morally pure, cleansed of sin” and finally “ritually clean”. In the Old Testament, the heart is mostly purified by God's action, but human action is also required. “There are...actions

543 Johnson, pg. 165: “The goal of Paul's parangelia is not conformity to a set of behavioral norms, but the deep internal attitude and disposition of the human spirit, particularly in relation to other people. Chief among such attitudes for Paul is agape.”

544 The heart is the inner man, organ of making decisions, reflection and feelings, it is almost synonymous with the consciousness, which is rather focused on the ethics and feelings of remorse for past undesired actions.

545 Columba Steward, O.S.B. Purity of Heart in Early Ascetic and Monastic Literature ed Harriet A. Luckman, The liturgical press, Minnesota 199, taken from introduction pg. 1 - 29

expected of human beings in order to maintain the purity of heart”, among these, there are “the fear of the Lord” and “obedience to his Law”.

Mounce summarizes by saying that ⁵⁴⁶: “..love is more significant than ritual observance such as law keeping.” The “good conscience” is the inner man, who is not any longer subject to the torture of the inner voice speaking about the eternal damnation, but relying on the message of the Gospel, that Christ has come for all and in him there is forgiveness of all sins and impurities. This then leads to love⁵⁴⁷, love of God and furthering of the life of holiness.

The second case of the collocation “pure heart” is in the second epistle: **2 Tim 2,22**: “τὰς δὲ νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας φεῦγε, δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην πίστιν ἀγάπην εἰρήνην μετὰ τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων τὸν κύριον ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας”. Timothy is encouraged to be in the near contact with people who “call on the Lord with pure heart”. Christians, once purified and sanctified, should be available to God (v 21). Timothy is discouraged from giving in to vain discussions, he should pursue rather peace along with the qualities that are given to Christians: righteousness, faith and love.

The verse copies the same notion of 1 Tim 1,3. Those, who are of the pure heart here, are people of Timothy's group⁵⁴⁸, not the opponents who preach the Gospel with ulterior motives, who preach the heresies for their own profit and fame⁵⁴⁹. Timothy should rather stick with the exemplary people of the Church,

546 Mounce, pg. 22. (cf v. 8 – 11)

547 Mounce, pg. 24: “love comes from a heart cleansed of sin, the heart being “the hidden person” (1 Pt 3,4)...[the notion of purified heart] carries with it the Old Testament concept of ceremonial cleansing in preparation for God's service”

548 The concept is the same as that of later 1 Clem where the author instructs: “κολλασασθε τοις ἁγίοις”.

549 Mounce says, pg. 533: “ἐτὰ τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων τὸν κύριον ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας” ostracizes those whose hearts are not cleansed and whose behavior is contradictory to those virtues”.

than trying to untangle useless discussions for discussions themselves. The “illustriousness” of the people is that their hearts are “undivided”, they are simple, they believe and trust God without second thoughts, they live their faith in all the listed qualities. Only those who are Christians, those who call on the Lord out of the pure heart and all altogether illustrious are good company for Timothy.

Next, we shall move to the two cases of *pure conscience*⁵⁵⁰. We have encountered already in the previous chapters the notion that the conscience of Gentiles, but also of all the people, has been *cleansed by faith*. In the epistle to Hebrews, it was shown how the sacrificially understood blood of Christ is able to wash this part of man, unlike the blood animals which can only ritually clean the body. The conscience is the inner part of man where the evaluation of the past actions occurs, it is the organ of guilt, which also regulates the future decisions. When it is said that “the conscience is cleansed”, it carries the significance of granting pardon for sins.

In the letters to Timothy, the conscience can be “good”, “pure” or “branded” (branded negatively). The author says that the Mosaic Law is good, if it is used well. If not, it leads to the heresies similar to those that Timothy had to deal

550 There is an article by M. Thrall in NTS 14, pp118-25 called “The Pauline Use of Synesis”. It is mostly statement of disagreement with C.A. Pierce's treatment of the topic in his book from 1955 called “Conscience in the New Testament” He comes out of a thorough analysis of the world in the Greek secular world, where it is considered a private matter of each person, nontransferable and only focused on past. What Thrall is most upset about, is this focus in the past only. She attempts to prove her point on three examples, but anyway fails to do so, especially in the case of 1 Cor 10, which has later been explained excellently by Alex T. Cheung, in his book from 1999, “Idol Food in Corinth. Jewish Background and. Pauline Legacy”. Probably for the lack of space for the article there are too many shortcuts and too much expectation of “obvious” axioms. She does not mention any case of the pastoral epistles and therefore this note is sufficient.

with. People following them are full of lies (against the pure heart), their consciousness is branded (scars showing that their owner and master is sin), they discourage from marriages and they forbid certain foods (1 Tim 4, 1- 2).

Faith in the sacrificially understood blood of Christ washes away sins. In such assurance, believers are not afraid to call on God. In the reliance that the faith is sufficient one's consciousness is literally clean, there is no space for fear and adding good deeds in order to achieve the salvation.

The two cases in the letters to Timothy both speak about some leading figure, in **2 Tim 1,3** it is Paul whose conscience, despite carrying the chains⁵⁵¹, is clean. "Χάριν ἔχω τῷ θεῷ, ᾧ λατρεύω ἀπὸ προγόνων ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει, ..." On one hand he may say that he is practically innocent and therefore he does not deserve to be so bound. On the other hand he does not have any remorse for preaching the Gospel, which has led him in such a precarious situation⁵⁵².

In **1 Tim 3,9** Paul is talking about desired qualities of a διάκονος.: "ἔχοντας τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει." They should be a person of pure consciousness. Preaching without remorse, knowing that the Gospel about "righteousness by faith" is a mystery. People who rely on the message wholeheartedly are the good candidates for becoming a διάκονοι.

Of course, the adepts must be illustrious⁵⁵³, so that the Church would make

551 Mounce, pg. 468 "a significant statement in light of the fact that Paul is chained as a criminal ready to die. His refusal to be ashamed despite his seemingly constant suffering echoes throughout this epistle."

552 We should also note the verb λατρεύω, which is usually used in the LXX for the service in the Jerusalem temple for priests. If the author says here that he wants to serve God like his ancestors, he addresses their temple worship, but out of context of the letter and situation it is very likely that his service is spiritual. This word is connected with the holiness as well and the semantic shift is in the same direction as is the shift of all the other words connected with holiness. From outwardly ritual, to inner, ethical and spiritual. What were the ancestors of the author and how did they worship God, and does he really want to worship in the same way?

good impression. But we should look deeper. The opponents were exactly the people who did not believe that Jesus and faith in him would be enough. They were trying to add other possible markers on the way to perfection which would be called the only right one leading to God. Here, therefore, the core messages is the “righteousness of faith”. God has done everything already for all people and therefore no one can boast, people can just accept this in faith. With such trust, the fear of condemnation loses its power and free person approaches God freely with conscience pure, like that of little children. Leaders of the Church should therefore be not only of very good character, but also of very bold and unshakable faith⁵⁵⁴.

7.2.1.3 Purify oneself

Holiness and purity are very closely connected in : **2 Tim 2,21** “ἐὰν οὖν τις ἐκκαθάρῃ ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων, ἔσται σκεῦος εἰς τιμὴν, ἡγιασμένον, εὐχρηστον τῷ δεσπότη, εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἡτοιμασμένον.” The author speaks here about false teachings⁵⁵⁵ and says that Church should cleanse from these⁵⁵⁶. Church needs to stay clean, separated, holy⁵⁵⁷. The author expects Timothy to understand the context and therefore he does not make any list of vices that should be avoided

553 Mounce writes on the page 200: “...knowledge must be accompanied with appropriate behavior, in case a conscience that is clear from any stain of sin ” I am not convinced that it is the case here.

554 Such leaders are also compassionate.

555 Probably meaning the mentioned two false teachers: Hymenaios and Philetos.

556 Similarly in 1 Cor 5,7 Paul urges Church to purify itself from a criminal.

557 Johnson, pg. 338 “εαν ουν τις” ... “shifts the discourse from metaphor to allegory by means of personification. Now it is a matter of human persons “cleaning themselves” from these....”... he prefers the moral purification “...background in Torah, but it is found in the sense of moral purification in Hellenistic moral philosophy”. Mounce similarly (pg. 532): the meaning of ἐκκαθάρῃ is “spelled out by the imperatives in the following verses, which describe general spiritual purification as well as dealing specifically with the Ephesians opponents.”

or be purified from. The encouragement is to „set apart“, to „purify“ the Church from “them”.

The “purification” is in this verse synonymous with the notion of separation included in “holiness”, which then also appears on the list of the *rewards* for such a selective behavior. Those who purified themselves from the futile talks, godlessness, and also from the teaching of the realized eschatology, which subverts the faith, those are heading toward good things. They then are not the bad vessels⁵⁵⁸ but the good and precious ones. Useful, set apart for the Master of the House - „sanctified and ready for every good deed“. The purification from false teachings is here expected from the believers themselves, the sanctification is then secondary outcome, not entirely in their hands anymore. This is in line with the general use of the semantic field of holiness.

In the following case, the Church is said to be purified *by* Jesus and *for* Jesus: **Tit 2,14** „ὁς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας καὶ καθάρσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον, ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων.“ This is the one case of “καθαρίζειν”, where it is clearly stated that even purification is in the hands of Jesus, who is titled as Christ and Savior. His death is explained not only as sacrificial but also as vicarious. It is ascribed the ability to redeem people from their sins and also to purify them. What is the purification form, what type of purification is it? It is a purification of sin, it is therefore soteriological in the first place, but I believe it is also understood in the ritual sense. Sins, according to the Old Testament are ritually defiling. Accepting the sacrificially and vicariously understood death of Jesus, the Christ, is said to procure purification.

Summary: In the Pastoral Epistles the notion of purity is closely connected

558 We have encountered this noun in 1 Thess 4.

to the concept of holiness. In several places, it is used in the meaning of separation, synonymous to “holy”, though it is not presupposition of the latter. Purity of heart and conscience changes person's perspective on life. Purified by faith, both heart and conscience are clean and thus such person cannot be defiled by things that sectarians forbid. As Jesus had said, “eating with unwashed hands does not defile”, the same is true of any other requirement from heretics. Such pure and undivided heart full of love and thankfulness is the goal of preaching of the Gospel. Moral purity is in question only in the second plane: it is mostly ritually-spiritual purity which manifests itself in high moral profile in love. If we are not able to ascribe any of the preceding categories to the purity, then let us introduce another two: it is foremost inner purity, not the outward. If the inside is pure, nothing can defile it. As we have already seen in the Gospels, nothing impure can defile from the outside, and in Paul, that to a pure person, everything is pure.

7.2.2 Purity words “ἀγνός” and “σεμνός”

The purity expressed by “ἀγνός” is always purity of conduct, usually in connection with the sexual purity of thought. This is also true of the two cases found in **1 Tim 4,12** and **5,1**, both involve the advice pure conduct of the new pastor with the young women of the Church. Behavior expected of women is submission to their husbands also in **Tit 2,5**.

The same is true of the cases of “σεμνός”, where the desired conduct has only little in common with holiness. It is rather connected with purity and dignity of human contact within the Church. Majority of the cases appear in the list of virtues and house orders. The notion is rather that of reverence. They are the

following: 1 Tim 2,2 (ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι - people will live as a result of their intercessions for the leaders); 1 Tim 3,4 (μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος - should the elders raise their children); 1 Tim 3,8 (deacons should be σεμνοί); 1 Tim 3,11: (wives of deacons should be σεμναί); Tit 2,2 (presbyters should be σεμνοί), Tit 2,7 (your teaching should be in all σεμνότητα).

These two words, despite being parts of the semantic field of purity, are already quite far from the concept of holiness⁵⁵⁹.

7.2.4 To Defile, “κοινωνεῖν”

The only case is the verb „to defile“ is in **1 Tim 5,22**: “χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει μηδὲ κοινωνεῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἄλλοτριαις· σεαυτὸν ἄγνον τήρει.” Timothy is advised certain precaution in laying on of hands on people who are have not proven themselves yet to be capable of executing the calling of a leader. The ritual impurity in the Old Testament could be transmitted by touch, but Jesus taught that nothing coming from the outside can defile a person. How should we then understand it? Also here Paul is warning to be careful about touch. The defiling source is not anymore unconscious diet transgression, neither any eczema nor genital discharge, neither is it contact with death. The source of defilement is sin here. But is a sinful person ritually defiling by touch?

The idea that sin is defiling can be found throughout the Old Testament, this

559 Unfortunately majority of books and articles that can be had on the internet and have “holiness” as their keyword, are usually connected with the notions described in this tiny section. From our observation it should be clear by now, that holiness is mostly connected with God who imparts sanctification and likewise, that purity is mostly “purity of heart” or “conscience” in the majority of the New Testament. The purity of conduct implicitly connected with the sexual overtones is quasi non-existent in the entire New Testament corpus, except for these few late exceptions.

is not a new thought. Sin was the ultimate defiling source, though it did not work vice versa, *defilement* was never understood as a *sin*⁵⁶⁰. Just a repellent of sacred. Therefore what we witness here is the transition of the semantic field away from the *ritualistic understood holiness and purity* on one hand towards the *ethical defilement* on the other hand.

Ethical defilement can not be transmitted by a touch. But the touch in question is extraordinary. It is the touch of sanctification, that is setting apart from someone for their service. Timothy is to be wise and slow to install new Church staff, because should these people prove defiling for the community, their sin and dirt is on his very hands. Therefore he should keep himself „pure“, in the sense of keeping his name, his fame „pure“, thereby he also keeps pure the name of the Church and also of God.

560 Viz. Works by Neusner, Maccoby, Milgrom, Klassen.

Chapter 8: The First Epistle of St. Clement

8.1 Holiness

8.1.1 Holy, “ἅγιος”

In the First Epistle of Clement, the term is used thirty-two times in its three derivatives “ἅγιος” - „holy“, “ἁγιάζω”- „sanctify“, and “ἁγιασμός”- „sanctification.“ Of these, ten are instances of it being used in the collocation “Holy Spirit.” As an adjective, it can designate the quality of the following: the Spirit, scripture, the Name, God, the Nation (Israel), angels, the City (Jerusalem), the Holy of Holies, and the Messiah. From this preliminary overview it is clear that this rich adjective designates the substantives of the realm of God. The substantives that make up this list are closely related to what the Gospel of Matthew renders as the Kingdom of God, so that God is then its source.

8.1.1.1 Holy Scripture.

The following phrases can be found: „φησὶν γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος λόγος” (13,3); “οὕτως γὰρ φησιν ὁ ἅγιος λόγος” (56,3); and “ἐγκεκύφατε εἰς τὰς ἱεράς γραφάς, τὰς ἀληθεῖς, τὰς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου” (45,2). The last example uses ἱεράς,⁵⁶¹ which is a term applied more frequently by the pagan ancient Greeks; nonetheless, the intention is synonymous. According to the last of these cases (45,2), the Holy Scriptures are the holy words given through the Holy Spirit. The same apposition is also found in 53,1 “Ἐπίστασθε γὰρ καὶ καλῶς ἐπίσταθε τὰς ἱεράς

561 “ἱερός” would designate the quality of things, places and people consecrated to the ancient Greek cult.

γραφάς. “ All of the above are introductory quotation formulas. In the first case, the citation comes from Isaiah⁵⁶², and the second one is from Psalm 117,18. The Scriptures that we call the Old Testament today are considered by Clement to be holy.

8.1.1.2 The Holy Name.

This collocation appears in two verses. First, 58,1 repeats twice in a parallelism that God's Name is „holy:“

“Ἰπακούσωμεν οὖν τῷ παναγιῶ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ ὀνόματι”
 “ἵνα κατασκηνώσωμεν πεποιθότες
 ἐπὶ το ὀσιωτατον τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ
 ὄνομα.”

To the all-holy and glorious name the Church is called to submit. Thus they prove to be loyal and escape the threats posed for the disobedient, they can hide and find refuge in it. This submission and obedience should result in trust in the „Name,“ a synecdoche for God. God is holy and so is God's name, even “all-holy.”⁵⁶³ A name is used to define a person; it is a metaphor of them and the way in which we are able to perceive and communicate with them. When the attribute of holiness is added, this metaphor earns the same awe shown toward its carrier, to the actual person behind the characterization. „Holiness“ in this case is, therefore, the quality of being powerful by its affinity to God, earning respect and providing refuge for the followers. Those who submit to God by belonging to God thus set themselves apart and then, hidden in the Name, they

562 The reference starts in verse 4 quoting Isaiah 66,2.

563 In 58,1 we observe two synonymous terms used beside each other (παν)αγιος and ὀσιος.

become holy themselves.

The next case is in chapter 64 where “the holy Name” appears again in the final intercessory prayer of Clement: “Λοιπὸν ὁ παντεπόπτῃς θεὸς ...δῶν πάσῃ ψυχῇ... τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ ἅγιον ὄνομα αὐτοῦ πίστιν, φόβον,...εἰς εὐαρέστησιν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ...” Here, again, the name is described as „holy,“ as well as „glorious.“ People who are called after this Name, i.e. those who seek refuge in it, who are so dedicated to it that they carry it (also by being called Christians) can, according to this prayer, receive the listed virtues: „πίστιν, φόβον, εἰρηνὴν, ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν, ἐγκράτειαν, ἀγνείαν, σωφροσύνην.“ As we can see also throughout the New Testament, „being set apart for God,“ being Christian, „carrying the Name,“ makes the Church “holy” by definition. The lists of virtues in general, as is the case here, are lists of the qualities acquired by belonging to the Name. These virtues are not required in order to be able to „call on the holy Name,“ but rather the opposite is true. Calling on the holy and glorious Name makes one special, its carrier. Clement, in his intercessory prayer asks that these positive qualities would be added to those who do so. The virtues are a possible outcome, an added value to the gift of being set apart for the Name. When God decides to grant these to God’s people, the name is glorified.

8.1.1.3 Holy Places.

The attribute of holiness is attached to places as well. One of the holy places mentioned in our epistle is the shrine, “the Holy of Holies.” However, since it is used figuratively about a group of people, it shall be discussed in another section. The epistle also speaks of a place of holiness where Paul retreated after

departing from this world.

In **1 Clem 5,7**, Paul is said to have come to “the holy place,” which parallels with the “place of glory” for Peter in 5,4, “δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δυσσεως ἐλθὼν καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου καὶ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον ἀνελήμφθη, ὑπομονῆς γενόμενος μέγιστος ὑπογραμμός” For a comparison, there are only a total two instances of the collocation *τοπος ἅγιον* in the Bible. The first is in 2Macc 2,18, describing a place where holy water is hidden, which can bring about fire upon a sacrifice.⁵⁶⁴ The second is in Acts 21,28 where it stands for the Temple of Jerusalem.⁵⁶⁵ The “holy place” in 1 Clem 5,7 is obviously not the temple, but a place of the rest. Whether this place of rest is a temporary limbus or heaven itself, it is a place of God's presence. It is place of holiness and glory and, therefore, it can withstand God. It is the hope of Christians that, when they die, they may join the apostles in the same place. In their earthly lives, both of the apostles Peter and Paul were expelled from the Jerusalem temple, the earthly place of holiness and glory. In the afterlife, they are both said to be accepted to the heavenly temple. Paul is said to have been literally “taken up” there, the

564 This legendary place was allegedly forgotten during the time of Jeremiah. We meet it again in the letter to the Jews in Egypt from 164BC in the beginning of the 2nd Maccabees. The authors of the letter have to trust in God that God would soon gather all Israel in the mysterious, sacred, holy place from all the diaspora.

565 This is as we have seen in the chapter on holiness in Lk-A. Let me add that Paul, according to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, was said to have desecrated the holy Temple by bringing pagans inside. The book of Acts is, of course, on the side of the apostles. It explains that Paul's friend of Greek origin was seen in the immediate vicinity of the Temple. The Jerusalemites thereby assumed he had also been to the Temple itself. Which would not have been the fault of Paul, but that of the temple guards. I suppose it was rather a clash between the tradition and novelty. The worshipers in the temple were afraid of this new and potentially defiling religion. Considering Paul's background and the strictness about the access to various premises of the Temple, this violation seems to be very unlikely. Whoever transgressed the rules differentiating sacred from profane ideally would have been put to death; however, under the Roman protectorate the Jews were no longer free to execute whomever they wanted to.

word describing his displacement - “ἀναλαμβάνειν”⁵⁶⁶ is used five times in the New Testament,⁵⁶⁷ most frequently to refer to Jesus‘ having been taken up to heaven.

In order to be able to understand the author better in what he means by the wording, “holy and glorious place,” we need to look at verse **50,3n**. “αἱ γενεαὶ ἅσαι ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ ἕως τῆσδε τῆς ἡμέρας παρήλθον, ἀλλ’ οἱ ἐν ἀγάπῃ τελειωθέντες κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ χάριν ἔχουσιν χῶρον εὐσεβῶν, οἱ φανερωθήσονται ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ.” This is a place in the “beyond”, where those who die are taken; however, it is not a place for all, just for those who had been „perfected in love.“ How can one be perfected in love? The answer is only by grace, which is both implied by the divine passive and voiced in the verse. The author does not say, “those who perfected themselves,” or, “those who were perfect,” but, “those who have been perfected,” which he follows with, “κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ χάριν ἔχουσι.” It is the place where God's people dwell after their death and where they wait for the resurrection in the *eschaton*. Nothing more is said. We do not know which part of the person should depart or what it looks like there. We are only told that there is a holy place awaiting those who died having been perfected in their love and that Peter and Paul are already awaiting the resurrection there.

8.1.1.4 Holy persons.

The adjective „holy“ is ascribed to angels (39,7), people, and it also designates the Messiah (a quotation in 23,5). The holiness of persons stems

566 „To receive up, to take in, to take up.“

567 Mk 16,12: Jesus was taken to heaven Acts 1,2.22; 1 Tim 3,16; in Acts 10,16, which is a particularly interesting parallel for this current case, the vision of unclean food for was taken back up.

from the holiness of God, which is expressed in 34,6 through the already mentioned exclamation of Isaiah 6,6 of the trihagios⁵⁶⁸.

In verse 8,3, there is a promise that the readers would become the holy people of God. It only will happen, however, if they turn their whole hearts toward God, confessing God as the Father. “Μετανοήσατε, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, ἀπό τῆς ἀνομίας ὑμῶν· εἶπον τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ μου. Ἐὰν ᾧσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐὰν ᾧσιν πυρρότεραι κόκκου καὶ μελανώτεροι σάκκου, καὶ ἐπιστραφήτε πρὸς με ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ εἴπητε· Πάτερ· ἐπακούσομαι ὑμῶν ὡς λαοῦ ἁγίου.” This verse is obviously a quotation; however, the source is unknown. Similarities can be traced with Ezekiel⁵⁶⁹ 18,30 and Isaiah 1,16ff.⁵⁷⁰ God calls God’s people to come back to God with repentant hearts. If they hear this call, they should not look at their sins, but, with trust, they should come to God, and God will come for them as the father in the parable of the prodigal son. God will come running for them, acknowledging them as God’s own people, giving them their new dignity in calling them a holy people. Is it possible that this verse is a call to the Gentiles to repent and to acknowledge the Lord, in which case God would make them “ὡς λαοῦ ἁγίου.”

Let us now inspect the peculiar case where, as mentioned earlier, the holy

568 34,6 cf. an exhaustive article by van Unnik.

569 Ezek 33,11 was quoted in the previous verse – 1Clem 8,2.

570 The intention of the quotation can be found, anachronistically, in Clement of Alexandria Quis div. Salv. – the whole 39th chapter speaks about the forgiveness of sins besides the prophecy of Isaiah about those with red sins being washed white. Also the following quote can be found there: “*For to every one who has turned to God in truth, and with his whole heart, the doors are open, and the thrice-glad Father receives His truly repentant son.*” Also, in the first book of Pedagogus 91,2, there is a quotation very similar to the Ezekiel 18, 3. According to the Lona, E. Horacio: Der erste Clmemensbief, Gottingen 1998 ad 8,3 this is the evidence for a common lost source.

people are likened to the Holy of Holies, found in **29,3**, “οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται· Ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὑψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς διέπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδάμ, ἔστησεν ὄρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ. ἐγενήθη μερὶς κύριος λαμβάνει ἑαυτῷ ἔθνος ἐκ μέσου ἐθνῶν, ὡσπερ λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος τὴν ἀπαρχὴν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἄλλω· καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους ἐκείνου ἅγια ἄγιων.” To keep within the limits of the context, we should also mention the surrounding verses which are a part of a larger discourse on God's people. Since there is no possibility of running away from the Creator, the only good response to such a situation is to turn to God. To approach God in worship, raising holy and undefiled hands, loving the Father. This exhortation is supported by two quotations: Deuteronomy 32,8n and another one from an unknown source.⁵⁷¹ Based upon the Scriptures, the text urges readers to perform the „deeds of holiness.“ Once they have become a portion of the Holy One, they are supposed to reflect God in their own holiness.

It was the original task of Israel to be God's people. According to them the inheritance, of which Paul also speaks in his letters, is measured. They are the first fruits. As the first fruits are special, set apart for God and holy, so are the first fruits of the nations as well. As the temple is divided into the outer and inner part, so also are the people. According to the quotation in 29,3, God will choose for God's self a special nation, and, from this nation, the Holy of Holies will arise.

What was meant by the term “Holy of Holies” in the time of Clement in general? The epistle was written after the year 70 AD, and, therefore, we cannot count on the existence of the Jerusalem Temple anymore. It is sure, though, that the general population of the empire was acquainted with the concept to a certain degree. The phrase used to designate the inner shrine of the Temple, into

571 Some suggestions are: Dt 4,34; 14,2; Num 18,27; 2Chr 31,14; Ezek 48,12

which the access was permitted only to the High Priest just once a year at Yom Kippur. It was diligently separated from all the outer world and thus protected from any defilement and vice versa. Surprisingly, the collocation קדש קדשים is used not only for this room in the temple, it can designate many other entities of special degree of holiness, given the pleonasm used in Hebrew for gradation. Beside the well-known shrine of “Holy of Holies,” it can also describe furniture in it, vessels used etc. Last but not least, with eight occurrences in the book of Leviticus, it can convey some portions of the manifold sacrifices. These parts, meat as well as bread, were usually eaten by priests. In this very case, there is not even a difference in the article. The shrine Holy of Holies can be found without the definite article as is, for example, the case in the 1 Chronicles 23,1 etc. Now, as shown above, in 1st Clement 29,3 it is difficult to add the signified to the expression.

What then is this „Holy of Holies“ in our epistle? Commentaries, considering the context of chapter 30, agree that it is the purified remnant of Israel, i.e. the Church. They, however, differ significantly about the authenticity of the quotation. Lona supposes it to be a mistake created by quoting from memory. Prinzivalli-Simonetti argues in favor of a now lost source. I would agree with the latter. The form of the verse seems to be quite regular Hebrew parallelism:

Ἰδοὺ,

κύριος	λαμβάνει ἑαυτῷ	ἔθνος	ἐκ μέσου ἐθνῶν,
ὡσπερ	λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος	τὴν ἀπαρχὴν αὐτοῦ	τῆς ἁλώ·
καὶ ἐξελεύσεται			ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους ἐκείνου

ἅγια ἁγίων.

If we consider the quotation as if it contained Hebrew parallelism, we must come to the conclusion that the “Holy of Holies“ stands in the same relationship to God's nation as the latter stands to all other nations and as first-fruits to the threshing-floor. This results in a logical conclusion that the Holy of Holies is a chosen part of God's people. A little elite group, chosen from a bigger portion.⁵⁷²

While discussing the holiness of persons, we must also mention **the group-holiness** of the new people, the Church. The sanctification, both as a noun (*ἁγιασμος*) and a verb (*ἁγιαζω*), are used five times in the entire epistle to describe the new quality of the group.

The term, “ἁγιασμένοι”, „sanctified“, was commonly used in early Christian literature as a designation for the Church as a whole.⁵⁷³ The Church is a group of believers who had been bought by the blood of Christ and renewed by the Holy Spirit. Having therefore obtained the Holy Spirit, they emanate its quality; they are changed into its likeness by its residence in their bodies.⁵⁷⁴

To call the Christians as a whole „sanctified“ is a statement of faith. Especially, given the context of our epistle, in which Clement is writing to the Corinthian Church troubled by internal conflicts. It is a Church that rebelled against their own leaders, struggling with elitism. The Church of Corinth, obviously, was not perfect. Evidently, it needed sanctification in the modern

572 Annie Jaubert claims it is not such a novelty to call some part of God's people the Holy of Holies. The community of Qumran (QS 8,5) called themselves:.....,the holy house for Israel built upon the Holy of Holies.“ She further says that here the Holy of Holies does not describe the community as in 1st Clement, but God, so one cannot truly speak of a parallel between the two.

573 Cf. previous chapters e.g. Rom 15,16; 1Cor 1,2 etc.

574 For an amazing introduction into this question see Elena Zocca: Dai “santi” al “santo” 1st chapter :Il linguaggio della santità.

sense. Nonetheless, following the lead of Paul, before he admonishes them, in the very introduction, Clement calls them sanctified. „Κλήμεντος πρὸς Κορινθίους Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον, κλητοῖς ἡγιασμένοις ἐν θελήματι θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ παντοκράτορος θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πληθυνθείη.“

The same Church of Corinth had already received some letters from the apostle Paul several years before. In both of the letter-introductions, we read that the Church consisted of chosen and sanctified members. Yet the reality did not correspond to a perfect Church. Clement, following the example of his predecessor, further explains the basis on which he dares to call this Church holy. The selection and sanctification are based, again, on God's will and they are affected through the work of Jesus the Christ. In the very beginning of the letter, the holiness and uniqueness of the Church is presented as a free gift.⁵⁷⁵

The Church as a group of saints is also found in **1 Clem 46,2**. The verse is introduced by a quotation, the source of which is unknown. Similar texts can be found in Clemens of Alexandria⁵⁷⁶ and in the Shepherd of Hermas.⁵⁷⁷ There are discussions about the origins of the given quotation. The verse reads: „Γέγραπται γάρ· «Κολλᾶσθε τοῖς ἁγίοις, ὅτι οἱ κολλώμενοι αὐτοῖς ἁγιασθήσονται.»“ Those who will watch, spend time with, and follow the saints will also become like them. The holiness is thus a contagious quality and the sanctification is happening passively on the subject, present actively around a given saint, a member of the Church. This reading opens the door to an authorized possibility of certain hierarchy of sanctity in a Church. Can it be that, in the eyes of the author, there are some members of the Church who are “more saintly” than the

575 This text closely corresponds to Hebrews 10,10.

576 Strom. V 52,3.

577 Cf. III 6,2 (1,2); Sim VIII 8,1 (74, 1).

others? If yes, then he would be playing the game of the two groups in the Church. What he more likely means is that the Church members should gather together.

The verb, κολλασαι, is a favorite among the Apostolic Fathers. It carries the significance of spending time together. It was important to whom Church members cling, whether their friends, who would lead them into a morally crooked life, or the Church, spending time with the Church members and imitating their lifestyle. What is meant here is not an adoration of holy leaders, it is rather clinging to the saints in general.

The next case of the Church as saints appears at the end of the epistle. In the long intercessory prayer, Clement asks that the eyes of the hearts of the readers be open, so that all could get to know God: “ἀνοίξας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ γινώσκειν σε τὸν μόνον ὑψίστον ἐν ὑψίστοις, ἅγιον ἐν ἁγίοις“ (59,3). God is the only highest among the highs and the ultimate holy among the holy ones. Given the parallelism here, the holy ones can also be super-human beings, such as angels, possibly other gods, etc. God is holy beyond holiness, as God’s holiness is not “being set apart for God,” but it is rather the ultimate quality of transcendent perfection emanating in the universe as the ultimate good and creating attraction, awe, and fear at the same time. The holiness of the God who is the *holy of the holy ones* is the absolute source of all holiness.

Further, in the final prayer of Clement, the author confesses that God is the agent in the lives of people. It is God, who makes some people important and others humble, sees everything, and knows every spirit, because God created them all. The verse continues: „τὸν πληθύνοντα ἔθνη ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ ἐκ πάντων ἐκλεξάμενον τοὺς ἀγαπῶντάς σε διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου παιδός σου, δι’ οὗ

ἡμᾶς ἐπαίδευσας, ἡγίασας, ἐτίμησας.“ God chooses from the nations, i.e. the Gentiles, those whom God calls. It is twice repeated that their election and change happen through Jesus Christ. Through him, they have been given sonhood, sanctification, and honour. These three are explicitly classified as gifts. Those who love God, get sanctification through Jesus. Their initial standing as Gentiles is overcome. They are called into the “holy family,” they become adopted children. In joining in the separated holy nation of God and in receiving the Holy Spirit, they are sanctified. As a result, they share in the future and glorious inheritance of the saints. The subject of the sanctification is here specifically Jesus Christ. No proper behavior is set as a prerequisite on joining in, and no progressive list of virtues is to be followed. It is twice repeated this all happens “διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.”

Last but not least, the Church as a new community of saints appears also at the end of the verse **56,1**: „Καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν ἐντύχωμεν περὶ τῶν ἐν τινὶ παραπτώματι ὑπαρχόντων, ὅπως δοθῇ αὐτοῖς ἐπιείκεια καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνη εἰς τὸ εἶξαι αὐτοὺς μὴ ἡμῖν, ἀλλὰ τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ· οὕτως γὰρ ἔσται αὐτοῖς ἔγκαρπος καὶ τελεία ἢ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους μετ’ οἰκτιρμῶν μνεία.“ In this case, the saints are those who are supposed to judge the wayward members, “those, who have fallen into any transgression.” It is not clear what sin the author has in mind, as he is very general. We have already seen in the letters of Paul to the Corinthian Church, that he was encouraging the judgment of the wayward Church-members. Here, Clement does not allow full freedom of the Church members, but neither does he encourage judgment. He rather inspires them to pray for such members, that they would be able to lead lives worthy of the inheritance and that they would be able to submit and comply, not to the leaders, but rather to God. Further in the chapter, he gives examples that there is no need for fear, that an admonition

is just a part of the life of faith. He closes the chapter saying that when God admonishes through holy discipline, God's subjects are also protected. Such chastisement is for their own good, says Clement, in the same vein as the author of the epistle to the Hebrews (ch. 12).

8.1.1.5 Sanctification

Of all the usages of the derivatives of “ἅγιος”, we are left with the last two occurrences both of which appear in the form of the noun, “ἁγιασμός”. The first one has been already mentioned with **29,3**. The fact that God has chosen God's people and made them holy, should lead to the sanctified life. Having obtained this new life, the people should also do all things that belong to sanctification. Some suggestions of how this should look practically are given immediately in **30,1**, in the list of vices, rather than virtues; it is a list of that which should be avoided. The works of sanctification in this verse are: “avoiding evil-speaking, foul and impure embraces, drunkenness, disorderliness, abominable desires, detestable adultery, execrable pride.” The true works of sanctification then are the opposites of these. There are seven vices named and seven virtues thus implied. These implied virtues are not a list of progressive sanctification, they are rather an outcome of what it means to “be holy as the Lord is holy;” they are the fruits of the Spirit; they are the outcome of what belonging to God brings about. “ἁγιασμός” has here, therefore, also an ethical ring; it is not a static expression, but designates action. However, this action of sanctification builds upon the static passivity in receiving the gift of being chosen and made a holy portion of God by God through Jesus Christ.

The last occurrence of the noun is in **35,2**. Written in poetic language, all the

essential ethical requirements of Christian living are summarized here: “Ζωή ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ, λαμπρότης ἐν δίκαιοσύνῃ, ἀλήθεια ἐν παρρησίᾳ, πίστις ἐν πεποιθήσει, ἐγκράτεια ἐν ἀγιασμῶ· καὶ ταῦτα ὑπέπιπτεν πάντα ὑπὸ τὴν διάνοιαν ἡμῶν.” A promise is given in the tension between the present reality and eschatological salvation. All of these are gifts of God: life, cheerfulness, truth, faith, and temperance. The logical sequence of these expressions, however, seems to me natural rather the other way round. Only the first two collocations possess a natural aspect: Life in immortality and joy in righteousness. But how about the other pairs? Truth in freedom? According to Jesus' saying that the truth sets free, it would be more logical to read it rather as „freedom in truth,“ not “truth in freedom.” Likewise, „faith in confidence“ seems to be reversed. „Confidence in faith“ makes us bold, standing firmly on one's beliefs. But what does it mean to have „faith in confidence“? And last but not least, “self-control in sanctification.” It seems that the first member of each pair should always be a quality subordinate to second member. At first sight, we would logically say: “holiness in self-mastering⁵⁷⁸.” It is in the temperance that holiness is visible. Or we would

578 Since I was very interested in the topic, I decided to study a little bit the background of the word and its relation to asceticism and holiness. I am coming out of my own readings of the original sources: Temperance, or self-control, is a term with a broad history. Socrates used it as well as Aristotle. In the seventh book of Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle describes a man who lacks this quality as ἀκρατής. It is a man who is not able to control his passions, which can cause harm to those who are near him. This damage is by no means intentional, since ἀκρατής is not inherently evil. In this, Aristotle calls into question Socrates' thesis that the sole knowledge of what is good is that which renders one's behavior good. in his Menon dialogue. Aristotle shows that even people who know what to do are sometimes unable to do so, because they lack ἐγκράτεια. Only those who are σοφρων, wise, are free from passions. In the ancient Greek times, ἐγκράτεια was usually used in connection with bodily functions. Εγκρατής is a person able to resist his hunger or thirst when needed, as well as to moderate his sexual drive. For Stoics, this was the sign of a personality elevated above the animal state. The ἐγκράτεια is a sign of human freedom from passion. Self-mastery was also highly valued among athletes. The history of the Greek usage of this term is rich, and it also carries a notion of asceticism. There was a group of gnostics in the second century CE called “encrateits,” The group became famous with Tatian, a student of John Chrysostom. They were against procre-

rather say “freedom in truth.” Truth is a field in which we experience freedom, seeing things as they are. The cryptic language of this passage is often explained as being part of a hymn.

The way to Christian sanctification does not lead through ascetic effort, a Christian cannot reach sanctification; rather, it is the other way round in that through sanctification one can reach temperance. In Christ, the Christians are given the benefit of self-control. It is not just vain *asceticism* any more, motivated by striving for salvation. The gift of belonging to the holy ones, the gift of sanctification causes one to strive for self-discipline. The training for temperance is taking place in the larger field of sacred space. It is not a gate through which readers enter, but it is walking the hidden path. Sanctification consists of self-control as well, but it is not a means to reach it.

Summary: Clement uses the “ἅγιος” terminology in accord with the New Testament. Like Paul, also Clement applies it to Christians, both in the beginning of the letter within the prescript as well as in its end. The holiness of Christians grows out of the gift of Jesus Christ who has called Gentiles into the family of the holy people. This, however, requires of the new adoptive children to comply. Their holiness does not require *asceticism* prior their election. It is better to say that their virtuous life is fueled by it.

ation because with every new birth the divine sparkle is being destroyed. They were also quite misogynistic. dedicated to living their lives in ascetic self-control, in order to reach salvation. This include the refusal of marriage and wine. To sum up, this type of ἐγκράτεια is, in a way asceticism, the ability to diminish one's desires. The self-mastery of old is the way to perfection.

8.1.2 Holy, “ὅσιος”

The term “ὅσιος” designates the holiness of the human realm. Rather than a priestly word, it is an ethical word. This is clear especially in the form of adverb “ὁσίως”, which is often translated “piously” in the following usages: “to live holily/piously,” “to do things holily/piously,” or “to serve God.” „Holiness,” “ὁσιότης”, as a noun is used four times and always in a pair with heart or soul. The Greek words “καρδία” - “heart” and “ψυχῆ” - “soul” are, here, interchangeable. In holiness of the soul, the readers are supposed to approach God. In holiness of the heart, they are to walk. However, the holiness of the soul, even if crowned with many good deeds, does not bring about righteousness.

8.1.2.1 The Adjective.

First, let us inspect the usage of the adjective ὅσιος.⁵⁷⁹ The Church of Corinth was full of “holy/pious plans,” according to **2,3**: “μεστοί τε ὁσίας βουλῆς, ἐν ἀγαθῇ προθυμίᾳ μετ’ εὐσεβεοῦς πεποιθήσεως ἐξετείνετε τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν παντοκράτορα θεόν, ἰκετεύοντες αὐτὸν ἰλέως γενέσθαι, εἴ τι ἄκοντες ἡμείρτετε.” “Βουλῆ”⁵⁸⁰ is a synonym of “θέλημα”, the will. It conveys the meaning of a decision one is determined to fulfill. We could also read the phrase the following way: the Church was determined to live piously. They did not lack in the strong spirit for doing what is right.

579 We have already encountered this adjective. God's name is all-holy (πανᾶγιος) and holy (ὅσιος) as well as glorious in 58,1.

580 In the New Testament this term is used 13 times, none of which appears in this same collocation. It is used most by the author of Luke/Acts (9x). In Luke it designates the executive apparatus. In Acts mostly a previously made decision and determination. Βουλή του θεου is used 4 times.

The adjective is used in a definition once: **14,1** “*Δίκαιον οὖν καὶ ὅσιον, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑπηκόους ἡμᾶς μᾶλλον γενέσθαι τῷ θεῷ ἢ τοῖς ἐν ἀλαζονείᾳ καὶ ἀκαταστασίᾳ μυσσεροῦ ζήλους ἀρχηγοῖς ἐξακολουθεῖν.*” It is just and holy to obey God. Loyalty to God is given higher value than compliance with people, especially with the leaders who seduce people and who may be more visible and near than God high above. Clement has probably some specific individuals in mind, the elders of the Corinthian Church, who had stood up against the official leaders. The letter does not contrast the revolting leaders with the official ones. It juxtaposes the “leaders of sedition” with God. Those who are against the officially installed leaders are against God. They are proud and disorderly. Those who, on the other hand, take the side of the official leadership, are doing not only the right thing, but also the holy thing.

A very similar meaning is found in **45,3** where it is written that holy men would never expel just persons, “*οὐχ εὐρήσετε δικαίους ἀποβεβλημένους ἀπὸ ὁσίων ἀνδρῶν.*” The reasoning moves from saying that in the Scriptures nothing corrupt or unjust appears, to the saying that righteous people are nowhere in the Bible expelled by holy men. The revolt in the Church of Corinth is implicitly labeled as unjust and corrupt in opposition to the righteous men. The attribute holy is here given to people; whereas in previous occurrences, it was attached to the act of obedience. The holy people in this verse would be the officially established leadership of the Church and also all those who follow them. They are also just.

Christians, as we have seen many times in the New Testament, as well as in this epistle itself, are holy and just by the virtue of being in Christ. Therefore, the rebellious group taking over the Church of Corinth probably took justice into their own hands, and they started to expel also the truly just members of

the Church who did not measure up to their own set of rules. On the other hand those who behave unjustly, the “*ἄδικοι*”, says Clement, are the same people who had been described as “*ζῆλοι*”, the self-appointed new leaders. The Church of Rome is talking about the internal conflict of the Corinthian Church, offering a perspective on how to orient oneself in the war of factions. Holy ones would never expel the just ones.

The following verse (**45,4**) defines them as explicitly unholy, *ἀνοσίων*, men. Yes, in the Scriptures it can be found that righteous men would be expelled, but never by the righteous and holy. The verse is numbering the sufferings of righteous in the Scriptures, yet those who caused these are always on the wrong side. They are called “lawless, unholy, sinners, wicked men.” All the examples of wicked behavior are put in a parallel. There is also a slow gradation from persecution to murder. All these vices have the same root - unjust envy. Nonetheless, the righteous suffer these “with a good report,” (45,5 „*ταῦτα πάσχοντες εὐκλεῶς ἤγγκαν*“). Daniel and his friends are set as examples of good sufferers. Almost as a school-teacher, the author of the letter asks: “Who sent these men to die in the fire? Was he good? No, he was not; he was bad! These jealous men were so wicked that they did not stop before torturing the just, good, and holy young men.”

At this point the author forgets himself a little, making a slight excursus which he ends with a benediction. Let us have a look at this detour, which is the climax of the **chapter 45 (v7)**: “*οἱ στυγητοὶ καὶ πάσης κακίας πλήρεις εἰς τοσοῦτο ἐξήρισαν θυμοῦ, ὥτε τοὺς ἐν ὁσίᾳ καὶ ἀμώμῳ προθέσει δουλεύοντας τῷ θεῷ εἰς αἰκίαν περιβαλεῖν, μὴ εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ ὕψιστος ὑπέρμαχος καὶ ὑπέρμαχος καὶ ὑπερασπιστὴς ἐστὶν τῶν ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει λατρευόντων τῷ παναρέτῳ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.*” Two exemplary groups are juxtaposed in a striking contrast.

On one hand, there are the “*όσίοι*” and on the other the “*ζήλοι*”. “Abominable men and full of all wickedness were inflamed to such a degree of wrath that they cast into tortures” the pious “not knowing” some basic information about the Most High, i.e. that God is the ultimate avenger.

On the other hand, stand “those who, with a holy and a blameless purpose, served God.” This group obviously had good knowledge of the Most High. What is this piece of information that makes so much difference between the two groups? “That the Most High is a champion and defender of those who, with a pure conscience, serve his most excellent name.” This sharp simplified division of coalitions should help the Church of Corinth to decide which side they are standing on.

The adjective “holy”, together with “blameless”, epitomizes the noun “*προθέσις*”, purpose.⁵⁸¹ Holy, “*όσιος*”, is here paralleled with blameless, “*άμώμος*”. Holiness goes hand in hand with purity,⁵⁸² though not the ritual one, as usually appears in the Old Testament. Those who, with pure and holy determination, serve God are the holy ones. These usually suffer by the hand of the unjust, but they are, nonetheless, defended by the Most High. If applied to the situation of the Corinthian Church, those who stood up against the official leadership are the unjust ones who actually do not know God because they are blinded by their own desires.⁵⁸³

581 It is almost synonymous to the word mentioned earlier, *βουλή*. *Προθέσις* was often used in the secular Ancient Greek for something laid before the eyes of public (*προ – τιθημι*) be it a corpse, a judicial case or an offering. Later, the meaning shifted to „purpose, supposition or calculation. In the New Testament, it is used twelve times some of which designate the show bread laid before the Lord inside the shrine. Seven of these are translated as “purpose,” usually used of God's purpose. God's *Βουλή*, mentioned earlier, though, is a much stronger term. The purpose is also a strong decision and determination. It rather designates the grounds for given decision or determination in this place.

582 Cf. later discussion in this chapter.

8.1.2.2 The Noun

„Holiness, “ὁσιότης”, of the soul, is the way in which the readers are supposed to approach God. In **29,1**, it is further described by two participial sentences, one speaking about raising undefiled hands to the Lord and the other one about loving the Father who has chosen the Church. ”Προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἀγνὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας ἄροντες πρὸς αὐτόν, ἀγαπῶντες τὸν ἐπιεικῆ καὶ εὐσπλαγχνον πατέρα ἡμῶν, ὃς ἐκλογῆς μέρος ἡμᾶς ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ.“ The holiness⁵⁸⁴ of heart describes the inner state of a believer before God.⁵⁸⁵ Lona explains accurately that the inner attitude of awe of God is yet empowered by the exterior movement of the risen hands unto God, as also the holiness of soul corresponds to the pure and undefiled hands.⁵⁸⁶

The way or path of holiness⁵⁸⁷ is mentioned in **48,4** again. “πολλῶν οὖν πυλῶν ἀνεωγιῶν ἢ ἐν δίκαιοςύνῃ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἢ ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν ᾗ μακάριοι πάντες οἱ εἰσελθόντες καὶ κατευθύνοντες τὴν πορείαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δίκαιοςύνῃ, ἀταράχως πάντα ἐπιτεοῦντες.” Following the context of our chapter, the way of holiness is introduced by a gate. This gate of righteousness, the gate of the Lord, opens to life in Christ (//John 10,9). Many other doors have been open but only those who enter through this particular one are blessed, the righteous ones who enter through it. Per analogiam, all the other gates bring about doom. The right way is antagonistic to the way of the separatist party of the Corinthian Church. Even

583 For a description of the idea, „holy is also God's chastisement, paideia,” cf. Stockmeyer in *Studia Patristica* and monography of Jaeger W.

584 Lona: „Osioetes ist die personliche Frommigkeit (Fr. Harnack ThWnt V 492) und wird in der Literatur des Judentums häufig gebraucht.“

585 Lona, pg. 330 makes reference to the same usage in Dt 9,5; 1 Ki 9,4

586 „Die innere Haltung bekräftigt die aussere Bewegung der Erhebung der Hände zu Gott, wie auch die Frommikeit der Seele die reinen und Makelosen Hande entsprechen.“

587 Lona says that “Die Zusammenhang mit Mt 7,1 ist nich vorhanden.” However, the contexts lay very near to each other. There are no parallels in other synoptics.

more, it is not only the initiation of the right path what brings about blessing, one must also stay in holiness and righteousness. What it means to stay on the path is further explained as performing one's duties.⁵⁸⁸ Holiness corresponds closely to righteousness. The Christological metaphor of the gate divides the imagined space into sacred and profane.⁵⁸⁹ Christ, as a priest, stands at the border as the one who enables the entrance by his own sacrifice. He acted in the same way in his life, when he brought purity to those who were rejected for their status of impurity. Jesus is the only doorway on this path though. The entire pilgrimage of a Christian through their life must be finished in the holiness and righteousness. "Quietly performing one's duties" stands in silent opposition to the loud screaming of the Corinthian Church faction, which demands remission of the appointed bishops. Holiness on the other hand, together with righteousness, is silent and diligent.

Towards the end of the epistle (60,2), Clement asks in his grand interceding prayer for God's leadership on this pilgrimage of life. *“μη λογίση πάσαν ἀμαρτίαν δούλων σου και παιδισκῶν, ἀλλὰ καθάρισον ἡμᾶς τὸν καθαρισμόν τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας, και κατεύθυνον τὰ διαβήματα ἡμῶν ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας προεὔεσθαι και ποιεῖν τὰ καλὰ και εὐάρεστα ἐνώπιόν σου και ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀρχόντων ἡμῶν.”* Both of the last occurrences describe the active, i.e. not static, element of the word “ὁσιότης”. The author asks God not to look at the sins of God's servants, but rather he asks for the purification of all as a gift of God's grace. This is the purification by truth.⁵⁹⁰

588 This is true only in the case that we assume that *„ἀταράχως πάντα ἐπιτεοῦντες”* is subordinate to *„ἐν ὁσιότητι και δίκαιοσύνῃ.”* Though, it might also be a complement.

589 We have seen a similar notion, especially in the Gospels where Jesus provides purity for those who could not afford it, as he quite frequently crosses the diligently delineated border between human impurity and strict ritual requirements. Jesus though does not pull down the border between holy and impure spirits.

590 Reminiscent of John's *„you shall know the truth and the truth will set you free.”* In the context of the Corinthian Church then we can assume the revolutionaries were spreading lies about the present bishops. The truth would prove them wrong and deliver the whole

He also asks for God's guidance on this path. In this context, it is simply „the way of life;“ yet, having spent almost one entire chapter on the image of gates and paths, I believe, that we can overhear subtle resonance with the previous instance. Furthermore, we should also consider the fact that holiness and righteousness are both collocated here with the image of walking. Being directed on this way corresponds with doing the right things, deeds that are pleasing to God and, surprisingly, also to the rulers.

The last case of “*ὁσιότης*” is in **32,4**: “καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν, διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, οὐ δι’ ἑαυτῶν δικαιούμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας,⁵⁹¹ ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι’ ἧς πάντα τοὺς ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν· ὃ ἔστω ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.” Wisdom, understanding, and holiness of heart proved by good deeds are the fruits of those who walk on the right path, who have entered through the right gate, but these good deeds are not the gate itself. Asceticism, morality, purity of heart, or moral excellence as a way to salvation are hereby dismissed. They are gifts. Clement gives examples of Jacob and priests and all the kings who had been glorified and magnified. Nonetheless, they had not been glorified by the virtues mentioned above. If even such heroes of times past, were not glorified “through themselves or through their works, or through the righteousness that they have done,” how did it happen then? The answer is in the same verse: “through His will”. If all the deeds of righteousness did not help them, how much less to the present readers. Those who are called in Jesus are justified on the basis of faith.

group from their schemes.

591 The works done ἐν οσιότητι καρδίας appear also in the LXX in 1 Kgs 9,4 and Dtn 9,5.

This point is followed by short doxology. The readers were called. The verb is connected by the preposition *διὰ*. Two things are named through which the readers were called and four through which they were not called. The former two render the readers *εκλεκτοί* „chosen.“ They are *εκκλησία* chosen according to God's will in Jesus Christ and faith. The latter virtues (which do not buy righteousness, nor are they a means to anything being ends in themselves) are: wisdom, understanding, godliness/piety, and deeds of holiness. These cannot stem from the very people, they have to be given to them from the outside.

The chapter started with a list of examples of venerable people of the past. Now the author is turning to the present the collected group of the Corinthian Church. The new elitist leadership, which probably may boast with purity and asceticism, good deeds etc. is radically put into question. What Clement is actually saying here, is that all their perfection has no value, since it does not stem from above. This is Paul's Gospel revisited.⁵⁹²

verse **32,4** is very important for the present study, because it admits the existence of deeds done in the holiness of heart outside the realm of righteousness. Even if a person not only *seems* pious, but effectively they *are* such, this by no means indicates their automatic righteousness. Not in the Pauline sense. Righteousness is, also here, a matter of being chosen by God. This chosenness is not the only thing needed to achieve righteousness, though. An effort is asked from the readers as well in accepting this gift from God by faith. Faith is the only action on the part of a person that can render one righteous. The question

592 While not directly here, Clemens exhorts his readers to come back to the “Gospel” of apostle Paul.

of how far it is itself a deed or gift is unfortunately too complicated for the present study of holiness in 1 Clem.

Summary: About the noun *δσιότης* we have learned that Clement uses it all four times in a pair with soul or heart, three times of which also stand by an image of a path. One of the cases brackets the idea of possible holy deeds in face of the gift of God's election and responsive faith.

8.1.2.3 The Adverb.

The adverb “*δσίως*”, „holily/ piously,“ is used eight times in 1st Clement. It appears beside the following verbs: „to live,“⁵⁹³ „to give love,“ „to serve,“ „to do things according to God's will,“ „to offer sacrifice,“ „to call on someone,“ and „to please God with righteousness.“⁵⁹⁴

Chapter 21, in the context of describing *house orders*, speaks to women and to children; the adverb appears twice here. Women are called to give love to their husbands piously,⁵⁹⁵ and children are to be educated to learn to live their lives in holiness. In **26,1** it is then written that those who serve God piously will be resurrected: “*Μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν οὖν νομίζομεν εἶναι εἰ ὁ δημιουργὸς τῶν ἀπάντων ἀνάστασιν ποιήσεται τῶν δσίως αὐτῷ δουλευσάντων ἐν πεποιθήσει πίστεως ἀγαθῆς ὅπου καὶ δι’ ὀρνέου δείκνυσιν ἡμῖν τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῆς ἐπαγγελίας αὐτοῦ*”. Clement has just finished his discourse on the Phoenix as the fore-picture of resurrection; he is literally saying that the pure existence of this bird shows the

593 In 6,1, people are mentioned, who lived their lives piously.

594 Given the preceding paragraph: How can we please God by righteousness if it is a gift?

595 It can mean love them in sexual purity, in purity of heart, but also in an adoring way.

greatness of the promises of God. The pledge is resurrection of those who served God⁵⁹⁶ holily and in the confidence of good faith⁵⁹⁷.

The two following sayings about bishops may be more timely to the situation of the Corinthian Church. The first one is in **40,3**: “ποῦ τε καὶ διὰ τίνων ἐπιτελεῖσθαι θέλει, αὐτὸς ὤρισεν τῇ ὑπερτάτῳ αὐτοῦ βουλήσει, ἵν’ ὁσίως πάντα γινόμενα ἐν εὐδοκῆσει εὐπρόσδεκτα εἶη τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ.” It is situated within a longer discourse about priesthood. Just as in the Old Testament the priest was appointed, so now the Church leadership is commissioned. Just as the things had been “done piously, according to his good pleasure, [so that it] might be acceptable to his will,” so they should continue to be done this way, not randomly or in disorder. In the Old Testament, God's service was highly specialized and organized to the smallest detail. Now, even though Christians do not serve God in the Temple anymore, they serve through spiritual worship. God is the one who appoints the order of Christian worship, not only the place and way but also the personnel.⁵⁹⁸ Worship is to be done holily/piously, i.e. according to God’s good pleasure. On the other hand of this scale of serving God would be the cry of God through Isaiah saying, that he does not enjoy the prayers of his people.

In **44,4** Clement uses the priestly language saying that: “ἀμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται, ἐὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως προσενεγκόντας τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς

596 Thinking about the situation in the Church of Corinth, it is possible that the separatist faction served itself rather than God. However, this is only a speculation, because we cannot judge their intention. Clemens describes their problem as jealousy. It is possible they thought they were serving God by expelling the, according to them malfunctioning, leadership.

597 Lona adds that in this place ὁσίως designates persons who fall on God in general. He goes on to say that the answer to the present question is not to consider resurrection of pious as something new, since God had already revealed the promise at giving the Phoenix.

598 Though practically there has to be an appointed way of how one finds out God’s will.

ἀποβάλωμεν.“ The way in which the sentence is built opens door to a possible reading which would recognize a certain gradation among sins. Clement implies that sins can differ in importance, some are graver than others. The dismissal of faithful bishops is classified as “not small.”⁵⁹⁹ The faction leaders cannot think they are perfect and pure, if they want to replace their bishops, because this would be sin, and not a small one. These bishops had been serving piously and blamelessly. “Ὀσίως” is then the way in which one can correctly serve Lord God, as was also implied in the previous occurrence.

In a similar way, we are also to understand the following verse in which the fathers are set as an example: calling upon God piously, the right way, according to Gods pleasure, i.e. in faith and truth. In **60,4** we read: “δὸς ὁμόνοιαν καὶ εἰρήνην ἡμῖν τε καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν τὴν γῆν, καθὼς ἔδωκας τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν, ἐπικαλουμένων σε αὐτῶν ὀσίως ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, ὑπηκόους γινομένους τῷ παντοκράτορι καὶ ἐνδόξῳ ὀνόματί σου, τοῖς τε ἄρχουσιν καὶ ἡγουμένοις ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.“ Clement is asking for the “ὁμόνοια” (unity/singleness of mind) of the Church, for the unity in the midst of inner perturbations. Unity and peace, not only for the Church but also for the whole community involved, such unity as the fathers had.⁶⁰⁰

The last occurrence of the adverb “ὀσίως” is in **62,2**: “περὶ γὰρ πίστεως καὶ μεταμοίᾳς καὶ γνησίας ἀγαπῆς καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ὑπομοῆς πάντα τόπον ἐψηλαφήσῃ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ μακροθυμίᾳ τῷ παντοκράτορι θεῷ ὀσίως εὐαρεστεῖν, ὁμοιοῦντας ἀμνησικακῶς ἐν ἀγάπῃ καὶ εἰρήνῃ μετὰ ἐκτενοῦς ἐπιεικείας, καθὼς καὶ οἱ

599 It can also be understood in the way that it is a big sin to abandon the gifts of the episcopacy at all, to dismiss hierarchy as such.

600 It is difficult to tell who exactly are meant here as the fathers. Was the Church already in its second generation in the time when Clemens was writing? Were they the Old Testament fathers? This last seems to be the best explanation.

προδεδηλωμένοι πατέρες ἡμῶν εὐηρέστησαν ταπεινοφρονοῦντες τὰ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ κτίστην θεὸν· καὶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους.⁶⁰¹ The readers are offered an example in the form of the fathers again. The Church of Corinth is challenged to seek God's approval on themselves. The adverb "ὁσίως" is used for the way in which this approval should take place. They should seek God's approval in piety, in holiness. They should not seek approval from each other. They should live their salvation practicing: "righteousness,⁶⁰¹ truth, and long-suffering" as well as "being of one mind, without malice, in love and peace with earnest obedience."

8.1.3 Pure, Seemly, "σεμνός"

Among all the expressions depicting directly the realm of holiness, the adjective "σεμνός", is going to be the last for this survey. In the classic Greek, it was used of the holiness of gods or heroes. In First Clement, the meaning has already shifted to „praiseworthy“ or „seemly.“⁶⁰² It appears describing God's name and Church tradition. It is used six times in the form of adjective and once each in the form of noun and an adverb.

8.1.3.1 The Adjective.

In the first chapter, the adjective appears twice, in **1,1** and **1,3**. In the first verse, "σεμνός" appears as an attribute of Church. The Church of Corinth as-

601 Above we have read that, according to Clement, righteousness is a gift of God; here it is a virtue that should be practiced. According to verse 32,4, God has justified. God is the subject of the justification; the members of the Church are its objects, its recipients. God has given it to all men; however, it is activated by faith.

602 This term is mostly used of human actions: how one should be thinking. The practice of love is, therefore, something that one should do.

pired to build itself as venerable/holy and a famous name by the great effort of its members. On the other hand stands the opposition-group, who are called “foul and [full of] unholy sedition.” Two verses later the way Corinthians taught their youth to venerate the elders is explained: “*νέοις τε μέτρια καὶ σεμνὰ νοεῖν ἐπετρέπετε*”⁶⁰³.

The following occurrence is in **7,2**: “*διὸ ἀπολίπωμεν τὰς κενὰς καὶ ματαίας φροντίδας, καὶ ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐκλεῆ καὶ σεμνὸν τῆς παραδόσεως ἡμῶν κανόνα...*” The term stands here beside “*εὐκλεῆ*”, used to describe the Church tradition. The glorious and venerable canon of the Church tradition is to be followed instead of the empty and vain inventions.

In **47,5**, Clement describes the former brotherly love of the Corinthian Church, which they had been known for and which now has been perverted by some of the members. Clement encourages the Church to take action and single out the specific persons who were responsible for the desecration of the name of the Church⁶⁰⁴. Therefore, if the Church before was renowned for its love, the high degree of the opposite tendencies detracts from its current saintliness and, therefore, desecrate it. Here we have a reminiscence of two other places in the writings of Paul. First is that of Rom 14,16, where the Church can be desecrated by the gossip of outsiders about their inner division. Second, in 1 Cor 5,7, Paul urges the Church to take action and get rid of a defiling member in order to purify the Church. It is noteworthy, that the word “*σεμνός*” itself has been desecrated by now by losing its ring of sanctity.

Continuing in the same discourse, several verses further in **48,1** the adjective appears again in the same context. “*Ἐξάρωμεν οὖν ἐν τάχει καὶ προσπέσωμεν τῷ*

603 Hoole translates *σεμνός* as „grave.“

604 I have decided to call the action of the wayward leaders as desecration, because *σεμνός* used to be employed for sacrificial holiness.

δεσπότη καὶ κλαύσωμεν ἱκετευοντες αὐτόν, ὅπως ἴλεως γενόμενος ἐπικαταλλαγῇ ἡμῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν σεμνὴν τῆς φιλαδελφίας ἡμῶν ἀγνήν ἀγωγὴν ἀποκαταστήσῃ ἡμᾶς.“

“Venerable” is the brotherly love, φιλαδελφία, of the Church. Now Clement prays for its restoration. He challenges the Church to repent in tears and genuflection and to start restoring what had been damaged. Thus God, seeing the contrition of their hearts, might become merciful; God might be touched by their repentance and restore them. If God would hear their prayers, they would be restored for the fight. What fight? The fight for brotherly love. Clement implies that φιλαδελφία does not happen by itself and that it is not static. It is a process, and it has been broken. Yet, there is hope for restoration, which includes fighting obstacles. This fight is σεμνή and ἀγνή, „venerable“ and „pure.“ It may be fitting also to translate this as “holy” or “pious.” This fight is never only in the hands of people, they should only procure the purity of the group. If they ask for help, God will work with them for the restoration of the broken fellowship.

In these occurrences, we have seen that “σεμνός” was often used of brotherly love, Church, and tradition. It describes the realm of Church.

8.1.3.2 The Noun.

In the form of the noun, “σεμνότης”, the word changes slightly in meaning, conveying “reverence.” It appears only once in **41,1**. Everyone should submit themselves to the rule (κανόνα) of God's service. The prescribed holy or sacred order of liturgy should be obeyed and not questioned, as we have seen earlier.

8.1.3.3 The Adverb.

The one case of adverb “σεμνῶς” describes women's moral sense: the conscience of women is to be blameless, seemly, and pure while performing their duties. Especially their love for husbands is described this way. Again, the language is reminiscent of the Pastoral Epistles.

8.1.4 Summary of Holiness

Compared to the writings of the New Testament, the holiness word-group in the epistle of Clement is much wider. Beside the well know group of the derivatives of ἅγιος, there are also other words. “ἅγιος”, as an adjective, describes first the Holy Scriptures inspired by the Holy Spirit in the quotation formulas. Second, “holy” is the name of God, the holiness of the Name stems from the affinity to God and being synecdochically used for Himself. The Church can find refuge here. Christians are then the carriers of the “holy name”. Third, the adjective describes “holy place”, where the saints, perfected in love, go after they die and where they wait for their resurrection. In comparison with the New Testament, it is no longer the Jerusalem, nor its temple. Fourth, the “holy ones” are then the saints, Christians, the new holy nation, called so by grace, in order to perform the deeds of righteousness. Interestingly, part of these saints are even called the “Holy of Holies”, transferring the image of the temple on the community, drawing upon the image of the righteous remnant as well. It is desirable to seek the company of other saints, in order to catch their seemly life and in order to learn to live one's life in righteousness, worthy of the calling. Those who do not live up to these expectations should be prayed for.

Sanctification is mostly the sanctified life. That is seemingly life, suggested by list of virtues setting forth the path of perfection, which draws its source from the salvation event. But this life of temperance is not end in itself, there is not temperance without sanctification. The former draws strength from the latter. We witness the shift away from the New Testament, where the sanctification was fully the process of becoming Christian and becoming the property of God, having been bought by Christ's sacrifice and having been sprinkled by his blood in the baptism.

Second word of holiness, the derivatives of “*ἁγιος*” convey holiness in the sense of righteousness, based on specific deeds and performance of people in response to God. It is connected strongly with the ethical notion of obedience to God, especially in the field of brotherly love, with which the addressed Church struggled in the midst of the faction-wars. Also this type of holiness goes hand in hand with purity, though not the ritually understood one, but the purity of conduct and singleness of heart, corresponding closely to righteousness. Church is like a sacrificial gift and Clement asks for their purification and sanctification, like Paul has done before him in his previous letters. Holiness then, together with wisdom and understanding and good deeds, is the desirable fruit proving that the Christians are on the good path. This however, still is not the way to salvation, it is the response to it. Some people of the divided Church may consider themselves better than the rest exactly by performing great deeds, but the most important is the love and knowledge that the good conduct does not lead to heaven, it only shows that people are on the good path. Nonetheless, the good deeds outside of the realm of Christian righteousness can also be called holy. The *σεμνός* word group is then used in the same way as in the Pastoral epistles.

8.2 Purity

There are several expressions identifying purity in First Clement: “καθαρός”, “αγνός”, as well as “ἀμώμος” and “ἀμιάντος”, though the last one belongs also to the field of perfection. It is difficult to divide these two fields in the 1 Clem, and we will therefore have to also speak about them both.

8.2.1 Pure, “Αγνός”

Let us first observe **the adjective ἀγνός**. It appears six times in the epistle. We have already mentioned several cases. For example that of **1,3** where it describes the wives' love for their husbands. We also met the adjective in parallel with *σεμνός*, while talking about the fight for brotherly love in **48,1**. Another case already mentioned is that of **21,8**, which describes the power of chaste love imposed upon the young Church. In all these occurrences the word “αγνός” appear near either “ὅσιος” or “σεμνός”. This is true about verse **29,1** as well. The readers are encouraged to approach God in the holiness of heart, “ἐν δσιότητι ψυχῆς”, which shows itself outwardly as the lifting of hands. These hands raised in worship are pure. Their purity is stressed by repeating the synonyms. The second expression describing them is even stronger, excluding any possibility of stain whatsoever. The hands go up to heaven as a sacrifice: pure, undefiled, and worthy of the Lord's attention.

One chapter later, in **30,1**, a case of defilement is mentioned: „impure embraces”⁶⁰⁵. The impurity here is not ritual contamination but moral corruption. This is the same use as in the Pastoral Epistles. Could sexual intercourse be meant here? Or a false embrace pretending friendship, while

605 Acc. Pl. ἀνάγνους συμπλοκάς.

keeping hatred in one's heart? Or the ban on embracing whatsoever? The last option is unlikely because of the existence of “the holy kiss” in the Churches of that time. The most likely is the idea of some embrace with sexual congress in mind when it is inappropriate.

The last case of this adjective in **48,5** is in the Christological discourse on the gate and path already mentioned in the section on holiness. Here it is used to describe the conduct of the members of the sectarian group: “ἦτω σοφὸς ἐν διακρίσει λόγων, ἦτω ἀγνὸς ἐν ἔργοις”. “Pure in deeds” were the leaders of the opposition. Maybe they were faithful, mighty in the exposition of Scriptures, and morally good; yet, Clement would say with Paul, without love these are good for nothing. All this purity should be crowned with humility, not pride and self-advancement.

„Purity,“ “**ἀγνεία**”, as a **noun** is used twice. Wives are encourage to exhibit the lovely habit of purity in 21,7, and at the very end of the final blessings, Clement asks for purity for the Church among the many other virtues named in the intercession.

8.2.2 Pure – “καθαρός”

Beside “ἀγνός” describing purity, there is also the word “καθαρός”, which is more common in the New Testament. In the form of an adjective it appears seven times, as a verb four times, and once as the noun. The majority of appearances of “καθαρός” are in the quotations of the Old Testament. In the LXX, the adjective is used in ritual contexts. Only four times does Clement decide to use this word on his own. First, the Old Testament quotations where “καθαρός” appears shall be discussed.

There are altogether eight cases, three of which come from Psalm 51. Another three are taken from the book of Job and two from Isaiah. All of them quote the LXX directly, even in the cases where the LXX does not follow the Hebrew text⁶⁰⁶. In all but one of the cases, Clement quotes the longer piece of text to support his point by the authority of the Scriptures. The texts are not chosen to prove any structured or fixed concept of purity. The reason for their use is mostly to prove something else, usually brotherly love.

In the case of Psalm 51 it is David who asks God to clean him and give him a new heart. The Lord is the source of his new purity, moral purity which was once lost, that he is now seeking to regain. In the case of Job, the expression of the impossibility to become pure in face of God is mentioned. In fact, the last quote says that even „the holy ones of God“ are not pure enough. Job declares that none can become pure enough by themselves. On the other hand, in the reference to the first chapter of Isaiah, the call for purification is heard. God had had enough of the superficial sacrifices of his people carried out just for the empty cultural habit. God calls them, through the mouth of Isaiah, to obtain purification. The cleansing then consists in walking the straight path, it is moral refinement.

In only one case, the quotation where *καθαρός* can be found, is it distorted from its source. It is found in 1 Clem **39,5**: “οὐρανὸς δὲ οὐ καθαρὸς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· ἔα δέ, οἱ κατοικοῦντες οἰκίας πηλίνας, ἐξ ὧν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πηλοῦ ἐσμέν· ἔπαισεν αὐτοὺς σητὸς τρόπον καὶ ἀπὸ πρωΐθεν ἕως ἑσπέρας οὐκ ἔτι εἰσίν· παρὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς βοηθῆσαι ἀπώλοντο.” The precedent verse 39,4 is a verbatim quotation of Job 4:17. This very verse, however, copies Job 15,15

606 Four times the ritual word טהר (clean ritually) is used, two times זכך (clean) and, surprisingly, once קדצ (righteous).

where the quote comes from the mouth of the Job's friend, Eliphaz. It is interesting that the author would quote the words of a man that is considered by God, in the Book of Job, to be speaking nonsense on the larger scale. The theology of prosperity, which he promotes, is countered by God in the very book.

Apart from the occurrences of *καθαρός* appearing in the quotations, there are a few instances original to the hand of Clement. In the concluding intercessory prayer, he asks God to cleanse the Church with the cleansing of God's truth. We had already mentioned the same verse of 60,2 while speaking about holiness. The imperative expresses a cry to God for help. It is an outcry: "Do not consider what we have done wrong, but cleanse us!" God is entreated to not lay eyes upon the sins, even if these have actually been done by God's very own servants.⁶⁰⁷ God is asked instead, to purify them by the means of God's truth, in line with the saying: "You shall know the truth and it will set you free." The truth may be meant mystically as well as practically—it can bring disentanglement into fight-driven group. The source of this purification, a moral one as in the quotations from Psalm 51, is of God and that is the reason why God is invoked to help⁶⁰⁸.

Summary: The purity in the epistle of Clement is rather spiritual/psychological than moral or ritual. Whenever *καθαρός* is used originally by the author, it is always near to at least one of the above studied expressions.

607 Similar to the Catholic exclamation before the communion. "Do not look at our sins but at the faith of your Church."

608 In 21,8, the adjective *καθαρός* is used to describe the ends of the children's education. This verse has been mentioned twice already in this chapter. The adjective can also be found in 45,7, where it describes the conscience of those who serve God and whom God protects, shown on the example of three Israelite boys surviving the flames of furnace. This verse has also been mentioned in the connection with the adjective *ῥσιος*.

This shows that for Clement all these terms actually are connected within a semantic field of holiness.

8.3 Conclusion

It has been shown how in the First Epistle of Clement the semantic field of holiness does not deviate much from the general use found in the New Testament writings. Especially close to it, is the use of holiness in Paul. Clement relates to the previous correspondence between Paul and the Corinthian Church, and he also stresses that holiness is a merciful gift of God. If there is a shift, it is toward the praxis of life, the holiness is human response of virtuous life, drawing strength from the Christ event. Ritual purity does not appear anymore at all, nor do Judaizing streams. Rather now the rebellious groups fight over spiritual elevation. The holiness and purity consist though belonging to God and relying on God's avenging activity.

Chapter 9: Didache

9.1 Holiness

The only expression describing holiness in Didache is "ἅγιος". It appears ten times in the sixteen chapters describing the Holy Spirit (7,1.3⁶⁰⁹), Holy Father (10,2), the Name (8,2; 10,2), the Church (10,5; 16,7), its members (4,2; 10,6) and figuratively also the Holy Communion (9,2.5)

9.1.1 Holy Name.

The expression "ἅγιος" describes the Name two times in Didache. The first one is to be found in **8,2**:

"μηδὲ προσεύχεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταὶ ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ οὕτω προσεύχεσθε Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἡμῶν ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας."

This is another version of the Lord's Prayer, almost identical with the one of Matthew⁶¹⁰. Just after calling on God, the Heavenly Father, the prayer asks for the sanctification of his Name and coming of his kingdom. The expression "holy name" appears in the beginning of this unique prayer⁶¹¹. Given its prom-

609 All the cases of the Holy Spirit appear within the baptismal Trinitarian formulas.

610 Note the addition at the end.

611 Similarly, in the very beginning of Decalogue, immediately after the introduction of the two most important commandments: To love and worship only him, people are warned

inent place within the writing, we may assume very high level of importance of keeping God's Name in special awe. As we have seen in the case of the First Clement, the Name stands for the entire person. The petition is formulated in passive voice. In the same way as we have seen in Gospels, Jesus does not pray that the Church would keep the Name sacred, he teaches his disciples to intercede for its glory in general. The Name is now in their hands, available for their use, helpless, as well as mighty⁶¹². The passive voice stands for divine passive. God is supposed to take care of his own fame. Milavec indicates that the petition is implicitly eschatological, since this will be fully realized when Jesus returns. "The name...will be sanctified precisely when his kingdom is established on earth."⁶¹³ When His kingdom will be realized here on earth, as it is in heaven, then surely his Name will be held in the appropriate awe. This cry is therefore, according to Milavec, synonymic to the Aramaic "Maranatha"⁶¹⁴. Further he says that sanctification of a god's name was an idea unknown to pagans, but for the Old Testament writings it is important⁶¹⁵ and so for Didache⁶¹⁶.

The collocation "holy name" also appears in the verse **10,2**:

Ἐὐχάριστοῦμέν σοι, *πάτερ ἅγιε*, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματος σου, οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ

not to desecrate Lord's Name.

- 612 So as in the case of the incarnation, a little helpless baby was given. The Name is now also given into the hands of gullible people who can abuse its power, who can preach in this name as they wish.
- 613 Milavec, Didache, pg. 318
- 614 And thus addressed to Jesus.
- 615 In connection with Didache 8,2 Milavec also turns our attention to the text of Ezekiel 36,22 – 24. Even though the Israel did not hold in awe His Name, God will act and repair its ring himself
- 616 Mal 1,11 quoted later in the writing is one such example. In the original verse of Mal, it is twice repeated that God's Name is great among the Gentiles, in the same way the petition in Did 8,2 should be understood: that God himself would take care of the fame of His Name.

ἀθανασίας ἧς ἐγνωρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.”

It is a liturgical prayer uttered after the Holy Communion. It expresses thankfulness to the “Holy Father” for four things: his holy Name, γνώσις (knowledge, understanding)⁶¹⁷, faith and immortality. All of these were made known to the readers through Jesus, the Son of the Holy Father. Of these four gifts, only one is further explained and that is the one of the Name. It has “made tabernacle” according to the Lightfoot, or “dwell” according to Hoole, “in our hearts”. The Greek term “κατεσκήνωσας” means “to pitch a tent”. In the Old Testament, it is God who decides where his Name will dwell and where, so that his people could be in communion with Him, so that they could be “in front of his face”, that is in his presence.

The Temple, the house of God's Name, is now spiritualized in line with other writings we have encountered so far. The Name has made its home in the hearts of the believers. The image is intimate, reminiscent of Paul's teaching that the Holy Spirit dwells there. Thus God is nearer than any time before⁶¹⁸. Niederwimmer adds that it is at the baptism that this inhabiting, or should we say, filling, happens⁶¹⁹.

We have seen the path of the Christian theology from the temple cult to the spiritualized internalized worship. This started already with Jesus who changes

617 The gnosis here is not the gnostic one. It is rather the understanding of the things above has been made known to the readers through Jesus, not through their own effort. Similarly the „gnosis“ is used in 1 Cor.

618 A. Vööbus, *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache.* , pg. 119. "these Christians felt themselves filled with the holiness of God, who has chosen to make his dwelling place not just among them but in them!"

619 Niederwimmer pg. 195 supporting texts Rom 8,9; 1 Cor 14,25, Jam 4,5, Barn 16,9; Ign Eph 15,3

focus from the externalized ritual worship to the purity of inner man, which should be of more concern than one's ritual purity. We have seen how Luke stresses also the purity of heart or conscience of Gentiles. Their hearts have been purified by faith. And last but not least⁶²⁰, Paul uses many metaphors to show that now the worship is inner as well as corporeal. The Church is a temple, each Christian's body is a new temple. The purity of heart is required to prepare a worthy dwelling place for the Spirit. Now that the hearts of Christians are purified by faith, which is also one of the items on the petition list in Didache: holy God has prepared for himself⁶²¹ a place worthy of his Name, in the hearts of believers. Not the tablets of stone any more. The holiness of the Jerusalem temple has been poured out to those who were previously considered impure. Holiness that even Jerusalem temple could not contain has been entrusted to "believers", those of faith.

Holiness of the Name stems from, and stands for, the holiness of the Father. Compared with 8,2 and 9,2 we would rather expect to read "*our* Father". The collocation "*holy* Father" is unique to this place. Milavec states that exchanging "holy" for the more usual "our" wants to "acknowledge importance of their host,...unseen but very much the present host at every Eucharistic meal. The drink and food were provided by him"⁶²². The connection to the Bucharest is already made in Didache itself, the only other occurrence outside of it, the collocation "holy Father" is in John 17,11⁶²³.

620 The author of Hebrews does not speak about the temple in the sense of human heart, but means the heavenly spiritual temple. On the other hand he does speak about conscience.

621 Note that also here the agent is God, not people with their ascetic effort.

622 Milavec, pg. 382; he also speaks about the "real presence of the Father" and "real absence of the Son."

623 There is a vivid discussion on how these two are connected. However this seems interesting, nothing sure can be concluded out of this fact. It is also difficult to prove literary dependency of the two texts as Clausen has attempted. One such attempt was made by Clausen in Greory Tuckett

9.1.2 Holy Church.

The cases in Didache where the word "ἅγιος" is used to describe Church are four, two of which are assigned to some specific members of it. First, the general cases will be mentioned, then the more specific ones.

In **10,5** "ἅγιος" appears in the form of verb only in the manuscript "H". The authors are asking God to remember the Church:

"μνησθητι, κύριε, τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου, τοῦ ῥύσασθαι αὐτήν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου, καὶ συναξόν αὐτήν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, τὴν ἁγιασθεῖσαν, εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν, ἣν ἠτοίμασας αὐτῇ· ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας."

Niederwimmer⁶²⁴ identifies it with a Christianized Jewish prayer, where instead of gathering the Israel from diaspora, God is asked to gather his Church. In this verse, there are three requests. God is asked to redeem/deliver his Church from every evil, to perfect it in love⁶²⁵ and to unite/gather it. The part of gathering is further developed. All parts of the Church that God had prepared and sanctified for His kingdom⁶²⁶. God had labelled some people and things beforehand to belong to Him and to his kingdom.

When his kingdom comes on this earth, the Lord shall come and all of these chosen, all his saints, with him (**16,6**):

624 For more on the text-critical problem of this passage Niederwimmer, pg. 201.

625 In this manuscript the part about perfection is missing. We will therefore skip the interpretation of the usage of the τελειοθῆναι in this verse. It is a request to God that He would by his might make his Church perfect and holy.

626 Viz Eph 2:10 where God had prepared the good deeds his Church would later work in.

"καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ σημεῖα τῆς ἀληθείας· πρῶτον σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως ἐν οὐρανῶ, εἶτα σημεῖον φωνῆς σάπιγγος, καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν. 7. οὐ πάντων δέ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐρρέθη· Ἡξεί ὁ κύριος καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ."

Not all will be risen from the dead, though, only those labelled by God beforehand. Everything belonging to his kingdom will invade this earth and establish the eschatological kingdom at his return. The quoted text is one of two direct Old Testament references in Didache, both of which come from small prophets and both of which will be of our interest. In this first case, it is rather an allusion to Zechariah 14,5, which speaks about the day of the Lord and the last apocalyptic battle⁶²⁷ when the Lord will come and all his "holy ones" with him. In the Rabbinic interpretation all the "holy ones" coming back at the end of the days stood for the martyrs. Milavec says that the "holy ones" applied to a wider group than just martyrs⁶²⁸. We have seen this also in the writings of Paul, where the eschatological party includes also angels⁶²⁹.

Since it has been sufficiently proved above that "οἱ ἅγιοι" is a term widely used for Church in general, as the new holy society of those who have been baptised, it seems very unlikely that the meaning would be different here. Especially given the context of Didache's last chapter, exhorting the readers to strive for perfection till the end. The author of Didache could have written holy "who" he has in his mind, there are collocations such as "holy angels" or "holy

627 LXX renders the text in a following way: "καὶ ἐμφραχθήσεται φάραγξ ὀρέων μου καὶ ἐγκολληθήσεται φάραγξ ὀρέων ἕως Ιασολκαὶ ἐμφραχθήσεται καθὼς ἐνεφράγη ἐνταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ σεισμοῦ ἐν ἡμέραις Οἰζίου βασιλέως Ιουδα καὶ ἥξει κύριος ὁ θεός μου καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ".

628 Milavec, pg. 830

629 Niederwimmer then draws attention to Mt 25,31 where all those who will return with the Lord (there Jesus) are angels. This would be in line with the favourite interpretation that we have also seen the discussion about the occurrence of the same notion in 1st and 2nd Thess.

one of God. Whenever the subject is missing, however, and the “holy” is in the form of substantive plural by the added article, then the notion is quite consistent. The holy ones, "οἱ ἅγιοι", are the Church.

Even though "οἱ ἅγιοι" is usually the general name for Christians, who had obtained this quality in the baptism, in some parts of Didache, unlike in the preceding writings⁶³⁰, there seem to be some of them who are holier. Such people should be sought out everyday for company. **4,2**: "ἐκζητήσεις δὲ καθ' ἡμέραν τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων, ἵνα ἐπαναπαῆς τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῶν." Context of this occurrence in Didache⁶³¹ is teaching about the needed mutual love and respect within the new community of Church – love: to the "holy ones", the community, to the poor, to children and servants. The fact that the conduct towards the Church in general is specified in the following verses leads us to think that this time the "ἅγιοις" does not stand for the Church in general, but for some special members of it. So says also majority of the commentators. Niederwimmer claims it to be the only possible reading, since the remarkable awe-giving for the speakers the Word of God is attested here⁶³².

Yet, I would not completely shut the door to the possibility of the "ἅγιοις" as the Church in general - more specifically the community. In the Church, the new member meets the holy ones, transformed by both baptism and consistent following of the Way of Life; those who help build each other sharing the faith

630 Exception is 1 Clem.

631 We have seen a similar notion in 1 Clem 46,2 "Κολλᾶσθε τοῖς ἁγίοις, ὅτι οἱ κολλώμενοι αὐτοῖς ἁγιασθήσονται."

632 Niederwimmer, pg. 137: "οἱ ἅγιοι" können (wie die neuerliche Bezug auf die λόγοι zeigt) hier nur die Lehrer gemeint sein: eine bemerkswerte Ehrenbezeugung für die λαλοῦντες τον λόγον θεοῦ.

in their lives. In the words of these holy ones, that is, in the words of the Church, one can also find rest⁶³³.

The last case where holiness is ascribed to the Church is in **10,6**: "ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος. Ὡσαννὰ τῷ θεῷ Δαεῖδ. εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέθω· εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοεῖτω· μαρὰν ἀθά· ἀμήν". The preceding verse, 10,5, has already been explained. This one, then, leads us to the discourse on the communion. Hoole's translation even adds in the brackets "to the Eucharist". If observed carefully, the context actually does speak about the Holy Communion as such. The chapter nine deals with the order for the Lord's Supper, it is closed by the prohibition of access of the unbaptised. Chapter ten is a prolonged after-meal thanksgiving. Our verse is concluding it. The saying about the repentance is interlocked within several eschatological exclamations closing the long prayer⁶³⁴. *Those who access the communion must be "saints" and they must know it. Holiness is the condition. The required holiness, its level or practical features are not explained. Only the insiders know whether they are holy or not, i.e. whether they are baptised and "in Christ"*.

Niederwimmer does not regard the prayer of chapter 10 as a thanksgiving, he rather says this was some liturgical signal for the "unholy" to leave⁶³⁵. It is

633 I would not be afraid to say directly the eschatological מלש such as the one in the epistle of Hebrews. Though we do not find any teaching on the Sabbath in Didache. Milavec says: "Being a realistic program, the Didache no sooner holds out the future promise of finding "rest" among the "saints" than it turns to the darker side: "dissension" and "fighting"" (Milavec pg. 161). He turns our attention yet to another source. From the Origen's report, Celsus' intent was to subvert the education of the Christian leaders. "Shops served as centres for dissemination the Christian way of life. Potential recruits were drawn to these shops, for there they could "seek everyday the presence of the saints." (Milavec, pg. 182)

634 It is reminiscent of the exclamation of the final verses of the book of Revelation 22, 17:

635 Niederwimmer, pg.204: „In Didache bezeichnet ἅγιός entweder einfach den baptizatus (μετανοεῖτω dann die Taufe), was zur Inhaltsgleichheit mit 9,5 führen würde; oder aber

not, according to him, "an exclamation of joy", rather than "*an invitation and warning*" for those who access to the Communion. According to Niederwimmer⁶³⁶, at this point of service, those who were accepting the communion would approach, whereas the unbaptised would have had left.

Milavec⁶³⁷, on the other hand, holds that is an overall warning not to take the communion lightly, to approach the Eucharist only when prepared and if not ready, to repent beforehand. This text would then be a warning, such as the one of 1 Corinthians 16,22. Milavec⁶³⁸ connects this verse with Matthew 25,41⁶³⁹ and points out that the acclamation clearly breaks the natural flow of the text. Also Prinzivalli-Simonetti read the text morally as the "invitation to those who are in the appropriate moral condition as to take part on the true and actual Eucharistic consecration with the reminiscence of the Last Supper, to which the prayers of the chapters 9 and 10 would form some sort of introduction."⁶⁴⁰

In my opinion, those who are not holy, those who are not "saints" are the non-Christians. There is not a list of vices and virtues which one could take as a moral mirror reflecting the possible level of required morality. The only condition is to be "holy" and in early Christian writings one becomes holy only by affiliation to Christ. The strongest argument for my claim is the verse 9,5,

(und das ist wahrscheinlicher) der Text ruft den schon Getauften dazu auf, als *ἅγιός* zum Herrenmahl zu kommen, was mit seinem Status als Baptizatus nicht schon ohne weiter gegeben ist.“

636 As well as Dibelius and Leitzman. Audet considers the "unholy ones" the unbaptised.

637 Milavec pg. 401

638 pg. 397-401

639 Τότε ἐρεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἐξ εὐνοῦμων, Πορεύεσθε ὅπ' ἐμοῦ [οἱ] κατηραμένοι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἠτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ:

640 E. Prinzivalli and M. Simonetti, *Seguendo Gesù. Testi cristiani delle origini*: 1. Rome, Italy: Milan, Italy: Mondadori, 2010. pg. 35: "invito di 10,6 (chi è santo, venga), inteso come invito a chi è in adatta condizione morale apprendere parte alla vera e propria consacrazione eucaristica col ricordo dell'ultima cena, di cui le preghiere dei capitoli 9 e 10 costituerebbero una sorta di "prefazione"”

which forbids partaking to all the unbaptized: “μηδεις δε φαγέτω μηδε πιέτω από τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ’ οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου”.

9.1.3 Holy Communion.

The last occurrence has already shifted our attention towards the Lord's Supper. For the Eucharist two metaphors are used in Didache: "holy vine" and "holy things". Both of them appear in the discourse on the Holy Communion in the chapter 9.

The chapter begins: "1. Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε· 2. πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου· Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυεὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου· ἡς ἐγνωρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου. σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας". Formal similarity with 10,2 has already been mentioned. Let us now compare both verses.

9,2	10,2
Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι,	Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι,
πάτερ ἡμῶν,	πάτερ ἅγιε,
ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυεὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου·	ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματος σου, οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν,
	καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας
ἡς ἐγνωρισας ἡμῖν	ἡς ἐγνωρισας ἡμῖν
διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου·	διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου·
σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.	σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

The only alterations are the designation of the Father as “holy”, and also the object of thankfulness has been changed. In the verse 10,2 gratitude was expressed for spiritual gifts: knowledge, faith and immortality beside the gift of His holy Name. In this verse, the gift is the "holy vine of the David". The king is described as the Lord's servant in the same way Jesus is the עבד 'הוה. This format of prayer also reminds of the Hebrew prayer of Kiddush. The holy vine would then correspond to פרי חגב and would reflect the dependence of the traditional blessing of the wine at the table⁶⁴¹.

The “holy vine” is a term richly used in the Old Testament: it can describe Israel, Judah, Wisdom, new eschatological people or the Messiah. Let us make a tour along the commentaries. Niederwimmer does not see much value in Borig's⁶⁴² exposition for the interpretation of our text of Didache, later he suggests that "the object of the revelation is the "holy vine", scil. the salvation, and so the eschatological salvation promised before David.⁶⁴³ Milavec writes: "Drinking the cup of the holy vine...enabled gentiles to join in fellowship with Israel and to partake of their messianic expectations.⁶⁴⁴" Also Prinzivalli-Si-

641 Niederwimmer, pg. 182. Many commentators draw attention to the work of R. Bohrig: "Der Wahre Weinstock"(1962) which deals widely with this subject.

642 “Der wahre Weinstock. Untersuchungen zu Jo 15,1-10 by BORIG Rainer: München, Kösel 1967 - Boekenantiquariaat De Lezenaar.” [Online]. Available: <http://www.abebooks.com/wahre-Weinstock-Untersuchungen-Jo-15-1-10/3504397818/bd>. [Accessed: 04-Jul-2015].

643 Niederwimmer, pg. 183: "Subjekt der Offenbarung ist der "Heilige Weinstock", scil. das Heil, und zwar das eschatologische Heil...zuvor dem David verheißen war."

644 Milavec, pg. 364 in accord with Rordorf saying that the "holy vine" for Jews is the messianic expectation of Israel. For more viz : “Branches on the Vine of David: What Can the Didache Tell Us about the Sabbath in the Early Jesus Movement? Henry Sturcke.” [Online]. Available: https://www.academia.edu/6295828/Branches_on_the_Vine_of_David_What_Can_the_Didache_Tell_Us_about_the_Sabbath_in_the_Early_Jesus_Movement_Henry_Sturcke. [Accessed: 04-Jul-2015].

monetti⁶⁴⁵ says that it is a symbol of the messianic expectations recognized by Church as fulfilled in Jesus. Vööbus holds that the “holy vine” evoked God's enduring love and election of Israel. Claussen⁶⁴⁶ unites the “holy vine of David” with the Eucharistic cup. He points out the fact that they both appear in the singular makes them “clearly singled out”, they are not consumed to satisfy hunger⁶⁴⁷. He goes on to say that in Israel, the vine of David conveyed the elect people: he considers “David as a qualifying reference to the messianic expectations now fulfilled in Jesus⁶⁴⁸” And later he follows that “the Didache's understanding of the Eucharist does not concern the death of Jesus (unlikely Paul or Hebrews)” There are no traces of “any interest in atonement. Didache does not make use of the Passover tradition.⁶⁴⁹”

9.1.4 Holy To Dogs

We are thus left with the last occurrence of “ἅγιος” in **9,5**: “μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ’ οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου· καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἶρηκεν ὁ κύριος· Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσίν.” The same restriction, as we have already seen, was also uttered by Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew. 7,6. Niederwimmer warns that we cannot be sure that Didache is quoting Matthew

645 pg. 436: Qui il simbolo è cristianizzato, stante la rivelazione apportata da Gesù, e nella vite-vigna di Davide é da ravvisare la chiesa in quanto coronamento dell'attesa messianica, secondo Nied 89 (183) in dimensione escatologica”.

646 “The Eucharist in the Gospel of John and in the Didache” by Carsten Clausen in A. Gregory and C. Tuckett, Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Pages 135–63

647 Claussen, pg. 143.

648 Claussen, pg. 153.

649 Claussen, pg. 155. In order to be able to give my assessment, I miss my own thorough study of the Gospel of John. Therefore these findings I consider yet preliminary and preparatory for my future work.

here⁶⁵⁰ and admits that it may be a work of oral tradition⁶⁵¹. In Didache, he says, "τὸ ἅγιον" conveys the holy food forbidden for the unbaptised, since the "ἅγιοι", according to him, are the baptised and "οἱ κύνες" the unbaptised. He draws this view from the fact that "the Jewish tradition used "τὸ ἅγιον" for the sacrificial meat"⁶⁵², which we have already seen before in this thesis. In this way could also be understood the quote from Rom 14,14 that there is nothing impure in itself and also in 1st Clement that "to pure ones everything is pure", especially in the case of communion, if one is holy, the communion means life to them, it is the sign of them being separated for the Lord, to be the society of the "holy ones". If one does not know whether they are thus separated, that they already *are* holy or also in the case they *are not*, it is their judgement, as we have also seen in Did 9 and 1 Cor.

Who are supposed to be the dogs here then⁶⁵³? Riggs in his study suggests that studying of the chapters 9 and 10 "reveals a transition from the table-sharing towards a divine food⁶⁵⁴". He goes on saying that the "Holy elements with fenced boundaries became prominent theme of 9,5 and 10,6⁶⁵⁵." Because of the decline of the mission efforts, the Church started to look rather inside at how to behave in the Church, how to put on the new life. "The idea of the divine food now separates the community"⁶⁵⁶. The answer to our question would then be

650 The same text also appears at the Coptic Gospel of Thomas 93.

651 Niederwimmer, pg. 192

652 Der Didachst nicht lediglich an das Gemeindemahl denkt..er die sakramentale Feier des Herrenmahls einschließt..."to hagian" in jüdischer Tradition gelegentlich für Opferfleisch verwendet – pg. 192

653 In Qumran viz 1Qs VII,16f, 20f.

654 John W. Riggs, The Sacred Food of Didache 9 and 10 and the second century ecclesiologies The Didache in Context, in C. N. Jefford, The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission. BRILL, 1995.

655 Riggs pg. 266

656 Riggs pg. 271. The circle is closing.

that all those who are not allowed to the Eucharist are the dogs. Rigs continues "the sacred food came to function in two ways. Food helped to mark the extra-mural boundary of the Church, separating the community from the larger world" but also inside, the Church was divided by boundaries, now, when the offices started to develop.

The Church has made a long path. In the beginning, the Gentiles were not allowed to eat together at the same table with the Jewish-Christians, but it did not take long before the new group started to treat their own spiritually-sacrificial meal with the same fierceness as that of their mother-group. Outsiders are not defiling for the sacrificial meal, though, the other way round exactly following the pattern of the "reverse flow of holiness", the sacrificial meal can be dangerous to them⁶⁵⁷.

Summary: We have seen that in the Didache all the occurrences of the words expressing holiness only one term is used, "ἅγιος". It is used to describe God's Name, Church and newly also the Eucharist⁶⁵⁸. There are no other expressions for holiness in the book of Didache.

9.2 Purity

The only expression for purity found in Didache is "καθαρός" always in

657 Making total circle to where it originally came from. Anthropologists say that in the oldest layers of the Old Testament, the holy is actually defiling. Douglas, Milgrom etc.

658 There are some very strong ties between the Gospel of John and Didache on the point of the sacrificial food and Communion the future, I wish to finish the overview of holiness also in the Johannine writings and then I could also offer much better explanation. Recently my friend finished her book which deals with this subject: M. J. C. Warren, *My Flesh Is Meat Indeed: A Nonsacramental Reading of John 6:51-58*. Fortress Press, 2015. I consider this chapter on Didache I am presenting here as preliminary, since deep inspection of the Johannine literature is key for that.

connection with "θυσία", sacrifice. Moreover, all of the cases appear in the chapter 14. The whole chapter describes the early Christian service. The communion is here designated as "κυριακή...ή θυσία", sacrifice. The sacrifice brought before the Lord must be pure. Didache draws on the Old Testament language of ritual, however, it is used metaphorically.

14,1: “Κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ κυρίου συναχθέντες κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαρίστησατε προεξομολογησάμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν ὅπως καθαρὰ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν ᾗ” In the first verse, it is written what the Church should do: break the bread, be merry and confess their sins. The sacrifice is the spiritual living in front of God as well as the communion. In the **second** verse it is said that this sacrifice can be defiled: “πᾶς δὲ ἔχων τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν μετὰ τοῦ ἐταίρου αὐτοῦ μὴ συνελθέτω ὑμῖν ἕως οὗ διαλλαγῶσιν ἵνα μὴ κοινωθῇ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν”. The bringing of one's life as the daily sacrifice, the communion is to be kept in purity. Especially the community dimension is stressed here, quarrels defile. We have encountered in Paul similar notion, in Rom 14,16, where the inner fights bring about blasphemy. And again, it is the inner impurity that Jesus was teaching about in Mt 15 and Mk7, that, which is coming out of heart, quarrels, that is the true defiling force. This uncleanness desecrates the spiritual sacrifice. Conflict person is not supposed to join in the sacrificial meal, unless they would have discussed the matter together, until they are able to have a dialogue again⁶⁵⁹. The **third** verse quotes Malachi 1,11: “αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ῥηθεῖσα ὑπὸ κυρίου Ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ καὶ χρόνῳ προσφέρειν μοι θυσίαν καθαρὰν ὅτι βασιλεὺς μέγας εἰμί λέγει κύριος καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου θαυμαστὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι”

659 This verse is also reminiscent of Jesus' teaching on bringing gifts at the altar of Mt 5,23. If one is not able to live in peace with their brothers, one would leave the gift at the altar, make things right, and then they can come back. In Mt the stress is on the others having problem with the worshiper, nonetheless, the outcome is the same.

The semantic field of the words here used has shifted from the actual temple-cult to communal-spiritual worship. For Jews, the Communion, where bread and wine are shared by both Jews and Gentiles together, symbolizing flesh and blood, would be utterly defiling. It would not be holy in *separation*. It would be *mixing* in „communion“ (κοινωνία) of those who should stay apart, it would be „common“ (κοινόν). In no way would it then be sacrifice, not even a spiritual one. Eating meat of sacrificial animal would be unthinkable in such context, eating symbolically flesh of a sacrificed *man*? Never. In Christian context, taking the Old Testament terms and giving them new meaning, the Communion is holy and requires high level of purity. It is a new sacrificial meal, it is new “קדש קדשים”. Who is not holy cannot come.

In the liturgy, there is a moment for confession of sins, while the bread is being broken, for repentance which purifies the believers. The purity required here is not ritual only but moral in accord with the theology of prophets⁶⁶⁰. And, surprisingly, it comes *after* the sanctification, yet it *is* the sanctification itself at the same time. Therefore, we may say, it is in a way synonymous with it, since this type of preparation inherently expresses separation. The Christians are separated for Christ, and thus sanctified by Christ in baptism. In order to take part on the new “קדש קדשים” they, however, need to purify. Purification is expected of people as their moral effort. The purification does not come here anymore with ablution and time, but with the “service of the lips”: deactivation of defiling force of impurity by confessing it coming from within, bringing it to light.

660 The spiritualized sacrifice was preferred at the breaking of era to the actual physical one also in the Jewish theology.

Milavec⁶⁶¹ says, that it was forbidden for Christians to eat the meet sacrificed to idols when also the Church has started to view their own communion as a sacrificial meal⁶⁶². Further he continues: "the voluntary confession of failings served sufficiently to manifest the "teshuva"⁶⁶³ that made a person capable of offering a pure sacrifice⁶⁶⁴". Space was created within the liturgy for people to reconcile; since, as we have seen, the most defiling item concerning the communion were the unresolved conflicts. Milavec paints suggestively the life of Christian assembly eating the sacrificial meal together⁶⁶⁵. It is special moment and the members are called to reconcile before taking part in it. This meal was different from all the other meals⁶⁶⁶. The Church did not meet to sacrifice, but to be perfected in the Way in the first

661 Milavec, pg. 569

662 However, as we have seen in the 1 Cor on the work of Cheung, on one hand there was freedom from kosher laws on the other Paul never consented to eating *εἰδωλόθυτα*, food offered to idols. Therefore even before the raise of the sacrificial meal of Communion, the pagan sacrificial meal had already long been forbidden to Christians. The Apostolic Decree clearly forbids it. Even if nothing is impure in itself, it is the intention that defiles. If eaten unknowingly, it does not have any power over the people. If eaten knowingly than it is the matter of conscience. But most of all, it is the question becoming one body and communion. People have their bodies from the lord, they have been ritually purified by faith, thus they have been united with Christ. There are two illicit unions of the body: that with prostitute and that with idol, through idol-food. If the dining person eats just a meat, they are not uniting with anyone, if what they eat for them is idol food, then they are in communion with the idol and thus taking part on its worship.

663 Teshuva literally means "return." When we "do teshuva," we examine our ways, identify those areas where we are losing ground, and "return" to our own previous state of spiritual purity. And in the process, we "return" to our connection with the Almighty as well. Source: <http://www.aish.com/h/hh/gar/48954551.html> 11:57; 23/05/2011

664 Milavec pg. 569

665 The communion is rather common meal, yet, with a special blessing for the cup and bread. The community, who probably lives together, runs its own business to provide work and food for the members and it also meets for the extraordinary feast together.

666 Later Milavec summarizes (pg. 50): "Didache 14,1-3 had the effect of establishing the eucharist as the "pure sacrifice" which according to Mal 1,11, took place "in every place and every time" and "among the Gentiles", thereby making the temple sacrifices not only entirely unnecessary but contrary to the "divinely instituted rule of the Lord (14,1)".

place. This perfection came about through the confession of sins⁶⁶⁷.

Didache does not know anything about the sacrifice of Jesus yet. It is not the pure sacrificing of Jesus⁶⁶⁸ but the pure communion⁶⁶⁹, “κοινωνία”. Our understanding of a sacrifice nowadays is distorted by centuries without any actual authentic sacrificial ritual at hand. Jews and pagans, however, lived sacrifice as a reality which did not need much explanation. Especially in the case of sacrificial meal. In the Roman cult, the meat of the sacrifice was eaten together and it was „a sacrament“ (sacrum facere). The only excommunication from their sacrificial meal happened when the sacrifice was in danger of being defiled, which would be the case if someone was misbehaving or quarreled. Then a fee was required to be paid.

If a person comes to the common meal while being in the argument with their “ἑταίρος”⁶⁷⁰, they have forbidden access until they reconcile (14,2). As seen on the example of pagan Roman sacrificial meal, also Christians who would come to the meal while in quarrel would „defile the sacrifice“. The access is forbidden until the time, when the opposed sides are able to sit together and lead a peaceful dialogue. It is important for the community of the Church. Until they are able to sit at one table without trying to forcing the community into

667 Milavec continues that it was only in the case of conflict that a person would not receive the communion in order to keep it pure and not to defile the sacrifice, for pure sacrifice can be brought only by those who are holy. "Προσομολογίσεις" appears only once in Didache. It is the confession of sins which grants one access to the Eucharist. There are also other possible explanations of what can mean the sacrifice here. Niederwimmer has proposed to understand it as the Eucharistic prayer which is brought by the Church. Niederwimmer pg. 237 In this case, it becomes defiled when guilty pronounce it.

668 Niederwimmer agrees with Milavec that the "θύσια" is not supposed to propitiate here, there are no merits of Christ that Christians would be taking on themselves. Therefore the sacrifice in view is not propitiatory, but peaceful and thankful.

669 Milavec pg. 546: "Unlike Paul and Hebrews, Didache pioneered an alternative: the act of gathering together, taking a meal and giving thanks (14,1) was the true sacrifice."

670 Friend as well as partner, not only brother/sister from Church. Also comrade, a member of the same society.

taking sides, they are not reconciled and they cause division in the fellowship. Pragmatically viewed, this defiles the common table. Therefore it is the reconciliation and confession of the failures that make this specific *θυσία* pure, in the sense of holy, „sacrificium“⁶⁷¹.

In the 14:3 the author is freely quoting pieces of two verses found the first chapter of the book of Malachia. There, the prophet is the voice of God against the people of Israel, who cheat their God in bringing inadequate sacrifices. Their sacrifices are literally evil, the word "רע" is repeated several times and so the prophet urges Israel to ask for mercy. In the verse Mal 1,10 he even says it would have been better if someone shut the door to the temple so that the sacrifices would not be brought in vain anymore. Even if the official cult stopped, the real sacrifice would not end, because the Name of the Lord is also big among the nations and He is able to provide his own worship. The sacrifices are not happening only in the Jerusalem Temple, the prophet says, in fact, in every place from the rising of the sun till the sunset the offerings are presented to His Name⁶⁷². Even “pure sacrifices” are brought to his Name by Gojim. What have the Israelites done wrong, they are asking. The answer is that they present themselves sacrificing animals in such a bad condition that they would not dare to bring such to their chiefs. The animals brought to the sacrifice are not acceptable. God requires ritually pure animals, healthy and beautiful. He wants the best, he wants holiness, special animals “set apart” for him. The people, on the other hand, bring blind lame and sick animals to save

671 In the Qumran "Manual of Discipline", just by belonging to the community, one can bring the sweet pure sacrifice, everyone outside is doomed, the holiness of the community is itself like the propitiation sacrifice.

672 Interesting part about this is, that the Gojim are bringing sacrifices to the Name. Is he talking about the Proselytes? Do the Gojim in bringing their own sacrifice celebrate the Name even without acknowledging it? Or is the prophet talking about the eschatological time?

money and thus they defile their sacrifice. God is making fun of their sacrifices. It would therefore be better to stop with the sacrifices than to suffer such a defilement and despise from the worshipers.

Let us have a look how the Didachist has quoted the text:

LXX Mal 1,11	Didache 14,3a
εν παντι τοπω	Ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ
	καὶ χρόνῳ
θυμιαμα προσαγεται	προσφέρειν μοι
τω ονοματι μου	
και θυσία καθαρα	θυσίαν καθαρὰν
Mal 1,14b	
διоти βασιλευς	ὅτι βασιλεὺς
μεγας εγω ειμι	μέγας εἰμί,
λεγει κύριος	λέγει κύριος
παντοκρατωρ	
και το ονομα μου	καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου
επιφανης	θαυμαστὸν
εν τοις εθνεσιν	ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι.

Summary: In the fourteenth chapter of Didache, all the occurrences of the word "καθαρός" appear; altogether three times always in collocation "θύσῖα καθαρὰ", the language of the Old testament is used on the new reality of the Holy Communion of the Church rather than on the body of Christ. If pure, it is sharing meal in joy and after confession, if defiled, eating while full of quarrels.

Chapter 10: The Epistle of Barnabas

10.1 Holiness

There are fourteen occurrences of the word “ἅγιος” in the Epistle of Barnabas. Four of them in the form of adjective, two of substantive, six as a verb. Compared to the previously referred writings, the epistle has no case of the collocation “πνεῦμα ἅγιον” at all.

10.1.1 Holy temple

The first case of “ἅγιος”, is in the second half of the chapter 6; in verses 15 and 16 the term appears twice. The chapter is full of metaphorical motifs of habitation, renewal, stone, heart, meat and the motif of land.

Verse **6,15** summarizes the previous discourse: “*ναός γάρ ἅγιος, ἀδελφοί μου, τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ κατοικητήριον ἡμῶν τῆς καρδίας*”. The chorus of all the previous writings is repeated here as well. The temple is holy. Here, the new life of the metaphor are the hearts of believers. The motif of dwelling first appears in the verse 8, where the order to enter the promised land is repeated from the Old Testament and used metaphorically. Verse 14 then says that the Christians are recreated. Hearts of God's people are not made of stone any more. Because this change happened to them, God decided to transfer his dwelling place there.

His people have now hearts of meat, which are the suitable temple for the Lord. Such temple is holy because God makes it such. The hearts of believers are not “old” any more, as of those who are against him and his chosen. They

had been renewed⁶⁷³. It is exactly for this renewal, that these hearts are now good enough for God himself to dwell. The renewal has turned them into sacred space suitable for the Lord to dwell. Heart is the inner space of the people, their inner man is now turned to the host of God⁶⁷⁴.

10.1.2 The Holy Ones

In **6,16**, the Church as the group of the holy ones appears again: "λέγει γὰρ κύριος πάλιν· Καὶ ἐν τίνι ὀφθήσομαι τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ μου καὶ δοξασθήσομαι; λέγει· Ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀδελφῶν μου, καὶ ψαλῶ σοι ἀνάμεισον ἐκκλησίας ἁγίων. οὐκοῦν ἡμεῖς ἐσμέν, οὓς εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἀγαθὴν." The verse contains a mixed quote⁶⁷⁵, which consists of two parallelisms. The first one is: "to confess him" and "to sing about/to him". The second parallelism is of more interest to us, it is the pair "Church of the brothers"//"Church of the holy ones". Again, the holy ones, or "the saints" are paralleled with "brothers", but both of these members collocate with the explanatory "Church". This is yet another verse describing Church in general as the group of those who are "saints" a priori just for the sake of belonging to the group of the chosen ones, who had been inaugurated by the baptism.

673 The motif of heart, if we also include the synonym *ψυχή*, is used twice. The hearts of those who got together against God and his Son, their soul- is old and will be eaten by moth, whereas the Christians have soul like that of children, because he had renewed them, as it is written in the Scriptures that he had changed the hearts of stone for those of flesh, he did it so that he would abide in them, since they are the temple.

674 Consider the terminology of Lk-Ac, which speaks about filling with the Holy Spirit. The newborn Christians, purified by faith, are indwelled by God's Spirit.

675 According to F. R. Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999., Psalm 41 (42),3 but rather Psalm 22,23 seems to be fitting. It is not a direct quote, rather an allusion.

10.1.3 Holy Age

Next occurrence is in 10,11d: the adjective “ἅγιος” here collocates with “αἰών”. “Holy“ is the coming age. It is the eschatological Sabbath, discussed further in this epistle (ch 15⁶⁷⁶), time of the final rest for all the holy ones in the presence of the ultimate Holy One. Context of the present case is a large discourse⁶⁷⁷ on metaphorical explanation of the food laws of Leviticus. The categories of impure and pure animals, says Barnabas, were given from the very beginning not in order to abstain from this food, but in order to understand the deeper message under the visible commandments.

The chapter ten of the epistle of Barnabas brings up the Levitical prohibition of eating pigs, some birds⁶⁷⁸, some sea-food⁶⁷⁹, hares and hyenas. Barnabas holds against the Jews that they had understood the food-laws literally as a ban to eat these animals, while the true meaning is rather allegorical⁶⁸⁰, it is hidden in the natural behavior of the forbidden animals. Pig, the ungrateful boarder; hunting bird, the life-stealer and fish living impiously in the darkness; hare, symbol of lust and hyena as a adulterer for "changing its sex". Barnabas argues that the king David, warning in Psalms not to join the evil-doers, had met the true point of the diet-laws. The texts of Psalms is according to him the hermen-

676 Viz my article in SaT 24 (2014/1): „Eschatologický sabbat v Žd 3,7–4,11 a Bar 15“ pg. 56 – 81.

677 Chapter 10 considers the food-laws of Torah. Barnabas locates them as Duteronomic. Nonetheless, they are to be found in Leviticus 11. „God has spoken through Moses“, yet later Barnabas says that David has added to them when he interprets them through the Psalm.

678 Eagle, hawk and crow.

679 Lamprey, polypus, cuttle-fish.

680 viz monography by J. N. Rhodes: Diet as Morality. In his commentary on Barnaba (pg. 96) he offers an explanation for why Barnaba has located the food-laws in Deuteronomy saying that: "Deuteronomy closely associates the notion of obedience of the commands with a fundamental disposition of loyalty, expressed in loving and fearing the Lord".

eutic key to the true understanding of the above-mentioned commandments, since they were never to be understood literally but spiritually.

After having forbidden three types of animals and explained them in light of Psalm 1,1, now Barnabas turns to the positive command, “what to eat”. But again, the original intention was not to eat, but to imitate and to understand the archetypal hidden meaning. The image of the animals with cloven hoof that chew the cud is explained here in terms of moral behavior (**10,11**):

"πάλιν λέγει Μωϋσῆς· Φάγεσθε πᾶν διχηλοῦν καὶ μαρυκώμενον. τί λέγει; ὅτι τὴν τροφήν λαμβάνων οἶδεν τὸν τρέφοντα αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἀναπαθόμενος εὐφραίνεισθαι δοκεῖ. καλῶς εἶπεν βλέπων τὴν ἐντολήν. τί οὖν λέγει; κολλᾶσθε μετὰ τῶν φοβουμένων τὸν κύριον, μετὰ τῶν μελετώντων ὃ ἔλαβον διάσταλμα ῥήματος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, μετὰ τῶν λαλούντων τὰ διδαιώματα κυρίου καὶ τηρούντων, μετὰ τῶν εἰδόντων, ὅτι ἡ μελέτη ἐστὶν ἔργον εὐφροσύνης, καὶ ἀναμαρυκωμένων τὸν λόγον κυρίου. τί δὲ τὸ διχηλοῦν; ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ περιπατεῖ καὶ τὸν ἅγιον αἰῶνα ἐκδέχεται. βλέπετε, πῶς ἐνομοθέτησεν Μωϋσῆς καλῶς."

After closing discourse on the negative examples⁶⁸¹, Barnabas goes on to speaking about the positive command of Moses to eat cloven-footed animals that chew the cud. These animals remember those who feed them and appreci-

681 So that "not walking in the counsel of ungodly" is the explanation of ban on the sea-food, because the deep-water fish live in the darkness. The basis for not eating the pork was, in fact, that the pig, while hungry, is attached to the food-giver. Once sate, however, it forgets who had fed it. Also hunting-birds should not be eaten, because they come all of the sudden on the happily living animal who had not done anything bad and steals its life from it. If so, one should not eat them because they take on their quality (viz totemism): It would seem more logical to eat them, so that the unlawfulness they are supposed to symbolize by their own existence per se would diminish with their number in the nature.

ate them. Therefore, the readers should cleave⁶⁸² to those who are set as an example.

The clean desired and praised behaviour is mediated by the biological features of the clean animals, who *chew the cud* and *have cloven hoof*. First, these animals are *grateful*. Second, the chewing of the cud is the symbol of *meditation*. God's commandments are to be "chewed on", they should be spoken about, practised in gladness, lived every day. Third, the cloven hoof is symbol of standing in two points at once. This does not mean "to be divided", since in the age of the Apostolic Fathers the call to "ἀπλότης", singleness of mind, was very important. The two points with which such animal's hoofs touch the floor are supposed to be *the two aeons*. With one part of their hoofs the saints live in this age, but with the other they already live in the coming age. They are still here, but with one half of their hoof they are already living the eschatology. They are the saints of the holy aeon, those who belong in the future, but are still kept here, with one half of their hoof. The adjective ἅγιος is used here to describe parallel dimension of holiness to the existent reality we live in⁶⁸³, or, to be more precise, the parallel reality which we expect to appear in⁶⁸⁴.

682 The same imperative is found in 1. Clem 46,2 - "*cleave to the holy ones*", even here, the readers should do so. The ἅγιος is only exchanged for the triple synonymous clause. Each member consists of two parts: meditating - speaking - knowing, further enriched by keeping the commandments in heart - observing Lord's ordinances - meditating the word of the Lord in the work of happiness.

683 Prostmeier adds (pg.435): "Leben und Glauben in den Strukturen und Vorgaben der Welt sowie Hoffnung auf eine Künftige Heilszeit. Dabei ist die Relation so zu denken, daß diese Hoffnung lebensprägend ist und die Grenzen der Weltlichkeit sprengt."

684 Hoole translates "expects the holy life", Lightfoot "looks for the holy world to come", Prostmeier: "Das der Gerechte zwar in dieser Welt wandelt, aber den Heiligen Äon erwartet"; Barcellona: "...il giusto cammina in questo mondo e contemporaneamente attende il santo eone."

10.1.4 The Holy Mount Sion

The next case of the adjective “ἅγιος” is in **11,3** it describes a holy place set apart for God, the holy mount Sion: "Μὴ πέτρα ἔρημὸς ἐστὶν τὸ ὄρος τοῦ ἁγίου μου Σινᾶ; ἔσεσθε γὰρ ὡς πετεινοῦ⁶⁸⁵ νοσσιᾶς ἀφηρημένοι." The whole chapter eleven consists of a catena of quotations from the Old Testament on the images of water⁶⁸⁶ and the cross.

In the second verse, Barnabas quotes from memory Jeremiah 2,12n⁶⁸⁷ and the 11,3 quotes Isaiah 16,1b⁶⁸⁸ and 2a⁶⁸⁹, both quotations correspond to the LXX⁶⁹⁰. He has taken liberty, however, to exchange the original mount *Sinai* for the mount *Zion*. Why would he do that⁶⁹¹? James N. Rhodes suggests following explanation: "It is not unthinkable that Barnabas intends to play on words between "Σινᾶ" and "Σιών". "It is not my holy mountain Sinai that is des-

685 cf. LXX Isa 16, 1b-2a: “ἀποστελῶ ὡς ἐρπετὰ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἢ πέτρα ἔρημὸς ἐστὶν τὸ ὄρος σίων ἔση γὰρ ὡς πετεινοῦ ἀνιπταμένου νεοσσὸς ἀφηρημένος θύγατερ μωαβ ἔπειτα δὲ ἀρνῶν “

686 Even though in the original text the opposition is running/fresh/living water against steady dirty water or rather no water at all, Barnabas, quoting from memory, uses freely the Scripture to make his point of two kinds of water: living water and dead water.

687 Barnabas obviously quotes from memory. He keeps in line with the original text, uses the same words in different syntax. In this verse the LXX follows the Hebrew text closely. „ἐξέστη ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐπὶ τούτῳ καὶ ἔφριξεν ἐπὶ πλεῖον σφόδρα λέγει κύριος ὅτι δύο πονηρὰ ἐποίησεν ὁ λαὸς μου ἐμὲ ἐγκατέλιπον πηγὴν ὕδατος ζωῆς καὶ ὠρυξαν ἑαυτοῖς λάκκους συντετριμμένους οἳ οὐ δυνήσονται ὑδωρσυνέχειν“ Yes, the Jeremiah text clearly speaks about water but in this reference, it does not.

688 Moab is challenged to send a lamb to the king of the land from Sela. They should send the lamb by the desert up till the mountain of the daughter of Sion. So the mountain Sion is the destination, however, Barnaba speaks about the holy mount Sion.

689 Even if Moab will do what is asked from him, i.e. show hospitality towards the escaping people of the tribe Judah, this will not be sufficient to expiate their guilt for their pride. Moab daughters will be like birds scared out of their nest.

690 Prostmeier points out that: "*Jer 2,13 und Jes 16,1b sind auch bei Iust. dial. 114,5 als freies Zitat verbunden*" pg. 451

691 Prostmeier says that in connection the quote of Jeremiah carries a ring of God's judgement over Israel by disowning his own people. The exchange of Sion for Sinai he explains by help of another Old Testament text, "το ἅγιον μου Σινᾶ" for "θυγατρος Σιών" of the Psalm 68,18:

olate rock, is it?" Such a reading would be pregnant with irony: God's holy mountain is not Zion, it is Sinai; not even Sinai in the desert is desolate when compared with Mount Zion⁶⁹²" The holy mountain Zion, where the commandments were given to Moses, should be the place of source of water of life. But there is no life in the Jewish old ways for Barnabas. It is still holy, but no life goes forth from here. There is no water in law, it is dry and desolate. The Church are like little birds who can not live in a desert place, they need water and therefore also their nest is not in the desolate place of law any more. Their new nest is placed where the water gushes, the cross.

9.1.5 Holy People

In 14,6, the adjective is used in to describe holy people: "γέτραπται γάρ⁶⁹³, πῶς αὐτῷ ὁ πατήρ ἐντέλλεται, λυτρωσάμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ σκότους ἐτοιμάσαι ἐαντῷ λαὸν ἅγιον". The context of the whole chapter 14 is the topic of covenant. Again, in the way of Barnabas' thinking the "covenant people" proper, the Israel, actually could not live up to the covenant. They tried to fulfill it, but they were focused on the law more than God. Therefore Jesus appeared, so that those who

692 James N. Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition; Polemics, Paraenesis and the Legacy of the Golden Calf Incident*, Tübingen, 2004 page 62; For further reading, he then recommends Kraft: "Barnabas' Isaiah Text" 347

693 Even though the verse begins with the typical quoting introductory formula "γέτραπται γάρ", it has not been possible to specifically locate the reference. Rhodes in the page 62 suggests directly "a series of three proof texts from Isa (42,6n; 49,6b-7a; 61,1) in forms that correspond closely, if not perfectly, to the LXX." He continues saying that "These proofs are held together by a cluster of related images: light, darkness, blindness, restoration of sight, captivity, liberation...These texts enable Barnabas to argue that the Lord Jesus is the light of Gentiles, and, by implication, that the Gentiles are God's people (14,6). Jesus does not merely establish the covenant in the author and his audience (14,5), in a manner of speaking. Jesus is the covenant for God's people." Prostmeier thinks, that it possibly might be Isaiah 62,12. He also turns the readers attention of parallel texts in the New Testament. Luke 1,17; 1 Pt 2,9a.

were not worthy of the true ultimate covenant would be perfected in their sin. Those, on the other hand, who would accept the new covenant, brought about by Jesus, are now new "holy nation" of God, who sent Jesus to redeem the hearts of those, who had been in the possession of death in the darkness.

"Holy ones" appear again in the **19,10**: "μνησθήσῃ ἡμέραν κρίσεως νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, καὶ ἐκζητήσεις καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων, ἢ διὰ λόγου κοπιῶν καὶ πορευόμενος εἰς λύτρωσιν ἁμαρτιῶν σου." The expression "τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων" is missing in several manuscripts⁶⁹⁴, therefore both Prostmeier and Barcellona have decided for the alternative translation⁶⁹⁵. The same phrase appears in Didache 4,2. In both cases the context is the Two Way discourse, more specifically the discourse on the Way of Life, as we have also seen in the previous chapter.

10.1.6 To Sanctify, “ἀγιάζειν”

The verb "to sanctify" is used only in the chapter 15 in the epistle of Barnabas, speaking about *the sanctification of the Sabbath day*. It occurs eight times there in the verses 1,3, 6 and 7. Also all the cases of “καθαρός” appear in this chapter. In the verse one, the topic of the chapter is introduced (**15,1**): "Ἐπι οὖν καὶ περὶ τοῦ σαββάτου γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς δέκα λόγοις, ἐν οἷς ἐλάλησεν ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινᾶ

694 For detailed information viz Prostmeier pg. 551

695 Prostmeier: "Du sollst Nacht und Tag des Gerichtstages gedenken und täglich nachforschen, indem du dich entweder des Wortes mühest und gehst, um zu ermahnen und Sorge trägst, jemanden (durchs) Wort zu retten, der du mögest durch deine Hände arbeiten zum Lösegeld deiner Sünden" Barcellona: "Notte e di ti ricorderai del giorno del giudizio; ogni giorno chercherai di affaticarti con la parola andando ad esortare e preoccupandoti di salvare l'anima con la parola, oppure di lavorare con le tue mani per redimere i tuoi peccati"

πρὸς Μωϋσῆν κατὰ πρόσωπον· Καὶ ἀγιάσατε τὸ σάββατον κυρίου χερσὶν καθαραῖς καὶ καρδίᾳ καθαρᾷ."

Barnabas claims to be quoting Decalogue, however, the text he offers is a combined saying mixed of two quite different sources⁶⁹⁶. First part quotes some parts of Jeremiah 17, 22-25⁶⁹⁷ and the second part of the verse quotes beginning of the Psa 24,4. In this compiled verse, two of the words of our interest are united: holy and pure. The way Barnabas, or his source⁶⁹⁸, unites the two different texts, is in accord with the theology of the prophets, who put together holiness and purity, not the ritual, but the moral one.

The pure hands and pure heart do not appear in the given pair nowhere in the Old Testament. Pure heart is a very common collocation in both of the parts of the Bible. Pure hands are required for right cultic worship, the motive recurs often. Hands would be the ritualistic part, heart would be the moral part of life in purity. Perfect purity, holistic preparation for the celebration is required, body and mind, hands and heart, all the person is to be ready to join in the required celebration of the Sabbath.

Again, in the third verse another quote is presented **(15,3)**: "τὸ σάββατον λέγει ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς κτίσεως· Καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἑξ ἡμέραις τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνετέλεσεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ καὶ κατέπαυσεν ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτήν". This time the quote actually does come directly from Decalogue as claimed for the first verse, it is to be found in Genesis 2,2. Barnabas quotes literally certain selection of the two verses with a slight change, the day in which God has ceased

696 The verse also very much relies on Ex 31, 12-17.

697 ἀγιάσατε τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων καθὼς ἐνετείλαμην τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν καὶ οὐκ ἔκλιναν τὸ οὖς αὐτῶν. It is the only imperative of the word

698 Barcellona speaks about a collection of Scriptures unknown to us.

his work. According to the Gen 2,2, this happened on the sixth day and then, on the following day, He had a rest. According to Barnabas, He has stopped and had a rest in the seventh day⁶⁹⁹. It is only formal change as the message is the same in both cases. Both texts say that God has ceased working, that he took a rest and that he also sanctified the seventh day for this reason. Genesis also adds that God, besides hallowing it, also blessed it. In this verse, the hands appear again, it speaks about the hands of God. It is God, who sanctifies the Sabbath. After short intermezzo, explaining that with God one day is like thousands, and speaking on other parts of the text, the term "sanctify" reappears again in the verses 6 and 7. These two verses are Barnabas' interpretations on how to understand the sanctification of the Sabbath.

In the **verse 6**, the shorter version of the quote known from the verse one appears. Having spoken of some other aspects, Barnabas is now going to explain how to sanctify Sabbath with pure hands and heart. And he is asking: "Who is able to be of such a pure heart in order to sanctify it." God has himself sanctify it, who else can? Who has the pure heart? The answer lies in the eschaton according to the verse 7." For the complexity of the verses let us make the graphic analysis⁷⁰⁰:

πέρας γέ τοι λέγει·

"Αγιάσεις αὐτήν

699 More on the eschatological mathematics and parallel with the concept of the eschatological Sabbath in Hebrews in my article on Eschatological Sabbath in Heb 3,7 – 4,11 and Bar 15, SAT 24 (2014/1).

700 Watch colours that signal doublets, also the vertical division is important, as well as occurrences of pure are signaled by the italics font and underlining

χερσὶν καθαραῖς καὶ καρδίᾳ καθαρά.⁷⁰¹ "
 εἰ οὖν ἦν ὁ θεὸς ἡμέραν ἡγίασεν⁷⁰²
 νῦν τις δύναται ἁγιάσαι⁷⁰³
 καθαρὸς ὢν τῇ καρδίᾳ⁷⁰⁴,
 ἐν πᾶσιν πεπλανήμεθα⁷⁰⁵.

ἴδε ὅτι ἄρα τότε καλῶς καταπαυόμενοι

ἁγιάσομεν αὐτήν⁷⁰⁶,

ὅτε δυνησόμεθα⁷⁰⁷

αὐτοὶ δικαιωθέντες

καὶ ἀπολαβόντες τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν,

μηκέτι οὔσης τῆς ἀνομίας⁷⁰⁸,

-
- 701 The proposal of the explanation in the following text, shortened version of 15,1. Note that in the one same verse holy appears beside pure, even more, that the purity here still *is* the condition for sanctification, like it was in the Old Testament.
- 702 The ultimate "person" able to sanctify the day of the rest is the Lord, who established it when He himself sanctify it.
- 703 Is anybody else able to sanctify it then? The same way God consecrates it? The implicit answer is: Not.
- 704 Because: What person is ultimately pure in their hands and heart? God was able to hallow Sabbath, but how about people, who are not so pure? Who is pure? The implicit answer is: None. In this case it is only spoken about the clean heart, not hands anymore. Maybe because it is in the realm of possibility to keep one's hands clean ritually as well as morally, but it is impossible to keep one's heart clean.
- 705 If therefore none is pure and thus does not stand up to the basic requirement for sanctifying it, something is wrong. Therefore the understanding up to the day of Barnabas had been mistaken. It is a passive form, as well as those following ones of being justified and sanctified. The agens here is disputable in the latter ones, obviously, it is God.
- 706 There is no possibility of sanctifying it now, but in the future, "then", it will be possible. In the following part the particle "then" appears three times. The possibility of sanctifying Sabbath therefore lies in the future. Even more, in the verse 8, Barnabas will say that since no one is now able to sanctify it, it would be better to stop with whatever attempt to do so. The polemic with the Jewish establishment is obvious.
- 707 The readers will be able to sanctify it only then when they will have been enabled to it. The enabling phrase in divine passive and the location in future, repeats twice. The first time, it is explained further in detail what does it involve. The enabling lies in being justified. Beside is then the ability to take on the promises. The third member corresponds to the first one. Being justified, the readers have lost the "ousia" of the unlawful.

καινῶν δὲ γεγονότων πάντων⁷⁰⁹
ὑπὸ κυρίου⁷¹⁰.

τότε δυνησόμεθα

αὐτὴν ἀγιάσαι⁷¹¹,

αὐτοὶ ἀγιασθέντες πρῶτον.

The sanctification in these two verses is fully dependent on God, who gives it by changing the *ουσια* of his believers. By their own efforts, the people should not even attempt to sanctify the Sabbath, since they lack the basic requirement, purity of hands and hearts. Only God can enable one to sanctify Sabbath the right way, by justifying them and recreating them, *thus* sanctifying *them*. It is therefore clear that, according to Barnabas, people are not able to sanctify themselves, for this they are dependent on the action of God.

Summary: Also author of this epistle understands the notion of holiness in line with that of the New Testament. It is rather pointed against the Jewish interpretation of the Old Testament, claiming for itself the only true understanding of God's precepts. Again, Church is holy, they are the holy temple and they are being recreated and getting ready in order to be able to be perfect in sight of

708 Being justified the readers will have been changed in their essence. They will no longer have been unlawful i.e. impure, but they will belong to the new world recreated by the Lord.

709 These happenings are placed far in eschaton

710 Agens of all the passive forms is the Lord.

711 When all these are fulfilled there will be open door for the actual sanctification of the Sabbath. Not now and not by the people. The Lord will enable the readers to sanctify it by being transformed and trans-located from the old world to the new, having been made into God's likeness, having been sanctified first. Then the readers, as expected, will have not only pure hands, but pure hearts as well.

God at the day of the eschatological Sabbath. No other words describing directly holiness appear in Barnabas' Epistle⁷¹².

10.2 Purity

Except for the above mentioned occurrences of the adjective "καθαρός" in the 15th chapter, there are also the derivatives of the adjective "ἄγνός", i.e.: one adverb, two verbs and one substantive, unique to the Apostolic Fathers. For precision, we will also mention the two occurrences of "ἀκάθαρτος" and "ἀκαθαρσία".

10.2.1 Pure, "ἄγνός"

The root is unusually common in the epistle, it appears in the form of an adverb, verb and even a noun.

10.2.1.1 The Adverb

The first case is in **2,3**, where the adverb appears: "τούτων οὖν μερόντων τὰ πρὸς κύριον ἄγνῶς συνευφραίνονται αὐτοῖς σοφία, σύνεσις, ἐπιστήμη, γνῶσις." This text is reminiscent of a list of virtues, abstract maxims are cumulated in just three verses. The introduction to the part of this text is in the verse 2,1 where Barnabas is warning that the days are evil and therefore the believers should seek out the ordinances of the law. What follows is a list of the "helpers" of

712 With the exception of hapax legomenon of the verse 16,2 where the term *αφιερειν* appears. The word is on the verge of both meanings - pure/holy. We shall refer to it in the following section.

faith: fear (φόβος), long-suffering (ύπομονή), patience (μακροθυμία) and continence (έγκράτεια)⁷¹³. Faith is the highest requirement of believers, not the above mentioned, the virtues are only helpers to it. They are not even the fruit of the faith, they are its companions. These, it is said in the following verse, "remain pure in things relating to the Lord" according to Hoole and "abide in a pure spirit in matters relating to the Lord" according to Lightfoot⁷¹⁴.

These, above mentioned, then rejoice together with the set of four another "virtues" which have in common wisdom. All four are some type of understanding/knowledge according to the Greek philosophy (σοφία, σύνεσις, έπιστήμη, γνώσις), the sum of which should contain the full understanding. There is no understanding apart from these. The same group reappears at the end of the epistle in the verse 21,5 also in the vicinity of the expression δικαιωματα, which occur in the verse itself as well as in the introduction to the whole part in 21,1 and in the introduction to the chapter two.

The two groups of the "virtues", merry together, help to faith and they literally "stay purely for the Lord (μενόντων τὰ πρὸς κύριον άγνώς)" In what sense? Does the author want to say that the φόβος, ύπομονή, μακροθυμία and έγκράτεια are the new qualities of purity? Or are then helping people in reaching they purity? In this verse, they are closely connected with the Lord, they are not apart from him, they are *for* him. But it can hardly be argued that they would be some prerequisites, they are rather helping features in one's walk with God. This can be especially seen further in 5,1 where the author uses passive, saying that we have been purified. The purity here has does not its usual sexual notion as we have seen in the New Testament, it is purity of conduct.

713 The same list of knowledge-nouns appears at the end of the epistle verse 21,5.

714 Prostmeier: "Bleiben diese in Bezug auf den Herrn rein".

10.1.2.1 The Verb “ἀγνίζειν”

In the epistle of Barnabas the verb "ἀγνίζειν" appears twice: 5,1 and 8,1. Both cases designate *purification of sins*. The first is explicitly in the passive voice: **5,1**: "Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ υπέμεινεν ὁ κύριος παραδοῦναι τὴν σάρκα εἰς καταφθοράν, ἵνα τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἀγνισθῶμεν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ." Hoole translates directly "sanctified", whereas Lightfoot uses more precisely "cleansed". The recipients, readers of the letter together with the writer, the "us", are the passive object recipient of the act of purification of the agent - Lord. The purification of the sins is the reason and cause of the Lord's suffering. Because of this, He was given in the flesh (he was incarnated⁷¹⁵) for destruction/annihilation. The sins are dealt with in the ritually symbolical language, again, Jesus' death is explained sacrificially. They are not told to be forgiven, as would be expected morally speaking, but the people stained by the sin are ritually purified⁷¹⁶. Analogy to the blood-sprinkling used in many rituals of the Old Testament as the purificatory means is made here⁷¹⁷.

In the similar cases in the New Testament, the more usual expression is “καθαρός”. Barnabas is here reminiscent of the Hebrew 9, where the perfect sacrifice of Christ is explained, there also he is said to have been “given flesh for destruction”. This is yet another analogy between these two epistles, as is the case also in the following occurrence.

715 Barcellona (pg. 134) points out that in the Barn 5, 1-12a the problematic of the incarnation and passion is characteristic

716 Such as in the Old Testament also the sin rendered one impure in need of purification and vice versa, one impure had to bring sacrifice for sin.

717 Prostmeier draws connection to the baptism, in which the recipients are unified with the suffering Christ in his passion given for their purification. He also draws from the more common case of forgiveness of sins often used in the New Testament in connection with baptism (Mk1,4; Lk 3,3).

The second case of the verb is in the verse **8,1**:

"Τίνα δὲ δοκεῖτε τύπον εἶναι, ὅτι ἐντέταλται τῷ Ἰσραὴλ προσφέρειν δάμαλιν τοὺς ἄνδρας, ἐν οἷς εἰσὶν ἁμαρτίαι τέλειαι, καὶ σφάξαντας κατακαίειν, καὶ αἶρειν τότε τὴν σποδὸν παιδία καὶ βάλλειν εἰς ἄγγη καὶ περιτιθέναι τὸ ἔριον τὸ κόκκινον ἐπὶ ξύλον (ἴδε πάλιν ὁ τύπος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ τὸ ἔριον τὸ κόκκινον) καὶ τὸ ὕσσωπον, καὶ οὕτως ῥαντίζειν τὰ παιδία καθ' ἓνα τὸν λαόν, ἵνα ἀγνίζωνται ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν;"

This verse is a question given to the readers. Barnabas presents them with the ritual of red heifer. When the time became ripe, the sinners killed a red cow and burnt it. The ashes were then taken by children who threw them into a bowl. They also put red wool around on the piece of wood and by hyssop the children sprinkled everyone. Could this possibly purify the people from their sins?

The expected answer is: "No." The argumentation is parallel to that of the epistle to Hebrews, where it is explicitly repeated that the blood of the animals was not able to purify conscience, that it was able to purify body for a certain time, but it had no effect on the inner man, it was not able to remove sins. Also here, the author suggests the same train of thought.

It is impossible that this complicated ritual would possess the ability of purification, Barnabas says. The true purification has only been made possible by the gift of the blood-sprinkling of the Messiah himself in place of the animals. When the sins reach the top of the bowl of anger, when humanity is perfected in their sins, also when they accomplish/finish them⁷¹⁸, when the time is ripe, the universal ritual of the red heifer at the universal feast of Jom Kippur take

718 Or, as Hoole translates, - in whom the sin had been accomplished - in sense who had finished and done or finished a sin Who have been perfected in sins parallel to Hebrews, where Jesus was perfected as well. Perfection as reaching of the telos.

place. Here we see again analogy to the epistle to Hebrews which also speaks about the cosmic Jom Kippur⁷¹⁹.

10.2.1.3 The Noun “ἀγνισμός”

The following verse explains again allegorically the original ritual, the sacrificed red heifer is a symbol of Jesus and the men bringing it - the sinners. **8,3**:

"οἱ ῥαντίζοντες παῖδες οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ἡμῖν τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τὸν ἀνισμὸν τῆς καρδίας, οἷς ἔδωκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τὴν ἐξουσίαν (οὓσιν δεκάδου εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν φυλῶν ὅτι δεκάδου φυλαὶ τοῦ Ἰσραεὴλ), εἰς τὸ κηρύσσειν."

In this explanation, the epistle of Barnabas goes much further in the allegory beyond the epistle of Hebrews. It explains the allegorical meaning of the children, who are the symbol of the preachers of the good news. Two synonymous verbs characterize them: those who evangelized, who gave the Gospel. The sprinkling (5,1; 8,1; 8,3; 8,4) is the act of sharing the Gospel⁷²⁰. They have the same effect: forgiveness of sins and cleansing of heart⁷²¹. In the same way sprinkling of blood ritually prepared the people of Israel to meet with their God in purification, the sprinkling by preaching the Gospel purifies the inner man.

719 Barnabas' version of the ritual differs from the one described in Numbers 19 in the favour of the Mishnah version, which uses the ashes to purify, not the water. F. S. Barcellona notes that the water of purification is not used for purification of a person having had contact with death, as would be the case according to the biblical ritual, but for someone stained by heavy sins.(Barcellona pg. 145) Prostmeier draws our attention to the six infinitives explaining step by step the process of the ritual. The children, he says, tended to be viewed as a symbol of un sinfulness and innocence.

720 In connection with purification it appears e.g. in the psalm 51 (purify me with hyssop and I shall be clean)

721 Even if in the original ritual, according to Barnabas, the sole action was not able to effectuate these. It was just a fore-picture of the things to come.

Preaching is a gift, it comes with power. Preaching of the twelve apostles is put in parallel⁷²² with the twelve tribes of Israel⁷²³, they are the founding fathers of the new Israel.

10.2.2 Purity Words, “καθαρός” and “ἀκάθαρτος”

There are also two negative expressions in **10,8** impure are the women similar to hyena, who sin with their mouth⁷²⁴ and **19,4** in the Two-Ways teaching, surprisingly forbids to speak God's word among the impure persons⁷²⁵.

“Αγαπήσεις τόν σε ποιήσαντα φοβηθήση τόν σε πλάσαντα δοξάσεις τόν σε λυτρωσάμενον ἐκ θανάτου Ἔση ἀπλοῦς τῆ καρδία καί πλούσιος τῷ πνεύματι Οὐ κολληθήση μετὰ τῶν πορευομένων ἐν ὁδῷ θανάτου Μισήσεις πᾶν ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀρεστόν τῷ θεῷ Μισήσεις πᾶσαν ὑπόκρισιν Οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπης ἐντολὰς κυρίου”

God's word is now sacred as well as purifying material, it is “holy”. We are reminded of the repeated order not to give holy to the dogs. How does this comply with the message of the Gospel, which is to be preached to all? The author does not ask this question. My suggestion for an answer is to be sought in the context and the genre.

722 This thought appears also in the synoptic Gospels e.g. Mt 19,28.

723 Considering the symbolic numbers, also the boys sprinkling people are three in order to symbolize Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

724 In the verse the stem appears twice: “ἀνομίαν ποιῶντας ἐν τῷ στόματι δι’ ἀκαθαρσίαν οὐδὲ κολληθήση ταῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ταῖς τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιούσαις ἐν τῷ στόματι”

725 As if they did not deserve to hear it. It is not explained who is meant. From the context, which may be tricky here, because it may be just a list of ordinances, we might assume they are adulterers, prostitutes, those who corrupt boys etc. Barcellona points to the verse already spoken about in Didache, the saying of Mat 7,6 - not to give the holy to dogs.

Since this text is inside a Two-Ways tractate, then we are basically dealing with a list of virtues and vices. It is the similar notion of that found in the wisdom literature in the Old Testament, where all the ethical maxims are set. It is therefore possible that the author⁷²⁶ put the saying about the prohibition of desecrating “holy” into such a wisdom literature in order to raise the value of the Gospel, showing how holy it is. On the other hand, by such a move he damaged the original message of Jesus, whose main intention was to come for the broken people and accept them despite their failings.

When quoted by Jesus, the saying was set in a completely different context. It is true that his preaching was limited to Israel and he did not wish the desecration, however, they are two different things. The resurrected Christ then sent his Church to preach the Gospel to all. How come that there is now limit to the Gospel? The author probably tried to make Gospel into the new “temple”, into a purity and holiness itself which needs protecting from any desecration, but on the way he forgot the power of holiness reversing unworthy into pure.

To mention all the cases of the words connected to holiness and grasp the semantic field of “ἅγιος”, the expression “ἀφιερώω” in the verse 16,2 should be mentioned. It means “to purify” and thus to consecrate, the word combines both notions together.

Summary: In the epistle of Barnabas we have seen many features already encountered earlier. He is the first author who clearly draws a line and explains the difference between Judaism and Christianity. He explains why Christians do not go on in keeping the ritual laws. Each of the main rituals is mentioned

726 In Didache, the saying does not appear within the tractate

here and explained allegorically and very politically incorrectly towards the Jews as the mother group carrying the tradition. In the eyes of the author, the only credit given to Jews is that they preserved in carrying on the law, but he says that they did not understand it.

Unlike himself. Barnabas, boldly, explains main themes of the Jewish heritage within the new context of Christianity. There are several notions parallel to the epistle of Hebrews, but Barnabas takes them a step further. The Sabbath as such is moved to the eschaton, together with sanctification of the people. However their sanctification has already happened and keeps happening for the new people of God, for they are the “holy ones”. Jom Kippur is understood universally and perpetually as the day of the atonement achieved through Jesus, sacrificed like a red heifer when the time of sin was ripe. New purity enabled through the sacrifice is achieved through faith and accepted passively as a gift. Preaching of the Gospel purifies the lives of believers.

The semantic field of holiness is almost the same as we have seen it throughout the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers. The original Old Testament prerequisite of purity for holiness and the connection of these two stays. But it is explained metaphorically. This is the main shift of the semantic field. What is different in this epistle in respect to the rest of the writings we have encountered, is that the adjective *ἁγνός* is not interpreted in line of sexual purity, but rather spiritualized ritual purity.

Conclusion

Development of the Semantic Field

We have seen that the semantic field has shifted on many levels and therefore we can speak about development. As suggested in the Introduction, it is not development into better grasp of holiness. It is rather a change growing from the need of adjustment after the teaching of Jesus and his death on the cross, a constitutive moment for the Christian Church. The literal meaning of the language of holiness connected with the cult, mostly described in Leviticus, is abandoned. The classification stays the same but the words get a new meaning. This, however, is not the same for all the authors of the new Church. Some authors tend to move the ritual features to spiritualized understanding, others press the ethical side. All of them move *from the outside to the inside*. We can therefore speak about internalization. Consistent is also the change in the direction of flow of the holiness and impurity, which stay the extremes of the semantic field. The impurity does not threaten the holy anymore, especially if they are person; the other way round, the holy is stronger, it can defend itself and floods what is unworthy and thus restores, heals, purifies and sanctifies it: that I called “the reverse flow of holiness”. Quite soon, however, as we have seen, some groups started to guard of their new holy rituals from the defilement of the outside world.

New Testament

Matthew

The semantic field of holiness in the Gospel of Matthew is not changed from the Old Testament as far as the choice of the words goes. Nonetheless, their

meaning has shifted and Jesus seems to be responsible for this. The words used are still ranging from “holy” to “impure” and the transitions between them are called the same way and Jesus does keep in line with the tradition, that it is important to divide these. However, his own re-interpretation of these words by his own actions speaks volumes.

Jesus' behavior raises many questions on the part of the religious establishment. He touches lepers, eats with sinners, does not keep ritual purity laws and lets his own disciples do the same. To the outside world, he seems as a defiler. To the group of his followers his is walking sanctification and liberation, in him the Kingdom of heaven has come. When Jesus touches the untouchables, he oversteps forbidden boundaries, but at the same time he restores them, since they are not end in itself, but their goal is love. The spirit of the Scriptures that Pharisees blindly adore, speaks about love, mercy and justice.

Human life is more important than orders and therefore unworthy people should be restored to the life of purity by his touch. At times Jesus does not need to touch the person, but he does so just to show his compassion and also to prove his point, which I called the “reverse flow of holiness”. Touch is not defiling, what is defiling is unredeemed heart. From inside of the heart come evils. People should not be afraid of the impurity coming to them from the outside through defiled objects or even people, that which is holy does not need guarding, it is strong. In fact, it is stronger than the impurity. Therefore where the Pharisees build the fence around Torah, Jesus opens the door of the holiness wide and invites everyone in. A source of defilement, on the other hand is inside of people, who can be likened to a cup. Pharisees busy themselves just with the outside, but Jesus has come to show that they need to clean the inside first. Therefore the ritual language of holiness has shifted to the ethical sphere.

Mark

Also in the Gospel of Mark, the terms used to describe the semantic field are unchanged. This is best shown on the maxims Holy Spirit vs. impure spirits. Exactly the same way as in the previous Gospel, the “holy” is more powerful than the “impure”, therefore in the many described exorcisms the demons, attracted to Jesus' holy presence, spirits, who smash people on the floor, scare everyone and bargain with Jesus, are not able to withstand his power. They are stronger than people, they do not want to let go of their lives, but the power of the Holy Spirit is stronger and in the end, they are always compelled to leave. The impurity in this Gospel is therefore not ritual, but spiritual. There is the same discourse about washing of the cups as we have encountered in Matthew, which reverses the flow of holiness, which is not attacked anymore, but purifies and sanctifies and one can not be attacked by ritually impure objects, but needs to purify inside first. For this the Gospel adds in 7,19: “thus he purified all food”. This is not mixing of the two realms which have nothing in common: holy and impure, which is forbidden; it is the victory of the holy.

Luke

Holiness in the writings of Luke is concentrated in the Spirit of Holiness. The Spirit is a mark of the trustworthy character. People who are filled with the Holy Spirit are given boldness and speech and they stand in the beginning of something new. In the Gospel the filling is connected with the family members of Jesus and disappear after the 4th chapter. In the book of Acts the characters full or filled with the Spirit are those who spread the Gospel according to the mission plan From Jerusalem ...to the ends of the world.

Jesus is Holy and his Name, as well as the name of his Father is Holy and should be revered. If someone disregards them, they disregard the Spirit. Also the prophets and Scriptures speak in the same Spirit.

Those who belong to Jesus, who receive the baptism are expected also to receive the Spirit, which is given to them mostly by laying on of hands. Not always though. There are special moments when even the new liturgy at birth is disregarded by the Spirit itself, when it floods Gentiles before they are baptized. Purification of the inside has preference over the outward one. Since the Spirit “floods” the inside, it is described as some sort of liquid which washes the inner man.

Also in this Gospel the reverse flow of holiness is present. The impurity is overcome. Lepers are healed and mercy is to be practiced, alms are said to purify everything for the donors. No impurity can threaten the holy. Peter in the vision is ordered to kill impure animals and then to enter a Gentile house, he is pushed by God out of his comfort zone and ordered to do something that he considered defiling. However, God has shown him that there is nothing and no one defiling, therefore the Gospel can be preached to the ends of the world.

Hebrews

The epistle to Hebrews takes the original concepts associated with holiness and gives them new meaning on the story of Jesus, whose death is explained sacrificially. According to the author the world is divided between two spheres, the human one and the heavenly one. Each has its own ritual system, but the human one, the one in Israel, is just a copy of the heavenly one, which is the original. The earthly cult was imperfect, sacrifices had to be repeated, but when Jesus, the High Priest of the order of Melchizedek entered the heavenly Holy of

Holies on the heavenly Yom Kippur, the heavenly “Today” broke into this world and the Priest sacrificed himself there. When his sacrifice was accepted by God sealing his oath in raising from the dead, the earthly sacrificial system was fulfilled, broken and overcome.

Sprinkling by the blood of sacrificial animals purified ritually impure body. Sprinkling by the blood of the sacrificed High Priest Jesus purifies the conscience and heart. Facing the difficulties of life, the listeners of this preaching should keep the faith and stay in this holiness. As Jesus had to be perfected by suffering, also they must focus on the parallel dimension and stay strong till the end. The semantic field of holiness is spiritualized in this homily to give strength in face of suffering.

Paul

Holiness in the epistles of Paul is mostly connected with the community of faith as the “holy ones” or “saints”, who form the new Israel, the new holy people, holy ekklesia. Holiness is never ascribed to an individual, but is always domain of the group. Even here, holiness is never considered as a reward for good ascetic behavior, it is fully external. The Church are those who have been separated by God through Jesus and baptism, to be his special people. These have Holy Spirit living in their hearts, it has been poured there through love, and from there it sanctifies. The purification is mostly purification of heart, which is reached by faith, thus even Christians from Gentile background are attached to the new community, new family of faith and their consciences are purified. Holiness is a transcendent quality that is imparted on those who believe. It is then expected of them, that they take the holiness and use it to live ethically in this world.

Holiness in Paul also carries strong element of belonging. It is important with whom people associate. In the family where just one person is holy, the rest of the house are sanctified by their presence. But the illicit union is that with prostitute and idols. Therefore there are some purity requirements on the new people, but they are just secondary. None and nothing is impure in itself. The judgment about impurity happens in the conscience, which, when purified by faith, sanctifies everything. There are boundaries to the acceptance, when someone inside the Church walls is an unrepentant criminal, the Church should purify themselves of them.

The language of holiness abandons the ritual background and moves towards the communal and ethical environment. Holiness and impurity are the extreme opposites and holiness and purity are intertwined, but as we have seen also in other authors the movement towards sanctification and purification is dependent on God and faith in him. The ethical element is secondary.

Deutero-Pauline Epistles

The focus is here on the community, Christians form the holy new people of God, the most common expression here are “the saints”. The epistles instruct the members how to live among themselves so that they would be worthy of the calling. The Gentiles are adopted and have become worthy of the inheritance of the saints through Jesus. Ethics follows holiness in these epistles. Impurity is the old way of the Gentiles before they became Christians and such is the way of those, who stay there. It is the immoral way of life that Christians should abandon. A Gentile-Christian is not a Gentile anymore and therefore they should live accordingly. Here the impurity is antonym to the good way of life, which is not holiness itself and is connected with it only secondary.

Pastoral Epistles

On the other hand, in the Pastoral epistles the purity is very closely connected with holiness, since it is often connected with separation. If conscience is pure, then nothing can defile that person, not even things prohibited by some sectarians who want to control the level of perfection with other people, who tell them what to eat, who restrict their sexuality etc. The heart purified by faith cleans conscience and thus changes person's perspective on life and purifies everything for them. The moral purity is secondary, the focus is not even on the transfer of the ritual purity to the spiritual it is rather focus inside. In these epistles the “reverse flow of holiness” appears strongly. There are also some unusual words describing purity, but they are not connected with holiness.

Apostolic Fathers

1 Clement

The author of this epistle uses both words for holiness. ἅγιος is used for Christians. Also the Gentiles are included in the new people of God, they are the new adoptive children and compliance is expected of them. Holiness is not asceticism, but the virtuous life is expected and it is fueled by this holiness acquired by grace. Ὁσιότης collocates unusually with soul and heart and describes the holy deeds in face of God's election. Purity, rather than morally-ritual is spiritually-psychological.

Didache

The holiness in this text is mostly attached to the new established ritual of the new holy society of those who call on the Name, which has been poured

into their hearts. Communion, the new pure *θυσία*, is restricted to the holy ones, those who are not holy are called dogs. It is the new sacred food with its restrictions, it is the new Holy of Holies. Those having part on it need to purify, mostly by confession of their inner impurities. The defiling source are the quarrels.

Barnabas

This epistle is the first one that consciously takes the Old Testament ritual practices abandoned by the Church and explains them in the light of the Christian faith. The Church is the new holy temple, they are like the pure animals who ruminate on God's word and their divided hoofs signal their presence in both eons, the present one as well as the future one. Sabbath is impossible to sanctify, since only God has the ability to sanctify anything and thus, like many of the mentioned issues, these are only a fore-pictures. The Israel have never understood their true meaning and took them literally, but now that the new Israel is here, these are starting to come their fulfillment.

Common Issues in Holiness

Holiness in all the writings is connected with God in the first place, with his Spirit and with his Son. In the second plane then with the new holy people. Their holiness is derivative and it is a gift. The holiness of the Church is usually depicted by the metaphor of "holy temple". The sanctification happens mostly by contact with people with God, since the Holy Spirit has been poured into their hearts. Out of this holiness then stems the requirement not to defile

the gift by faction fights or unethical living. Holiness is not reached by human effort. The order to divide between holy and impure is kept.

Common Issues in Purity

Purity is not the prerequisite of the sanctification anymore, it is its outcome. Impurity does not threaten the holy, which is more powerful and therefore Jesus touches impure and turns them into saints. External sources of impurity are neutralized. Sacrificially understood blood of Christ is the purifying agent. The main fight is for the heart, which is purified by faith, likewise the conscience. Thus even Gentiles become pure and acceptable offering for God. There is also purity of conduct, which is reached by living out of the strength of the indwelled spirit. Only partially in some writings it is connected with the sexuality. Defiling unions are those with idols and prostitutes.

Bibliography

- Adewuya, J. Ayodeji, *Holiness and Community in 2 Cor 6:14 - 7:1: Paul's View of Communal Holiness in the Corinthian Correspondence*(Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2011)
- Albright, W. F., and C. S. Mann,*Matthew* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1995)
- Altmann, Peter, *Festive Meals in Ancient Israel: Deuteronomy's Identity Politics in Their Ancient Near Eastern Context*(Berlin; New York: Walter De Gruyter Inc, 2011)
- Angel, Joseph L., *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BRILL, 2010)
- Asgeirsson, Jon Ma, and Kristin de Toyer, *From Quest to Q: Festschrift James M. Robinson* (Peeters Publishers, 2000)
- Asting, Ragnar, *Heiligkeit im Urchristentum*(Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930)
- Attridge, Harold W., *Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*(Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989)
- Audet, Jean-Paul, *La Didache: Instructions des Apotres*(J. Gabalda et Cie, 1958)
- Augustine, Saint, *Commentary on the Lord's Sermon on the Mount with Seventeen Related Sermons* (CUA Press, 2010)
- Balabanski, Victoria,*Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew and the Didache* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- Banks, Robert, Ed,*Reconciliation and Hope New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology*, Edition or Printing Not Stated edition (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Pub Co, 1974)

- Barcellona, F. Scorza, *Epistola Di Barnaba* (SEI, 1900)
- Barnard, Leslie William, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background*(Schocken Books, 1966)
- Barnett, Paul, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*(Grand Rapids, Mich: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1997)
- Barth, Markus, *Ephesians: Translation and Commentary on Chapters 4-6* (Garden City, N.Y: Anchor Bible, 1974)
- Barton, Stephen C., *Holiness: Past and Present* (A&C Black, 2003)
- Bauer, Johannes B., *Die Polykarpbriefe* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)
- Bergamelli, Ferdinando, 'Cristo "L'uomo Nuovo" E "L'uomo Perfetto" in Ignazio Di Antiochia (Efesini 20,1; Smirnesi 4,20).', *STUDIA PATRISTICA, Leuven, XXVI* (1993), 103–12
- Berger, Klaus, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament. Teil I: Markus und Parallelen (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 40. Band)*. (Neukirchener, 1972)
- Best, Ernest, '1 Cortinthians 7:14 and Children in the Church.', 12 (1990), 158–66
- Betz, Hans Dieter, *Galatians*, Edition Unstated edition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989)
- , *Plutarch's Theological Writings and Early Christian Literature* (BRILL, 1975)
- , *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain*, First Edition edition (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995)

- Bolten, Johann Adrian, *Der Bericht des Matthäus von Jesu dem Messia* (Altona: Im Verlag bey Johann Heinrich Kaven, 1792)
- Booth, Roger P., *Jesus and the Laws of Purity: Tradition History and Legal History in Mark 7* (JSOT Press, 1986)
- Bovon, Francois, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.3/1, Das Evangelium nach Lukas*(Düsseldorf: Benziger, 1989)
- , *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.3/2, Das Evangelium nach Lukas*(Zürich etc.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger, 1996)
- , *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.3/3, Das Evangelium nach Lukas*(Zürich: Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger, 2001)
- Brent, Allen, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic: A Study of an Early Christian Transformation of Pagan Culture* (Mohr Siebeck, 2006)
- Brower, Kent E., and Andy Johnson, *Holiness and Ecclesiology in the New Testament* (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2007)
- Brox, Norbert, *Der Hirt Des Hermas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991)
- Bruce, F. F., *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, ed. by David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, and Ralph P. Martin, 16th edition (Waco, Tex: Word Books, 1982)
- , *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, 2nd Revised edition edition (Grand Rapids, Mich: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1984)
- Buchanan, George Wesley, *To the Hebrews*, 1st edition (Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday & Co., 1972)

- Buchler, R. A., 'The Law of Purification in Mark VII. 1-23.1', *The Expository Times*, 21 (1909), 34-40
- Buschmann, Gerd, *Das Martyrium Des Polykarp*(Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)
- Pascuzzi, Maria , *Ethics, Ecclesiology and Church Discipline: A Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Corinthians 5*, 32 edition (Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 1997)
- Campbell, J.Y., 'KOINΩNIA and Its Cognates in the New Testament', 51 (1932), 352-80
- Carlston, Charles, 'The Things That Defile (Mark VII. 14) and the Law in Mathew and Mark', *New Testament Studies*, 15 (1968), 75-96 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0028688500018956>>
- Carson, D. A., and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 2nd edition (Grand Rapids, Mich: Zondervan, 2005)
- Celsus, Aulus Cornelius, *De Medicina* (Classics of Medicine Library, 1938)
- Cheung, Alex T., *Idol Food in Corinth: Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999)
- Clark Kee, Howard, 'The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories', *New Testament Studies*, 14 (1968), 232-46
- Collins, Adela Yarbro, and Harold W. Attridge, *Mark: A Commentary*(Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007)
- Anna, Alberto D', 'Sacrificio E Scrittura Nell' Epistola Di Barnaba', *Il Sacrificio Nel Giudaismo E Nel Cristianesimo*, *Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi*, 18 (2001), 181-95

- Columella, Lucius Junius Moderatus, *L. Junius Moderatus Columella Of Husbandry: In Twelve Books: And His Book Concerning Trees* (A. Millar, 1745)
- Conzelmann, Hans, *Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988)
 ———, *First Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*(Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988)
 ———, *Geschichte des Urchristentums*(Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989)
- Cranfield, C. E. B., *Romans: A Shorter Commentary*, Abridged edition (Grand Rapids, Mich: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985)
- Davies, Glenn N., *Faith and Obedience in Romans: A Study in Romans 1-4*(JSOT Press, 1990)
- Davies, W. D., 'Paul and the People of Israel', *New Testament Studies*, 24 (1977), 4–39
- Delling, G., 'Merkmale Der Kirche Nach Dem Neuen Testament', 13 (1966), 297–316
- Delling, Gerhard, *Nun aber sind sie heilig* (Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958)
- Destro, A., and M. Pesce, 'La Normativa Del Levitico: Interpretazioni Ebraiche E Proto Cristiane ', *Annali Di Storia dell'Esegesi*, La purità e il culto nel Levitico. Interpretazioni ebraiche e cristiane, 13 (1996), 15–37
- Dillon, J. T., *Musonius Rufus and Education in the Good Life: A Model of Teaching and Living Virtue*(University Press of America, 2004)
- Dodd, C. H., *Gospel and Law*(Cambridge University Press, 1951)

- Dorian, Nancy, *The Gospel of Thomas: Introduction and Commentary* (BRILL, 2014)
- Douglas, Mary, 'Deciphering a Meal', *Daedalus*, Myth, Symbol, and Culture, 1972, 60–81
 ———, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo*(Psychology Press, 1966)
- Dunn, James D. G., *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*, 1st American ed edition (Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990)
 ———, *New Perspective on Paul: Collected Essays*(Tübingen, Germany: J.C.B. Mohr, 2005)
 ———, *The New Perspective on Paul*, 2 edition (Grand Rapid, Mich: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007)
 ———, *The Parting of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, 2nd edition (London: SCM Press, 2006)
 ———, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, 3 edition (London: SCM Press, 2006)
 ———, *Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 38B, Romans 9-16* (Dallas: Word Books, 1988)
 ———, *Word Biblical Commentary: Volume 38A, Romans 1-8* (Dallas, Tex.: Thomas Nelson, 1988)
 ———, 'Pistis and the Righteous One', *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 40 (2009), 400–402
 ———, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today* (Hymns Ancient and Modern Ltd, 2010)
 ———, 'Baptism in the Spirit: A Response To Pentecostal Scholarship On Luke-Acts', *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 1 (1993), 3–27
 ———, *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135: The Second Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism, Durham, September,*

- 1989 (Mohr Siebeck, 1992)
 ———, 'Spirit-and-Fire Baptism', *Novum Testamentum*, 14 (1972),
 81–92
- Etzold, Otto, *Der Römerbrief, Der Gemeinde Neu
 Erschlossen* (Brunnquell-Verl. der Bibel- u. Missions-Stiftung,
 1970)
- Evans, Craig A., Ralph P. Martin, and Lynn A. Losie, *Word Biblical
 Commentary Vol. 34b, Mark 8:27-16:20* (Nashville: Thomas
 Nelson, 2001)
- Faas, Patrick, *Around the Roman Table: Food and Feasting in
 Ancient Rome*, trans. by Shaun Whiteside, 1 edition
 (Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 2005)
- Falconer, Robert Alexander, '1 Timothy 2:14,15: Interpretative
 Notes', 60 (1941), 375–79
- Fee, Gordon D., 'II Corinthians Vi. 14–vii. 1 and Food Offered to
 Idols', *New Testament Studies*, 23 (1977), 140–61
 ———, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1st edition (Grand
 Rapids, Mich: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987)
- Ferguson, Everett, 'Baptism according to Origen', *EQ*, 78 (2006),
 117–35
 ———, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and
 Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* (Wm. B. Eerdmans
 Publishing, 2009)
- Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler, *Jesus: Miriam's Child, Sophia's
 Prophet: Critical Issues in Feminist Christology* (Bloomsbury
 Publishing USA, 1994)
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *First Corinthians*, 1st Edition edition (New
 Haven ; London: Yale University Press, 2008)
 ———, *First Corinthians*, 1st Edition edition (New Haven; London:

Yale University Press, 2008)
 ———, *Romans* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1993)
 ———, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, 1998)
 ———, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, 1st edition (Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday & Co., 1982)
 ———, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* (New Haven, Conn. u.a.: Yale University Press, 1985)

Foerster, W., 'ΕϋΣbeia in Den Pastoralbriefen', *New Testament Studies*, 5 (1959), 213–18

Fredriksen, Paula, 'Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel', *New Testament Studies*, 56 (2010), 232–52
 ———, 'Paul, Purity, and the Ekklesia of Gentiles', in *The Beginnings of Christianity* (Jerusalem, 2005), pp. 205–17
 ———, 'Paul's Letter to the Romans, the Ten Commandments, Andpagan "Justification by Faith"', 133 (2014), 801–8

Friderichsen, Anton, 'Hagios-Qados. Ein Beitrag Zu Den Voruntersuchungen Zur Christlichen Begriffsgeschichte; Friderichsen, Anton'

Garland, David E., *The Intention of Matthew 23* (Brill Archive, 1979)

Gaugler, Ernst, *Die Heiligung Im Zeugnis Der Schrift* (Bern, 1948)

Gnilka, Joachim, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Zürich etc.: Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978)
 ———, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.2/2, Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Zürich u.a.: Benziger, 1999)

Barbara K. Gold, John F. Donahue, *Roman Dining: A Special Issue of The American Journal of Philology* (Baltimore: Johns

Hopkins University Press, 2005)

Gould, Elizabeth Porter, *St. Mark*, 1 edition (Edinburgh: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2000)

Grant, Robert M., *Second-Century Christianity, Revised and Expanded: A Collection of Fragments*, 2 edition (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003)

Andrew Gregory, Christopher Tuckett, *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, 1 edition (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006)

———, *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

Grocock, Christopher, C. W. Grocock, and Sally Grainger, *Apicius, A Critical Edition with an Introduction and English Translation* (Totnes England: Prospect Books, 2006)

Gräßer, Erich, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.17/1, An die Hebräer* (Zürich: Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger, 1990)

———, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.17/2, An die Hebräer* (Zürich: Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger, 1993)

———, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.17/3, An die Hebräer* (Zürich: Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger, 1997)

Guelich, Robert A., *Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 34a, Mark 1-8:26 (guelich)*, 498pp (Dallas, Tex.: Thomas Nelson, 1989)

Guthrie, Donald, *New Testament Theology*, First Edition edition (Leicester, England ; Downers Grove, Ill: IVP Academic, 1981)

Haber, Susan, *They Shall Purify Themselves: Essays on Purity in*

Early Judaism, ed. by Adele Reinhartz, 1st Edition edition
(Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008)

Hagner, Donald A., *Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 33a, Matthew 1-13 (hagner)*, 483pp (Dallas, Tex.: Thomas Nelson, 1993)

Hagner, Donald A., *Conflicts and Challenges in Early Christianity* (A&C Black, 1999)

Harrington, Hannah K., *Holiness: Rabbinic Judaism in the Graeco-Roman World* (London; New York: Routledge, 2001)

Harris, Gerald, 'The Beginnings of Church Discipline: 1 Corinthians 5', *New Testament Studies*, 37 (1991), 1-21

Havelkova, Eliska, 'Eschatologický Sabat v Žd 3,7-4,11 a Bar 15', *Studie a Texty Evangelické Teologické Fakulty*, 24 (2014), 57-82

———, 'Vegetariánství v římském Sboru 50 Let 1. Století.', in *Jednota v Mnohosti* (presented at the Jednota v mnohosti, Olomouc: Fórum Velehrad X., Refugium, 2014)

———, 'Ritualni Zakony v Barnabasove Epistole', in *Jednota v Mnohosti* (presented at the Jednota v Mnohosti, Bratislava: UKB, 2012)

Hayes, Christine, 'Review of HYAM MACCOBY. *Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and Its Place in Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Pp. 231.', *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 93 (2002), 286-92

Hengel, Martin, and C. K. Barrett, *Conflicts and Challenges in Early Christianity*, ed. by Donald Alfred Hagner, annotated edition edition (Harrisburg, Pa: Bloomsbury 3PL, 1999)

Hipkiss, Robert A., *Semantics: Defining the Discipline* (Routledge, 2014)

Hodge, Mr Charles, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*,

New issue of 1886 ed edition (Grand Rapids, Mich: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1950)

Hodgson, R.JR, '1 Thess 4,1 – 12 and the Holiness Tradition', *SBL Seminar Papers*, 1982, 199–215

Hofius, Otfried, *Der Vorhang VOR Dem Thron Gottes: Eine Exegetisch-Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung Zu Hebraer 6,19 F. Und 10,19 F*(Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1972)

———, *Katapausis: Die Vorstellung vom endzeitl. Ruheort im Hebräerbrief*(Mohr (Siebeck), 1970)

Hofmann, Thomas R., *Realms of Meaning: An Introduction to Semantics*(Longman, 1993)

Holl, Karl, *Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde* (de Gruyter[in Komm.], 1921)

Holleman, Joost, *Resurrection and Parousia: A Tradition-Historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15* (BRILL, 1996)

Holtz, Traugott, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.13, Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*(Zürich: Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger, 1998)

Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm, *Das Angeld des Geistes: Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie*(Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992)

Howard, George, *Paul: Crisis in Galatia: A Study in Early Christian Theology*, 2 edition (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Hundley, Michael B., 'Sacred Spaces, Objects, Offerings, and People in the Priestly Texts: A Reappraisal', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 132 (2013), 749–67

- Hur, Ju, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield Academic Press, 2001)
- Hutson, Ch.R., "'Saved through Childbearing" The Jewish Context of 1 Timothy 2:15', 56 (2014), 392–410
- Hvalvik, Reidar, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century ... Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 2.Reihe*(Tübingen: Coronet Books Inc., 1996)
- III, Ben Witherington, *1 and 2 Thessalonians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*(Grand Rapids, Mich: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2006)
- Ivarsson, Fredrik, 'A Man Has To Do What A Man Has To Do. Protocols of Masculine Sexual Behaviour and 1 Corinthians 5-7', in *Identity Formation in the New Testament, Ed. by Bengt Holmberg and Mikael Winninge* , WUNT, I , 2008, xxii
- Jackson, Howard, *Words and Their Meaning* (Longman, 1988)
- James, William, *The Varieties Of Religious Experience: A Study In Human Nature*(Lexington, KY: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2009)
- Jaubert, A., 'Themes Levitiques Dans La Prima Clementis', *VigChr*18 (1964), 193–203
- Jefford, Clayton N., *The Apostolic Fathers and the New Testament* (Baker Books, 2006)
- , *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission* (BRILL, 1995)
- Jenni, Ernst, and Claus Westermann, *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, 7th edn (Gütersloher

Verlagshaus, 2001)

Jensen, Joseph, 'Does Porneia Mean Fornication ? A Critique of Bruce Malina', *Novum Testamentum*, 20 (1978), 161–84

Jenson, Philip Peter, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World* (A&C Black, 1992)

Jewett, Robert, *Romans: A Commentary*, Second Impression edition (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006)

Johnson, Alan F., *1 Corinthians*(Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2010)

Johnson, Ken, *Ancient Epistles of Timothy and Titus*(CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2013)

Johnson, William Stacy, and John H. Leith, *Reformed Reader: A Sourcebook in Christian Theology: Volume 1: Classical Beginnings, 1519-1799*(Westminster John Knox Press, 1993)

Josephus, Flavius, *The Antiquities of the Jews (Start Classics)* (Start Classics, 2013)

Keck, L. E., 'The Poor Among the Saints in the New Testament', 56 (1965), 100–129

Keener, Craig S., *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power*(Hendrickson Publishers, 1997)

Kim, Seyoon, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2002)

———, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2002)

Kirschner, Robert, 'The Vocation of Holiness in Late

Antiquity', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 38 (1984), 105–24

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10th edition (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1984)

Käsemann, Ernst, *Commentary on Romans* (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1994)

———, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk. Eine Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief. Von Ernst Käsemann. (= Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Herausgegeben von Dr. Rudolf Bultmann, Neue Folge, Heft 37. Der ganzen Reihe Heft 55).* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961)

———, *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970)

———, *Paulinische Perspektiven* (Mohr Siebeck, 1969)

Klassen, William, 'The Sacred Kiss in the New Testament: An Example of Social Boundary Lines', *New Testament Studies*, 39 (1993), 122–35

Klawans, Jonathan, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (OUP USA, 2009)

Kloppenborg, John S., *Synoptic Problems: Collected Essays* (Mohr Siebeck, 2014)

Knox, John, 'Romans 15,14 – 33 and Paul's Conception of His Apostolic Mission', 83 (1964), 1–11

Koester, Craig R., *Hebrews* (New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, 2001)

Kruger, Michael J., *The Gospel of the Savior: An Analysis of P. Oxy. 840 and Its Place in the Gospel Traditions of Early Christianity* (BRILL, 2005)

- Kruse, Heinz, 'Gemeinschaft Der Heiligen', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 47 (1993), 246–59
- Kulzer, Linda, *Purity of Heart in Early Ascetic and Monastic Literature: Essays in Honor of Juana Raasch, O.S.B.*, ed. by Harriet Luckman (Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1999)
- Kuss, Otto, *Der Römerbrief* (F. Pustet, 1963)
- Lachs, Samuel Tobias, 'Hebrew Elements in the Gospels and Acts', *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 71 (1980), 31–43
- Ladislav Tichý, Dominik Opatrný, 'Apoštol Pavel a Písmo ¢ : Sborník Příspěvků Z Konference /'
- Lanci, John R., *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery* (New York: Peter Lang International Academic Publishers, 1997)
- Landovska/Havelkova, Eliska, 'From Clean Hands to Clean Heart', in *Wichtige Wendepunkte//Pivotal Turns, Beihefte Zur Ökumenischen Rundschau*, 98 (presented at the Verändernde und sich ändernde Traditionen in Zeiten des Umbruchs //Transforming Traditions in Times of Transition, Elod Hodossy-Takács | Leo J. Koffeman, 2014), pp. 57–67
- Lane, William L., *Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 47a, Hebrews 1-8* (Dallas, Tex.: Thomas Nelson, 1991)
- , *Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 47b, Hebrews 9-13* (Dallas, Tex.: Thomas Nelson, 1991)
- Lightfoot, Joseph Barber, Clement I. (Pope.), Saint Ignatius (Bishop of Antioch), Saint Polycarp (Bishop of Smyrna.), and John Reginald Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers ...* (Macmillan and Company, 1898)
- , Saint Ignatius (Bishop of Antioch), and Saint Polycarp (Bishop of Smyrna.), *The Apostolic Fathers ...: S. Ignatius.*

S. Polycarp. Revised Texts, with Introductions, Dissertations, and Translations. 1885. 3 v(Macmillan and co., 1885)

Lincoln, Andrew T., 'Luke and Jesus' Conception: A Case of Double Paternity?', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 132 (2013), 639–58

Liu, Yulin, *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians* (Mohr Siebeck, 2013)

Loader, William R. G., *Jesus' Attitude Towards the Law: A Study of the Gospels*(Mohr Siebeck, 1997)

Lona, Horacio E., *Der Erste Clemensbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

Longenecker, Richard N., *Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 41, Galatians* (Dallas, Tex.: Thomas Nelson, 1990)

Luckman, Harriet, and Linda Kulzer, *Purity of Heart in Early Ascetic and Monastic Literature: Essays in Honor of Juana Raasch, O.S.B.* (Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1999)

Luther, Martin, *Commentary on Romans* (Kregel Publications, 2003)

Luz, Ulrich, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.1/1, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*(Zürich; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger Vlg., Düsseldorf, 1997)

———, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.1/2, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*(Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger, 1999)

———, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.1/3, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*(Zürich u.a.: Benziger, 1997)

———, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.1/4 Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, MT 26-28*(Zürich; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger, 2002)

- Luz, Ulrich, and Helmut Koester, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007)
 ———, *Matthew 21-28: A Commentary*, trans. by James E. Crouch (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishing, 2005)
- Maccoby, Hyam, *Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and Its Place in Judaism* (Cambridge University Press, 2009)
 ———, 'The Washing of the Cups', 14 (1982), 3-15
- MacDonald, Nathan, *Not Bread Alone: The Uses of Food in the Old Testament*(Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)
 ———, *What Did the Ancient Israelites Eat?: Diet in Biblical Times* (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2008)
- Malherbe, Abraham J., *The Letters to the Thessalonians* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004)
- Malina, Bruce, 'Does Proneia Mean Fornication? ', 14 (1972), 10-18
- Mann, C. S., *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st edition (Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday & Co., 1986)
 ———, *Matthew: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st edition (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1971)
- Marcus, Joel, *Mark 1-8*, 1ST edition (New Haven Conn.: Yale University Press, 2002)
 ———, *Mark 8-16* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009)
- Martin, Dale B., *The Corinthian Body*, New edition edition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999)
- Martin, Ralph P., *Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 40, 2 Corinthians (martin)*, 591pp (Waco, Tex: Thomas Nelson, 1985)

- Martyn, J. Louis, *Galatians*(New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004)
- Matz, David, *Daily Life of the Ancient Romans*(Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002)
- Mearns, C. L., 'Early Eschatological Development in Paul: The Evidence of I and II Thess.', *New Testament Studies*, 27 (1981), 137–57
- Meier, John P., 'John the Baptist in Matthew's Gospel', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 99 (1980), 383–405
- Meshel, N., 'Toward a Grammar of Sacrifice: Hierarchic Patterns in the Israelite Sacrificial System', 132 (2013), 543–67
- Meshel, Naphtali S., *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*, 1 edition (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2008)
- Milavec, Aaron, *The Didache: Faith, Hope, & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50-70 C.E.*(Paulist Press, 2003)
- Milgrom, Jacob, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st edition (New York: Anchor Bible, 1998)
- , *Leviticus 17-22* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2000)
- , *Leviticus 23-27* (New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2001)
- Miller, Patrick D., *The Religion of Ancient Israel*(Westminster John Knox Press, 2000)
- Moffatt, James, *Hebrews* (A&C Black, 1924)
- Montague, G.T., *The Holy Spirit: The Growth of a Biblical Tradition*,

Paulist (New York, 1976)

Morris, Leon, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, Revised edition (United States: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2009)

Mounce, William D., *Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 46, Pastoral Epistles*, ed. by Ralph P. Martin (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000)

Muirhead, I.A., 'The Bride of Christ', 5 (1952), 175–87

Murphy O'Connor, 'Works Without Faith in I Cor.,VII,\$', 84 (1977), 349–61

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome, *Keys to First Corinthians* (Oxford University Press, 2009)

Müller, Gerhard, and Gerhard Krause, *TRE* (Walter de Gruyter, 1985)

Jacob Neusner, *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities, Part 22: The Mishnaic System of Uncleaness: Its Context and History* (Eugene, Or.: Wipf & Stock Pub, 2007)

———, *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities, Part 3: Kelim: Literary and Historical Problems* (Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2006)

———, 'First Cleanse the Inside. The "Halakhic" Background of a Controversy Saying. ', 22 (1975), 486–95

———, *Judaism When Christianity Began: A Survey of Belief and Practice* (Westminster John Knox Press, 2002)

———, *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism: The Haskell Lectures, 1972-1973* (Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2006)

———, *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (Yale University Press, 1991)

- Newton, Michael, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- Niederwimmer, Kurt, *The Didache* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998)
- Nolland, John, *Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 35a, Luke 1:1-9:20* (Dallas, Tex.: Thomas Nelson, 1989)
 ———, *Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 35b, Luke 9:21-18:34 (nolland), 501pp* (Dallas, Tex.: Thomas Nelson, 1993)
- Novakovic, Lidija, *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick: A Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew* (Mohr Siebeck, 2003)
- Nygren, Anders, *Der Römerbrief* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959)
- Obeng, E.A., 'The Origins of the Spirit Intercession Motif in Paul ', 32 (1986), 621–32
- Ogereau, J. M., "'The Jerusalem Collection as Κοινωνία: Paul's Global Politics of Socio-Economic Equality and Solidarity'", 58 (2012)
- OP, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul the Letter-Writer: His World, His Options, His Skills* (Collegeville, Minn: Michael Glazier, 1994)
- OSB, Kilian McDonnell, and George Montague SM, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Second Revised Edition, Second Edition, Revised edition* (Collegeville, Minn: Michael Glazier, 1991)
- Osiek, Carolyn, *The Shepherd of Hermas* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999)

- O'Brien, P. T., 'Thanksgiving and the Gospel in Paul', *New Testament Studies*, 21 (1974), 144–55
- O'Brien, Peter, John D. W. Watts, and Ralph P. Martin, *Colossians-Philemon, Volume 44*, ed. by David Allen Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker (Zondervan, 2014)
- O'Rourke Boyle, Marjorie, 'Pure of Heart: From Ancient Rites to Renaissance Plato', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 63 (2002), 41–62
- Paget, James Carleton, *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background* (Mohr Siebeck, 1994)
- Pani, Giancarlo, 'Culto E Purità Rituale Nella Lettera Ai Romani: Lefèvre d'Étaples, Erasmo E Lutero', *La Purità E Il Culto Nel Levitico. Interpretazioni Ebraiche E Cristiane*, *Annali di storia d'esegesi*, 13 (1996), 257–89
- Paschen, Wilfried, *Rein und Unrein: Untersuchung Zur Biblischen Wortgeschichte* (Kösel-Verlag, 1970)
- Pastor, Jack, and Menachem Mor, *The Beginnings of Christianity: A Collection of Articles* (Yerushalayim: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2005)
- Penna, Romano, *Le prime comunità cristiane: persone, tempi, luoghi, forme, credenze* (Carocci, 2011)
- Pernveden, Lage, *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas* (Gleerup, 1966)
- Pervo, Richard I., and Harold W. Attridge, *ACTS: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008)
- Pesch, Rudolf, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.5/1, Die Apostelgeschichte* (Zürich: Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger, 1995)

- Öhler, Markus, 'Cultic Meals in Association and the Early Christian Eucharist', *Early Christianity*, 5 (2014), 475–502
- Peterson, David, *Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*(Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- Peterson, David G., *Possessed by God: A New Testament Theology of Sanctification and Holiness* (Leicester, England : Downers Grove, Ill: IVP Academic, 2001)
- Pierce, C. A., *Conscience in the New Testament* (London: SCM-Canterbury Press Ltd, 1955)
- Plummer, Alfred, *2 Corinthians*, 1 edition (Edinburgh: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2000)
 ———, *St. Luke*, 5 edition (Edinburgh: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2000)
- Poorthuis, Marcel, and Joshua J. Schwartz, *Purity and Holiness* (Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 1999)
- Porter, S.E, and Stanley E. Porter, *Paul and His Theology* (Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2006)
- Porter, Stanley E., 'What Does It Mean to Be "Saved by Childbirth" (1 Timothy 2.15)?', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 15 (1993), 87–102
- Pratscher, Wilhelm, *Der Zweite Clemensbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007)
- Prinzivalli, E., and M. Simonetti, *Seguendo Gesù. Testi cristiani delle origini: 1*(Rome, Italy : Milan, Italy: Mondadori, 2010)
- Prostmeier, Ferdinand Rupert, *Der Barnabasbrief*(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999)

- Puente, Carolina Núñez, *Feminism and Dialogics: Charlotte Perkins, Meridel Le Sueur, Mikhail M. Bakhtin* (Universitat de València, 2011)
- Purcell, Nicholas, 'The Way We Used to Eat: Diet, Community, and History at Rome', *American Journal of Philology*, 124 (2003), 329–58
- Quinn, Jerome D., *The Letter to Titus* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005)
- R. A., Wild, S.J., 'The Encounter Between Pharisaic and Christian Judaism: Some Early Gospel Evidence', XXVII (1985), 105–24
- Radl, Walter, 'Kult Und Evangelium Bei Paulus', 31 (1987), 58–75
- Raisanen, Heikki, *Challenges to Biblical Interpretation: Collected Essays, 1991-2000* (Leiden ; Boston: Brill Academic Pub, 2001)
- Reasoner, Mark, *The Strong and the Weak: Romans 14.1-15.13 in Context* (Cambridge University Press, 1999)
- Rescio, Mara , and Luigi Walt, "'There Is Nothing Unclean": Jesus and Paul against the Politics of Purity?', *ASE* , 29 (2012), 53–82
- Rhodes, James N., *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident* (Mohr Siebeck, 2004)
- Kent H. Richards, *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 1982* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982)
- Ridderbos, Herman, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1997)

- Riesner, Rainer, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem. Neue Funde und Quellen*, Auflage: 2., erweiterte Auflage. (Giessen: Brunnen, 1998)
- Räisänen, Heikki, 'Jesus and the Food Laws: Reflections on Mk 7,15', 16 (1982), 79–100
- Rissi, Mathias, *Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs: ihre Verankerung in der Situation des Verfassers und seiner Leser* (Mohr Siebeck, 1987)
- Robertson, C. K., *Conflict in Corinth: Redefining the System* (New York: Peter Lang International Academic Publishers, 2001)
- Robinson, Theodore Henry, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1964)
- Roloff, Jürgen, *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)
- Rordorf, Willy, *Der Sonntag: Geschichte Des Ruhe Und Gottesdiensttages Im Alttesten Christentum* (Zwingli, 1962)
- Rosner, Brian S., "'Drive out the Wicked Person" A Biblical Theology of Exclusion', 71 (1999), 25–36
 ———, Rosner, Brian, S., 'Temple and Holiness in 1. Corinthians 5', *Tyndale Bulletin*, 42 (1991), 137–45
- Sampley, J. Paul, Richard B. Hays, Judith Gundry-Volf, Morna Hooker, and Andrew T. Lincoln, *The New Interpreter's Bible* : *Second Corinthians - Philemon* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000)
- Sanders, E. P., *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 Bce-66 Ce* (London : Philadelphia: Trinity Pr Intl, 1992)
 ———, *Paul* (New York: Sterling, 2009)
 ———, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of*

- Religion*, 1st Paperback Edition edition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977)
- , *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Fortress Press, 2009)
- Sanders, Jack T., *The Jews in Luke-Acts*, 1st Fortress Press ed edition (Philadelphia: Fortress Pr, 1987)
- , 'Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letters of the Pauline Corpus', 81.4 (1962), 348–62
- Van de Sandt, Huub, "'Do Not Give What Is Holy to the Dogs" (Did 9:5D and Matt 7:6A): The Eucharistic Food of the Didache in Its Jewish Purity Setting', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 56 (2002), 223–46
- , 'Why Does the Didache Conceive of the Eucharist as a Holy Meal?', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 65 (2011), 1–20
- Schenck, Kenneth L., *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews: The Settings of the Sacrifice* (Cambridge University Press, 2007)
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich, *Schleiermacher: On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers* (Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- Schmeller, Thomas, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament* (Neukirchen-Vluyn : Ostfildern: Patmos Verlag, 2010)
- Schmid, Josef, J Blinzler, O Kuss, and F Mussner, *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze. Festschrift für ... Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag* (Regensburg, 1963)
- Schmithals, Walter, *Der Römerbrief. Ein Kommentar* (Gütersloh: Guetersloher Verlagshaus, 1994)
- Schneider, Bernardin, 'Κατα Πνευμα Αγιοσυνης (Romans 1,4)', *Biblica*, 48 (1967), 359–87

- Schnelle, Udo, *Paulus: Leben Und Denken* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003)
- Schoedel, William, and Helmut Koester, *Ignatius of Antioch* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985)
- Schrage, Wolfgang, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.7/1, Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Zürich u.a.: Benziger, 1991)
- , *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, EKK, Bd.7/2, Der erste Brief an die Korinther*(Zürich: Benziger, 1995)
- Schwarz, Günther, 'MATTHÄUS VII 13a', *Novum Testamentum*, 12 (1970), 229–32
- Schweizer, Eduard, *Der Brief an die Kolosser [von Eduard Schweizer]*, 1. Auflage. (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1979)
- Scrofani, Giorgio, *La religione impura. La riforma di Giuliano imperatore*(Brescia: Paideia, 2010)
- Seifrid, Mark A., *Justification by Faith: The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme* (BRILL, 1992)
- Sellin, Gerhard, "Die Auferstehung Ist Schon Geschehen" Zur Spiritualisierung Apokalyptischer Terminologie Im Neuen Testament', *Novum Testamentum*, 25 (1983), 220–37
- Shafer-Elliott, Cynthia, *Food in Ancient Judah: Domestic Cooking in the Time of the Hebrew Bible* (Sheffield, U.K. ; Bristol, CT: Routledge, 2013)
- Silva, M., 'Semantic Borrowing in the New Testament', *New Testament Studies*, 22 (1975), 104–10

- Simonetti, Manlio, and Emanuela Prinzivalli, *Letteratura cristiana antica: antologia di testi* (Piemme, 1998)
 ———, *Storia della letteratura cristiana antica* (EDB, 2010)
- Smith, David Raymond, 'Hand This Man Over to Satan': Curse, Exclusion and Salvation in 1 Corinthians 5 (Bloomsbury Academic, 2009)
- Stadler, Kurt, *Das Werk Des Geistes in Der Heiligung Bei Paulus* (EVZ Verlag, 1962)
- Stendahl, Krister, 'The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 56 (1963), 199–215
- Stettler, Hanna, 'Sanctification in the Jesus Tradition', *Biblica*, 85 (2004), 153–78
- Stuhlmacher, Peter, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (Westminster John Knox Press, 1994)
- Sweeney, James, 'Jesus, Paul, and the Temple: An Exploration of Some Patterns of Continuity.', 46 (2003), 605–31
- Theissen, Gerd, *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion* (London: SCM Press, 2003)
 ———, *Social Reality and the Early Christians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Publishers, 2001)
- Thompson, James W., 'Hebrews 9 and Hellenistic Concepts of Sacrifice', 98 (1972), 567–78
- Thrall, Margaret E., '2 Corinthians 1,12 ΑΓΙΟΤΗΤΙ or ΑΠΛΟΤΗΤΙ ▪ ?', in *Studies in the NT Language and Text*, NovT Sup, 44, ed J.K. Elliot (Leiden-Brill, 1976), pp. 366–72

- , 'The Pauline Use of Συνειδησις', *New Testament Studies*, 14 (1967), 118–25
- , 'The Problem of II Cor. Vi. 14–vii. I in Some Recent Discussion', *New Testament Studies*, 24 (1977), 132–48
- Van Stempvoort, P. A., 'Eine Stilistische Lösung Einer Alten Schwierigkeit In 1. Thess. V. 23', *New Testament Studies*, 7 (1961), 262–65
- Tompson, J.W., 'Hebrews 9 and Hellenistic Concepts of Sacrifice ', 98 (1979), 567–78
- Toney, Carl N., *Paul's Inclusive Ethic: Resolving Community Conflicts and Promoting Mission in Romans 14-15* (Mohr Siebeck, 2008)
- Trench, R. C., *Trench's Synonyms of the New Testament* (Baker Books, 2000)
- Ulrichs, Karl Friedrich, *Christusglaube: Studien zum Syntagma pistis Christou und zum paulinischen Verständnis von Glaube und Rechtfertigung* (Mohr Siebeck, 2007)
- Unnik van, W., '1 Clement 34 and the "Sanctus,"' *VC*, 5 (1951), 340–41
- Varkey, Wilson, *Role of the Holy Spirit in Protestant Systematic Theology*(Langham Creative Projects)
- Vielhauer, Philipp, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter*(Walter de Gruyter, 1978)
- Vincent, Marvin R., *Philippians and Philemon*, 1 edition (Edinburgh: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2000)

- Visscher, Gerhard H., *Romans 4 and the New Perspective on Paul: Faith Embraces the Promise*, First printing edition (New York: Peter Lang International Academic Publishers, 2009)
- Vouga, François, *Teologie Nového zákona*, Nakladatelství MLÝN
- Vööbus, Arthur, *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache*(ETSE, 1968)
- Wainwright, Elaine M., *Towards a Feminist Critical Reading of the Gospel according to Matthew* (Walter de Gruyter, 1991)
- Walter, Nikolaus, 'Christusglaube Und Heidnische Religiosität In Paulinischen Gemeinden', *New Testament Studies*, 25 (1979), 422–42
- Warren, Meredith J. C., *My Flesh Is Meat Indeed: A Nonsacramental Reading of John 6:51-58* (Fortress Press, 2015)
- Wells, Jo Bailey, *God's Holy People: A Theme in Biblical Theology*(Sheffield, England: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2000)
- Wendebourg, Nicola, *Der Tag des Herrn: zur Gerichtserwartung im Neuen Testament auf ihrem alttestamentlichen und frühjüdischen Hintergrund* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2003)
- Wevers, John William, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta, Ga: Society of Biblical Literature, 1993)
- White, Benjamin L., 'The Eschatological Conversion of "All the Nations" in Matthew 28.19-20: (Mis)reading Matthew through Paul', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 36 (2014), 353–82
- Wilckens, U., *Der Brief an Die Römer* (Benziger Verlag, 1978)
 ———, *Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen*

Testament, EKK, Bd.6/3, Der Brief an die Römer: TEILBD VI/3(Zürich, 1989)

Williams, David J., *Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character*, Reprint edition (s.l.: Baker Academic, 2003)

Willis, Wendell Lee, *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10* (Scholars Press, 1985)

Windisch, Hans, *Der Barnabasbrief* (Nabu Press, 2011)

Wolter, Michael, *Paulus: Ein Grundriss seiner Theologie*, 1st edn (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2011)

Wright, N. T., *Paul: In Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2009)

Wynne-Tyson, Esme, *Porphyry On Abstinence From Animal Food* (Kessinger Publishing, 2006)

Yerkes, Royden Keith, *Sacrifice: In Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism* (Charles Scribner, 1952)

Yinger, Kent L., *The New Perspective on Paul: An Introduction* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2011)

Young, Frances Margaret, *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom*(Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979)

Young, N. H., 'The Gospel According to Hebrews 9', 27 (1981), 198–210

Yulin, Liu, *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2013)

Zetterholm, Magnus, 'Purity and Anger: Gentiles and Idolatry in

Antioch', *International Journal of Research on Religion*, 1
(2005), 3-24

Zocca, Elena, *Dai 'santi' al santo: un percorso storico- linguistico
intorno all'idea di santità* : Africa romana, secc. II-
V (Studium, 2003)